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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, June 21, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Michael K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

MEDICAID

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

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

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

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

But thanks to Medicare, we changed all of that, providing guaranteed health insurance coverage to our Nation’s seniors. As a result, the senior poverty rate decreased by 75 percent. But our retirees once again face that nightmare scenario as the Republican budget plan for fiscal year 2012 seeks to eliminate Medicare for everyone 54 years and younger and force future retirees into finding insurance in the private market—the private market which could choose not to offer them coverage at all. Many seniors will be forced to pay more for health insurance; many seniors won’t find any coverage.

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

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

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

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

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

True fiscal responsibility requires a firm commitment and shared sacrifice. It involves long-term focus to rein in and reduce spending in a responsible, sustained manner. Real fiscal discipline requires us to look at every area of the budget, including revenues, savings, efficiencies, and cuts where
necessary. Ultimately, the budget represents our Nation’s priorities. Reducing deficits is a significant priority, and as my constituents in the 11th District of Virginia have made clear, protecting seniors and their Medicare is equally significant.

WARNING: LIGHTBULBS DANGEROUS TO YOUR HEALTH

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

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

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

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

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

1. Carefully scoop up glass fragments and powder using stiff paper or cardboard and place debris in a plastic bag. (NOTE: Since a plastic bag will not prevent the mercury vapor from escaping, remove the plastic bag(s) from the home after cleanup.)

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

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

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

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

   - Promptly place all bulb debris and cleanup materials, including vacuum cleaner bags, outdoors in a trash container or protected area until materials can be disposed of properly. Check with your local or state government about disposal requirements in your area. Some states and communities require fluorescent bulbs (broken or unbroken) be taken to a local recycling center.

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

5. Continue to air out the room where the bulb was broken and leave the heating and air conditioning system shut off for several hours. This is the only part of the job that is really important. The EPA has provided more detailed instructions on its Web site, and I submit this 3-page, single-spaced, typed document of over 1,000 words on how to clean up one of these light bulbs if it’s broken into the RECORD. Mr. Speaker.

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

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

None of these bulbs are made in the U.S.A. In fact, the light bulb that I just read off of says “Made in China.” That’s right. Our industry that began all the way back to Thomas Edison.

So these job-producing light bulb factories have been shipped off to China and now to Mexico, leaving even more manufacturing over here. In fact, the light bulb that I just read off of says that it is made in China, and it’s in several languages, of course.

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

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

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

So it’s time we repeal the unconstitutional job-killing, bad-for-your-health light bulb mandate. Otherwise, it looks like we’ll be singing “the party’s over” to the incandescent light bulb. “Because they say that all good things must end. Call it a night. The party’s over. And tomorrow starts the same old thing again.”
glass remains after all other cleanup steps have been taken. (NOTE: It is possible that vacuuming could spread mercury-containing powder or mercury vapor, although available information on this problem is limited.) If vacuuming is needed to ensure removal of all broken glass, keep the following tips in mind: Keep a window or door to the outdoors open; where the bulb was broken using the vacuum hose, if available; and remove the vacuum bag (or empty and wipe the canister) and seal the bag/vacuum debris, and any materials used to clean the vacuum, in a plastic bag.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE TO PREVENT BROKEN COMPACT FLUORESCENT LIGHT BULBS

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

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

Always handle CFL bulbs carefully to avoid breakage.

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

Gently screw in the CFL until snug. Do not overtighten.

Never forcefully twist the glass tubing.

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

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

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

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

INVEST IN THE FUTURE OF OUR NATION

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

Mr. DeFAZIO. We’ve seen some pretty miserable employment numbers recently, but the real unemployment rate is actually about twice what you read in the paper. It’s closer to 18 percent, with discouraged workers and people who are underemployed. Now, commissions send us to Washington for solutions? On the Republican side of the aisle, the answer is simple: more tax cuts. That will put people back to work. Let’s see, for 10 years now, we’ve been living under the Bush tax cuts; and we’ve got the Republican creation for the last decade since World War II. Now, it doesn’t seem to be working too well, but it is all based on the theory of trickle-down. But I think at this point, the American people have been tricked on so much, particularly those who are unemployed and looking for work, that they’d like an umbrella and they’d like a little shelter from these nonsensical policies.

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

Last December, the President caved, went along with extending the Bush tax cuts, and we’ve still got miserable job creation. Oh, wow, that’s a surprise. Now they’ve floated a balloon. The White House has a great new idea. Let’s continue the Social Security tax holiday. That was added to the Bush tax cuts in December. That’s created a lot of jobs. Sure, working families can use an extra $1,000 a week. But what about the 20 million people who are unemployed? They don’t get any of that. And how much of that $15 a week, how many jobs does that create? But the White House thinks we should extend that, and maybe we should give it on the employer side too.

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

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

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

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

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

IN RECOGNITION OF TWO MEN FROM HOBBS, NEW MEXICO

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

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

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

I think that also is a function community participation at all levels. From his one small congregation there in Hobbs, New Mexico, we have city counselors, county commissioners, judges, two State representatives, a State senator, and a U.S. Congressman. Now, that says a lot, coming from one small corner of the State of New Mexico. But his life didn’t end there. He also had two missionaries check in
from very difficult parts of the world. They were on Skype and checked in at the ceremony, saying that if it hadn’t been for his teachings, that they would not have been there.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE BARBER OF BIRMINGHAM

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the directors for their wonder- ful rendition of Mr. James Armstrong’s life, a Birmingham legend and civil rights activist.

This documentary celebrates the thousands of foot soldiers whose names are not written in the history books, who stand at all of us. I applaud the directors for their wonderful rendition of Mr. James Armstrong’s life.

I applaud Gail Dolgin for her steadfast determination to battle breast cancer while directing and editing the film from her hospice bed in order to submit the film for the Sundance Film Festival. She died 2 weeks prior. I pay homage to Ms. Amelia Boynton of Selma, who was interviewed and provided historical footage for segments of the film. The film also visited and revisited the news footage of the beating of Ms. Amelia Boynton and others that endured beatings on Edmund Pettus Bridge on Bloody Sunday during their march for the Voting Rights Act.

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

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

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

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

As many in this August body will note, our colleague, the Honorable J ohn Lewis of Georgia, was among the foot soldiers of this historic march.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a point of personal privilege. Growing up in Selma, Alabama, I take great pride in paying tribute to a film that not only shares our painful history, but also celebrates our time-tested resilience through the life of James Armstrong and other unsung foot soldiers and heroes. This documentary, which people will be able to see in theaters in New York and Los Angeles in August and September, should motivate us all to protect the right to vote for every single American. The film not only shares our painful history, but also celebrates our time-tested resilience through the life of James Armstrong and other unsung foot soldiers and heroes. This documentary, which people will be able to see in theaters in New York and Los Angeles in August and September, should motivate us all to protect the right to vote for every single American.
I look forward to attending the Capitol Hill premiere tonight and urge all to see The Barber of Birmingham: Foot Soldier of the Civil Rights Movement.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

ECONOMIC DIFFICULTIES WE FACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

Okay. Fooled us once, shame on you. Fooled us on the infrastructure.

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

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

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

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

We found out now that this administration is negotiating with the Taliban; basically, you know, just let us out. We’re negotiating with the Taliban? Did Hoover negotiate with Dillinger, and Dillinger and Clyde? Did Robert Kennedy, as Attorney General, negotiate with the Mob?

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

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

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

For us to be negotiating with the Taliban is a blight on those who have given their lives there. I attended a funeral this weekend of Brad Gaudet, who went down in a helicopter accident on June 5. We owe those people who have given their lives fighting against the Taliban is a blight on those who have given their lives there. I attended a funeral this weekend of Brad Gaudet, who went down in a helicopter accident on June 5. We owe those people who have given their lives fighting against the Taliban—just give them the advisers, the trainers, all that they need, and let them whip the Taliban for us again.

Let’s rearm the Northern Alliance, the people that originally defeated the Taliban—just give them the advisers, the trainers, all that they need, and let them whip the Taliban for us again.

Let’s not negotiate with Dillinger. It makes no sense and we lose credibility.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

NLRB KILLING JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

NLRB KILLING JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

NLRB KILLING JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.
of the Obama administration is a threat to American workers.

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

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO SAVE $50 MILLION FOR TENNESSEE TAXPAYERS

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

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

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

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

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

REPUBLICAN PLAN FOR AMERICA’S JOB CREATORS

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, since President Obama was elected, 2½ million more of our fellow citizens have lost their jobs. Unemployment has now been above 8 percent for 26 straight months, the longest stretch since the Great Depression, and if you look at the underemployment numbers and those who have simply given up, the situation is far worse. The top three credit rating agencies have now all issued warnings about our spending-driven national debt. A recent report by the Bureau of Labor Statistics says that new business startups are at a 17-year low.

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

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

REAL RECOVERY AGENDA

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

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

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m. today. Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

SERGEANT CHRIS DAVIS POST OFFICE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1632

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

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

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

While deployed in Iraq, Sergeant Davis was tragically killed on June 23, 2007, when his unit was attacked by insurgents using an improvised explosive device and small arms fire in Baghdad. He was 35 years old and left behind his wife, Debbie, and two children.
As a Representative from Texas, it is my honor to stand in this Chamber and pay tribute to fellow Texans who have made the ultimate sacrifice courageously defending our country’s freedom. I am truly grateful for the service of Sergeant Chris Davis and for all those who serve and protect us each day. I urge all Members to join me in strong support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve my good friend from south Texas, and I urge the passage of H.R. 1632. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question was taken, and the SPEAKER pro tempore declared the Yeas to have had a majority, and the ayes have it.

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

MARINE SGT. JEREMY E. MURRAY POST OFFICE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 349) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4865 Tallmadge Road in Rootstown, Ohio, as the “Marine Sargent Jeremy E. Murray Post Office.”

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 349

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 349, introduced in the Senate by Senator Sherrard Brown of Ohio, would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4865 Tallmadge Road in Rootstown, Ohio, as the Marine Sgt. Jeremy Murray Post Office.

From a young age, Marine Corps Sergeant Jeremy E. Murray had a strong desire to join the military and to serve his country. According to his mother, Pam Murray, and a Gold Star for his heroic achievements and sacrifice for his country, I urge the swift passage of this measure, which will recognize Sergeant Murray’s contribution to America by naming this postal facility after him.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FARENTHOLD. I again urge all Members to support passage of S. 349.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken.

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

SCHERTZ VETERANS POST OFFICE

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

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

SECTION 1. SCHERTZ VETERANS POST OFFICE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

This is unacceptable and we can do better.

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

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

To the men and women who have served, thank you for all you have done and for the countless sacrifices that you have made. I am truly grateful for your service and for the hardships you and your families have endured. I am proud to stand in this Chamber and to
Mr. DOGGETT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I want to thank my good friend and colleague from south Texas, along with Congressman RUBÉN HINOJOSA, and then on the Senate side, both Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON and Senator CORNYN. All of us have been working as a team, and have been working to improve the access to veterans' care. And I certainly want to thank Mr. FARENTHOLD for all the leadership that he has provided. Thank you very much.

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

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank both of my colleagues from Texas for using this as an opportunity, not only to herald this important bill, but as well the importance of health care for our veterans in south Texas. As a sponsor myself, through significant sessions of this effort to strengthen health care in south Texas, I am pleased we are finally making some progress on it. We need to continue to redouble our efforts, whether it is there or at Audie Murphy, or at the burn center, or at Lackland, or, as with our success last Friday in Austin, Texas, where we broke ground on what will become the largest veterans' outreach clinic to provide outpatient care for our veterans of any place in the entire United States.

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

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

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

I think it's a step in the right direction of the Schertz Veterans Post Office.

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and the ayes have it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.
Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 655) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 95 Dogwood Street in Cary, Mississippi, as the “Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office.”

The Clerk reads the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows: S. 655

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

S. 655, introduced in the Senate by Senator THAD COCHRAN of Mississippi, would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 95 Dogwood Street in Cary, Mississippi, as the Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office.

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

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

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

I’d like to urge all Members to join me instrong support of this bill. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

The underlying bill before us was introduced by Senator THAD COCHRAN of Mississippi on March 22, 2011, and passed by the Senate on May 16, 2011. Our colleague, Representative BENNIE THOMPSON from the State of Mississippi, also introduced a companion bill to this measure in the form of H.R. 1072. Both measures aim to acknowledge and recognize the heroic service of Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr., by renaming the local post office in Cary, Mississippi, in his honor.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. by and with the unanimous consent of a majority of the Members.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1632, by the yeas and nays; H.R. 771, by the yeas and nays; S. 349, by the yeas and nays.

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

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

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

YEA—396

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Altman
Anderson
Austria

Bass (GA)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NR)
Becerra
Benjamin
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bilbo
Bilirakis
Baca
Bachmann
Barfield
Bartlett
Bartlett (TX)
Bilirakis

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Gibson). The Chair would ask all present to observe a moment of silence.

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

SCHERTZ VETERANS POST OFFICE

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 461]

YEAS—398
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The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, not voting 35, and as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

**YEAS—397**

Ackerman  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Alexander  
Almire  
Amash  
Andrews  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barlett  
Barrow  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Benjamin  
Berger  
Biggs  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blackburn (NC)  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (FL)  
Brady (TX)  
Brady (IA)  
Burgess  
Burke  
Burgess, Burgess (TX)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Campbell  
Campbell (TX)  
Caso  
Carter  
Carter (FL)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MD)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Conaway  
Connelly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Cravaak  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crawley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davies (CA)  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DelCotto  
DeLauro  

**NAYS—0**

Denham  
Dent  
DeSaulnier  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doug装  
Dole  
Donnelly (NH)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Drier  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Elmers  
Emerson  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Finger  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fonseca  
Frank (MI)  
Frank (PA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallagher  
Garamendi  
Garner  
Garrison  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gonalez  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffin (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harker  
Hansen  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Rayworth  
Reck  
Reinhardt  
Renacci  
Romero  
Restler  
Higgins  
Hinojosa  
Rirono  
Hochuli  
Holmes  
Horn  
Honda  
Hoyt  
Hunt  
Huntzinger  
Huntzinger  
Hyer  
Hyer (OH)  
Hyer (OK)  
Huizenga  
Hurt  
Inakis  
Isakson  
Jackson  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson (TX)  

**NOT VOTING—34**

Berkeley  
Bishop (NY)  
Bosley  
Brown  
Burton  
Candidate for Secretary of the Senate  
Culberson  
Davis  
Dent  
Engel  
Fattah  
Giffords  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  

So, (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MARINE SGT. JEREMY E. MURRAY POST OFFICE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 349) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3865 Tallmadge Road in Rootstown, Ohio, as the “Marine Sgt. Jeremy E. Murray Post Office,” on the which the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.
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**June 21, 2011**

**HANSREY 4346**

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

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

**HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW**

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

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

There was no objection.
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. G RIM M). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 672) to terminate the Election Assistance Commission, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 672

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the "Election Support Consolidation and Efficiency Act".

SECTION 2. TERMINATION OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.
(a) Termination.—The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new title:

"TITLE X—TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

Subtitle A—Termination

SEC. 1001. TERMINATION.
"The Commission (including the Election Assistance Commission Standards Board and the Election Assistance Commission Board of Advisors under part 2 of subtitle A of title II) is terminated and may not carry out any programs or activities.

SEC. 1002. TRANSFER OF OPERATIONS TO OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET DURING TRANSITION.
"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall, effective upon the Commission's termination date—

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

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

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

SEC. 1003. SAVINGS PROVISIONS.
"(a) General. The termination of the Commission under this subtitle shall not affect any contract that has been entered into by the Commission before the Commission termination date. All such contracts shall continue in effect until modified, superseded, terminated, set aside, or revoked in accordance with law by an authorized Federal official, a court of competent jurisdiction, or operation of law.

(b) OBLIGATIONS OF RECIPIENTS OF PAYMENTS.—

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

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

(c) PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 1004. COMMISSION TERMINATION DATE.
"The ‘Commission termination date’ is the first date following the expiration of the 60-day period that begins on the date of the enactment of this subtitle.

Subtitle B—Transfer of Certain Authorities

SEC. 1011. TRANSFER OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION FUNCTIONS TO FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.
"There are transferred to the Federal Election Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the ‘FEC’) the following functions of the Commission:

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

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

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

(4) The development of a standardized format for reports submitted by States under section 211 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, and the making of such format available to States and units of local government submitting such reports, in accordance with subtitle B.

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

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


SEC. 1012. EFFECTIVE DATE.
"The transfers under this subtitle shall take effect on the Commission termination date described in section 1004.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The title of this Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

"TITLE X—TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

Subtitle A—Termination

Sec. 1001. Termination.
Sec. 1002. Transfer of operations to Office of Management and Budget during transition.
Sec. 1003. Savings provisions.
Sec. 1004. Commission termination date.
Sec. 1011. Transfer of election administration functions to Federal Election Commission.
Sec. 1012. Effective date.
" SEC. 3. REPLACEMENT OF STANDARDS BOARD AND BOARD OF ADVISORS WITH GUIDELINES REVIEW BOARD.
"(a) REPLACEMENT.—Part 2 of subtitle A of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15301 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"PART 2—GUIDELINES REVIEW BOARD

Sec. 211. Establishment.
"There is established the Guidelines Review Board (hereafter in this part referred to as the ‘Board’).

Sec. 212. Duties.
"The Board shall, in accordance with the procedures described in part 3, review the voluntary voting system guidelines under such part.

Sec. 213. MEMBERSHIP.
"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall be composed of 8 members appointed as follows:
“(1) One State or local election official from each State, to be selected by the chief State election official of the State, who shall take into account the needs of both State and local election officials in making the selection.

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

“(3) 2 members appointed by the National Association of County Recorders, Election Officials, and Treasurers.

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

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

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

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

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

“(9) 2 members appointed by the Architectural and Transportation Barrier Compliance Board.

“(10) The chief of the Voting Section of the Department of Justice.


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

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

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

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

“(14) 4 members representing voter interests, who shall be—

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

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

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

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

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

“(d) EXECUTIVE BOARD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the day on which the appointment of its members is completed, the Board shall select 8 of its members to serve as the Executive Board of the Board of Advisors.

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

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

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

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

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

“(A) 1 shall serve for 1 term;

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

“(C) 3 shall serve for 3 consecutive terms,

“as determined by lot at the time the members are first appointed.

“(4) DUTIES.—The Executive Board of the Board shall carry out such duties of the Board as the Board determines.

“(b) BYLAWS; DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Board may promulgate such bylaws as it considers appropriate to provide for the operation of the Board. The Board may delegate to the Executive Board to grant to any of its members the authority to act on behalf of the Executive Board.

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

“(a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(e) NO COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE.—Members of the Board shall receive no compensation for their service, but shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies in the executive branch of the United States. Title 5 of United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Board.

“SEC. 215. STATUS OF BOARD AND MEMBERS FOR PURPOSES OF CLAUSES AGAINST BOARD.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(d) EXECUTIVE BOARD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the day on which the appointment of its members is completed, the Board shall select 8 of its members to serve as the Executive Board of the Guidelines Review Board, of whom—

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

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

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

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

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

“(A) 1 shall serve for 1 term;

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

“(C) 3 shall serve for 3 consecutive terms,
(b) TESTING, CERTIFICATION, DECERTIFICATION, AND RECERTIFICATION OF VOTING SYSTEM HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title II of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:—

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

(a) TRANSFER.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

(B) PERSONNEL.—

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

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

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

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

(c) DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDIZED FORMAT FOR REPORTS ON ABSENTEE BALLOTING BY ABSENT UNIFORMED SERVICES VOTERS AND OVERSEAS VOTERS.—Section 310(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–34(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:—

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

(2) RECIPE OF REPORTS ON NUMBER OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS THAT ARE RESTRICTED AND RECEIVED.—Section 102(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–34(a)) is amended by inserting ‘‘the Election Assistance Commission’’ and inserting ‘‘the Federal Election Commission’’.


(e) TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROGRAM FOR ABSENT MILITARY AND OVERSEAS VOTERS.—Section 312(a)(1) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–34(a)) is amended by striking ‘‘the Election Assistance Commission’’ and inserting ‘‘the Federal Election Commission’’.

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

SEC. 6. OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS REGARDING TERMINATION.—

(a) HATCH ACT.—Section 7232(b)(2)(B)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ‘‘or the Election Assistance Commission’’.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947.—Section 312(a)(1)(C) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ‘‘the Election Assistance Commission’’.

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

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

SEC. 7. STUDIES.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.
Mr. HARPER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Supporters of the bill once told us that it would save $14 million each year. I’m not sure how they came up with that number. What we do know is that when Ranking Member BRADY asked the FEC if they could handle the responsibilities of EAC, this is what they said: Sure, if you give us more money. So this bill would take money from an agency they don’t like and give it to an agency that no one likes. It will take money from an agency that has met many challenges and has improved its operations in the past few years.
our county $100,000 per year. That’s $100,000 in savings for one county, from one EAC instructional video, and we have more than 8,000 election jurisdictions in the United States.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot see that in these very difficult budget times we have to make some difficult decisions and look at programs that we no longer need to be doing. When we defeat this, when we move to the floor with no chance to offer an amendment, I offered a very simple amendment that the gentleman has just made, that somehow the FEC is not up to snuff, is not an argument I would think that the gentleman would support somehow get rid of the FEC. We are giving them some responsibilities with funds, and hopefully they can carry those out.

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

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

How often do we have people who come to us and say, We don’t need this assistance anymore? Not very often. Should we ignore that in this particular case? Admittedly, this is a small amount of money. It’s only in the millions. Where I come from, that’s important. Millions mean a lot. This is more important, though, as a symbol or a signal as to what we will do.

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

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

States are looking at us to see whether we can give them some relief, and more efficient. Our constituents are looking at us as they look for some glimmer that we understand the terrific fiscal situation we find ourselves in. And they’re looking for just the tiniest, the smallest suggestion that we are going to be serious about the fiscal mess that we find ourselves in.

This is a small start, but it is a start. Again, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip who was instrumental in a bipartisan effort to actually pass, a few years ago, the Help America Vote Act. Mr. HOYER, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Bob Ney of Ohio, who was chairman of the House Administration Committee, so well as he knows. The gentleman from Mississippi said, if we can’t do this now, when can we do it? When you have a demonstrable record of an agency that’s outlived its usefulness, you have to act. That’s all we’re attempting to do. I would hope that we would have a near unanimous vote in support of the gentleman’s bill.

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The right to vote is at the foundation of our democracy, so it is extremely disappointing that this bill would undermine our Nation’s ability to protect that right. From 1789 to 2000, the Federal Government had elections which it did not pay for nor did it administer.

Now, under this bill, we’re still not paying for elections and we’re not paying for elections that the bill that’s on the floor. But under our scheme of things, the elections are still run by States and counties and localities.
What this agency was designed to do was to bring the best information possible so that elections could be run in the best way possible. There are over, I think, 120 million voters in America. So this is 20 cents for each one of those voters, to make sure that they have access and that their vote is counted properly. Eliminating funding for the Election Assistance Commission would harm the integrity of our elections in 2012 and for years to come. Voters deserve assurance that their votes will count.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Thank the gentleman for yielding the additional minute.

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

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

Defeat this legislation.

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Harper bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, the minority whip just basically said the same thing, that once an agency is created, even after it’s performed its function, it’s done its duty, it’s time to eliminate it. And we’re talking about millions of dollars. This is an important bill. As the gentleman from Mississippi so clearly stated, if we can’t do this, what can we do in regard to reducing unnecessary spending of the taxpayer dollars so we’ll have those precious dollars for other more important matters to help our States?

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

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

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

And let me remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more crucial to democracy than guaranteeing the integrity, fairness, accessibility, and accuracy of elections. Democracy works only if the citizens believe it does. The system must work, and the people must believe that it works. But voting shouldn’t be an act of blind faith. It should be an act of record. The EAC helps maintain the integrity of the American electoral process. And too many people across the country lack confidence in the legitimacy of election results, and the dismantling of the EAC would further erode that faith that is so essential to democracy.

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

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

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

H.R. 672 is another example of the desire of this Chamber that seems to equate things like not rendering services, rather than engage in the hard work of making government work at its best.
I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this misguided bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting that the statement was just made that the FEC is too political to take on the responsibilities of
we are in that situation of an agency that needs to be eliminated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The question was taken.

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

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

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. Speaker, on reconsideration, the EAC was restored. Those against this bill have said that this agency needs to be protected. Well, I happen to have been a Secretary of State for the State of Colorado, and I am calling for this Agency to be eliminated. In fact, the National Association of State of State has passed two resolutions calling for the EAC’s termination.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair’s prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.
STANDING BEHIND NORTH DAKOTA RESIDENTS AFTER DEVASTATING FLOODS

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

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

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

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

REPUBLICAN WOMEN ON JOB GROWTH

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

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

While our backgrounds and professions may be different, one thing is not: We are all conservative reformers committed to leaving America better for our children and grandchildren. After all, women in this country know better than anyone the effects of harmful economic policies. Why? Because two out of three businesses are started by women. Women-owned business are the fastest growing segment in the United States economy and they generate over $2.5 trillion in revenue a year. Women, more than any other group, own 98 percent of household income, spend two out of three health care dollars, and make up the majority of health care providers in America.

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

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

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

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

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

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

There are too many107,000 uninsured Americans in the United States, and I am first generation college educated. I basically put myself through college and nursing school with many different jobs. I became a nurse, and I have been a nurse for over 21 years and am very happy to be so. I am a wife and a mom. My son, Ben, is 16 years old.

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

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

As a woman, being a multitasker, Mr. Speaker, as you know how wonderful women are, we can put our minds to it and we can solve these problems.
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Speaking as a nurse, I’ve always taken care of many patients, but none more dear to me than my seniors. And what they are faced with today because of the destruction that has been put forward by our Democrat colleagues across the aisle in ObamaCare, it has truly been just that—destroyed it. And it is our job to rescue it back for the American people so that it will be there for our seniors and it will be there for generations to come.

As it is right now, $500 billion has been taken out, and a 15-person panel will be put in place to decide what kind of health care you receive. That right will be taken away from you and your physician. Imagine a group of individuals without any health care background whatsoever deciding for you whether or not you’ll be able to have surgery or what kind of health care you receive. That right will be taken away from you and your physician. Imagine sitting at the bedside of your
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usiness; balancing checkbooks, dealing with regulations, and paying taxes. I didn’t run because I was a woman, and I didn’t expect people to vote for me because I was a woman. That had never ever even entered into the mind of the person I was running against was also a woman. I worked to earn each vote in talking about what was important in this country, in talking to folks about our life experiences and my position on the issues. That’s what I knew mattered to South Dakotans, and that’s what mattered to me.

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

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

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

I would like to close by thanking all of my colleagues for this opportunity to speak on the House floor tonight on what it means to be a Republican woman and what it means to be someone who serves here with common sense, business experience, and life experience, who cares about our children and grandchildren in this country. I would like to thank my colleagues as well for organizing this special hour. It’s an absolute and incredible honor to represent exactly what it means to be a Republican woman and how much we all, if we work together, can come up with the answers to our problems.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Next, I’d like to yield to the gentlelady from South Dakota.

Mrs. NOEM. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my fellow female colleagues and Members on this side of the aisle to highlight exactly what it means to be a Republican woman and how much we all did it all. My dad taught me years ago, women in my family restaurant and our hunting and fishing, and that girls, but that we all did it all. My dad taught me how to drive a semi-truck and a combine, just like he did my brothers. I was expected to help with the chores even though they were tough and they were often dirty ones. I grew up thinking that I could do anything that the boys could do, and that way of thinking has certainly stayed with me. Over the years, I helped run our family businesses, including the farm and the ranches. I helped run the family restaurant and our hunting lodge for businesses never grew so large that I was one of the women who are a part of what controls now 51 percent of the New York Stock Exchange. I always remembered what my dad said, and I always remembered that I could work just as hard as the guys could. My contribution was always just as valuable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I made a promise to the men and women in District 24 that I would fight...
to end the spending-driven debt crisis that led to our Nation’s dire economic state. I will continue to keep this promise, and I will continue to fight for families across this country by working towards fiscal responsibility, lower taxes, and by removing job-killing regulations that have stifled our Nation’s economic growth for far too long.
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We need to get our people back to work. We want jobs, and that’s what we are fighting so hard to do. As Republican women, we understand, and we will continue to fight to empower small businesses and to reduce the regulations that is hurting our businesses.

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

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

When the Obama administration took office, many Americans were so concerned that the administration was too inexperienced to know how to even govern. We truly saw, and we have seen, that they were too mistaken to learn and too arrogant to care.

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

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

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

We Republican women stand here tonight, and we are the women that are not going to accept being marginalized because of our political party. We are real women. We are real Republicans. We are here to restore the American Dream.

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

Ms. BERGERT. I thank the gentlelady for having this tonight.

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

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

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

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

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

Then finally, when a seat opened up in Congress, I said, I’m going for this. I was elected, and I’ve been here and on three committees that are really important still—with the Financial Services, the Education and Labor, and the Science Committee.

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

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

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

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

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

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you. A great point.
Next, I would like to yield to the first woman from Alabama.

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

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

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

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

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

About 2 years practicing law, I was watching the news one night, and my predecessor on the city council said that it was time for me to seek re-election, and I felt this lurch in my stomach. It was just really a gut check moment for us. I tapped Riley and I said, That’s what I need to be doing. I want to serve my community.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you.

Let’s hear from the lady from Ohio.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Let’s look at some of the facts. The White House advisers said that passing the stimulus would keep unemployment below 8 percent. The unemployment rate is currently over 9 percent, and it’s above 8 percent for more than 2 years. I’ve got a visual aid here that shows a new study by economists from the University of Western Ontario and Ohio State University that found that the President’s failed stimulus, the largest stimulus in American history, destroyed or forestalled roughly 1 million private sector jobs. Taxpayers will end up paying $1.16 trillion for the bill, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, to be over $820 billion, and interest on the debt for the bill will be nearly $350 billion for over a $1 trillion price tag. The number of net jobs the economy has shed since the Democrat stimulus was signed into law is reaching almost 2 million. In the last 12 months, entrepreneurs have started up the fewest new U.S. businesses in more than a decade. The national debt has increased by almost $5 trillion.

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

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

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Great. Thank you.

Next, I would like to yield to my classmate and member of the Rules Committee from North Carolina, Ms. FOXX. Thank you. I want to thank my colleague from the State of Washington, CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, for organizing this Special Order tonight, and Mr. Speaker, I am a Republican woman and so proud to be a part of this great group of women that we’ve heard from tonight.

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

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

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

I came to Congress as a Republican because my life experience in business and education taught me that, by easing off the rulemaking and the tax hiking, government can help foster an environment where hardworking, innovative, and dedicated people can succeed. I’m a Republican because I want to be part of creating a Federal Government that is nimble, focused, responsive, and aligned with the Constitution. I believe that such a government will capitalize on our strength as a Nation of innovators and entrepreneurs by removing barriers to job creation and wealth creation.

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

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

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you.

Next, I’d like to yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri, Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, my friend from Washington State.

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

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

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

I grew up on a farm near Archie, Missouri, and my mom and my dad and my sister and I, we raised corn and soybeans and had a lot of hogs and had a cow/calf operation. And one thing that strikes me is very pivotal to my life is the values that I learned in my childhood. And the values that I learned in my childhood is that’s the right way to do things. And the reasons I align myself with the Republican Party is a reflection of my background and experiences that I’ve had over the years. I wanted to share just a few of those things with you.

I grew up on a farm near Archie, Missouri, and my mom and my dad and my sister and I, we raised corn and soybeans and had a lot of hogs and had a cow/calf operation. And one thing that strikes me very pivotal to my life is the values that I learned in my childhood. And the values that I learned in my childhood is that’s the right way to do things. And the reasons I align myself with the Republican Party is a reflection of my background and experiences that I’ve had over the years. I wanted to share just a few of those things with you.

I grew up on a farm near Archie, Missouri, and my mom and my dad and my sister and I, we raised corn and soybeans and had a lot of hogs and had a cow/calf operation. And one thing that strikes me very pivotal to my life is the values that I learned in my childhood. And the values that I learned in my childhood is that’s the right way to do things. And the reasons I align myself with the Republican Party is a reflection of my background and experiences that I’ve had over the years. I wanted to share just a few of those things with you.
live within your means. And I learned that you can’t spend more than you take in. I learned fiscal responsibility that is so much a part of the Republican Party, and what we’re here trying to do is to restore that because Washington keeps spending money that it doesn’t have. It can’t build that at home. We don’t do it on our farms. We don’t do it in our businesses, and it’s time that Washington learned some lessons from the heartland and from ordinary families like mine.

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

Something else I learned growing up was a love of our country and a respect for our military. My dad served in the U.S. Army Reserves. That really made a huge impression on me, that he was willing to serve his country. And all of those brave men and women who today are putting their lives on the line for those men and women and keep our government strong and safe and secure. I grew up and became a teacher, and I taught home economics. Now they call it “family and consumer sciences.” I love that. I chose that profession because I believe in the family, and I want to make it as strong as possible, and I love young people. One thing I can’t control. But one thing that I’ve taught my kids at school how to do. I taught them the mantra that we share with our young people today, and make sure we preserve the opportunity that we had. Later I was a State representative. And then after that, the Governor appointed me as chairman of the Missouri Women’s Council, and I enjoyed that for 2 years. In that council, as an agency in the Department of Economic Development, we helped women connect with and meet their economic goals, and that’s jobs. You know, Mr. Speaker, women are starting businesses at twice the rate of men, which amounts to 400 new businesses every day that are started by women. And woman-owned businesses are the fastest-growing segment of the United States economy. There are 10.6 million businesses owned in the United States by women that employ over 19 million American workers, and women-owned businesses generate some $2.46 trillion in revenue each year. Women are smart. They’re able to own their own businesses, and we here in Washington need to help them meet those goals, not provide hindrances for it. And clearly from the last speaker, you see that President Obama’s plan has failed. Throwing money at something does not create jobs. There is a better plan. I’m also a small business owner now. My husband and I own a company in Missouri. We employ about 50 people, have three stores. So I know the challenges of day-to-day operating a small business in America. Most jobs in America are created by small business owners, the same people that President Obama is trying to tax. What he doesn’t understand is that if you tax job creators more, they’re not going to have money to be able to hire a worker. It doesn’t make sense. We’ve got to change course here.

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

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

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

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

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

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the inspiring Representative from Tennessee.

Mrs. Black. My name is Diane Black, and I represent the Fourth Congressional District in Tennessee. I am hearing more and more from women in my district. More and more women are decision makers in their households. As a matter of fact, statistics show us that 72 percent of primary care and decision makers today. They set their budgets. They buy groceries. They take their children to school and to doctors, and they also work outside the home. I hear from women all over my district who are on the front lines, and they say that the economy is making life tougher and that they are constantly trying to do more with less. They tell me that when they go to the grocery store, how much the rising food prices are cutting into what they buy. Gas is more expensive, and their budgets are shrinking, and their choices are limited because Washington is deciding for them.

As these past few years get harder, government stood in the way of our economy getting back on track. And in 2009, when the unemployment rate was 9.6 percent. I also hear from women in my district whose husbands are looking for jobs, and these women
are working two jobs to make ends meet, a struggle that is very real to me. As a nurse for over 40 years, I worked two jobs when my children were little and our family was trying to better ourselves, as my husband was working on his degree. I worked not only to help pay the rent but also to have school for children in my home. My fellow GOP women here tonight, we are all with similar stories of struggles and challenges and working hard for our families. Government needs to get out of the way and allow businesses to grow so that jobs are created and America gets back on track.

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

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. I would like to yield to my wonderful colleague from the State of Washington, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, chairman of the International Relations Committee.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Ms. Ros-Lehtinen), chairman of the International Relations Committee.

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

And as a wonderful friend, the colleague from the State of Washington, pointed out, my name is ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN; and I represent Florida’s proud and beautiful 18th Congressional District that covers from Bal Harbor all the way down to sunny Key West, 260 miles of beautiful beach area.

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

And I am also a Republican woman.

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

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

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

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

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. I’m proud to yield to my colleague from Washington State.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled Joint Resolutions of the Senate of the following titles: S.J. Res. 7—Providing for the reappointment of Shirley Ann Jackson as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

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

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Mr. Speaker. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned for a dinner hour, Wednesday, June 22, 2011, at 9:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

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

2087. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Ethylene Glycol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0631; FRL-8870-7] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

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

2089. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pyrfluzin-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0426; FRL-8873-5] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2090. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pyrfluzin-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0426; FRL-8873-5] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2091. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pyrfluzin-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0426; FRL-8873-5] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2092. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Kalispell, Montana) [Docket No.: 10-20] received May 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2093. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the determination that a continuation of a waiver of the requirement of a test in the pilot program of Belarus will substantially promote the objectives of section 402, of the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(e) and (d); (H. Res. No. 459) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

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

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

2096. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTIC 11-012, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(e) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2097. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTIC 11-011, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(f) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

2099. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; Rewrite of Part 70; Acquiring Leasehold Interests in Real Property [GSAR Amendment 2011-01-GSAR Case 2006-G508; Change 45] Docket 2009-0017; Sequence 1 (RIN: 7502-0001) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2100. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contract Closeout [FAC 2005-52; FAR Case 2008-023; Item II; Docket 2009-0031; Sequence 1 (RIN: 7500-AL48) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2101. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2006-52; Item VI; Docket 2001-0078; Sequence 2] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2102. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2006-02; Introduction [Docket FAR 2001-0076; Sequence 4] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2103. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contractor Ethics Programs [FAC 2005-52; FAR Case 2010-017; Item V; Docket 2010-0017, Sequence 1] (RIN: 7500-AL23) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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

2105. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace: Gruver Cluck Ranch Airport, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0022] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2106. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace: Livermore, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1294; Airspace Docket No. 10-AWP-23] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2107. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace: Idaho Falls, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0023; Airspace Docket No. 11-AWM-2] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

2109. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace: McCall, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0067; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANX-3] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2110. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace: Gruver Cluck Ranch Airport, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0022] received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
GmbH Models DA 42, DA 42 NG, and DA 22 M-
NG Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0185; Direc-
torate Identifier 2010-CE-002-AD; Amendment
39-16694; AD 2011-10-13] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2119. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Models 150, 152, 170, 172, 173, 179, 180, 182, 185, 188, 190, 192, 210, 212, 214, 215, 216, 218, 220, 221, 222, 226, 230, 232, 235, 236, and 337 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1101; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-013-AD; Amendment 39-
16690; AD 2011-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2120. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320 Series Air-
planes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1274; Direc-
torate Identifier 2010-EN-991-AD; Amendment
39-16688; AD 2011-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2121. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319 Series Air-
planes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1275; Direc-
torate Identifier 2010-EN-991-AD; Amendment
39-16688; AD 2011-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2122. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-112, A319-111, A320-
torate Identifier 2010-EN-992-AD; Amendment
39-16698; AD 2011-10-08] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2123. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DASSAULT AVIATION Model MYSPEKE-FALCON 50 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0042; Directorate Identifier 2010-EN-267-AD; Amendment 39-
16695; AD 2011-10-14] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2124. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211-524, Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-
2008-1165; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-38-
AD; Amendment 39-16683; AD 2011-09-22] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2125. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211-534, Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0067; Directorate Identifier 2010-EN-253-AD; Amendment 39-
16691; AD 2011-10-10] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2126. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211-535, Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0068; Directorate Identifier 2010-EN-253-AD; Amendment 39-16691; AD 2011-10-10] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2127. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211-536, Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0069; Directorate Identifier 2010-EN-253-AD; Amendment 39-16691; AD 2011-10-10] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2128. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211-541, Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0070; Directorate Identifier 2010-EN-253-AD; Amendment 39-16691; AD 2011-10-10] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2129. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRARER) Model ERJ 170 Airplanes; and Model ERJ 190-100 STD, ERJ 190-100 NG, and ERJ 190-100 LGW Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0083; Direc-
torate Identifier 2010-EN-153-AD; Amendment
39-16684; AD 2011-10-03] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2130. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Vorteks Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1276; Direc-
torate Identifier 2010-EN-992-AD; Amendment
39-16688; AD 2011-10-08] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.

2131. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DASSAULT AVIATION Model MYSPEKE-FALCON 50 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0042; Directorate Identifier 2010-EN-267-AD; Amendment 39-
16695; AD 2011-10-14] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure.
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savings, and money market deposit ac-
counts; to the Committee on Financial Ser-
vices.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. SLOCUM, Mr. posey, Mr. BURTON of Arizona, Mr. Latta, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Hall, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. Mica, Mr. MCCOTTER of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FORKES, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Gingrey of Georgia, Mr. Flores, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 2252. A bill to protect the right to obtain firearms for security, and to use firearms in self-defense, family, or home, and to provide for the protection of such right; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 2253. A bill to establish within the Department of Education the Innovation Inspiration school grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. Krating, Mr. Frank of Massachusetts, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Markley, Mr. McCarthy of New York, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Neal, Ms. Norton, Mr. Olver, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Sherran, Mr. Tierney, Ms. Tsongas, and Mr. Visclosky):

H.R. 2254. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish national tunnel inspection programs, to improve the safety of all highway tunnels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DeLAURO (for herself and Mr. PATTEN):

H.R. 2255. A bill to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Professional Development Institutes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Young of Florida, Mr. Frank of Massachusetts, Mr. Ackerman, Mr. KISSEL, Mr. Farr, Mr. Filner, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Moran, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Rothman of New Jersey, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Ms. Berkley, Mr. Olver, Mr. Gallegly, Mr. LaTourette, Ms. Tsongas, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Kucinich, and Ms. McCollum):

H.R. 2256. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to ensure that all dogs and cats used by research facilities are obtained legally; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

H.R. 2257. A bill to provide for a study by the National Academy of Engineering regarding improving the accuracy of collection of royalties on production of oil, condensate, and natural gas under leases of Federal lands and Indian lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCOTTER (for himself and Mr. Burton of Indiana):

H.R. 2258. A bill to encourage United States contributions to the United Nations or a United Nations agency if the United Nations or such agency supports the recognition of an independent Palestinian state, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2259. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts distributed from tax-favored accounts during a period of unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2260. A bill to provide that Washington’s Birthday be observed on February 22, rather than the third Monday in February, of each year; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 2261. A joint resolution authorizing the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H. Res. 317. A resolution demanding that Hamas immediately and unconditionally release Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Markley, Mr. Frank of Massachusetts, Mr. Neal, Mr. Olver, Mr. McGovern, Mr. DelRosario, Ms. Tsongas, and Mr. Kratting):

H. Res. 318. A resolution congratulating the Boston Bruins on winning the 2010-2011 Stanley Cup, to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2262. A bill to direct the President to forgo recoupment of liabilities relating to assistance provided under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 2263. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from Federal tax certain tax credits in connection with reductions in force; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KESKIN:

H.R. 2264. A bill to reduce the trafficking of drugs and to prevent human smuggling across the Southwest Border by deterring the construction and use of border tunnels; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 2265. A bill to direct the President to forgo recoupment of liabilities relating to assistance provided under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 2266. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reform Department of Defense energy policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 2267. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely reimbursement for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 2268. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that Washington’s Birthday be observed on February 22, rather than the third Monday in February, of each year; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2269. A bill to ensure that Washington’s Birthday be observed on February 22, rather than the third Monday in February, of each year; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:
To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:
H.R. 2297.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By MS. DELAURO:
H.R. 2253.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:
H.R. 2257.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:
H.R. 2258.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HECK:
H.R. 2259.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MALONEY:
H.R. 2260.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:
H.R. 2261.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PAUL:
H.R. 2262.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Sixteenth Amendment, which gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, clearly gives Congress the authority to provide tax relief to the unemployed.

By Mr. REYES:
H.R. 2264.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Sixteenth Amendment, which gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, clearly gives Congress the authority to provide tax relief to the unemployed.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:
H.R. 2266.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1) and Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:
H.R. 2297.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is pursuant to the following:
1) Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.
2) Clause 5: To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures; and clause 8: the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;
3) Clause 7: To establish Post Offices and post Roads;
4) Clause 8: to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;
5) Clause 9: To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;
6) Clause 10: To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;
7) Clause 11: To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;
8) Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;
9) Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy;
10) Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;
11) Clause 15: To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;
12) Clause 15: To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;
13) Clause 17: To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings:

And

Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RICHMOND:
H.R. 2295.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1) and Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. SWARTZ:
ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 49: Mr. Diaz-Balart.
H.R. 166: Mr. Paul.
H.R. 190: Mr. Hice and Mr. Luján.
H.R. 366: Mrs. Eilers.
H.R. 363: Mrs. Christensen.
H.R. 373: Mr. Goodlatte.
H.R. 420: Mrs. Schmidt, Mr. Hultgren, Mr. Whitfield, Mr. Miller of Florida, Mr. Harris, Ms. Buehrle, Ms. Black, Mr. Yoder, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, and Mr. Hunt.
H.R. 421: Mr. Aderholt.
H.R. 452: Mr. Poe of Texas, Mr. Bass of New Hampshire, and Ms. Burch.
H.R. 507: Mr. Mica.
H.R. 574: Ms. Schakowsky and Mr. Kildee.
H.R. 607: Mr. Paschell.
H.R. 610: Mr. Carter and Mr. Frank of Massachusetts.
H.R. 615: Mr. Neugebauer and Mrs. Schmidt.
H.R. 652: Mr. Calveyt and Mr. Sessions.
H.R. 674: Mr. Campbell, Mr. Griffin of Arkansas, Mr. Smith of Texas, Mr. Rogers of Kentucky, and Mr. Carter.
H.R. 867: Mr. Daniel, E. Lungen of California.
H.R. 692: Mr. Palazzo.
H.R. 733: Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Young of Alaska, Mr. Brou of Florida, Mr. Rush, Mr. Crenshaw, Mr. Oliver, and Ms. Brown of Florida.
H.R. 735: Mr. Thornberry, Mr. Brady of Texas, Mr. Smith of Texas, Mr. Houlkamp, Mr. Mack, Mr. Gowdy, and Mr. Stivers.
H.R. 838: Mr. Huizenga of Michigan.
H.R. 886: Ms. Richardson, Mr. Kraating, Mr. Bono of Georgia, Ms. Tsonias, Mr. McKeon, and Mr. Sullivan.
H.R. 870: Mr. Oliver.
H.R. 880: Mr. Brou of Iowa.
H.R. 894: Mr. Escobar.
H.R. 901: Mr. Duncan of South Carolina.
H.R. 905: Mr. Gonzalez.
H.R. 942: Mr. Akin.
H.R. 949: Ms. Speier.
H.R. 972: Mr. Whitfield, Mr. Hensarling, Mr. Stivers, and Mr. Bachus.
H.R. 990: Mr. Conaway.
H.R. 1001: Mr. Scott of Georgia.
H.R. 1006: Mrs. Hartzler.
H.R. 1031: Mr. Roskam.
H.R. 1041: Ms. Clarke of New York, Mrs. McMorris Rodgers, Mr. Lucas, and Mr. Brooks.
H.R. 1085: Mr. Ryan of Ohio.
ROYCE.

NORTON.

DREIER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DONTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NELLY of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, SMITH of Washington.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KENTUCKY.

ABACHER.

Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DONTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NELLY of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, SMITH of Washington.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KENTUCKY.

ABACHER.

Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DONTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NELLY of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, SMITH of Washington.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KENTUCKY.

ABACHER.

Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DONTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NELLY of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, SMITH of Washington.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KENTUCKY.

ABACHER.

Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DONTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NELLY of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, SMITH of Washington.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KENTUCKY.

ABACHER.

Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DONTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NELLY of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, SMITH of Washington.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KENTUCKY.

ABACHER.

Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DONTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NELLY of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, SMITH of Washington.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KENTUCKY.

ABACHER.

Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DONTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NELLY of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, SMITH of Washington.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KENTUCKY.

ABACHER.

Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DONTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NELLY of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, SMITH of Washington.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KENTUCKY.

ABACHER.

Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DONTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NELLY of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, SMITH of Washington.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KENTUCKY.

ABACHER.

Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DONTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NELLY of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, SMITH of Washington.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KENTUCKY.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGELL

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out military operations in Libya.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGELL

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Central Intelligence Agency or the Department of Defense against Libya.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGELL

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support Operation Unified Protector.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGELL

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support Operation Odyssey Dawn.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGELL

AMENDMENT NO. 5: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Central Intelligence Agency or the Department of Defense to furnish military equipment, military training or advice, or other support for military activities, to any group or individual, not part of a country’s armed forces, for the purpose of assisting that group or individual in carrying out military activities in or against Libya.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGELL

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Central Intelligence Agency or the Department of Defense to furnish military equipment, military training or advice, or other support for military activities, to any group or individual, not part of a country’s armed forces, for the purpose of assisting that group or individual in carrying out military activities in or against Libya.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 109, line 25, strike “acquisition management” and insert “product support”.

Page 110, line 1, after “systems,” insert the following: “; other than those mission assignments or transfers approved by the Secretary of the Air Force or the Secretary’s designee prior to June 19, 2011,”.
The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable Michael F. Bennet, a Senator from the State of Colorado.

PRAYER

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

You come to us, O Lord. Into our poverty comes Your wealth. Into our emptiness comes Your fullness. Into our fears comes Your peace. Into our ugliness comes Your beauty. Empower our Senators to prepare themselves for Your coming. Remove any barrier that will keep them from experiencing Your presence. Lord, give them more than human wisdom so that justice, truth, and peace will prevail.

Come to us, O Lord, and make us instruments of Your peace. We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable Michael F. Bennet led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows: I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Presiding Officer. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. Inouye).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate
President pro tempore
Washington, DC, June 21, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable Michael F. Bennet, a Senator from the State of Colorado, to perform the duties of the Chair.

Daniel K. Inouye
President pro tempore

Mr. Bennet thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The Acting President pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The Acting President pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will be in morning business until 11 a.m., with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half. I would ask at this time that the morning business hour be a full hour, not stop at 11.

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Reid. The filing deadline for second-degree amendments to S. 782, the Economic Development Revitalization Act, is at 11 a.m. this morning.

Following morning business, the Senate will be in executive session to consider the nomination of Michael Simon to be United States District Judge in Oregon. Then, at noon, there will be a vote on confirmation of the Simon nomination.

Following the vote, the Senate will recess until 2:15 p.m. today for the weekly caucus meetings.

At 2:15, the Senate will consider the nomination of Leon Panetta to be Secretary of Defense, with 2 hours of debate. At about 4:15 this afternoon, Senators should expect up to three rollcall votes: the first on confirmation of the Panetta nomination; the second will be a cloture vote on the EDA bill; and, if cloture is not invoked, there will be a third vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to the Presidential Appointment and Streamlining Act.

I might note that this, or some version of this, we have talked about for a long time. When Senator McConnell and I were both whips, we talked about this legislation and spent a lot of time on it.

EDA

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, this afternoon we will have a cloture vote on reauthorization of the Economic Development Administration, a law we have depended on for more than 50 years.

This is the fourth jobs bill Democrats have brought to the floor this year. I do hope Republicans will not allow it to be the fourth jobs bill to wither on the vine thanks to their obstructionist tactics. This is a good piece of legislation with decades of helping American businesses in economically distressed communities to innovate, grow, and to hire.

In the last 5 years alone, the Economic Development Administration has created 314,000 jobs and successfully turned every $1 in Federal investment into $7 in private sector investment. It is good legislation that will create good jobs for Americans who need these jobs. Unfortunately, that is not enough to win bipartisan support among Republicans here in the District of Columbia who are more interested in
destroying Medicare than creating jobs.

The Small Business innovation research bill is a good piece of legislation too. That also died in the Senate last month under a pile of unrelated amendments. The hope is the Senate passes this year reauthorizing the Federal Aviation Administration and reforming America’s patent system were good legislation also. They would have created or saved about 480,000 jobs. It made it out of the Senate alive but now languishes in the Republican-controlled House. Will the Economic Development Authority suffer the same fate? I hope not.

Here, 24 hours ago, I presented to the American people in the Senate a myriad of amendments that have been filed in regard to this legislation. A lot have been offered but more filed. I read about 40 of them dealing with different types of endangered species, the lesser sand dune reptile, I don’t remember what that is. All kinds of nonrelated amendments. Global warming. Post office reform. As I said, almost 100 amendments, and I read 35 or 40 of them here yesterday, having nothing to do with this legislation. Nothing.

I believe, I have another bill that is blocked, the fourth this year. If they do that, it would be clear they are more interested in this rightwing ideology than creating much-needed employment. Of the 90-plus amendments, I repeat, only one on which my staff was able to find any germaneness to the bill, and that is one the chairman of the committee, Senator BOXER, would agree to anyway because it was offered by Senator INHOFE.

This is an important piece of legislation. This legislation will put hundreds of thousands of people to work. So today’s vote is again about priorities. Americans have been very clear, job creation is their No.1 priority, their No. 2 priority, their No. 3 priority. Democrats share that priority. Republicans obviously don’t.

We will never stop bringing jobs bills to the floor, and we will never stop fighting the other side’s obstructionism to try to get them passed. Again, Republicans have a different priority, it appears, and that is ending Medicare. And that is too bad. They have worked hard to block three bills that could have created and saved hundreds of thousands of jobs during tough economic times, but they pushed even harder for their ideological plan to kill Medicare as we know it.

The Republican plan would put insurance company bureaucrats between seniors and their doctors. Every senior would pay $6,400 more for health care in the first year alone. It would force more than 7 million seniors to pay more for cancer screenings, wellness checks, and treatments beginning next year.

Americans have been clear about this too, very clear. They have resoundingly rejected this ideological plan to hurt seniors. Republicans think it is a bad idea. Democrats think it is a bad idea. And, of course, the Independents think it is a bad idea. All polls show this.

Unfortunately, I haven’t heard a shred of evidence that my Republican friends here in Congress are getting the message. Medicare that the American people have gotten. Today they will have a chance to show the American people once again whether they have heard the message on jobs. I hope they have, because so much is at stake. And America is watching.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

The Acting President pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

**KENTUCKY COAL MINERS**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday I came to the floor to report that there were several miners in my State trapped in a mine as a result of floods. I want to start today with an update on that situation.

I am happy to report that all three were rescued after spending 14 hours trapped in a Bell County coal mine. They were all reunited with their families last night, which is great news. Their families were waiting for them at the West Cumberland Baptist Church, and we are certainly glad this particular story had a happy ending.

**DEBT REDUCTION**

Mr. McCONNELL. This morning, I wish to say a word about the upcoming vote on the debt ceiling and the bipartisan negotiation surrounding it, to reiterate why we are having these talks and what they ought to achieve. But first, a little context.

Right now, ratings agencies are threatening to downgrade U.S. debt, putting us on red alert that the kind of economic crisis we are seeing in parts of Europe could very quickly happen right here.

We know that failing to do something significant about our fiscal problems would be a serious drag on jobs and our economy. That is why, over the past several weeks, I have come to the floor of the Senate and spoken at press conferences, with a now familiar refrain: The time to act on significant reforms is right now. And I have been crystal clear about what qualifies as significant.

Above all, it means doing something to strengthen and preserve our long-term entitlement programs, so we can actually keep our promises to those who have been paying into these programs for years, and so these programs don’t end up consuming every single dollar we take in. Entitlements are the biggest drivers of our debt. By definition, they have to be a part of any plan to lower the debt.

This is hardly a controversial view. Everyone from the President on down has said that entitlements must be reformed if we have any chance at all of reining in our debt and strengthening our long-term fiscal health.

In fact, 3 months ago, 31 Senate Democrats signed a letter to the President urging him to put together a plan to reduce the deficit, a plan they said they hoped would include entitlement changes. 31 members of the Democratic conference right here on the other side of the aisle, including the occupant of the chair.

As the occupant of the chair put it recently, “I think it’s absolutely clear that we have to redesign our entitlement programs.”

Here is how Senator DURBIN put it a few weeks ago: “We have serious economic problems ahead of us if we don’t have some reform in both Medicare and Social Security.”

This was from former President Bill Clinton after the recent congressional election in New York: “I don’t think this Democratic Congress and the Republicans should conclude from the New York race that no changes can be made in Medicare.” He said, “or that no changes can be made in Social Security that no changes can be made that will deal with this long-term debt problem.”

Here is President Obama’s lead negotiator on the debt talks, Vice President BIDEN, from last January: “Everybody who is talking about how we have to do something about Social Security and Medicare, and we do.”

Here are the two chairs of the President’s debt commission, Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson, in a recent op-ed in “Politico”: “A credible plan must address the growth of entitlement spending . . . .”

Here is the President himself, about a month after he took office: “To prevent our long-term fiscal health we must . . . address the growing costs in Medicare and Social Security.”

And, as for me, I have been clear on this same point in public and in private from the moment of a meeting with the President and other Members of Congress at the White House on May 12.

So it is not exactly a groundbreaking observation that if these discussions are to mean anything they have to involve entitlement reform since no one believes we actually get at our fiscal problems without it. This is what serious people expect and are hoping for out of these talks.

The moment requires, as I have said for weeks, three things: Real cuts in spending over the short term; that is, over the next 2 years—not more spending increases or “freezes”; real cuts over the medium-term; that is, over the next 10 years with enforceable caps on spending; and meaningful reforms to entitlements, which are the major drivers of our debt. That is the definition of a significant package.

Some Democrats are insisting that they will only agree to cuts if Republicans agree to raise revenue. That is...
Washington speak for tax hikes and it is absurd.
First of all, is there anyone outside of Washington, DC, who really thinks that with 14 million people looking for work in this country, the solution is to raise taxes? I think you and I know that the real thing you do in the middle of a jobs crisis is raise taxes. Does anyone seriously think that is a good idea? Even the President has said as much. It is just common sense. Remember, the President signed the extension of current tax rates back in December, and it seems to be undercut by the very report the administration sent to Congress which makes clear that U.S. Armed Forces have been and presumably will continue to fly limited strike missions to suppress enemy air defenses, to operate armed Predator drones that are attacking Qadhafi's forces in an effort to protect Libyan civilians, and to provide the overwhelming support for NATO operations, from intelligence to aerial refueling. Indeed, we read in today's New York Times that since the April 7 date that the administration claims to have ceased hostilities in Libya, U.S. warplanes have struck at Libyan air defenses on 60 occasions and fired about 30 missiles from unmanned drones.

For 30 years beginning in 1971, Federal spending as a percentage of the economy has averaged around 20.8 percent. But after 2 years of out-of-control spending by the President and his Democrat allies in Congress, government spending is now projected to rise a full 4 percentage points above the historical norm.
That may not sound like a lot, but 4 percent of a $13 trillion economy is an enormous amount of money. Just as the economy sank, Democrats increased government spending by hundreds of billions of dollars. And now they want to make it permanent. That is the reason we have a deficit like we do.

Today, Democrats want to use that budget deficit as an excuse to lock their friends in Congress in place. They want to use it as an excuse to raise taxes, which would only make the economy worse, cause us to lose even more jobs, and make it even harder to create new jobs.

So let's just be clear about what is going on here. Right now, Washington is borrowing roughly $4 billion every day above what it collects in taxes. And Democrats don't want to admit we have a spending problem?

We have a national debt the size of our entire economy and Democrats are wondering whether they want to do anything about the biggest drivers of the debt?

Look: Democrats can continue to argue among themselves about whether to step up and address this crisis they have helped create, but they can't argue about what is chasing it or what is needed to address it.

Republicans have been crystal clear about where we stand. And Democrats have also been crystal clear about what's needed for these talks to be a success. It is my hope that they consider their own past statements on entitlement reform as we approach the end of these talks.

The path to success is clear. Let's not let this opportunity to do something go to waste. I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore.
After the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

LIBYA
Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to join the Senator from Massachusetts, who will shortly submit the product of many hours of bipartisan cooperation and negotiation, an authorization for the limited use of military force in Libya. The resolution, as will be introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts and authorized, would authorize the President to employ the U.S. Armed Forces to advance U.S. national security interests in Libya as part of the international coalition that is enforcing U.N. Security Council resolutions in Libya. It would limit this authority to 1 year, which is more than enough time to finish the job, and it makes clear that the Senate agrees with the President that there is no need and no desire to commit U.S. conventional ground forces in Libya.

I will be the first to admit that this authorization is not perfect and it will not make everyone happy. It does not fully make me happy. I would have preferred this authorization make clear that our military mission includes the President's stated policy objective of forcing Qadhafi to leave power. I would have preferred that it urge the President to commit more U.S. strike aircraft to the mission in Libya so as to help bring this conflict to a close as soon as possible. And I would have preferred that it call on the President to recognize the Transitional National Council as the legitimate voice of the Libyan people so as to free Qadhafi's frozen assets for the Transitional National Council to use on behalf of the Libyan people. I have called on the administration to do all of these things for some time, and I do so now again.

That said, this authorization has been a bipartisan effort. My Republican colleagues and I worked to make compromises, just as have the Senator from Massachusetts and his Democratic colleagues. I believe the end result is an authorization that deserves the support of my colleagues in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and I am confident they will support it.

I know the administration has made it clear that it believes it does not need a congressional authorization such as this because it is their view that U.S. military operations in Libya do not rise to the level of hostility. I believe this assertion will strike most of my colleagues and the Americans they represent as a confusing breach of common sense, and it seems to be undercut by the very report the administration sent to Congress which makes clear that U.S. Armed Forces have been and presumably will continue to fly limited strike missions to suppress enemy air defenses, to operate armed Predator drones that are attacking Qadhafi's forces in an effort to protect Libyan civilians, and to provide the overwhelming support for NATO operations, from intelligence to aerial refueling. Indeed, we read in today's New York Times that since the April 7 date that the administration claims to have ceased hostilities in Libya, U.S. warplanes have struck at Libyan air defenses on 60 occasions and fired about 30 missiles from unmanned drones.

Mr. President, I ask that this authorization be reported out of the Senate as quickly as possible. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

The Senator from Arizona.

The path to success is clear. Let's not let this opportunity to do something go to waste. I yield the floor.
times with aspects of the administration's policy in Libya. But at the end of the day, I believe the President did the right thing by intervening to stop a looming humanitarian disaster in Libya.

And all our arguments over prudence, legality, and constitutionality of the administration’s policy in Libya, we cannot forget the main point: In the midst of the most groundbreaking geopolitical event in two decades, as peaceful protests for democracy were sweeping the Middle East, with Qadhafi’s forces ready to strike at the gates of Benghazi and with Arab and Muslim allies in Libya and across the region pleading for the U.S. military to stop the bloodshed, the United States and our allies took action and prevented the massacre Qadhafi had promised to commit in a city of 700,000 people. By doing so, we began creating conditions that are increasing the pressure on Qadhafi to give up power. The turning point toward this goal has been slower than many had hoped and the administration is doing less to achieve it than I and others would like, but the bottom line is this: We are succeeding. Qadhafi is weakening. His military leaders and closest associates are abandoning him. NATO is increasing the tempo of its operations and degrading Qadhafi’s military capabilities and command and control. The Transitional National Council is gaining international recognition and support and performing more effectively, and though their progress is uneven, opposition forces in Libya are making strategic gains on the ground.

We are all entitled to our opinions about Libya policy, but here are the facts. Qadhafi is going to fall. It is just a matter of time. So I ask my colleagues, is this the time for Congress to turn against this policy? Is this the time to ride to the rescue of a failing regime or to turn our attention to what will happen if Qadhafi collapses? Is this the time the Senate to speak, and when that time comes I believe we will find a strong bipartisan majority in favor of authorizing our current military operations in Libya and seeing this mission through to success. That is the message Qadhafi needs to hear; it is a message Qadhafi’s opponents, fighting to preserve the regime, need to hear; and it is a message America’s friends and allies need to hear.

So let’s debate this authorization, but then let’s vote on it as soon as possible. I wish to thank my colleagues from Massachusetts for his hard work on this resolution. I understand he will be submitting it very soon. I hope the majority leader of the Senate will schedule a debate and vote on this resolution as soon as possible and not long overdue.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, June 20, 2011]

SCORES OF U.S. STRIKERS IN LIBYA FOLLOWED HANDOFF TO NATO

BY CHARLIE SAVAGE AND THOM SHANKER

WASHINGTON.—Since the United States handed control of the air war in Libya to NATO in early April, American warplanes have struck Libyan air defenses about 80 times, and remotely operated drones have fired missiles at targets for about 30 times, according to military officials.

The most recent strike from a piloted United States aircraft was on Saturday, and the most recent one on an American drone was on Wednesday, the officials said.

While the Obama administration has regularly acknowledged that American forces have continued to take part in some of the strike sorties, few details about their scope and frequency have been made public.

The unclassified portion of material about Libya that the White House sent to Congress last week, for example, said “American strikes are limited to the suppression of Qadhafi’s forces and do not include enemy territory or regime.” The White House included data on such radar.

On the other hand, military doctrine also considered the turning on of air-defense radar to be defensive actions, not offensive. Suppressing air defenses are typically considered to be defensive actions, not offensive.

The most recent strike from a piloted United States aircraft was on Saturday, and the most recent one on an American drone was on Wednesday, the officials said.

While the Obama administration has regularly acknowledged that American forces have continued to take part in some of the strike sorties, few details about their scope and frequency have been made public.

The unclassified portion of material about Libya that the White House sent to Congress last week, for example, said “American strikes are limited to the suppression of Qadhafi’s forces and do not include enemy territory or regime.” The White House included data on such radar.

On the other hand, military doctrine also considered the turning on of air-defense radar to be defensive actions, not offensive. Suppressing air defenses are typically considered to be defensive actions, not offensive.
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem. — Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Arizona for his important and thoughtful comments that ran counter to the political currents of the day, some of which have been expressed in the other body and elsewhere. I thank him for thinking about the strategic interests of the country ahead of some of the political interests with respect to the next election.

There have been many occasions when this body has behaved very differently when a President, either Republican or Democrat, has engaged American forces in one way or another without authorization within that 60-day—or even outside of the 60-day—parameter of the War Powers Act. The fact is, we have had a number of military actions—Panama, Libya in 1986, Grenada in 1983, Iraq in 1990, in 1991, the Persian Gulf in 1987 to 1988, Lebanon in 1982, and then subsequently Kosovo in 1999, Bosnia in 1992, Somalia in 1992—which didn’t have this fight about authorization.

In fact, only from 2001 to 2003, Afghanistan in 2001 and Iraq in 1990 were authorized prior to our engagement. The fact is, four of those I mentioned ended before the 60 days had expired, but the others didn’t. Bosnian, Kosovo, and Somalia all went beyond 60 days, and it seems that never really scared us. So I think it is important for us to put this in context, if you will, and to measure some of the realities and the choices we face with respect to Libya today.

We will shortly this morning—a little later—be submitting this resolution. It is a bipartisan resolution. Democrats and Republicans are joining together to put in a very limited authorization with respect to our engagement in a support role—not any direct engagement but a support role only—and it is limited to that support role.

I am particularly familiar with the debate relating to, and with the War Powers Act itself, over these years because that was a debate that took place specifically in response to the war that Senator McCain and I were both a part of—the Vietnam war. The War Powers Act was a direct reaction to that war which was at that time the longest war in our history, until now—Afghanistan and Iraq. Over 58,000 Americans lost their lives, and it spanned several administrations, including Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon. The fact is, as a result of that war in which we never declared war, the Congress wanted to assert its appropriate prerogatives with respect to the declaration of war and the engagement of American forces. So the War Powers Act was passed.

The War Powers Act very specifically created this dynamic where the Congress relents the President. The President could deploy troops for a period of 60 days without their action, and if they hadn’t acted, the action itself would require a President to then withdraw troops. So it didn’t actually require the Congress to act, but it created this 60-day period. The fact is, any Member of Congress during those 60 days could bring a resolution to the floor denying the President the right to go forward. Nobody did that in the past 60 days. I am glad to say, and we are now beyond those 60 days.

It is not without precedent, incidentally, that we have authorized an action much later. In fact, I think one action was authorized for about a year, and that was the action in Lebanon. About a year after they had landed it was authorized. So we are within days of that in terms of this discussion.

Let me read specifically what the War Powers Act says. It says:

In the absence of a declaration of war, in any case in which the United States Armed Forces are introduced into hostilities or into situations where armed forces are engaged in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances . . . .

I think the operative words, the critical words, are “United States Armed Forces are introduced into hostilities.” Now, one of the people there is an article in the Washington Post today, and there are other articles where people are saying: Well, of course we are in hostilities. Hostilities are taking place. Bombs are being dropped. That is okey-doke. But even that I think is a very judgment, even though I support the War Powers Act—and President Obama, incidentally, has supported it here, which is unique from other Presidents—but the fact is, just because hostilities are taking place and we are supporting people engaged in those hostilities does not mean we are ourselves, in fact, introducing troops into hostilities.

No American is being shot at. No American troop is on the ground or contemplated being put on the ground. So the mere fact that others are engaged in hostilities and we are supporting them I don’t believe automatically triggers what was contemplated in the aftermath of the Vietnam war.

Frankly, that is not the principal argument we need to be having. What we need to be doing is looking at the bigger picture. I don’t think any country—the United States, the U.N., or any nation—ought to be drawn lightly into any kind of military intervention. So the mere fact that others are engaged in hostilities and we are supporting them is not the principal argument we need to be having. What we need to be doing is looking at the bigger picture. I don’t think any country—the United States, the U.N., or any nation—ought to be drawn lightly into any kind of military intervention.

So, in my judgment, there were powerful reasons the United States should have joined in establishing the no-fly zone over Libya and forcing Qadhafi to keep his most potent weapons out of the fight.

If we slice through the fog of misinformation and weigh the risks and the benefits alongside our values and our interests, which are always at stake, I think the justification for the President’s involvement, for our country’s involvement, and for our supporting it, is compelling, and I think they are clear.

What is happening in the Middle East right now could be the single most important geostrategic shift since the fall of the Berlin Wall. It has profound implications for U.S. expenditures and for U.S. military engagement in other parts of the region. It has significant impact on the threats we will face, on the potential strategic risks for our country, and for our interests in terms of that region.

Absent United Nations-NATO resolve, the promise that the democracy movement holds for transforming the Arab world—the whole Arab world—and all it could mean for the United States in terms of hopes for peace between Israeli and Palestine, hopes for a different set of relationships, hopes for restraining Wahabism, hopes for diminishing the levels of religious extremism, hopes for reducing the amount of terrorism—all of those things are contained in this awakening, in this transformation people are trying to achieve. It is an effort which I and others believe would have been dashed if the hopes of the pro-democracy movement were simply ignored and we turned our backs on them.

I can’t imagine—just think about the consequences. Colonel Qadhafi says: I am going to show no mercy. I am going to go and kill those dogs—dogs—who have risen up and expressed their desire to have fundamental freedoms and rights. He is going to go into Benghazi and he is going to annihilate anybody who is opposed to him. He already saw him pulling people out of hospital beds. We already saw him attacking women—using rape as a tool of war—dishonoring people in the Muslim world as a consequence for life. We saw what he was doing.

Are we really serious that in the wake of the Gulf states, in an unprecedented request saying to us: We want your help; in the wake of the Arab League in an unprecedented request saying to the U.S. and other Western engagement in their part of the world to stand up for these rights, that we would simply say: Too bad, so sad, go about your business, we have better things to do?

The consequences would have been extraordinary. Remember, President Clinton said his greatest regret of his Presidency was he didn’t engage in Rwanda and prevent—which we could have done at very low cost—what happened with the genocide in Rwanda. That was his greatest regret.

How many Senators have gone to Israel and gone somewhere else in the world and said to people with respect to the Holocaust: Never again; never again. Do the words only apply to one group of people or do the words have meaning in terms of genocide, in terms of wanton killing of innocent people at the hands of a dictator?

So what is the cost to us of this great effort? I believe other dictators would believe the failure to challenge Qadhafi as a complete license to act with impunity against their people at any other place.
The vast majority of the protesters in these countries are simply crying out for the opportunity to live a decent life, get a job, provide for a family, have opportunities, and have rights. I think abandoning them would have betrayed the very people we were trying to support in building democratic freedoms, but I think we would have abandoned the core values of our country. And I can hear now—I can hear it. Some of the same people now who are complaining about the President being involved have been the first people at the barricade complaining about why the United States did not stand up for our values and how reckless the President was that he was not willing to stop a dictator from coming at these innocent people. You can hear it. Everybody in the country knows that is exactly where we would be.

Now, why there and not in Syria? A legitimate question. There are different interests and different capacities. The reality is, the Gulf States asked the Arab League, which has never before asked us to come in. And we knew whom we were dealing with with respect to the council and the players. There is a whole set of uncertainties with respect to Syria, even today, that distinguish it from the situation we face in Libya. The Arab League, which has never before asked for this kind of assistance. It came from the Gulf States, which have never before said to the West: We need your help to come intervene. Even during the decoration, when Qadhafi is finished. Ask the people in the Arab League, which has never before asked us to come in. And we knew whom we were dealing with with respect to the council and the players. There is a whole set of uncertainties with respect to Syria, even today, that distinguish it from the situation we face in Libya. The Arab League, which has never before asked for this kind of assistance. It came from the Gulf States, which have never before said to the West: We need your help to come intervene.

I believe passage of this resolution would be an important step in showing the country and the rest of the world and particularly showing Muammar Qadhafi that the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States are committed to this critical endeavor. I firmly believe the country is on the strongest footing when the President and the Congress speak with one voice on foreign policy matters. So I hope our colleagues will support this resolution.

Men who were behind the bombing of Pan Am 103 were found to be the originators of the bomb. They are responsible for the deaths of 189 passengers and crew members. American intelligence and in the NATO intelligence community are saying that the nature of this man, his own people, to his own fellow Muslims, the particular nature of this man, who was going to go after the “dogs” who dared to challenge him, and his role in the past, I believe, mandated that we act.

I think passage of this resolution would be an important step in showing the country and the rest of the world and particularly showing Muammar Qadhafi that the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States are committed to this critical endeavor. I firmly believe the country is on the strongest footing when the President and the Congress speak with one voice on foreign policy matters. So I hope our colleagues will support this resolution.

For 60 years, we have been working to build a cohesive and consistent alliance with our partners in NATO. Many times our military and political leaders have complained that our European allies have not carried their share of the burden; that Americans have paid too high a price in blood and treasure; that we have led while others followed. Earlier this month, Secretary Gates warned that the NATO alliance is at risk because of Russian troop-pinch, distaste, and disinterest. He said the United States was not going to carry the alliance as a charity.
case. Well, here is the alliance leading. Here is the alliance doing what we have wanted them to do for years. And here, all of a sudden, are Members of Congress suggesting it is OK to pull the rug out from under that alliance. I think that would really toll the bell for NATO.

I believe we need to see the realities of the strategic interests that are on the table and proceed. Will we stand up for our values and our interests at the same time? Will we support the legitimate ambitions of the Libyan people? I think our own security ultimately will be strengthened immeasurably if we can assist them to transition to a democracy. The cost now will be far, far less than the cost in the future if we lose our resolve now.

I thank my colleague for his generous allowance of the extra time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). The Senator from Nebraska.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. JOHANNS. Madam President, over a year ago now, the President signed into law health care legislation that promised no fewer than 20 times that soaring premiums. President promised. I wish I could tell them the new health care law addressed the rising costs of health care, as the President promised it would. Instead, these stories reflect what the experts predicted would happen if the law passed. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimated that individual health insurance premiums would increase by an average of $2,100 per family due solely to the new mandates included in the law. That puts the gap between Candidate Obama’s promise and President Obama’s health care law at an alarming $4,600 per family.

The administration’s own Medicare Actuary expects health care costs to increase $311 billion over the next decade under the new law. In fact, the Actuary estimates that the health care law would lower costs was “false, more so than true.”

Now, some may say: Mike, just wait until the law is fully implemented. That is when the promises will be fulfilled. But I continue to get reports on my desk forecasting the negative consequences of this irresponsible and shortsighted piece of legislation.

For example, one of the law’s major flaws is that rising costs of health insurance coverage is achieved by locking millions of people on an already-broken Medicaid system. Yet the New England Journal of Medicine recently published a study showing those on Medicaid struggle to find doctors to treat them.

The medical journal’s research revealed that 66 percent of individuals who mentioned Medicaid’s Children Health Insurance Program when calling to schedule a medical appointment were denied an appointment for the child. That is compared to only 11 percent who said they had private insurance.

And when Medicaid was accepted, the children had to wait, on average, 22 days longer than those with private insurance.

Researchers blame low Medicaid payments, delays in paying, and bureaucratic red tape driving doctors from private insurance.

As a former Governor, I can tell you that these problems have long plagued the Medicaid Program.

Yet in 2014 the President’s new law dramatically expands Medicaid, dumping over 24 million more Americans onto this very broken system. How can the President promise guaranteed coverage for these millions of Americans when this study showed the majority of our most vulnerable population would be denied treatment under the Medicaid system? The bottom line is that you cannot receive care if you cannot find a doctor to provide it. The logic simply does not match the promise.

Another recent study by the consulting group McKinsey & Company calls another one of the President’s guarantees into question. Their study analyzed the impact of the health care law on employer-sponsored benefits.

Prior to the health care law, America’s employers were the backbone of our Nation’s health care system, providing 165 million Americans with health care coverage. The McKinsey study found that 30 percent of employers will definitely or probably stop offering their employees health care insurance after 2014.

During the health care debate, supporters of the law insisted that the law builds on the principle of employer-sponsored coverage.

The President even repeatedly promised if you like your plan, you can keep it. But again, this appears to be an empty promise.

According to the study—and others that came before it—employees will be stripped of plans that they like and dumped onto the new law’s health care exchanges to fend for themselves.

I realize there is some disagreement surrounding this particular study. But how can we deny this commonsense logic?

The more you know about this law, the more you conclude it just does not make sense for employers to offer a health care plan.

Beginning in 2014, the health care law mandates that employers with more than 50 workers offer health insurance coverage or pay a penalty of $2,000 per worker. And with this mandate comes a slew of other requirements. Suddenly dropping coverage and paying the $2,000 penalty becomes an economic necessity.

During the health care debate, I spoke about this on the Senate floor. And many others warned that the proposed penalties for businesses who fail to provide coverage would create a perverse incentive. When you do the math, I said back then this is no penalty at all, compared to the cost of private insurance.

It is a wise business decision if you are worried about this bottom line. That is how the law encourages employers to dump their employees onto the exchange.

A Deloitte consultant told the Associated Press, ‘I don’t know if the intent was to find an exit strategy for America’s employers for businesses who wrote the bill as written provides the mechanism.’ John Deere has responded by saying businesses will look into ‘just paying the
fine." Not surprisingly, employers have done their own math. AT&T reported that its $2.4 billion cost of coverage would drop to $600 million for the penalties. Estimates reveal Caterpillar could save 70 percent on health care costs by eliminating coverage and paying the penalties. And the list goes on.

Prior to its passage, the Congressional Budget Office predicted 7 percent of employers would drop insurance coverage due to the health care law. Now studies and business logic are challenging that estimate. This may mean the CBO's projected cost of the health care law may be significantly too low.

That is right—the $2.6 trillion cost estimate for the health care law could be surprisingly too low. The President promised that this bill would lift the burden off the middle class. Not only will they see their premiums continue to increase due to out-of-control health care costs, but they will foot the cost of the new exchanges.

Unfortunately, time is confirming what we have been predicting all along. The case for repeal of the health care law grows stronger every day. I still work to overturn these negative consequences. I believe Americans deserve better. They deserve promises that we can keep.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

MONTANA FLOODS

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I wish to talk a little bit about the flooding that is going on in Montana and has been going on for basically better than the last month. The picture I have is that of the Musselshell River east of Roundup. The river channel is not in this area. In fact, it is on the far side of this river.

My guess is—I have not seen this—this picture was taken about 10 days ago. But my guess is, it is still flowing like this and for a number of reasons I want to address in my speech today.

Over the past few months, we have seen severe flooding in Montana that has impacted our homes and businesses. It has devastated farmland and ranch land. It has displaced families across our State.

The flooding has tested thousands of Montanans and the basic services and infrastructure they rely on every day. But when disaster hits Montana, we rise to the occasion. When I meet the families and the community leaders affected by flooding and when I tour their towns, I do not see resignation or hopelessness. I see resilience. I see our traditions of hard work and working together. I see communities that are rebuilding and moving forward, ordinary people and local officials working diligently with local, State, and Federal partners to address urgent and ongoing needs they are unable to address alone.

Thanks to that spirit of working together, neighbor to neighbor, Montana communities are rebuilding and businesses are reopening. We are looking to account for the severe crop damage and livestock loss suffered by Montana's farmers and ranchers, and we are looking for resources to make up for the $36 million damages to our State's infrastructure. Sadly, that number is only getting bigger.

Montana's resiliency is going to be tested because we are not out of it yet—not even close. Given the unusually large snowpack in the Rocky Mountains that has yet to melt, our rivers and streams will continue to swell. The cost to Montana communities and families will continue to mount, and more and more of them will look to emergency assistance to provide timely services and assistance to those most in need, to help them get back on their feet.

That is why I am particularly alarmed by近些年 FEMA’s Disaster Relief Fund, which the House left dangerously unfunded, even amid a string of weather-related disasters across this country that have led us to 45 declared disasters. We are now looking at estimates of a $2 to nearly $5 billion shortfall for fiscal year 2012 alone.

The total need is estimated to be as much as $36 billion. Montana is still tallying the damage. The risk of further damage is still very high. Yet we do not know right now if there will be enough money left over to meet the needs this disaster has already created in our State of Montana.

The House thinks we should pay for past disasters with funding allocated for current and future disasters and by cutting assistance to firefighters and other first responders. In Roundup, Billings, and elsewhere in Montana, the authorities are sending stranded residents in boats to take them to get urgent medical care are not from FEMA; they are the same men and women who fight to protect our communities every day—the cops and firefighters who are part of these communities.

Taking away the resources they need will not fly. It is irresponsible and unacceptable. I want all my colleagues to understand the importance of what we are facing, not just in Montana but across this country. There are 45 declared disasters around the country. It is time to do our part for communities across this country that are facing unprecedented disasters from floods, tornadoes, and wildfires.

Let's make sure this Nation’s emergency responders have what they need to do their jobs. They are doing their part for all of us. Tough economic times have forced us all into some very difficult decisions. There is no doubt about that. But it is critical that we do everything we can on behalf of the communities and families across our Nation who are simply looking to pick up the pieces, to rebuild their homes, their schools and businesses, and to get back on their feet.

When small businesses cannot get back on their feet and when our No. 1 industry, agriculture, gets a punch during the growing season, our entire economy will be impacted in a negative way. Montanans will continue to be resilient, and they will continue looking out for one another. But there are some burdens that are simply too big for them to bear alone. It is time for Congress to stand, do its part, and the sooner the better.

I look forward to working with Chairwoman LANDRIEU and Ranking Member COATS on the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee to make sure that no community from Montana or anywhere else in the country is left wondering if the government will make good on a commitment to help them rebuild.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be equally divided.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL H. SIMON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael H. Simon, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour of debate on the nomination, equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate will finally consider the nomination of Michael Simon to fill a judicial emergency vacancy on the District of Oregon.
Court for the District of Oregon. Mr. Simon, the head of litigation at the Portland office of Perkins Coie, is one of the most highly regarded lawyers in the country. He spent 5 years as a trial attorney at the Department of Justice during the Reagan administration, including a stint as a Federal prosecutor, and 3 years as a volunteer judge pro tem on an Oregon county court. Mr. Simon’s nomination has had the strong support of his home State Senators, Senator Wyden and Senator Mrazek, since he was nominated nearly a year ago and has twice been reported by the Judiciary Committee with significant bipartisan support. I mention that because, traditionally, someone like this would go through almost the first day after he was reported.

I thank the majority leader and the Republican leader for finally scheduling this vote. It is most unfortunate that the Republicans objected to considering this nomination when it was reported last year. That meant that we had to spend more time and taxpayer money to consider it a second time in the Judiciary Committee, and the nomination had to be reported again earlier this year. It should not have taken more than two months for the committee to report Mr. Simon’s nomination for a second time for the Senate Republican leadership to finally consent to debate and a vote.

This is, finally, the last of the judicial nominations reported last year that could and in my view should have been considered then. Now, after 6 months of unnecessary delay, the people of the District of Oregon may finally see a longstanding judicial vacancy filled by a highly qualified nominee who has always had bipartisan support from the days he was working for the Reagan administration. The Senate may finally be able, 6 months into this year, to start to focus on nominees who had previously considered and reported by the Judiciary Committee this year.

There are currently 16 judicial nominees who were reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee over the last several months who are still awaiting final Senate consideration and confirmation. They include nominees with the support of Republican home State Senators and nominees for judicial emergency vacancies. These delays mean that judicial vacancies around the country have grown larger. With current vacancies hovering around 90 and many more upcoming, the Senate is being prevented from solving the vacancies crisis that the Chief Justice, President, Attorney General and judges around the country have urged us to end.

When we take nominations considered 1 year and then delay them into the next year, it is wrong to say that you are moving right along. I have served with, and stand with, Dora Ford, Carter, Reagan, the first President Bush, Clinton, the second President Bush, and now President Obama. During all that time, whether Democrats or Republicans were in the majority, no President had to put up with these unseemly delays, except for President Obama.

The delay in considering this nomination is only the latest demonstration that those who say that the majority leader can simply call up nominations are wrong. Senators know it is not true. If that were true, nominees like Mr. Simon would have been considered and voted on last year.

Some Senators may seek to avoid responsibility for the Senate’s historically slow pace of confirming judicial nominations and claim their hands are clean, but they know the Senate is a body that requires consent to avoid excessive delays. They know that if there is no consent, it takes the burdensome requirement of invoking cloture in order to end a filibuster and have a vote. Moving forward to address the ongoing judicial vacancy crisis—and it is a crisis—requires cooperation. It requires Senators to work together with the majority and set aside partisan differences for the good of the American people.

Last week, the Senate was able to get consent to confirm the first two judicial nominees since May, even though almost a score of qualified nominees has been awaiting final confirmation since that date. In addition to the Simon nomination, there are 19 judicial nominations currently pending on the Senate’s Calendar. Of those, 16 are, by anyone’s definition, consensus nominees. Seven of them were nominated to fill judicial emergency vacancies. Sixteen nominees were unanimously approved by every Republican and every Democratic Senator on the Judiciary Committee after thorough review, and an additional nominee was reported with only one Senator in opposition. All are supported by their home State Senators, Republicans and Democrats.

These are the kinds of nominees who in past years would have been confirmed within days of being reported to the Senate. Instead, extended delays now burden every nomination before the Republican leadership finally consents, if it does, to take up nominations. Mr. Simon’s nomination was first reported with bipartisan support last December. Three district court nominations reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee remained unstalled before the Senate. Paul Oetken and Paul Engelmayer of New York, and Romana Mangiona of the Mariana Islands. All of these consensus nominations would easily have been confirmed if the majority leader was not blocked from bringing them up. We should not need to file cloture to vote on these kinds of consensus nominees, but that is what has been required by the Senate Republican minority. Incidentally, when we have filed for cloture on these nominations, for many of them we got a vote and they passed overwhelmingly.

We should have regular votes on President Obama’s highly qualified nominees instead of more delays. We should also restore the Senate’s tradition—tradition I can speak to as one who has been in the Senate for 37 years—of working to clear the calendar of pending nominations before a recess. Contrast that traditional practice with the Senate Memorial Day recess, when no judicial nominees were confirmed. With vacancies still totaling more than 90 on Federal courts throughout the country, and with nearly two dozen future vacancies on the horizon, there is no time to delay consideration of these nominations. If we were to take positive action just on the nominees who received unanimous support in committee, vacancies could be reduced below 80 for the first time since the beginning of President Obama’s administration.

With judicial vacancies continuing at crisis levels, affecting the ability of courts to provide justice to Americans around the country, I have been urging the Senate to vote on the judicial nominations reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee and pending on the Senate’s Executive Calendar. My efforts have not yielded much success or sense of urgency. Nor have the Senate and the Chief Justice of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the Federal Bar Association and a number of Federal judges across the country.

Those who delay or prevent the filling of these vacancies must understand they are delaying and preventing the administration of justice. We can pass all the bills we want to protect Americans and others of our citizens from fraud and other crimes, but you cannot lock up criminals or recover ill-gotten gains if you do not have judges. The mounting backlogs of civil and criminal cases are growing larger.

I think of the first 2 years of the last President Bush’s term in office. During those months that he was in the majority, they did not bother to hold a hearing on President Bush’s nominees. But in the 17 months that the Democrats were in charge, the Democrats held hearings and confirmed 100 of his nominees. To their credit, in the following 24 months, the Republicans confirmed 105.

Ah, for those days.

Our ability to make progress regarding nominations has been hampered by the misplaced controversy over many nominees’ records. As with the long-delayed nomination of Judge Edward Chen, the supposed “controversy” that has delayed and obstructed the nomination of Michael Simon is the result of some Senators seeking to impose a partisan litmus test in place of our sworn constitutional duty to offer advice and consent on nominations. That Mr. Simon filed amicus briefs on behalf of the ACLU and several Jewish organizations in cases involving the First Amendment, discrimination against gay and lesbian individuals, and the rights of religious minorities does not...
We have long favored an up-or-down vote on judicial candidates nominated by the president. The Senate has generally agreed not to hold hostage qualified judicial candidates because the Senate, where Liu’s nomination remained bottled up through the efforts of Republicans, had generally agreed not to hold hostage qualified judicial candidates from the opposing political party. It is a shame that we have allowed this to happen.

The San Francisco Chronicle editorialized:

Fair-minded people who have looked at Liu’s record and determined that he has the intellect and temperament to be a superb appellate judge include prominent conservatives Richard Painter, chief ethics lawyer in the Bush White House, and Whitewater prosecutor Ken Starr. But neither fair play nor intellectual honesty carried the day in the Senate, where Liu’s nomination remained bottled up through the efforts of multiple Republicans who had opined (in the Bush White House) that it was unconstitutional for senators to deprive a judicial nominee of an up-or-down vote.

In an editorial entitled, “Trashing of Court Nominees Must End,” the Iowa City Press-Citizen wrote:

What is most disturbing about Thursday’s Senate vote is not the fact that the Senate rejected this nominee, but how it was done: through a filibuster. In 2005 the Republicans used the Senate rules to prevent a simple up-or-down vote on the Liu nomination.

I ask unanimous consent that copies of these editorials be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

MR. LEAHY. The question for me about Mr. Simon is the same question I have asked about Judge Chen, Professor Liu, and every judicial nominee, whether nominated by a Democrat or a Republican President: whether he or she will have judicial independence. I don’t care what their politics are. I don’t care what party they belong to. I don’t care who they have represented in the past. All I want to know is: Will they have judicial independence? Do they understand the role of a judge and how that differs from the role of an advocate?

The Senate GOP agreed that 

Mr. Liu dared to criticize Justice Samuel Alito Jr. as harshly conservative before he was confirmed to the Supreme Court. The filibuster apparently was payback, and the Republican eagerness for revenge has broken faith and a clear understanding on the Senate floor. That will make it harder to fill benches during this administration and many more to come.

[From denverpost.com, May 28, 2011]
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include the president getting to choose judicial candidates, even if they are controversial.

A return to the so-called judge wars in an effort to get the president's picks for the federal bench ultimately will serve neither party.

[From SFGate.com, May 20, 2011] SHAME ON GOP SENATORS WHO BLOCKED GOODWIN LIU

Senate Republicans, dripping with partisanship and hypocrisy, blocked an up-or-down vote Thursday on the nomination of UC Berkeley law professor Goodwin Liu to the Ninth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco.

The argument that Liu is a leftist ideologue does not hold up to scrutiny. Instead, the continuing filibuster of Liu's nomination carries the distinct scent of political retribution.

Fair-minded people who have looked at Liu's record and determined that he has the intellect and temperament to be a superb appellate judge include prominent conservative Richard Painter, chief ethics lawyer in the Bush White House, and Whitewater prosecutor Kenneth Starr.

But neither fair play nor intellectual honesty carried the day in the Senate, where Liu's nomination remained bottled up throughout efforts of multiple Republicans who had opined (in the Bush years) that it was unconstitutional for senators to deprive a judicial nominee of an up-or-down vote. The obstructionists included Sens. John McCain, R-Ariz., and Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., who were among a group of 14 senators who had pledged that they would filibuster a nominee only in "extraordinary circumstances."

Both McCain and Graham suggested, unconvincingly, that Liu was sufficiently out of the mainstream to merit such extreme action. Graham specifically mentioned Liu's "outrageous attack" on Samuel Alito during his Supreme Court confirmation hearings in 2006. But, again, on closer inspection, Liu's point-by-point dissection of Alito's record was meticulously documented with facts.

Another undercurrent at play is a GOP fear that Liu, with his intellect and appealing manner, might be a candidate to become the first Asian American on the Supreme Court. The gamesmanship and unqualified nominees constitute a disgrace to the Senate and a disservice to the judiciary.


The judicial confirmation wars just got a fresh supply of ammunition. The U.S. Senate on Thursday failed to muster the votes needed to move forward on the confirmation of a nominee for a federal judgeship.

That almost certainly ended the Obama administration's two-year struggle to win confirmation for Goodwin Liu to the 9th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals.

The rejection also shattered any hope that partisan battles over confirmations might finally end. Democrats outraged over this loss will no doubt remember this and look for an opportunity for payback. This has been the story since 1987, when President Ronald Reagan's nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court.was rejected by the Senate. Then, as now, Democrats led the effort to defeat Robert Bork, Ronald Reagan's nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court. Since then, both parties have been guilty of trashing the potential judicial careers of clearly fit nominees: Republicans skewering Democratic presidents' nominees; Democrats returning the favor for Republican presidents.

Sadly, Sen. Chuck Grassley, R-I.A., played a role in defeating the Liu nomination. This is especially disappointing since, as the ranking Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee—which vets judicial nominees—Grassley could have helped set a new tone on confirmations. Instead, he has done just the opposite. Grassley has consistently opposed Liu's confirmation because, he has said, the professor and associate dean at the University of California School of Law has made numerous controversial statements in his writings and speeches that express an "activist judicial philosophy" and because he has no prior appellate experience. In a prepared statement, Grassley said "Liu holds a view of the Constitution that can only be described as an activist judicial philosophy, and if appointed to the court, he will bring a personal agenda and political ideology into the courtroom."

That is one opinion, and Grassley is certainly entitled to it. Others—including several conservative Republican lawyers, including former Whitewater prosecutor Kenneth Starr and two former law clerks in the Bush administration—disagree. Liu was given a unanimous "well qualified" endorsement from the American Bar Association, his rod with the strongest a 52 senators who voted for cloture voted for confirmation. The effort to end the filibuster fell five votes short of the needed 60. But had the 52 senators who voted for confirmation been right then, Liu would be headed for the bench.

This is the very same tactic Republicans (including Grassley) condemned when Democrats filibustered to block Republican nominees. They said that all presidential nominees deserve an up-or-down vote, and they were right then. How soon they forget.

Aias, Democrats who are outraged by Thursday's move will not forget, and this mindless back-and-forth battle over judges will continue, probably forever. It is a sad day for the courts, for bipartisanship in the Senate and for the administrative system.

Mr. GRASSLEY, Today, the Senate will consider the nomination of Michael Simon, nominated to be a U.S. district judge for the District of Oregon. This nominee was reported out of Judiciary Committee with four votes in opposition. I am one of those who opposed the nominee and would like to detail my reasons for doing so.

Mr. Simon received his B.A. summa cum laude from the University of California, Los Angeles, in 1978, and J.D. cum laude from Harvard Law School in 1981. He began his career as a trial attorney with the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department.

In 1985, he spent 6 months as special assistant U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia and argued one appeal before the Fourth Circuit. Mr. Simon joined a large law firm as an associate in 1986. Since 1990, he has been a partner and the head of litigation for the firm's Portland office.

Throughout his career, Mr. Simon has advocated on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon as a pro bono attorney. But his involvement in the ACLU goes beyond mere representation of a client. Mr. Simon has been a member of the ACLU of Oregon since 1986. He is an active member of their Lawyers' Committee and served as a board member from 1997 to the year 2004, the vice president for legislation 1997 to 1999, and the president for litigation from 2000 to 2004.

I recognize that judicial nominees should not be evaluated solely on client lists or memberships, that would be very unfair. However, these are relevant bits of information about a nominee.

Listen to the words of one of my Democratic colleagues, who inferred that the ACLU is beyond a moderate and mainstream approach. This was stated during the debate on judges nominated by President Bush:

"If you look at the records of these judges and you put scales, left to right, 10 being the most liberal and 1 being the most conservative, these judges are "ones," to be charitable. When Bill Clinton nominated judges, I understood mainstream people who tended to be a little more liberal, but were moderate and mainstream—very few legal aid lawyers or ACLU charter members, but a few more prosecutors and partners in law firms.

My colleague recognized that ACLU lawyers were beyond moderate and mainstream. I would complete his analysis and rank this organization as very liberal.

In Mr. Simon's case, there has been concern about whether or not he shares the far out views of the ACUL. On this question, Mr. Simon refuses to provide a clear answer. At his hearing he stated that "we do not necessarily agree with all of the positions taken by the American Civil Liberties Union."

When asked in follow-up questions to describe the legal or policy position with which he disagrees, he argued that his advice to the ACLU was confidential and that the ACLU had not asked him to disclose anysten privilege. In a second round of questions, committee members clarified they were not asking about advice to a client, but policy positions with which he disagreed. This was met with "I am not at liberty to describe the legal or policy positions advocated by the ACLU with which I disagree."

The ACLU does hold very liberal views, and Mr. Simon has been the voice for those views. For example, Mr. Simon wrote a letter to the Tillamook County Courthouse in Oregon expressing the ACLU's concern with religious Christmas signs and decorations. The letter encouraged the county to repeal its resolution that deemed the county a "Merry Christmas County."

On another issue after Mr. Simon refused to dissociate himself from legal and policy positions held by the ACLU, that are far outside the mainstream. This includes the legalization of drugs, the unconstitutionality of the death penalty, the unconstitutionality of the Patriot Act, the ACLU's opposition to tax exemptions for churches and extreme views regarding separation of church and state.
Mr. Simon’s views on the war on terrorism and a liberal view on civil liberties are troubling to me. In a speech in 2007, Mr. Simon argued that Americans’ civil liberties have been threatened because of measures undertaken following 9/11. In his speech, he said that religion would be excluded and our solutions more effective if we stop thinking about—and stop calling—terrorism a “war” or a “crime,” and argued that calling military action against terrorism a “war” “implies that it’s a methodical, legal and efficient tool for this fight” and that terminology “may limit more creative and even more successful techniques to promote and protect our security.

Perhaps Mr. Simon agrees with the Attorney General who, in a recent speech, asserted that “our most effective terror-fighting weapon” is our article III [civil] court system. I certainly disagree with that assertion, and I think most national security experts and most Americans would disagree as well.

Mr. Simon appears to approach constitutional theory with an activist slant. In remarks before a conference sponsored by the Oregon Lawyers Chapter of the American Constitution Society on May 23, 2007, Mr. Simon stated:

There is also support for the conclusion that the Founders did not believe that their intentions and understanding should bind future generations, that may be the only real ‘original intent’ of the Founders.

That quotation makes me wonder, if the Constitution wasn’t going to have any hold on future generations, why did the drafters spend so much time during that summer of 1787—and even longer periods of time—getting the Constitution adopted? That seems to be the implication of what he says there.

It is no surprise, then, that Mr. Simon has a hostile view of religion in the government. He continued in those remarks. “There is also support for the proposition that the concept of ‘separation of church and state’ was an ‘unfolding and evolving’ idea at the time of the Founders.

Mr. Simon appears to demand an absolute wall of separation between church and state, as opposed to the U.S. Government promoting a specific religion. He has argued against religious displays on public land, against religious schools, against a coach praying with his football players. I assume that means even if you’re praying that they don’t get injured. Mr. Simon has argued that it is unconstitutional under the establishment clause to teach intelligent design in public school science classes.

Based on his views regarding the war on terror, his activist approach to constitutional interpretation, his hostility to religion in the public square, and his remarks and advocacy of ideas which indicate a legal view that is outside the mainstream, I will oppose this nomination. I ask my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see my two friends—the two outstanding and distinguished Senators from the State of Oregon—and I yield the floor to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MERKLEY.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his comments and perspective on judicial independence. It is extremely important that our court system that can both be effective and reflect the faith of the citizens of this Nation that they have a system of true justice.

I rise in support of the nomination of Michael Simon to the post of U.S. District Judge for the District Court of Oregon. Quite simply, Michael Simon is a man of enormous integrity, intellectual breadth and depth, and good old-fashioned common sense and dedication. He has earned a reputation as a top lawyer in commercial litigation, appellate law, and constitutional law. He is respected nationally. He is eminently qualified for this seat.

After graduation cum laude from UCLA, he attended Harvard Law School, where he graduated cum laude. He began his legal career in the Department of Justice’s anti-trust division, where he served as a trial attorney. It’s even more successful techniques to promote and protect our security.

Mr. Simon is currently a partner at Perkins Coie in Portland, where he has worked since 1986 and earned a reputation as one of the Northwest’s real legal stars. He has engaged in extensive pro bono work and has volunteered for many nonprofit organizations. He has served as an adjunct faculty member at Lewis & Clark Law School, teaching antitrust law, drawing on his earlier life experience. He has also served as a pro tem judge on the Multnomah County Circuit Court.

In the good old days, Michael has made his name as a staunch defender of consumer protection, anti-trust laws, and the first amendment. He has found the time to be deeply involved in his community, displaying a commitment to voluntarism, civic participation, and public service.

For years, Michael has been a leader of the Consumer Project, a non-profit that prepares youths to become active, engaged and informed participants in our society. Serving as president, and then as a board member, he has helped bring a love of civics and democracy to thousands of public school students across Oregon.

In addition to his service in government, he has been active in the Jewish community. Mr. Simon has been an active member of the Jewish community in Portland. He is a familiar and beloved face at his temple, Beth Israel, and has served on the boards of the American Jewish Committee and the Jewish Federation of Greater Portland.

In short, Michael Simon exemplifies the traits that every Federal district judge should possess—a brilliant legal mind and a heart dedicated to service, fairness, and community.

The U.S. District Court of Oregon has historically had a reputation as a place of efficient and fair courts led by outstanding professional judges. I know that Michael Simon will uphold this tradition. He will be an outstanding judge who will continue the district’s tradition of fairness and commitment to public service, and he will fill a critical vacancy in this district.

Michael Simon is an excellent nominee. And I urge all my colleagues to reflect on his record and his capacity in multiple dimensions throughout his life that I’ve seen. I urge the Senate to support his nomination.

I thank the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, Senator MERKLEY has said it very well this morning. I had a chance to speak about Michael Simon yesterday, and I want to take a few minutes this morning to do so.

After the retirement of Senator Hatfield, whom we all know is still beloved by many here in the Senate, I have had a chance to work with our former colleague Senator Gordon Smith and now with Senator MERKLEY to send to both Republican and Democratic Presidents some outstanding men and women for their consideration for the District Court in Oregon. Today, Senator MERKLEY and I send to the Senate for its consideration another outstanding individual—someone who is going to take his place with the other leaders who have been named to the district court of Oregon.

Michael Simon is one of those persons who, when you look at what kind of jurist you want to have, meets all the essential tests. He is a thoughtful man, he is a fair man, and he is an independent jurist who always has all the facts in front of him before he makes a reasoned judgment. When I look at his background—and Senator MERKLEY has laid out several of the areas that were special and that we are especially proud of, his work in the private sector at Perkins Coie—I come particularly to his work in consumer protection and the antitrust field, because it highlights the kind of person Michael Simon is.

It has been one of his most notable contributions to strengthening consumer protection law working on behalf of the Department of Justice on the case of the United States v. American Airlines, and he successfully argued then for the antitrust division of the Sherman Act to include monopolization and attempted monopolization.

This is not a partisan issue. This is the kind of issue that helps all Americans. It’s all Americans, regardless of their political philosophy or party they belong—to benefit from the fruits of a more competitive American marketplace.
Michael Simon’s work in that area benefits each and every one of us every single day.

Second, as I talked about yesterday, and Senator MERKLEY has described eloquently this morning, we are very proud of Michael Simon’s service as a volunteer. I can tell you, that it seems as though virtually every good cause that comes across my desk at home seems to have Michael Simon’s name on it urging that Oregonians participate and volunteer their time.

We are especially proud of his work on behalf of children. His work with the Classroom Law Project, his work at the Waverly Children’s Home, where he was past head of the board of directors, these kinds of positions are ones where you make a difference. These kinds of positions give Mr. Simon a chance to teach not just right and wrong to young people but a chance to give them the kind of background about the rule of law and the rights and responsibilities we want to instill in our children. That is why we are very proud to bring to the attention of the Senate his work with Oregon’s youngsters.

Finally, I want to stress the immediacy of the need for the Senate to confirm Michael Simon today. This seat has been vacant for 664 days. It is just 1 of 136 judicial vacancies.

Justice delayed is justice denied. Until the Senate begins to move expeditiously to fill these vacancies, justice will continue to be denied to thousands of Oregon’s youngsters.

Both Senator MERKLEY and I are very grateful to Senator LEAHY and Senator GRASSLEY, the majority leader Senator REID, and the minority leader Mr. MCCONNELL for their work to bring this nomination to the floor.

I hope colleagues who have questions about Michael Simon will come to Senator MERKLEY and myself. We will stay on the floor and be available to colleagues to answer any questions.

But this is a good and decent man who possesses all of the requisite qualities we would like in a jurist, whether it is his work in the private sector, whether it is his pioneering work in the field of extending the reach of the Sherburne to households with no legal representation. This is a person who will reflect great credit on the District Court of Oregon and on the legal system of our country.

I hope all our colleagues will support Michael Simon today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Leon Panetta to the 23rd Secretary of Defense. Director Panetta has a long history of government and private sector service and experience, including service in the U.S. Army.

Director Panetta served ably for eight terms as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, rising to be chairman of the House Budget Committee. He left that position to be President Clinton’s Director of the Office of Management and Budget and later served 2½ years as President Clinton’s Chief of Staff, which is where I got to know him well. He then spent 10 years codirecting a foundation with his wife that seeks to instill in young men and women the virtues and values of public service. Knowing Director Panetta, this comes as no surprise. In February 2009, he became the 19th Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and it was in this capacity where I have had the opportunity to work very closely with him over the last several years and consider him a close friend.

Director Panetta has been an outstanding leader of the Central Intelligence Agency, and it is bittersweet to see him leave. Director Panetta is a true leader in every sense of the word. He understands how Capitol Hill works since he served in Congress for 16 years. He has always been a strong supporter of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, which is the committee that oversees his organization, the right kind of deference and responding to our questions and concerns promptly and directly.

Although he leaves the CIA, he is not leaving the administration and I am quite pleased that I will continue to have the opportunity to work with him as Secretary of Defense. I think he has the right qualifications for his new job. He understands and in this time of economic austerity we need someone with that knowledge and his ability to understand and manage the resources of a huge organization such as the Department of Defense.

In his capacity as Director of the CIA, he has also worked and built strong partnerships with the Department of Defense, having been involved in the planning and execution of numerous joint operations, including of course the operation against Osama bin Laden. He will continue this strong partnership in his new position, and I know he will continue to ensure that these two organizations work closely together and cooperate successfully in the interest of our national security and for the safety of our country.

Director Panetta has a very challenging job ahead of him. The United States is involved in three major military operations overseas, as well as countless smaller ones. Budgets are extremely tight, and they are only going to get tighter. However, no country has the global interests and global responsibilities that the United States has, and for that reason we need a military that can protect those interests and carry out those responsibilities. Director Panetta will need to decide how we do that and will also help decide what, if anything, the United States can and cannot do.

He will also need to take responsibility for shaping our military to be prepared for the future. For the last decade, our military has necessarily focused on fighting and winning the conflicts we are in; namely, Iraq and Afghanistan. We continue to meet that challenge, and I am very optimistic that we, with the Afghan people, will prevail against insurgents in Afghanistan just as we prevailed with the Iraqi people against insurgents in Iraq. However, we can’t take our eyes off the future. As a nation, we have a very poor record of predicting where our next conflict will come from.

I heard Secretary McNamara has his confirmation hearing to be Secretary of Defense in 1961, no one asked him a question about a country called Vietnam. And when Secretary Rumsfeld’s confirmation hearing in 2001, no one asked him about Afghanistan. But in both cases, those were the issues that would dominate their tenure as Secretary of Defense.

We need our Armed Forces need to be prepared to fight conflicts that are unlike our current ones. We cannot, and should not, assume that the next war will be like the current one. We need to be prepared for both high-end and low-end conflict. We need to be prepared not just so that we can fight and win these conflicts but so we can deter potential adversaries and not have to fight in the first place.

Similarly, Panetta recognizes that, and I know he will continue to be committed to ensuring our military is as prepared as possible to meet whatever challenges may come our country’s way. That will not be easy, and it will take a man of his ability to do this successfully and in a way that takes into account our current fiscal situation. However, I believe the President has chosen the right man for the job.

I support Leon Panetta nomination to be the next Secretary of Defense, and I encourage my colleagues to support that nomination as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, let me first say I thought the statement from the distinguished Senator from Georgia was spot on, and I particularly appreciated his point that when we confirm Leon Panetta to head Defense, no one can possibly predict what kind of challenges he will face there. But this is the kind of person who, because of ability and background, is up to any kind
of challenges that are thrown to him. So I want to associate myself with my colleague from Georgia.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back the remainder of the time and I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michael H. Simon, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The roll call will be onye.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE).

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

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 35, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAHS</th>
<th>NAYHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The risk of a terrorist organization getting their hands on and detonating an improvised nuclear device or other weapon of mass destruction remains one of the gravest possible threats to the United States. To counter that threat, the Defense Department is working with the Departments of State, Energy, Homeland Security, and other U.S. Government agencies to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, fissile materials, and dangerous technologies. As Secretary of Defense, Mr. Panetta's leadership in this area will be of vital importance. Here again, it is that experience as Director of the CIA which will be so invaluable.

In the coming weeks, President Obama and his advisers will face a number of key national security decisions. While the drawdown of U.S. forces in Iraq remains on track, there have been recent signs of instability in that country. As a result, it is possible that Iraq's political leadership may ask for some kind of continuing U.S. military presence beyond the December 31 withdrawal deadline which was agreed to by President Bush and Prime Minister Maliki in the 2008 Security Agreement.

Another key decision point is looming in Afghanistan regarding reductions in U.S. forces starting next month. President Obama said the other day:

It's now time for us to recognize that we have accomplished a big chunk of our mission and that it's time for Afghans to take more responsibility.

The President also said a few months ago that the reductions starting next month will be 'significant.' Hopefully, they will be, Director Panetta, while not assigning a specific number, agreed they need to be significant. A significant reduction in our troop level this year would send a critical signal to Afghan leaders that we mean it when we say our commitment is limited and that they need to be urgently focused on preparing Afghanistan's security forces to assume security responsibility for all of Afghanistan. The more that Afghan security forces do that, the better the chances of success because the Taliban's biggest nightmare is facing a large, effective Afghan Army—an army which is already respected by the Afghan people, but now, hopefully—and soon—in control of Afghanistan's security.

Another major issue facing the Defense Department is the stress that 10 years of unbroken war has placed on our Armed Forces. Over the last decade, many of our service men and women have been away from their families and homes for multiple tours. Our force is stressed, so are our military families. We owe them our best efforts to reduce the number of deployments and increase the time between deployments.

The next Secretary of Defense will have to struggle with the competing demands on our forces while Washington struggles with an extremely challenging fiscal environment. The
Defense budget will not and should not be exempt from cuts. But Congress, working with the next Secretary of Defense, will need to scrub each Defense program and expenditure and make the tough choices and tradeoffs between our war fighters' requirements today and preparations for the threats of tomorrow.

Last week, the Armed Services Committee marked up the fiscal year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act. The committee cut about $6 billion from the President's budget request. However, the President has decided to reduce the national security budgets for the next 12 years by $400 billion. What we don't know is how much of that $400 billion will he recommend to come from the Defense budget and how much from the intelligence and homeland security budgets or how much is recommended to be in the first of that 12-year period—fiscal year 2012.

The Nation is fortunate that Director Panetta has almost 50 years of public service when I did. I know him as a person, I know his family. I know what he thinks. I know his values. I have to tell you, President Obama and America are fortunate to have a person of this quality who is willing to give even more of his life in public service. He could have stayed out in Monterey, CA, his home area, and no hardship as- sessments, Secretary Gates' leadership, and candor have earned him the trust and respect of all who have worked with him. Secretary Gates has combined vision and thoughtfulness with toughness, clarity and courageous decision-making. History will estimate that we established a direct and open relationship with Congress and with our Senate Armed Services Committee in particular. As chairman of that committee, I will always be personally grateful for that. Secretary Gates as Secretary of Defense will be judged by history to have been truly exceptional. So our next Secretary of Defense will have enormous responsibilities but also big shoes to fill. I am confident Leon Panetta is the right person to take on that challenge and our colleagues to support this nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that any time consumed during the quorum call be equally divided.

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

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 23rd Secretary of Defense, Mr. Leon Panetta. These are big shoes to fill. Secretary Gates has had a remarkable career in public service. In addition, the challenges our military faces in this economic climate are significant. We must have a serious discussion about crafting a sustainable way forward.

I sat with Director Panetta earlier this month to discuss these challenges. I can say with certainty, Leon Panetta is up to the test. He has the experience and wisdom required, and I look forward to working with him once the Senate gives its advice and consent to his nomination.

I have known Leon Panetta for a long time. We served together in the House of Representatives, and we worked together in government for many years. He has an amazing history of public service to America. We served together on the House Budget Committee when we were both Congressmen in the early 1990s, and he chaired that committee. He understands budgets and the challenges they present.

As Director of the Office of Management and Budget, he took that skill to the executive branch; and as Chief of Staff to President Clinton, he crafted the proposal which brought us to balance in our budget as a nation. It is hard to imagine it was only 10 years ago that we had a balanced Federal budget. In fact, we were generating a surplus, putting that money into the Social Security trust fund to make it stronger. Ten years later, mired deep in debt, it is hard to imagine that happened, but it did, and Leon Panetta was a big part of that occurrence.

He advised President George W. Bush on how to bring a close to the Iraq war in a responsible way. For the last 2 years, he has had an awesome responsibility as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Thanks to the President's strategic focus and Director Panetta's extraordinary leadership, Special Forces and CIA operatives were able to locate and capture Osama bin Laden last month in Pakistan. These are precisely the skills and experiences we need at the table at this moment.

I know Leon Panetta as more than just a fellow colleague in the House and a person who shared some time in public service when I did. I know him as a person, I know his family. I know what he thinks. I know his values. I have to tell you, President Obama and America are fortunate to have a person of this quality who is willing to give even more of his life in public service. He could have stayed out in Monterey, CA, his home area, and no hardship assessments, Secretary Gates established a direct and open relationship with Congress and with our Senate Armed Services Committee in particular. As chairman of that committee, I will always be personally grateful for that. Secretary Gates as Secretary of Defense will be judged by history to have been truly exceptional. So our next Secretary of Defense will have enormous responsibilities but also big shoes to fill. I am confident Leon Panetta is the right person to take on that challenge and our colleagues to support this nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that any time consumed during the quorum call be equally divided.

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

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the quorum call to be rescinded.

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

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the quorum call to be rescinded.

Mr. President, the President's strategic focus and Director Panetta's extraordinary leadership, Special Forces and CIA operatives were able to locate and capture Osama bin Laden last month in Pakistan. These are precisely the skills and experiences we need at the table at this moment.

I know Leon Panetta as more than just a fellow colleague in the House and a person who shared some time in public service when I did. I know him as a person, I know his family. I know what he thinks. I know his values. I have to tell you, President Obama and America are fortunate to have a person of this quality who is willing to give even more of his life in public service. He could have stayed out in Monterey, CA, his home area, and no hardship assessments, Secretary Gates has had a remarkable career in public service. In addition, the challenges our military faces in this economic climate are significant. We must have a serious discussion about crafting a sustainable way forward.

I sat with Director Panetta earlier this month to discuss these challenges. I can say with certainty, Leon Panetta is up to the test. He has the experience and wisdom required, and I look forward to working with him once the Senate gives its advice and consent to his nomination.

I have known Leon Panetta for a long time. We served together in the House of Representatives, and we
I have been proud to have the support of Secretary of Defense Gates in this effort, and I look forward to the same support from the next, Secretary Panetta. The DREAM Act would strengthen our military and strengthen our Nation, and I am sure, as General Colin Powell has said, "immigration is what’s keeping this country’s lifeblood moving forward." These young people can help us move forward as a nation to be safer and create more opportunity.

We have a number of challenges ahead. Our men and women are fighting wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, and now Libya. Servicemembers and their families have borne an incredible burden of sacrifice in these conflicts over the last decade. As a nation, we are spending tens of billions of dollars a month to sustain them in their efforts.

At the same time, public support for these undertakings will not last forever. The current situation needs to change. The President is about to make an announcement when it comes to our troop levels in Afghanistan. We have to craft a way forward and deal honestly and responsibly with what is possibly one of our most challenging situations in Afghanistan. I believe it has to begin with a substantial redeployment of U.S. forces back to America from Afghanistan.

Last week I joined Senator Jeff Merkley of Oregon and 24 of my colleagues in expressing these concerns. I trust the President and incoming Secretary of Defense and Congress can find a responsible path forward. We need to take a hard look at every aspect of our Federal budget, including our Department of Defense, to sustain our men and women in uniform but not to waste money on privatization, on contractors, and on runaway contracts.

As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mullen has commented that our greatest national security threat is our ballooning deficit. Of course, we need to protect our country, but we need to do it in a fiscally responsible manner. Even as we address the path forward in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya, even as we trim the spending in the defense budget, we will not back away from our commitment to the men and women in uniform. I know Leon shares that statement.

I support Leon Panetta as our next Secretary of Defense because now more than ever we need his steady hand, his leadership, to tackle these challenges in budgets, in management, and in the critical conflicts we are engaged in around the world. I congratulate President Obama for selecting Leon Panetta for this awesome responsibility, and I look forward to working with him on these issues and others in the years to come.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the nomination of Leon Panetta as the next Secretary of Defense. Director Panetta comes to this job at an extraordinarily challenging time for the Department of Defense and for our Nation. Among the many issues he will confront, Mr. Panetta will oversee the completion of our direct military operations in Iraq, the beginning of the transition of our forces out of Afghanistan, the enhancement of our cyber defenses, and the reduction of our defense budget.

I have known Leon Panetta for many years, and I know he is particularly well suited to address all of these challenges. He is a man of great intellect, of great decency, and great determination.

At the end of this year, for example, in compliance with the Status of Forces Agreement, we will complete the withdrawal of our forces from Iraq and hand over primary responsibility for our ongoing relationship with Iraq to the government of Iraq. It remains to be seen whether the Iraqi Government will ask us to extend our military presence past December 31. But for now, we are thoroughly and determinately preparing our troops to leave. Having served on the Iraq Study Group, Mr. Panetta certainly understands the importance of this transition and will carry it out.

As the next Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta will also continue to focus our efforts on fighting terrorism in Afghanistan and Pakistan. We are facing a critical turning point in our operations. This week, we expect President Obama to announce his plan to begin reducing our force levels in Afghanistan this summer, a commitment he made in his speech at West Point in 2009.

Along with the reduction in forces we must sustain the security gains that we have accomplished during the past year and further build the capacity of the Afghan forces so they are able to take full responsibility for their own security. Mr. Panetta understands how important it is for all of our agencies to work together in this effort and all security missions; that using military force may be our primary weapon of securing areas but enduring success comes from coordination among the intelligence and law enforcement communities, from effective diplomacy, and from assistance programs administered by the Department of State and the USAID.

The conditions on the ground in Afghanistan are directly related to our ability to successfully attack the terrorist networks that are operating along the border in Pakistan. In his current position as Director of the CIA, Mr. Panetta has reinvigorated these efforts, most notably with the successful raid on Osama bin Laden. Indeed, I believe when history looks back, outside of the attack and ultimate victory by the President of the United States, one of the most important roles played in this effort to prepare the way for those courageous SEALs was the steady leadership of Leon Panetta at the Central Intelligence Agency. He understands the complexities of our relationship with Pakistan and, indeed, throughout the world. This expertise will be critical as we move forward, and critical for the next Secretary of Defense.

He will also lead the Department of Defense in preparing for the emerging threats to our national security, such as attacks to our cyber infrastructure. Indeed, every branch of government is working to define the roles various organizations will play to protect people, infrastructure, and information within cyberspace.

During his confirmation hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee, I discussed with Director Panetta the strategy the Department of Defense would employ in confronting the potential of a cyber attack against the United States. He responded in no uncertain terms. His words:

I have often said that there is a strong likelihood that the next Pearl Harbor that we confront could very well be a cyber attack that cripples our power system, our grid, our security systems, our financial systems, our governmental systems. This is a real possibility in today’s world. And as a result, I think we have to aggressively be able to counter that.

Indeed, Mr. Panetta understands the future as well as the present, and he will bring his experience as well as his vision to bear on the emerging challenges that face the United States.

Perhaps most challenging of all, Leon Panetta will lead the Department at a time of great fiscal constraints. As our Nation continues to find a path forward to rebound from the economic challenges of the last few years, there is an ever-growing pressure to reduce the size of the defense budget, which has nearly doubled over the past 10 years. But we must be careful to do so in a way that removes unsustainable costs without losing vital capability.

As a result of the high operational tempo and the dual overseas operations, all of our services are facing serious reset and recapitalization needs. Serious decisions will have to be made to ensure that we have the right systems in place to meet the threats we face, all at a price level that we can afford.

Having served as the House Budget Committee chairman, and as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, there is no one who has more knowledge, more experience, more sense of the details than Leon Panetta, and I believe he is the most well-qualified individual to tackle the huge budgetary issues that are facing the Department of Defense.

Leon will have an extraordinary role to play, particularly in the wake of the extraordinary service of Secretary of Defense Robert Gates to the men and women of our armed forces and to this country with more distinction,
who has served with more selfless dedication to the Nation, and fundamentally who has made his decisions knowing full well that at the end of the day young Americans in the uniform of the United States will carry out his orders. Bob Gates has done a superb job. But I have every confidence that Leon Panetta will continue to carry on, will continue to meet those standards, will continue to lead the Department of Defense with distinction, with dedication and duty, just as Secretary Gates has done, and ultimately we will know that at the end of all the decisions emanating from the Pentagon there is a young American willing and able and ready to serve, to support this Nation and defend it.

With that, I rise to express my great support for Secretary-designee Panetta and wish him well in all of his endeavors and pledge to work with him closely.

I yield the floor.

I note the absence of a quorum.

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

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

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

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

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, first of all, I rise in total support of Mr. Leon Panetta as the new Secretary of Defense. Bob Gates is an outstanding public servant who has served in many capacities and he has been a tremendous leader in every role he has held.

THE DEBT CEILING AND AFGHANISTAN

With that being said, I rise to speak on our war in Afghanistan. Very soon our Nation, this esteemed body; and particularly the President of the United States will address two of the greatest challenges our Nation currently faces. The first is Afghanistan. This is raising the debt ceiling and confronting our Nation's unsustainable spending and debt. To the average American, Afghanistan and raising our debt ceiling may seem unrelated, but they are, in fact, directly related. They are directly related to the hard fiscal and strategic choices our Nation must make if we are to remain safe and secure in the coming decades.

With respect to raising the debt ceiling, the budget realities we face are both striking and frightening. While some may choose to ignore this threat, mere words cannot give weight to the fiscal peril our Nation now faces. Only numbers can.

Since 2001, we have raised the debt ceiling 16 times. In 1992, our national debt stood at $4.1 trillion. Between 2002 and today, our national debt rose from $5.9 trillion to over $14.3 trillion. Now for the first time in our Nation's history, our yearly budget deficits may exceed $1 trillion. At the current pace of deficit spending, the budget realities we face are both striking and frightening. While some may choose to ignore this threat, mere words cannot give weight to the fiscal peril our Nation now faces. Only numbers can.

In order to pay for the financial hole we have dug, the Congressional Budget Office projects that net interest payments will increase fourfold over the next 10 years, from $179 billion in fiscal year 2011 to $792 billion in fiscal year 2021. To put that number into perspective, one dollar in net interest payments on our $23.1 trillion debt will exceed the amount we currently spend on education, energy, and national defense combined. Numbers of this size are not only unimaginable, they will prove catastrophic for our Nation's future.

I believe that our debt is the greatest threat to our national security. If we as a country do not address our fiscal imbalances today, the cost of our failure will erode, and the costs to our ability to maintain and sustain influences could be great.

We can no longer in good conscience cut services and programs at home, raise taxes, or—this is very important—lift the debt ceiling in order to fund nation building in Afghanistan.

Ten years ago, when our mission in Afghanistan began, it was a just and rightful mission to seek out and destroy those responsible for the terrorist attacks of September 11. But today, in Afghanistan, in a nation of 30 million people, intelligence estimates suggest there are only between 50 and 100 al-Qaida terrorists harbored there. Because of the incredible work of our military men and women, the mission of destroying al-Qaida has been accomplished. After the cost of moving our supplies was indirectly funding the very enemy we face. I was told that China—yes, China—could reap billions for their resources from Afghanistan, but guess what. They are not contributing anything to the cost of security. I was told that after years of spending billions training a new Afghan military and police force, it could be years longer before they could fully defend their nation and their people, and even then it would demand billions more in funding from us. I was also told we were building schools, roads, and infrastructure as well as providing billions in small business opportunities to the Afghan economy so Afghanistan could become more self-sufficient. But today, 97 percent of the Afghan economy is based on foreign aid, and that is after 10 long years. I have been told again and again that American aid is critical to rebuilding Afghanistan but that local projects built with American tax dollars could not be branded as American-funded projects out of fear of reprisals. I was told the people of Afghanistan agreed that U.S. troops should not stay there for another year as they pursued this nation building mission. During the trip I heard from Ambassador Eikenberry and General Petraeus. I visited Helmand Province and Kandahar. I met with local tribal leaders and President Karzai of Afghanistan. What I heard from many of these small diplomatic efforts is that progress could be just around the corner but only if we give it time and more money. I heard we must stay to counter the threat of al-Qaida but then was told that only a handful of al-Qaida members existed in Afghanistan. I was told that governance was improving, but that corruption was so rampant that billions—yes, billions—of dollars were lost to corrupt officials who seemed more interested in improving their own lives than the lives of their own people. I was told we need a sizable force to diffuse the threat posed by the Taliban but that estimating the size of the enemy was difficult. Still, everyone acknowledges that their force is a fraction of the number of troops we have there now. I was told that because of rampant corruption and theft, the very cost of moving our supplies was indirectly funding the very enemy we face.

I was told that China—yes, China—could reap billions for their resources from Afghanistan, but guess what. They are not contributing anything to the cost of security. I was told that after years of spending billions training a new Afghan military and police force, it could be years longer before they could fully defend their nation and their people, and even then it would demand billions more in funding from us. I was also told we were building schools, roads, and infrastructure as well as providing billions in small business opportunities to the Afghan economy so Afghanistan could become more self-sufficient. But today, 97 percent of the Afghan economy is based on foreign aid, and that is after 10 long years. I have been told again and again that American aid is critical to rebuilding Afghanistan but that local projects built with American tax dollars could not be branded as American-funded projects out of fear of reprisals. I was told the people of Afghanistan agreed that U.S. troops should not stay there for another year as they pursued this nation building mission. During the trip I heard from Ambassador Eikenberry and General Petraeus. I visited Helmand Province and Kandahar. I met with local tribal leaders and President Karzai of Afghanistan. What I heard from many of these small diplomatic efforts is that progress could be just around the corner but only if we give it time and more money. I heard we must stay to counter the threat of al-Qaida but then was told that only a handful of al-Qaida members existed in Afghanistan. I was told that governance was improving, but that corruption was so rampant that billions—yes, billions—of dollars were lost to corrupt officials who seemed more interested in improving their own lives than the lives of their own people. I was told we need a sizable force to diffuse the threat posed by the Taliban but that estimating the size of the enemy was difficult. Still, everyone acknowledges that their force is a fraction of the number of troops we have there now. I was told that because of rampant corruption and theft, the very cost of moving our supplies was indirectly funding the very enemy we face.

...
fighting and killing al-Qaeda terrorists in Afghanistan but policing and building a state where the leaders seem indifferent to the difficulties of their people and their people seem indifferent at best, if not hostile, to our presence.

Tomorrow, President Obama will present to the American people his latest review on the war in Afghanistan and whether our mission will change. As is already clear, some in this esteemed body will argue for the President to stay the course and others will suggest a very different course. The question the President faces—and we all face—is quite simple: Will we choose to rebuild America or Afghanistan? In light of our Nation’s fiscal perils, we cannot do both.

I believe if we are being honest with the American people about the depth of fiscal challenges we face at home, it is impossible to determine the microwave billions of dollars in Afghanistan in which we are rebuilding schools, training police, teaching people to read—in other words, building a country—even at the expense of our own.

Neither the President nor any Senator can divorce the difficult decisions we must now make on Afghanistan from the equally difficult decisions we must now make on cutting domestic spending in order to raise the debt ceiling. While the truth is the war on terrorism must be fought and it must be won, that war is not in Afghanistan. Yet, with every passing month, we are choosing billions we can’t afford to fight a war against an enemy that is no longer there.

Since the day I was sworn in, I have heard from countless of my fellow West Virginians who ask, How is it possible we are choosing billions we can’t afford to build America or Afghanistan while we face mountains of debt and spending cuts here at home? How is it possible we will choose to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to build Afghanistan when we have college students, our seniors, our veterans, the poor, and the middle class being asked to bear the brunt of massive spending cuts?

I have carefully thought over these questions over these many months, and after hearing from my constituents, seeing Afghanistan again with my own eyes, listening to our soldiers on the ground, hearing from dozens of diplomats, foreign policy experts, and our military leaders over these many months, as well as confronting the truth about the fiscal and economic peril our Nation faces in the coming years, I believe it is time for President Obama to begin a substantial and responsible plan to rebuild America and move beyond the war in Afghanistan. I believe it is time for us to rebuild America, not Afghanistan.

That is why I strongly agreed with Senators MERKLEY and Lee, and the words of 27 of my Republican and Democratic colleagues, who made it clear in a letter they sent to the President last Thursday that:

. . . . we must accelerate the transfer responsibility for Afghanistan’s development to the Afghan people and their government. We should maintain our capacity to eliminate any new threats, continue to train the Afghan National Security Forces, and maintain our diplomatic and humanitarian efforts. However, these objectives do not require keeping 100,000 American troops engaged in intensive combat operations.

I believe it is time for us to compel the elected leaders of Afghanistan and its people to take responsibility for the destiny of their nation. We can ensure the destiny of ours. In that spirit, I have sent President Obama a letter calling on him to pursue significant reductions and end the scope of our current mission in Afghanistan well before 2014. I believe any further mission in Afghanistan should, as my Senate colleagues suggested in their letter, focus primarily on responding to any resurgent terrorist threat as well as providing targeted training for the Afghan military and police.

Throughout this transition period and beyond, I have asked the President to provide the American taxpayer a monthly accounting, to be published online, of every dollar that will be provided to the Afghanistan government officials and agencies so as to ensure that no American tax dollars are lost to corruption and greed.

As for those on the right or the left who believe that leaving Afghanistan too soon is in fact more responsible, I will simply ask them: Is 10 years not long enough? I ask them to tell the families of our brave military men and women who are on their third and fourth tour of duty, how much longer must they wait to come home. I ask them to look into the eyes of any American child and ask them to surrender our Nation’s future for the sake of another. I ask all of them to explain to the American people the sanity of spending $185 billion more than we have spent, to build Afghanistan over the next decade at the very same time our Nation drowns in a sea of debt.

The time has come to make the difficult decision. Charity begins at home. We can no longer afford to rebuild Afghanistan and America. We must choose, and I choose America.

As I made clear when I ran for this esteemed office, I would not put my political party before country, but I was right then. I was right in opposition, I am right in responsible, I am right in our mission here. The time has come to make the difficult decision. We must give America the priority it deserves, the priority it needs.

The words of the great West Virginia statesman Robert C. Byrd ring even more true today than in October 2008 when he gave his last floor speech about the war in Afghanistan. Our friend said this:

During a time of record deficits, some actually continue to suggest that the United States should sink hundreds of billions of borrowed dollars into the war in Afghanistan, effectively turning our backs on our own substantial domestic needs, all the while deferring the costs and deferring the problems for future generations to address. Our national security interests lie in defeating—no, I go further, in destroying al-Qaeda. Until we take that and only that mission seriously, we risk the rise in America.

May God bless the brave men and women who serve this Nation and the United States of America.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Leon Panetta to succeed Robert Gates. But first I feel compelled to respond to the statements by the Senator from West Virginia which characterize the isolationist, withdrawal, lack of knowledge, of history and future that seems to be on the rise in America.

In case the Senator from West Virginia forgot it or never knew it, we withdrew from Afghanistan one time. We withdrew from Afghanistan, and the Taliban came, eventually followed by al-Qaeda, followed by attacks on the United States of America.

The Senator from West Virginia has expressed his admiration for the men and women who are serving. I hope he would pay attention to the finest military leader who will now be the head of the CIA, General Petraeus, whose knowledge and background may exceed that of the Senator from West Virginia.

If we leave Afghanistan in defeat, we will repeat the lessons of history. It is not our expenditures on Afghanistan that are the reasons we are now experiencing budget difficulties.
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I am pleased the Senator from West Virginia went to Afghanistan once. I would suggest he consult with the people who know best that since 2009, when the surge began, we have had success on the ground in Afghanistan, and we are succeeding.

There are enormous challenges ahead of us. But as Secretary Gates has said: Withdrawal to “Fortress America”—which is basically the message of the Senator from West Virginia—will inevitably lead to attacks from them on the gates of America. I view the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia as at least uninformed about history and strategy and the challenges we face from radical Islamic extremism, including al-Qaida.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to vote in favor of this nomination today.

Director Panetta has had an extraordinary career of public service. He served in the House of Representatives, representing his California district for eight years, served in the White House in the Clinton administration, and served as President Clinton’s Chief of Staff and Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Since February 2009 he has been the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, strengthening that agency and forging positive relationships in the interagency process and with the congressional intelligence oversight committees. It is my expectation that Director Panetta will work closely with GEN David Petraeus, the nominee to succeed him at the CIA, and continue the cooperation and commitment that enabled the finding and elimination of Osama bin Laden.

I am certainly hopeful that as Secretary of Defense Director Panetta will successfully lead the effort to find and eliminate Ayman al-Zawahiri, who we are told has assumed leadership of al-Qaida, and other al-Qaida leaders. Zawahiri is a sworn enemy of the United States and is a threat to the way of life and values we hold dear. We must combat him in Afghanistan and, like bin Laden, must be dealt with in similar terms.

Before discussing the challenges Mr. Panetta will encounter, I want to express my thanks and admiration for the service of Secretary Gates as he nears the end of his 4½-year tenure as Secretary of Defense. I recall that through much of 2007 and 2008 we heard about Secretary Gates’ countdown wristwatch that displayed the number of days until a new administration would take over in January 2009, and he and his wife Becky could finally return to their peaceful lakeside home and retirement in Washington State. It is fortunate for the country that President Obama asked, and Secretary Gates agreed to, postpone retirement, and that he continued to serve and, presumably, discarded that wristwatch.

Secretary Gates testified at his nomination hearing on December 5, 2006, that he agreed to leave Texas A&M University to go to government service out of love for his country, and he and his family have provided one of the greatest examples I have seen of that kind of patriotism, answering the call to duty when his talents were most needed. For this, and for innumerable other contributions he has made to the men and women of the Armed Forces, he has truly earned a place in history as one of America’s greatest Secretaries of Defense.

In December 2006, at a time when so many Senators were clamoring for a cut-and-run strategy in Iraq—just as they are calling for a cut-and-run strategy in Afghanistan—Secretary Gates made the following statement at his nomination hearing:

While I am open to alternative ideas about our future strategy and tactics in Iraq, I feel quite strongly about one point. Developments in Iraq over the next year or two will, I believe, shape the entire Middle East and greatly influence global geopolitics for many years to come. Our course over the next year or two will determine whether the American and Iraqi people, and the next President of the United States, will face a slowly, but steadily improving situation in Iraq and in the region or will face the very real risk, and possible reality, of a regional conflagration. We need to work together to develop a strategy that does not leave Iraq in chaos and that protects our long-term interests in, and hopes for, the region.

Mr. President, you could substitute the word “Afghanistan” for exactly what Secretary Gates then said in December 2006. Then we had the surge. There were 59 votes against the surge that would have called for withdrawal in the summer of 2007. Some of us knew what was right and fought for it, and we have succeeded in Iraq, just as we will fight to continue the surge in Afghanistan. We will succeed in Afghanistan, and we will come home with honor, and Afghanistan will not deteriorate to a cockpit of conflict between regional countries that will then cause again the threat of radical Islamic extremism to threaten our very existence—certainly the threats of attacks on the United States.

Secretary Gates was, of course, correct then about Iraq. Today we must add Afghanistan and Libya to his warning about the future consequences of the decisions we make today. In the next few months, our country faces decisions related to our national security and defense that will echo for decades to come—decisions that will determine whether we remain the world’s leading global military power, able to meet our many commitments worldwide, or face the reality that we will begin abandoning that role.

One of these decisions that will have perhaps the most impact on this outcome is our response to the President’s statement that there will be national security spending by 2023—on top of the $78 billion in efficiencies and top line reductions that Secretary Gates already has imposed.

Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen have sounded the alarm against misguided and unaffordable defense spending that cut into the muscle of our military capabilities. If we get this wrong, it will result in a dramatic drop in U.S. influence and, as Secretary Gates has said, “a smaller military able to go fewer places and do fewer things.”

Defense spending is not what is sinking this country into fiscal crisis, and the President is right to focus on that flawed assumption they will create a situation that is truly unaffordable: the decline of U.S. military power and influence.

It is inevitable there will be cuts to defense spending, and those reductions are no doubt necessary to improve the efficiency of the Department of Defense. But I also remember GEN Edward Meyer, then-Chief of Staff of the Army, who warned in 1980 that exces- sive defense cuts over many years had produced a “hollow army.” That is not an experience we can or should repeat in the years to come. We must learn the lessons of history.

I sincerely hope Director Panetta, upon assuming office, will not focus exclusively on how but on whether the President’s proposal should be implemented and will apply his independent judgment in providing advice to the President on the cuts that can be made without damage to our national security.

Last week, the Committee on Armed Services completed its markup for the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012. In a very tough fiscal environment, this markup represents an effort to support our warfighters and bolster the readiness of the U.S. military. Unfortunately, the committee chose to authorize hundreds of millions of dollars in unnecessary and unrequested porkbarrel projects and rejected my efforts to stop the out-of-control cost overruns of the F-35 program.

The Defense authorization bill is an important piece of legislation while our country continues to be engaged in two wars; therefore, I voted to move this legislation out of committee. Neverthe- less, I will continue my efforts to fight the egregious and wasteful spending during debate on the floor of the Senate, and I will urge Director Panetta, once he is confirmed, to favorably endorse the proposals I will make to properly use precious national defense dollars.

In addition, especially in this budget environment, it will be important to continue to eliminate weapons programs that are over cost, behind schedule, and not providing improvements in combat power and capabilities. After 10 years of war, we must continue to eliminate every dollar of wasteful spending that siphons resources away from our most vital need: enabling our troops to succeed in war.

One of the key criteria I am looking for in the next Secretary of Defense is continuity—the continuation of the wise judgment, policies, and decision-making that have characterized Secretary Gates’ leadership and commitment to providing the Department of Defense. As Director of the CIA, Mr. Panetta has demonstrated that he possesses the experience and
ability to ensure that we achieve our objectives in the three conflicts in which U.S. forces are now engaged: Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya.

In Iraq, the key question now is whether some presence of U.S. forces will remain beyond the end of this year, pending an Iraqi request and approval, to support Iraq's continuing needs and our enduring national interests. I believe such a presence is necessary, and I encourage the administration to work closely with the Maliki government to bring about this outcome.

In Afghanistan, the main question is the size and scope of the drawdown of forces beginning this July. Here, too, I agree with Secretary Gates that any drawdown should be modest so as to maximize our ability to lock in the hard-won gains of our troops through the next fighting season. I hope Director Panetta, as the Secretary of Defense, will support “modest” reductions in troop numbers that would undermine the hard-won gains in Afghanistan.

Finally, we know that there is growing opposition to continuing the U.S. involvement in Libya. There has already been considerable attention to bind the President’s authority as Commander-in-Chief, and there will likely be others. In short, the accumulated consequences of the administration's delay, confusion, and lack of meaningful consultation have been a wholesale revolt in Congress against the administration’s policy.

Although I have disagreed, and disagreed strongly at times, with aspects of the administration’s policy in Libya, I believe the President did the right thing by intervening to stop a humanitarian disaster in Libya. Amid all of our present arguments about legal and constitutional interpretations, we cannot forget the main point: In the midst of the greatest groundbreaking geopolitical event in two decades, as peaceful protests for democracy were sweeping the Middle East, with Qadhafi’s forces ready to strike Benghazi, and with Arabs and Muslims in Libya and across the region pleading for the U.S. military to stop the bloodshed, the United States and our allies took action and prevented the massacre that Qadhafi had promised to commit in a city of 700,000 people. By doing so, we began to change conditions that are increasing the pressure on Qadhafi to give up power.

Director Panetta has been nominated to lead our Armed Forces amid their tenth year of sustained overseas combat. Not surprisingly, this has placed a major strain on our forces and their families. And yet, our military is performing better today than at any time in our history. That is thanks to the thousands of brave young Americans in uniform who are writing a new chapter in the long history of our great country. They have shown themselves to be the equals of the greatest generations before them. And the calling that all of us must answer, in our service, is to be equal and forever faithful to the sacrifice of these amazing Americans.

I have outlined some of the challenges that lay before Mr. Panetta. I have the highest confidence, however, that he is up to the task.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the nomination of Leon Panetta to be the 23rd Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Panetta, who currently serves as the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, was nominated by President Obama on April 28. The Senate Armed Services Committee held a hearing on his nomination on June 9, and I was honored to introduce him at that hearing. His nomination was approved unanimously by the committee on June 14.

I would like to speak briefly about Director Panetta’s career, and in particular his time at the Central Intelligence Agency.

In his 3 years of public service, Director Panetta has held the positions of Congressman, chairman of the House Budget Committee, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, chief of staff to the White House, codirector, with the wife of the Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy, which I have had the pleasure of speaking before, member of the Iraq Study Group, and Director of the CIA.

His career and service started in 1964 as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army, and now 47 years later he has come full circle to be nominated to lead the Department of Defense and U.S. Armed Forces.

In the course of 2 years as Director of the CIA, Mr. Panetta has mastered the intelligence field, led the CIA through a very tumultuous time, restored badly damaged relationships with Congress and with the Director of National Intelligence, and carried out President Obama’s direction to find Osama bin Laden.

It has been my pleasure to serve as the chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence during this time and to be able to work closely with Mr. Panetta.

I have no doubt that his past experience and his capabilities prepare Leon Panetta to meet the major challenges before the Department of Defense.

With knowledge of CIA operations and his health at the Pentagon with a thorough understanding of the situation in Afghanistan as well as the aggravating factors of our relationship with Pakistan. Through CIA analysis and operations, he is also well aware of the other contingencies around the globe where the U.S. military may be called to deploy.

Director Panetta is also well positioned to guide the Department through the constrained budget environment. The budget cuts to the Pentagon have already begun, for the first time in 10 years, with the appropriations bills now moving through Congress.

The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I serve, held a hearing last week with Secretary Robert Gates and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ADM Mike Mullen. Both of them expressed concerns that budget cuts not lead to a “hollow force” or deprive the Department and the Nation of needed capabilities.

I am confident that Leon Panetta possesses the credentials and experience to make cuts where needed and will do so in a way that keeps the military strong and capable, and in a way that maintains the cohesion of the Department and its services.

Beyond Director Panetta’s experience is his leadership style, his character, and a deft personal touch. As we all know, personal relationships and the way one approaches things matter a great deal, whether within Cabinet meetings or negotiating with foreign counterparts. Mr. Panetta’s approach is effective, and it provides for a very good working relationship with the Congress.

Positions like the Director of the CIA or the Secretary of Defense require a special character and a strong moral compass, qualities that this nominee possesses.

Let me give you an example. Early in his tenure at the CIA in 2009, Director Panetta was briefed on a number of acrimonious and recent intelligence programs. One of them, which I can’t describe here, was particularly sensitive and provoked questions and concern. Director Panetta asked the CIA staff if the congressional intelligence committees had been briefed on this program. He was told they had not.

Mr. Panetta immediately requested an urgent meeting with the Intelligence Committee to brief us. He said he found it unacceptable that this program had been withheld from Congress, and terminated it in large part on that basis.

In the 2 years since, he has never declined to answer a question or provide us with his candid views. He has been completely forthright, and motivated only by what is best for the CIA, and more importantly, this nation.

The Department of Defense is the largest Department in the Federal Government. As Secretary Gates recently testified before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I serve, held a hearing last week with Secretary Robert Gates and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ADM Mike Mullen. Both of them expressed concerns that budget cuts not lead to a “hollow force” or deprive the Department and the Nation of needed capabilities.

I believe that Leon Panetta, who has served exemplary and successfully in Congress, at the Office of Management and Budget, at the White House, and now the CIA, is uniquely qualified to be
another outstanding Secretary of Defense in this very challenging time. I urge his confirmation.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to enthusiastically support the nomination of Leon Panetta, the current Permanent Representative to the Central Intelligence Agency, to be the 23rd Secretary of Defense.

Director Panetta has contributed nearly five decades of public service to our Nation, including as an officer in the U.S. Army, a distinguished Congressman, and most recently as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, a position for which he was confirmed by the Senate on February 12, 2009. He and I served together in the House of Representatives from my first term in 1979 until he departed in 1993 to become Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Over the past 2 1/2 years, I have had the opportunity to frequently work with Director Panetta, in my role as a senior member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. Like his predecessor, Dr. Robert Gates—who also served as CIA Director before becoming Secretary of Defense—Director Panetta brings to the Pentagon a wealth of experience built over a lifetime of service to his Nation and his fellow Americans. Over the past 2 1/2 years, Director Panetta has repaired a damaged relationship between the CIA and Congress, an impressive accomplishment, to say the least, and led the agency and the Nation’s human intelligence activities at a time when the Nation waged two wars and contended with such threats as Islamic extremism, terrorism, and cyber intrusion and attack.

And of course, Director Panetta will forever be remembered as the CIA Director during the May 1, 2011, mission in which U.S. forces once and for all rid the world of public enemy No. 1, Osama bin Laden. On that night, the combined might of our Nation’s military, intelligence, and counterterrorism professionals sent the unmistakable message to the terrorists of the world that America will prevail in this fight.

I deeply appreciate Director Panetta’s efforts at the CIA, and believe he leaves the entire Agency, from the halls of Langley to its agents in the farthest reaches of the world, a better and more organized organization than it was when he arrived. I am confident that Director Panetta’s unique experiences within the military, the Congress, and the intelligence communities will serve him, the Department of Defense, and the Nation well when he assumes the role of Secretary of Defense.

More than 4 1/2 years ago, in December 2006, I rose in support of the nomination of Dr. Gates for the position for which we consider Director Panetta well prepared for the challenge of being the only Secretary of Defense in U.S. history asked to remain in that office by a newly elected President, and the only career officer in the CIA’s history to rise from entry-level employee to Director. These two stand-out achievements and two volumes about Secretary Gates’ work ethic and love of country. Our country and our security have been forever enhanced by his dedication to public service, and I wish him well in his future endeavors.

And of course, Director Panetta will face similar challenges today. At the time, I said that Secretary Gates will prepare for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I have the utmost respect for the Senator from Arizona and his commitment to this country and his service to this country.

I can only report what I have seen. I was in Afghanistan twice—as a Governor in 2006, representing the National Guard of West Virginia, and I went back in 2010. While there, I saw deterioration. I did not see a country that had an infrastructure and an economy. I saw corrupt leadership and nothing good coming of it.

With that, I know that the Senator has had much more experience. I can only speak from common sense and for the people of West Virginia about what I see. We are a very hawkish State and a patriotic State. If 10 years is not enough, how long is enough—I think that is the question being asked—for the sacrifices being asked of them? When we cannot buy water lines and sewer lines or fix roads and repair bridges in West Virginia, yet they hear about the billions we are spending in a country that doesn’t want us there, I think it is time to leave.

Respectfully, that might be the disagreement we have.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Leon Panetta for Secretary of Defense. The President has chosen wisely. He has a terrific record of service to our country. He has a brilliant intellect, a great deal of experience—three tours on the ground. General Petraeus has become the CIA Director. Mr. Donilon has done a great job as National Security Adviser. In Leon Panetta, the President could not have chosen better. I am pleased with Ambassador Crocker. Ambassador Eikenberry. General Petraeus. It looks like we might have the right mix to provide the best possible professionalism and a tough approach to this challenge.

I think we are on track. I think we are well on track. I think we are on target to Afghan control. I think we are on target to withdraw troops. The only thing I urge the President to do is never lose sight of why we went there and our national security goals in Afghanistan. We will all be judged by what we leave behind. We should want the Afghan people to say no to the Taliban and reject extremism. They have the will, but they don't have the capacity yet. But they are getting there. Anytime you have the desire of the people who are oppressed by the Taliban and al-Qaeda and you can help them help themselves, that makes it all safer.

Here is what happened since the President sent surge forces in. In November of 2009, there were two nations and 30 NATO trainers—two nations helping train the Afghan security forces from NATO. They had a combined 30 people. You could put them all in a bus. One thing the President did when he surged American forces in was that he insisted NATO step up their involvement. As a result, we have had 1,300 NATO trainers in Afghanistan with 32 countries providing assistance. We have 49 different countries helping in some form of training.

In the last month, we have added 90,000 Afghan Army and police forces. So there has been a surge, far beyond the American coalition surge, in Afghan forces. How did that happen? We have better training. In September of 2009, 800 people were joining the Afghan Army per month. They were losing 2,000 a month. That was a terrible trend. In December of 2009, because of this new construct we came up with, we have been averaging 6,000 army recruits a month and 3,000 for the police. Today, we have the Afghan National Army and 126,000 in the Afghan National Police. By the end of the year, we will have 305,000 army and police forces in Afghanistan. And the reason that has happened is because we have changed the way we train the Afghan security forces.

I hope the President, listening to Secretary Panetta, Secretary Gates, and Secretary Petraeus, will tell the American people we can start bringing forces home beginning this summer because we have been successful, and we are not going to do anything to undermine that success because it has come at such a heavy price.

In reality, ladies and gentlemen, we have been in Afghanistan with the right configuration for about 18 months. The army retention rates today in the Afghan Army are 69 percent—almost doubled. The literacy rate among the Afghan Army and police force is twice that of the national population. We are focused on literacy. It is hard to be a policeman or army officer if you can't read or write. We are helping a people who have been dirt poor, who have been at war for 30 years, and who have been treated very poorly by everybody in the world. The day of the year, it is in our national security interest to make sure the country where the Taliban took over and allowed bin Laden to come in as an ally, we end up giving those guestries back into the hands of an extremist.

I am confident Leon Panetta has the wisdom and background, as the CIA Director, as a former Member of Congress, as a successful businessperson, to lead the Pentagon at the most challenging time since World War II.

He is taking over from Bob Gates. There is not enough we can say or do for Secretary Gates to thank him. He has had the job for 5 years. When he came on board, Iraq was a hopeless, lost cause in the minds of many, and he and General Petraeus, Ambassador Crocker, and many others—mainly our troops and coalition forces—took an Iraq that was on the verge of an abyss and turned it over to people who want to go a different way than the Taliban, and they have the ability to fight back and say no, all of us will be safer.

I congratulate the President on picking Leon Panetta to be Secretary of Defense. I know he has had a lot of hard decisions in the war on terror, and one of the biggest decisions he will make is coming up maybe tomorrow night. I want to work with him, Republicans and Democrats together, in making sure our Nation is never attacked again from Afghanistan. That is possible. We are on the verge of getting that right.

As we draw down troops, I ask the President to please tell those who are left behind still fighting in Afghanistan that he hasn't lost sight of the prize. The prize is not just bringing our troops home, the prize is to make sure their children never have to go back and fight in the future. That is the goal—to withdraw from Afghanistan in a way that we are safer and that our national security is enhanced. We are on the verge of achieving that goal.

I want to congratulate the President and others are going to be challenged with as we go forward in the 21st century is going to be substantial. That enemy is still alive, even though not well. We have punished the enemy—al-Qaeda and other extremist groups—but they will not give up easily. At the end of the day, the goal is for our country to be safe, and it will take more than killing bin Laden to do that. Killing bin Laden was a form of justice long overdue, and it did make us safer, but the ultimate security of our country depends on our ability to kill individuals but with our ability to help those who need to fight in their own backyard and protect
understand that, in fact, the Taliban’s argument that they are being occupied, and that weakens the Taliban tremendously as well.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the Senator yield for a question, Mr. LEVIN. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the time to have some good bipartisanship.

Senator LEVIN, is it not true—I have to ask you a question—that you have been saying as long as I can remember that the surge that really needs to occur is on the Afghan side?

You have focused like a laser in the last couple of years on training capacity. Not only are we producing 90,000 additional Afghan Army and police forces, 97 percent of them now can pass Western shooting standards. Two years ago, that number was less than a third. Of the NCOs—noncommissioned officers—graduating from the schools in Afghanistan, there is about an 80-percent literacy rate. Two years ago, it was less than 50 percent.

So what I wish to acknowledge is that Senator LEVIN has been focusing on what I think is the ticket home in honor and security: building up an Afghan force that can fight the fight without 100,000 Americans. We are well on the way. If we had not changed our training program—which the Senator has been focused on for a very long time—we would not have the hope, success, and General Caldwell is one of the unsung heroes of this war.

But I couldn’t agree more with my colleague from Michigan. The reason we can bring American troops home is because there are more Afghans to do the fighting. And the Senator mentioned that during the surge in Helmand, it was a 10-to-1 ratio. For every Afghan, there were 10 American forces. It is almost 50–50 today, with a climb where it will be Afghans in the lead.

The final thought is that among the trainers themselves, the goal by 2013 is to replace NATO trainers with Afghan trainers, and we are well on our way to having a majority of the training done by Afghans themselves. So if we can get the fighting ratios to 1-to-1 this year and improve on that by 2014, we will be able to turn the country over to the Afghan security forces. And I think we have a good plan. Let’s just stick with it.

Mr. LEVIN. I want to first of all thank my good friend from South Carolina for his analysis on Afghani- stan as well as his great support for Leon Panetta in his analysis about 90,000 additional Afghan Army and police forces, he is exactly right. The surge has not just been 30,000 of our troops but the many in terms of Afghan troops. And the importance of that is not just the numbers, not just the training, and not just the literacy, which the Senator pointed out, but also the mentoring and the partnering in the field with coalition forces.

We have tracked this very carefully, and there has been a significant increase in the number of Afghan units that consistently are in the field partnering with our troops and with other coalition members’ troops, and that makes a huge difference too because when the Afghan people see Af- ghan troops in the lead instead of foreign nations’ troops in the lead, they would have success in Afghanistan. Indeed, we see some real evidence of that success in the military situation on the ground. If only that could be equivalent to the governance situation, we all would be a lot more comfortable.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the Senator will yield for one final thought, the two big impediments to our success in Afghanistan are Pakistan and poor governance. The reason the Taliban came back is because the governance in Afghanistan was not well accepted by the people, and lack of security. We now have better security, and I do see signs of better governance. And we have to fix the Pakistan side of the equation. On the Afghan side of the border, we are doing about everything we can do to build up the Afghan people. We will deal with Pakistan and we will deal with better governance, but none of that is possible without better secu- rity. Now we have a security environment that I think will lead to better governance. But don’t lose sight of the prize, and that is to leave the country in a sustainable manner.

I look forward to working with Sen- ator LEVIN to push the Afghan govern- ment to do their part and also to en- gage Pakistan and say: What you are doing in Pakistan is unacceptable. Stop the double-dealing. Get involved.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEVIN. I think we know our Pre- sident, Senator SHAHEEN, is very much into the issue of putting some real pressure on Pakistan to end the Haqqani network’s intrusions and excursions into Afghanistan. And I think we are all together on that es- sential goal of changing Pakistani be- havior in terms of what they are allowing to occur on their soil, which is that safe haven, particularly for the Haqqanis.

I again thank my friend from South Carolina, and I am reminded by something he said of an earlier visit I made to Afghanistan, by the way, with a number of colleagues—I think Senator REED and one other Senator were with us—we were with some Afghan leaders in a small town. This is what they call their Shura. It just happened that they were having this the day we were visiting. There were maybe 50 or 60, 70 guys—old guys, all guys—sitting on the ground on a dirt floor. We intruded, burged in, and I asked one question.

I said: Do you want us here?

The answer: We want you to train our army and leave, and then we will invite you back as guests.

You can’t say it much more suc- cinctly.

I thank my colleague.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the ab- sence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further pro- ceedings under the quorum call be dis- pensed with.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. We are prepared to yield the remainder of our time and do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Leon E. Panetta, of California, to be Secretary of Defense?

Mr. LEVIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

(Roll Call Vote No. 93 Ex.)

YEAS—100

Akaka  Gillibrand  Moran
Alexander  Graham  Murkowski
Ayotte  Grassley  Murray
Barrasso  Hoeven  Nelson (NE)
Baucus  Harkin  Nelson (FL)
Begich  Hatch  Paul
Bennet  Hiler  Portman
Bingaman  Hoovers  Pryor
Bingaman  Hoeven  Pryor
Blumenthal  Hirono  Reed
Blunt  Inhofe  Reid
Boozman  Inouye  Risch
Boxer  Isakson  Roberts
Brown (MA)  Johnson (SD)  Rockefeller
Brown (OH)  Johnson (WI)  Rubio
Cantwell  Kerry  Sanders
Cardin  Kirk  Schumer
Casper  Klahnchar  Sessions
Casey  Kohl  Shaheen
Chambliss  Kyl  Shelby
Coats  Lankins  Snowe
Coburn  Lautenberg  Stabenow
Coehran  Leahy  Tester
Collins  Lee  Thune
Conrad  Levin  Toomey
Coons  Lieberman  Udall (CO)
Corker  Logar  Udall (NM)
Coryn  Manchin  Vitter
Crapo  McCain  Warner
DeMint  McCaskill  Webb
Durbin  McConnell  Whitehouse
Enzi  Moran  Wicker
Feinstein  Merkley  Wyden
Franken  Mikulski  Wyden

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The President shall be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate shall resume legislative session.

The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have 10 minutes. Senators should listen to the debate. It is very important. We have an important vote in just 10 minutes, and it is my understanding that the arrangements have been made that Senator Boxer would close. She would have the final 10 minutes. Does anybody have any problem with that?

I ask unanimous consent that be the case.

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

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVITALIZATION ACT OF 2011

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 782, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 782) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes.

Pending:

DeMint amendment No. 394, to repeal the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

Paul amendment No. 414, to implement the President's request to increase the statutory limit on the public debt.

Cardin amendment No. 407, to require the FHA to equitably treat home buyers who have repaid in full their FHA-insured mortgages.

Merkley/Snowe amendment No. 228, to establish clear regulatory standards for mortgage servicers.

Kohl amendment No. 380, to amend the Sherman Act to make oil-producing and exporting illegal.

Hutchison amendment No. 423, to delay the implementation of the health reform law in the United States until there is final resolution in pending lawsuits.

Portman amendment No. 417, to provide for the inclusion of independent regulatory agencies in the application of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

Portman amendment No. 418, to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) to strengthen the economic impact analyses for major rules, require agencies to analyze the effect of major rules on jobs, and require adoption of the least burdensome regulatory means.

McCaIN amendment No. 412, to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act.

Merkley amendment No. 440, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an Energy Efficiency Loan Program under which the Secretary shall make funds available to states and local assistance provided by qualified financing entities for making qualified energy efficiency or renewable energy improvements.

CoBURN modified amendment No. 436, to repeal the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit.

Brown (MA)/Snowe amendment No. 405, to repeal the imposition of withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities.

Inhofe amendment No. 430, to reduce amounts authorized to be appropriated.

Inhofe amendment No. 438, to provide for the establishment of a committee to assess the effects of certain Federal regulatory mandates.

Merkley amendment No. 427, to make a technical correction to the HUBZone designation process.

McCaIN amendment No. 441 (to Coburn modified amendment No. 436), to prohibit the use of Federal funds to construct ethanol blender pumps or ethanol storage facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 10 minutes of debate only equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Who yields time?
assistance in commercialization that will ultimately help small businesses and new entrepreneurs streamline business plans and create new jobs.

Under the Recovery Act, EDA helped fund the creation of a micro revolving loan fund in Chicago, Illinois, operated by a local economic development organization, and to support the establishment of an international nonprofit organization dedicated to microfinance. ACCION is using the project funds to expand its existing microlending activities in Cook County and to promote entrepreneurship by providing low-cost capital and financial literacy counseling to clients who don’t have access to traditional bank credit. The $1,200,000 revolving loan fund is projected to make 120 loans in the initial round of lending—creating or saving about 400 jobs.

After terrible flooding in 2008 and the subsequent disaster declaration, EDA was able to award $677,000 in disaster supplemental funding to the city of Princeton. The city of Princeton used these grants to build infrastructure for a 137-acre industrial site, including re habilitation of existing roadway, construction of new roadway, water-main, sewer lines, and city-owned electric and fiber optic cable. This project not only helped the long-term economic options for the community, but is expected to create 500 jobs and induce $50,000,000 in private investment in the region.

The bill on the floor right now would reauthorize EDA to continue making these necessary investments for an additional 5 years. And it would also improve flexibility and efficiency at the agency. For example, the bill would allow EDA to do more in the most distressed communities by increasing the cap on the Federal share of projects in areas that have very high unemployment rates and very low per capita income. And it would allow communities using EDA’s revolving loan fund to more readily help businesses get those dollars in the economic development project with the greatest potential to help the region.

When Senator Douglas led the effort to create ADA he faced opposition from none other than Senator Goldwater. Senator Goldwater argued that distressed regions are, and I quote, “perfectly normal to the economic cycle of American enterprise, and not in need of government intervention.”

While history has proven he is wrong, at least debate help to bring those dollars into the economic development project with the greatest potential to help the region. At least he was grappling with policy issues actually being considered. The reality is, if Congress wants to help create jobs and bring down the unemployment rate, we need to be able to pass simple pieces of legislation that will help create jobs with little to no costs. Instead for the second time in 2 months, we find a jobs bill illiberalized by amendment.

If we can’t find a way to work together on the floor of the House, reauthorization of SBIR/STTR reauthorization, the American public is justified in believing that we will do nothing to help create jobs. And to borrow a quote from Paul Douglas during his work on the ADA, “The lives of too many human beings are at stake to sit by and do nothing...”

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation and move quickly to final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, we have spent many days talking about the importance of the bill before us which would reauthorize the Economic Development Administration. The EDA is a proven success. I think it is instructive that no one on the other side is speaking out against it. It is amazing to me they do not speak out against it, but I have a feeling we may not get this cloture vote. I hope I am wrong.

As I look at ways for us to be bipartisan, there are a couple of areas where I think we can come together. One would certainly be job creation. We Democrats know how to do it. We did it under Bill Clinton, and we are the only party in 50 years to pass a budget that actually brought us to a surplus. We can do that with our friends on the other side, and I am glad there are a couple of them. There are.

The other area is job creation and job preservation. The other side says they want to do it with us. This is a golden opportunity for them to join with us. We have seen—and Leader Reid knows this because he has selected various jobs bills to bring to the Senate floor. It was not by chance this bill came. He wanted committee chairmen to say which bills had bipartisan support in their committees. We voted this bill out nearly unanimously. We had one objection in a time when things are pretty contentious. Why is it? I will tell you why it is.

One of the best ways to tell you is to quote Senator JOHN CORNYN, who said a couple of weeks ago, and I agree: “In Texas will ‘pave the way for creation of new jobs and business opportunities.’” That says it all.

We have 27 Republicans who went on the record saying the EDA was a good job creation bill. We know that historically $1 of EDA investment attracts $7 in private sector investment. So while this is a $500 billion bill, if you see that it is $7 for each $1, it is into the millions in terms of the job creation that would certainly be deficit reduction. We know the jobs created will be between about 250,000 and 1 million over the life of the bill. One million jobs. All we need is a cloture vote.

This EDA started in 1965, and it has been supported by Democrats and Republicans. I gave you an example of Senator CORNYN and what he said. These are just some of the people who are supporting us: the Conference of Mayors, the Public Works Association, the University Economic Development Association—why do they support it? They know this particular program is a spark plug. Put in $1 and attract $7 of private sector investment. People get to work again.

I am just hopeful that we do not see this bill die today. This is a moment in time we can show that we mean what we say. Senator CRAFO said the EDA business statement will help “keep Idaho firms on the cutting edge.”

Senator LUGAR said EDA funding is “essential in our efforts to improve the quality of life and the standard of living for Hoosier families.”

It goes on. Senator COLLINS has some beautiful statements. Twenty-seven of our colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, have always supported this legislation. The last time it was signed into law was by George W. Bush, yes, and it passed this Senate unanimously. If this bill goes down because our friends on the other side keep wanting to offer—they have offered tens of amendments. It is up to about 100 amendments: one about the prairie chicken, another one about a lizard—all fine but do not belong on this bill. This bill is about jobs. I hope our friends with their hearts and will look back on their press releases. I certainly think if they did that, they would cast an “aye” vote, and we would pass this bill and do something for jobs in this Nation.

Thank you very much.

I yield back my time, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 782, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that act, and for other purposes. Harry Reid, Barbara Boxer, Kent Conrad, John F. Kerry, Sheldon Whitehouse, Amy Klobuchar, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeff Bingaman, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Robert Menendez, Jeanne Shaheen, Bernard Sanders, Frank R. Lautenberg, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Daniel K. Akaka.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 782, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that act, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 94 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Akaka
Baucus
Berech
Bingaman
Bennett
Blumenthal

NOES—51

Bingaman
Boxer
Baucus
Bennett
Bingaman
Bennett
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 51. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. If we could have the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Senator SCHUMER and Senator ALEXANDER are that far from an agreement that we can move forward on the next bill. So with everyone’s patience, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote scheduled to occur immediately—right now—be postponed until Wednesday; that is, June 22, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, and that if cloture is invoked tomorrow, time postcloture be counted as if cloture was invoked at 6 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business until 6 p.m. this evening, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each during this time.

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

The Senate from Vermont is recognized.

NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about a critical issue for the State of Vermont and for my State’s energy future, and that deals with the Vermont Yankee nuclear powerplant. The Vermont Yankee nuclear powerplant is one of 23 plants in our country with the same design—General Electric Mark One—as the Fukushima plants that have experienced partial or perhaps full meltdowns in Japan.

All of us feel terribly about what has happened in Japan, and our hearts go out to that struggling country. But at the same time, in our Nation, we also have some very critical developments regarding nuclear power, and I wish to touch this afternoon on two of them.

The first is, we have a situation in the State of Vermont in which a powerful $14 billion energy company called Entergy is trying to force the people of my State to keep an aging and troubled nuclear reactor open for another 20 years. This is a plant that is 40 years old. They want to keep it open for another 20 years. The Vermont Yankee plant is currently licensed to operate beyond March of 2012. The Vermont State Senate, representing the wishes of the people of our State, voted on a bipartisan basis, 26 to 4—not to grant an extension of the license of that plant. The law is clear that States have the right to reject nuclear power for economic reasons, and that is exactly what the Vermont State Senate did in an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

We know Vermont Yankee has had serious problems in the last several years, including a collapse of its cooling towers in 2007 and radioactive tritium leaks in 2005 and 2010. The tritium leaks came from pipes plant officials claimed under oath did not exist.

In support of the Vermont legislature’s decision, the Vermont congressional delegation has been clear that Entergy should respect Vermont’s laws. In other words, what we are saying—the delegation here—is that Entergy should respect the laws of the State of Vermont and what our State Senate has done. If we have learned anything in the past week, we are learning that Entergy’s well-paid corporate lobbyists and lawyers have been meeting in secret with Federal agencies, including the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff, pushing the Federal Government to intervene in the lawsuit Entergy filed against Vermont. Entergy wants the Federal Government to take up its extreme argument that Vermont’s right to decide its own energy future is preempted by Federal nuclear safety laws.

It so happens that the NRC Chairman Greg Jazcko, who is, in my view, a fair-minded public servant, does not agree with Entergy. He told me last week at a Senate hearing that “I see nothing that would tell me that there’s a pre-emption issue here.” He said in a conversation with reporters that Vermont had a “role to play in determining Vermont Yankee’s future” and that he “doubted the NRC would do anything to interfere with the state’s process.” I believe the Chairman’s position is correct. The NRC regulates safety—safety—although some Vermonters believe they do not do that very well. Nevertheless, it is not the arbiter of political disputes between a powerful energy company and the State of Vermont. That is not the business of the NRC.

So I was very surprised to learn last week that against the Chairman’s public recommendation, the NRC voted in secret, by a 3-to-2 margin, to tell the Department of Justice to intervene on Entergy’s behalf. When I questioned the NRC’s Commissioners at a hearing last week, they refused to tell us how they voted; they said they had not even read the major 1993 Supreme Court opinion on this issue—a case between PG&E v. California, where the Supreme Court said—and I quote an important point regarding States rights and nuclear energy. This is the quote from the Supreme Court:

The promotion of nuclear power is not to be accomplished “at all costs.” The elaborately licensing and safety provisions and the continued preservation of state regulation in traditional areas belie that. Moreover, Congress has allowed the states to determine—as a matter of economics—whether a nuclear power plant vis-a-vis a fossil fuel plant should be built. The decision of California to exercise authority does not, in itself, constitute a basis for preemption. . . . The legal reality remains that Congress has left sufficient authority in the states to allow the development of nuclear power to be slowed or even stopped for economic reasons.

That is the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, 1993.

We have now had the NRC’s secret hearing, and do so again today, that this lawsuit is none of their business, and their getting involved damages the credibility of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The NRC opted to relicense Vermont Yankee based on safety, and that is where their concern and authority begins and ends. The main point is this: The NRC does not represent the people of Vermont and has no right to tell us what kind of energy future we should have. The people of Vermont believe—and I agree—that our future lies significantly with energy efficiency and sustainable energy. Today, I renew my call on the floor of the Senate for the Federal Government to stay out of this case. Entergy is a $14 billion corporation. They have all kinds of lobbyists and they make all kinds of campaign contributions. They don’t need the help of the Federal Government.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. I am very pleased the Senator took to the floor to speak to the American people about what they are going through in his State. I am
Mr. SANDERS. I thank Senator Boxer for her thoughts and the extraordinary leadership she is providing on the Environment Committee.

I think everyone understands that the function of the NRC is very simple. It is to make sure the 104 nuclear powerplants in this country run as safely as possible. That is their job. Their job is not to tell the State of Vermont or the State of California or the State of Pennsylvania what future they might want to pursue in terms of energy. It is not their job. Their job is to make sure the nuclear powerplants are being run safely.

So in terms of economics, the people of Vermont or any other State in this country have the right to determine what the future of nuclear powerplants is in their State. What our State is saying is, after 40 years, we want to move in a new direction that we think benefits our State. We do not want the Department of Justice to intervene in this case, where Entergy is suing Vermont.

Let me conclude, while we are on the issue of nuclear power, and point out that the Associated Press recently revealed that 48 out of 65 nuclear power sites in this country have leaked radioactive tritium, and Vermont Yankee is one of those sites. Thirty-seven facilities had leaks at levels that violated Federal drinking water standards, and some leaks have migrated off the sites, contaminating private wells, although none is yet known to have contaminated public drinking water supplies.

These allegations by the Associated Press are extremely disturbing. Safety at our nuclear plants should be the most important priority at the NRC, particularly after what we saw happen in Japan. The function of the NRC is not to represent the nuclear power industry; rather, it represents the needs of the people of the United States.

That is why I will be working as a member of the Environment Committee, which has oversight over the NRC, with our chairperson, Senator Barbara Boxer, and others on the committee who are interested in this issue, to call for a GAO investigation of the allegations made by the Associated Press. We need to determine whether it is true that the NRC is systematically working with the industry to undermine safety standards for aging plants in order to keep them operating.

Let me conclude by mentioning that around the world there is growing concern about the dangers of nuclear power, and I think that concern has been heightened by the terrible tragedy in Japan. It is important to note that Germany has decided to close all 17 nuclear plants in the next decade and not to build any new ones. They are getting out of the nuclear power industry. Switzerland is also phasing out nuclear power. In Italy, just a few weeks ago, 94 percent of the people voted in an election against restarting the nuclear power industry.

Here in the United States, some States are moving in the same direction. In addition to Vermont, New York City, led by Governor Cuomo, wants the Indian Point plant shut down. Massachusetts is supporting Vermont in its lawsuit to preserve States rights to decide their own energy future, and I believe other States will support us as well.

The bottom line—and the law supports this—is that Vermont wants to move away from aging and troubled nuclear reactors and to a sustainable energy future, we have the right to do that. I will fight tooth and nail to protect that right.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, Senate Republicans, in their typically unanimous way, just blocked this Chamber from even voting on the Economic Development Revitalization Act or any of the other bills.

We heard Senator Boxer point out how many Republicans have supported the Economic Development Administration many times in what they did for economic development in their home states. We know that Vermont, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, before EDA works with small Federal investments, leveraging that money in the private sector through incubators, in many cases, or accelerators or whatever the communities call them, and they do, in fact, create jobs. Unfortunately, every Republican in this Chamber decided that wasn’t such a good thing—perhaps to deny a political victory to President Obama. What it did was take away another tool to get this economy back on course.

So many people in this body seem to think it is all about reducing the debt. It is about reducing the debt, but it needs to be largely about creating jobs. There doesn’t seem to be that much interest in that on the other side of the aisle.

Just last week, I spoke with economic development directors and county commissioners from the city of Moraine, a suburb of Dayton where a GM plant was closed, and in my county, my wife’s home county in the northeast corner of the State. They explained the importance of EDA funding and how it supports economic growth in their communities.

EDA has traditionally been a non-controversial and bipartisan job-creation bill. It helps broker deals between the public and private sectors, which is critical to economic growth and recovery. It is particularly important to economic development in communities and in these types of economic times.

Every $1 of EDA grant funding leverages $7 worth of private investment. For every $19,000—and this is one study, proven by evidence and fact—of EDA investment in business incubators, which helps entrepreneurs start companies, between 50 and 70 jobs are created. When we put money into the Youngstown incubator or a bit of Federal money into LaunchHouse in Shaker Heights—an incubator just launched, if you will—it creates jobs. It helps entrepreneurs and startup companies create jobs in our communities.

Some of these businesses will fail. A few of them will wildly succeed. Many will hang on for several years, hiring 5, 10, 20 or maybe hundreds of people.

In Ohio, since 2006, more than 40 EDA grants worth $36 million have leveraged a total of more than $87 million of private resources were matched.

Colleges and universities from Bowling Green in the northwest to Ohio University in the southeast, to Miami
in the southwest, have received EDA funds. So too have port authorities in Toledo and Ashtabula—the Presiding Officer’s border with Erie—in that part of Ohio and entrepreneurs in Cleveland and Appalachia.

If we are going to strengthen our competitiveness, communities will need to equip businesses with the tools they need to survive, and communities will need to create higher skill, living wage jobs and attract private investment.

That is what EDA is designed to do; it is the “front door” for communities facing sudden and severe economic distress.

When economic disaster hits, communities turn to the government, and in so many cases it is EDA that does the job.

EDA has helped redevelop the former GM plant in Moraine—several thousand GM jobs, Frigidaire jobs. Because of EDA, local partnerships, and outside private partners, we expect to see hundreds and hundreds, maybe a few thousand jobs in manufacturing in that Moraine plant. We have seen EDA help redevelop the DHL plant in Wilmington. Ashtabula’s Plant C received EDA incentive grants to make vital repairs. The bill Republicans just blocked us from even voting on would have strengthened a proven job-creating program.

How many times do we hear about businesses worried about uncertainty created in a still recovering economy? This bill would have provided certainty in funding for an established job-creating problem. It would have reduced regulatory burdens to increase flexibility for grantees. It would have encouraged public-private partnerships that we have already seen make a difference across Ohio.

I offered two amendments that would have further strengthened EDA. One would have assisted former auto communities when a plant closure or downsizing causes economic distress, such as Wilmington or Moraine.

The other would have made more Ohio communities eligible to receive funds for business incubators. Ohio is the home of the National Business Incubator Association—the trade association for all incubators in southeast Ohio and Athens. We have a model for business incubators in Toledo, Youngstown, and now Shaker Heights.

The amendment would have allowed more Ohio communities to support homegrown entrepreneurship.

Republican Senators chose to bog down the EDA bill with other unrelated amendments. All of them were unrelated to the task at hand: that is, how do we create jobs? Just yesterday, I was at Cleveland State University, where its Veteran Student Success Program goes above and beyond in serving our Nation’s veterans.

Unemployment among young Americans is especially acute and disproportionately affects young veterans, and that is an outrage. Today, the unemployment rate for returning service-members between 20 and 24 is 27 percent—almost 3 times the national unemployment average. That means more than one in four veterans can’t find a job to support his or her family, easing the transition to civilian life. When our economy needs them, even veterans can get the job done, too often veterans are turned away. Cleveland State University has a Project SERV Program to ensure servicemembers who return home and into the classroom receive all benefits they earned and deserve. Imagine the difficulty for someone 25 years old, who has done two combat tours in Iraq, who comes back to Cleveland or to Philadelphia or anywhere else in this country and tries to integrate into a classroom of 18- and 19-year-olds who have seen nothing like the 25-year-old who has been in combat in Iraq or Afghanistan.

This Project SERV at Cleveland State has been groundbreaking and is one of the few in the country—and now at Youngstown State University. What they are doing is establishing veteran support programs at colleges and universities. It started as an idea at a community roundtable I convened at Cleveland State a few years ago. It became law in the last Congress, and we have ensured its funding.

Yesterday, I met with Clarence Rowe, a staff sergeant in the Marine Corps, who is using the veterans resource sources at CSU to translate his military skills to the needs of the civilian job market. But as much as CSU and other universities do to assist our veterans, high unemployment continues to hurt all Americans. Too often, people such as Staff Sergeant Rowe, who has put years into serving his country, come back and, even with developing their job skills in school, they simply can’t find jobs.

Education—workforce investment, and EDA have long been sound Federal investments that have helped to create jobs and strengthen our economy. It is a shame Republicans have yet again placed a roadblock on the pathway toward a strong and more prosperous middle class. We can do better than that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

I am acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise tonight to speak about our policy in Afghanistan. We know the President is about to announce a major decision on the policy. As the President determines the degree and scope of the drawdown, we should remember the importance of our objective, our debate, about troop levels, principally. But while this is an important discussion, we need to step back and comprehensively focus on overall U.S. strategic interests in the region.

Over the course of my time in the Senate, some 41⁄2 years now, I have participated in more than 20 Foreign Relations Committee hearings on Afghanistan and Pakistan. I will hear from Secretary Clinton on the U.S. policy on both Afghanistan and Pakistan. I personally chaired four hearings on U.S. policy in the region, I have traveled to Afghanistan and Pakistan on two occasions with our military and civilian leadership as well as senior government officials in both countries. I have spoken repeatedly on the Senate floor about the importance of accountability of U.S. military and civilian programs.

When it comes to matters of war, the Senate has a special responsibility to ask questions and to hold the executive branch accountable no matter what party is in the White House. I have taken this responsibility very seriously and have repeatedly questioned and examined U.S. policy in south Asia.

There has been substantial progress in Afghanistan. On the battlefield, the United States coalition and Afghan forces have rolled back advances made by the Taliban. We have made measurable, albeit fragile, gains on security in key provinces of the country. Al-Qaida, operating from Pakistan, has been significantly degraded.

There has also been measurable progress in the education and health fields. Only 900,000 boys and no girls attended school under the Taliban. Today more than 6 million children are in school and a third of them are girls. In the field of health, more than 85 percent of Afghans now have access to at least some form of health care, up from 9 percent in the year 2002.

These gains have not come without immeasurable sacrifice on the part of our Armed Forces and of course their families. In Pennsylvania we have lost 30 servicemembers killed in action in Operation Enduring Freedom since 2001. 461 wounded, some of them grievously wounded.

In Iraq, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania lost 197 servicemembers killed in action and 1,233 were wounded. These courageous men and women gave what many years ago Lincoln called “the last full measure of devotion” to their country. We owe them a debt of gratitude. We owe the same debt of gratitude to their families and to all veterans and their families returning from the battlefield.

After this exhaustive review, and based upon measurable gains in Afghanistan, I believe the United States can shift from a strategy of counterinsurgency to one that is even more focused on counterterrorism. It is time for the United States to lighten its footprint in the country. It is also a time to accelerate the shift in responsibility to Afghan forces and for a drawdown of a significant number of United States troops from Afghanistan. The capabilities of both al-Qaida and the Taliban have been severely degraded.
The United States-led development projects have strengthened the health and education sectors, as I mentioned before. At a time of economic austerity here in the United States, the approximately $120 billion per year pricetag is, for sure, unsustainable. We must take a serious look at our strategy.

As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Near Eastern, South, Central Asian Affairs, I am focused on our broader national security interests in both regions. We must focus on the threat that extremist groups both here and abroad are posing to the capability and intent to project terrorism on the United States homeland and interests around the world. We should continue to conduct counteterror operations on al-Qaeda, Pakistani Taliban, and others who seek to strike the United States homeland and our interests.

Significant challenges, however, do remain and the United States should focus on the following. First, we must reduce our reliance to train Afghan security forces. We made substantial progress in recruiting and training, but this needs to be ramped up. In the long run, Afghanistan’s ability to deny safe haven to al-Qaeda or any terrorist organization will greatly depend upon a strong and durable army and police in Afghanistan.

Second, much work remains in Pakistan. In Senate hearings and meetings with U.S. and Pakistani officials, I have pressed Pakistan’s full commitment to addressing the extremist threat within its borders. For example, Pakistan has done little to stop the flow of bomb components across the border into Afghanistan, where they are used against our troops. Terrorists in Pakistan have the capability to strike internationally, and have done so in recent years.

These terrorists are also the central threat to the Pakistani state itself, a concern that grows as Pakistan inexplicably expands its nuclear arsenal.

The Pakistani people have suffered greatly in the struggle against these extremist groups as thousands of civilians and security forces have died. This is precisely why it is so unfortunate that the Pakistani Government is not fully committed to confronting this threat.

I have been very patient with respect to this critical relationship, but I am compelled to speak the truth when the stakes are so high for the American people. The United States troops and the people of Pakistan both have a lot at stake, in addition to the American people. In my judgment, recent developments are unacceptable and merit a serious examination of U.S. aid to Pakistan. The Senate should hold hearings so we have a full accounting of Pakistan’s efforts to combat terrorism.

The third area of our focus should be the concern that many of us have—and I have for sure—about the future of women and girls in Afghanistan. If nothing else, we cannot lose precious ground gained in rights for this critical 50 percent of the population—women and girls. Over the past 10 years, women have assumed seats in Parliament and girls have returned to school. I mentioned the number earlier. Women’s rights have become a part of the public discourse, at long last.

When speaking to a group of Afghan women in May, Secretary of State Clinton said, “We will not abandon you, we will stand with you always.” We must prioritize and honor this commitment to the women and girls who live in Afghanistan. Empowered women are the most influential voice to dissuade young men from taking up arms in Afghanistan and places around the world. These women are the most likely to develop their own communities as well.

Finally and most importantly, it is our moral obligation to protect those who are most vulnerable in Afghanistan.

I have significant concerns about governance in Afghanistan. I have closely examined Afghanistan’s uneven governance record and have serious questions about the viability of the democratic experiment in that country. The foundational act of democracy, elections, has not met international standards in Afghanistan and has established the basis for an unresponsive government and unresponsive government officials and corruption.

As the United States draws down its military presence, the international community must renew its focus on governance in Afghanistan and efficient disbursement of U.S. assistance. A recent Senate Foreign Relations Committee report suggests that we must do a better job of accounting for the resources spent on bolstering the Afghan Government.

In conclusion, we have made progress in Afghanistan all these years. The U.S. and NATO, working with coalition forces and the Afghan Army, has rolled back gains made by the Taliban. Our special forces have killed Osama bin Laden and several other senior al-Qaeda leaders. The numbers and capabilities of the Afghan security forces are better off than they were in the year 2001, and the health sector has improved.

Significant challenges remain, but based upon these advances and on the significant costs of our current policy, it is time, after 10 long years, to begin the drawdown process. I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CONRAD JONES
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to recognize a distinguished doctor and Kentuckian, Dr. Conrad Jones. Dr. Jones has risen to become one of the most admired and applauded physicians in America. He is a feat that was recognized at the Murray-Calloway County Hospital in 2007 when they opened their new women’s health facility and named it the Conrad Jones Women’s Pavilion. As Dr. Jones has contributed to the field of women’s health for six decades now, it was a very fitting tribute.

When Dr. Jones was born in 1922, there was no ultrasound or the home pregnancy test. Dr. Jones’s father, Dr. Cody Jones, was also a physician, and a young Conrad would accompany him on his rounds as a country doctor. The Jones family had come to Kentucky from the Carolinas. Conrad’s mother was a school teacher who taught in Hazel and at Murray High School.

Conrad remembers his father worked long, hard hours. His father would have preferred that Conrad become a farmer instead of a doctor, in fact, because a doctor’s life was too hard. Luckily for the people of Kentucky, Conrad did not take that particular piece of advice.

Dr. Conrad Jones attended Murray State and then went to medical school at the University of Louisville. After serving his country in uniform, he returned to Murray, KY, to work at what was then the new city-county hospital and its obstetrics unit. He helped patients from the immediate area as well as all over Marshall, Graves and Henry counties.

Dr. Jones has practiced medicine in Murray so long he can tell you the history of how medicine and medical technology has advanced in the area. Dr. Jones certainly knows medical technology, and is proud that Murray has what he calls by today’s standards state-of-the-art facilities.

I wish to commend Dr. Conrad Jones for his many decades of service to his community. The people of Murray, Calloway County and Kentucky are lucky to have him. I know my colleagues join me when I say this U.S. Senate is grateful to him and his family for all he has contributed to make our stronger community.

The Murray-Calloway County Chamber of Commerce published a 2008 Viewbook that contained an illuminating article detailing Dr. Conrad Jones’s life and career. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed, as follows:

[From the Murray-Calloway County Chamber of Commerce 2008 Viewbook]

MURRAY’S CONRAD JONES: A LIFE IN MEDICINE

(By Robert A. Valentine)

In February 2007, the Murray-Calloway County Hospital opened a state-of-the-art facility dedicated to women’s health. Almost everyone there recognized the appropriate name of the new facility: The Conrad Jones Women’s Pavilion. Dr. Conrad Jones, who had already witnessed six decades of progress in women’s health, was looking on in a state of near-speechless humility.

He was born long before the MRI, the ultrasound or even the home pregnancy test. Most women had yet to vote in their first presidential election, and all but a very few babies were born at home. It was a warm October in 1922.
“My father wanted me to be a farmer because a physician’s life was hard,” Dr. Jones told me in an interview in his offices at the Murray Woman’s Clinic. He was attracted to the life of an obstetrician, despite the long hours and long, hard hours. “Work in the tobacco fields made me know that I didn’t want that.”

After Murray State, he entered medical school at the University of Louisville. Following that, he went directly into the service. “There were few specialists there,” he remembers. “You did whatever was necessary for the patient.”

He returned to Murray after the service. By that time, the new city-county hospital had come on line with an obstetric unit on the second floor of the northwest wing. “It was pretty crude by today’s standards,” he remembers. “But it was probably the best OB unit for several counties around. We did about as many deliveries then as we do now.” Dr. Jones observed, because many patients came from Marshall, Graves and Henry counties.

“Murray has always been a very progressive community in terms of technology” he reminded us. “By today’s standards, what we have here is state-of-the-art. This should serve us well for several years.”

We asked Conrad Jones how long he has been in Murray. He laughed and answered, “Always.” That makes him the ideal source of information on changes in women’s healthcare over the years. We also asked about the most important changes during his career.

“Today there are far more caesarian sections being performed. In the ’80s and ’90s, if your section rate got above 5 or 6 percent, it was uncommon. Now, we see 23 to 30 percent. Surgery is much safer now, and we have better tracking technology, so you can tell how the foetus is doing. Pelvic monitors were a major step forward by the late ’80s and early ’90s.”

Modern techniques make it much safer for the mother. “Anesthesia was the ‘saddle block’ (a procedure which cuts off sensation in the pelvic region) or nitrous oxide. Now, the epidural has replaced that.”

But the main change is the technology and the facility. The custom of hospital instead of home delivery with an obstetrician on call ended the infant mortality rate. Only two generations ago, maternal and infant mortality was all too common. “The mothers of today have a much better chance of having a healthy baby,” he recalls. “It’s a very happy, joyous experience; you are not alone.”

After so many sleepless nights and the constant, tiring work of his associates in fertility treatment, he remembers, “You’ve got to have a good partner and that’s my wife. She was with me all the way; when I was as cold as I was a week before I was delivered, she had to be alone. We couldn’t take vacations as other folks might, and maybe we missed a lot of things. She has been a real trooper; without her, I couldn’t have done it.”

While he changed anything about his career, those who write history will probably agree that it’s been not merely a career so much as it is a life in medicine.

**FELONY STREAMING**

**Mrs. FEINSTEIN.** Mr. President, I rise to address S. 978, legislation passed by the Judiciary Committee last week that would increase the penalties for willful copyright infringement by streaming. I would like to explain why I voted “pass” on the bill at the Judiciary Committee markup, and to express what my concern is.

First, I very much appreciate the intent behind this legislation, and commend Senators KLOBUCHAR and CORNYN for bringing it forth. Online infringement of copyrights has had a very serious, detrimental, effect on the entertainment industry, which is based in large part in my State of California. This bill simply copies the penalty structure from the current law that makes larger scale illegal downloading a felony. That law makes “the reproduction or distribution, including by electronic means”—i.e. downloading—a felony punishable by up to 5 years imprisonment, if it involves: 10 or more copies; with a total retail value of more than $2,500; and within a 180-day period.

This bill just replicates that penalty structure, with the additional element of an alternative “fair market value” threshold. It makes willful infringement through “public performances by electronic means”—i.e. streaming—also a felony, subject to the same 5-year maximum sentence, if it involves: 10 or more public performances; within a 180-day period; with either a total retail or economic value of more than $2,500; or total fair market value of licenses of more than $5,000; or within a 180-day period. The effort to keep kids learning during summer is based on research that shows that without effective summer learning opportunities: students fall more than 2 months behind in math over the summer; low-income children fall behind 2 to 3 months in reading each summer; and that by the end of fifth grade, lower income children can be nearly 3 years behind their higher income peers in reading.

Last year, nearly 500 events were held nationwide that highlighted how summer learning programs advance academic growth, support working families, keep children safe and send students back to school ready to learn. Therefore, I hope to work with the bill’s sponsors before this legislation goes to the floor, to craft a more appropriate threshold, which reflects the differences between downloading and streaming. As the sponsors and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, have stated, there are other outstanding issues that are committed to addressing before this bill comes to the floor, and I hope this concern that I have can be resolved in the same way.

**SUMMER LEARNING**

**Mrs. MURRAY.** Mr. President, today I wish to discuss the importance of summer learning, and to draw attention to the significance of high-quality summer learning opportunities in the lives of young people.

Given that downloading is much more common than viewing or listening that streaming creates. This is very likely why downloading was made a felony to begin with, while streaming wasn’t. Given that downloading is much more serious and damaging, to have a moral consistency with the downloading penalties, the streaming thresholds, at least in quantity, should be much higher. Therefore, I hope to work with the bill’s sponsors before this legislation goes to the floor, to craft a more appropriate threshold, which reflects the differences between downloading and streaming. As the sponsors and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, have stated, there are other outstanding issues that are committed to addressing before this bill comes to the floor, and I hope this concern that I have can be resolved in the same way.

**ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS**

**TRIBUTE TO LINDA RUNDELL**

- **Mr. BINGAMAN.** Mr. President, today I recognize Ms. Linda Rundell, the Bureau of Land Management’s New Mexico State director, for her exemplary public service and to express my congratulations on her upcoming retirement after 32 years.

Linda has held many titles during her time with BLM, including range
conervationist, wildlife biologist, environmental impact statement team leader, program analyst, congressional fellow, and district manager. And her work has taken her to nearly as many parts of our country, including Alaska, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, D.C.

But the hallmark of her career has kept her in my home State of New Mexico where she will finish her tenure with BLM as State director for New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Kansas. Since 2002, Linda has overseen an annual budget of $250 million, responsible for 13.4 million acres of public lands in New Mexico and nearly 54 million acres of Federal and tribal subsurface minerals underlying non-BLM lands in the four States.

With a mission of multiple-use management, the BLM is tasked with balancing competing uses of our public land—including oil and gas development, wildlife protection, recreation, grazing, landscape conservation, and cultural resource protection—to name just a few. Attempting to balance these activities can be a challenging task for any land manager. However, Linda’s career demonstrates how well she has personified this mission by assisting groups with opposing viewpoints to find common ground through collaboration.

Restore New Mexico, a program Linda established in 2005, demonstrates the benefits that can be achieved through collaboration. In only about 6 years the BLM—in partnership with environmental groups, ranchers, oil and gas companies, and sportsmen—has begun the restoration of 1.5 million acres of grasslands and woodlands in New Mexico. These efforts are reversing decades and even centuries of habitat fragmentation, encroachment by invasive species, and the legacy of orphaned oil and gas wells across the State. The results have been excellent, and efforts that have been built between long-time adversaries cannot be understated. With this collaboration as a framework, the long-term successful restoration of our public lands is more likely than ever.

Linda’s impressive record as State director is no doubt a product of what she learned in the years leading up to it. Her background as a wildlife biologist, for example, gave her the foresight to recognize that the BLM had a significant role if further population declines of the lesser prairie chicken were to be averted. Before this small grouse began gaining headlines in newspapers, Linda knew that a continued decline of this species would have far-reaching implications. For this reason, she has worked diligently to protect and expand lesser prairie chicken habitat in the State.

Linda exemplifies the attributes found in effective leaders—honesty, a strong work ethic, and a willingness to make the right decision even when it may be difficult. She is highly respected within and outside the agency for her leadership skills and her staff in New Mexico mirror these traits. I appreciate how helpful she and her staff have been while working with my office in the development of various policy initiatives including conservation measures—which many of which have been signed into law—like the Oñito Wilderness, Prehistoric Trackways National Monument, Fort Stanton-Snowy River Cave National Conservation Area, and Sabinoso Wilderness.

Linda’s tenure as BLM State director will leave a lasting legacy that has and will continue to benefit the health of our public land and wildlife as well as the economy of our State and Nation. Our Nation is grateful for her service, and I wish her the best on her future endeavors.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

At 12:36 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolutions:

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

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

The enrolled joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 21, 2011, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolutions:

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

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

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2207. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Robert L. Van Antwerp, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general, to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2208. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General David H. Petraeus, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general, to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2209. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the RQ-4A/B Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Global Hawk Block 30 Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2210. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the RQ-4A/B Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Global Hawk Block 30 Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2211. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the principal financial statements, and supporting schedules, of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston, Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, Federal National Mortgage Association, and Federal Home Loan Bank; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2212. A communication from the Chairman and Ranking Member, the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2213. A communication from the Chair- man and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Bangladesh; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2214. A communication from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank’s management reports and statements on system of internal controls for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2215. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule entitled “Safety Standards for Toddler Beds” (RIN3001–AC79) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2216. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Standards for Toddler Beds” (RIN3001–AC79) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2217. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for General Law, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pipelines Safety: Control Room Management/Human Factors” (RIN2114–AE04) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2218. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Model BAe 146 and Avro 146–RJ Airplanes’’ (BAE SYSTEMS (OPERATIONS) LIMITED Model Bae 146 and Avro 146–RJ Airplanes’’ (RIN2137–EC–2207. A communication from the Under
dom Operations; Technical Amendment” (RIN2112–AH06) (Docket No. FAA–2001–1073) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2219. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the RQ-4A/B Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Global Hawk Block 30 Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–229. A communication from the Senate Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Model DA 42 Planes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0521)) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–230. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Application for Reinstatement and Retroactive Reinstatement for Reasonable Cause under Internal Revenue Code Section 6033(j)” (Notice No. 2011–44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–231. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers from the Chapman Valve Manufacturing Company (i.e., Building 24 and the Dean Street facility) in Indian Orchard, Massachusetts, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–232. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers from the Grassley and Company in Madison, Illinois, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–233. A communication from the Inspector General of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–234. A communication from the Staff Director, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the appointment of members to the Tennessee Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–229. A communication from the Staff Director, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the appointment of members to the Connecticut Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 1180, a bill to extend the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Rept. No. 112–23).

By Mr. LIEBERMAN, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Report to accompany S. 679, a bill to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation (Rept. No. 112–24).

By Ms. STABENOW, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, without amendment:

H.R. 872. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BURR, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1237. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow manufacturing businesses to establish tax-free manufacturing reinvestment accounts to assist them in providing for new equipment and facilities and workforce training; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 1238. A bill to make bills implementing trade agreements subject to a point of order unless certain conditions are met, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1239. A bill to provide for a medal of appropriate design to be awarded by the President to the memorials established at the 3 sites honoring the men and women who perished as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs):

S. 1240. A bill to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Professional Development Institutes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COURURN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. KYL, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1241. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1242. A bill to provide for the treatment of certain hospitals under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 1243. A bill to require that certain Federal job training and career education programs give priority to programs that provide an industry-recognized and nationally portable credential; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. McCAIN, Mr. LIEVIN, Mr. KYL, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KIRBY):

S. Res. 11. A joint resolution authorizing the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mrs. SHARAK, Ms. KLOBuchar, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. Res. 212. A resolution congratulating the people and Government of the Republic of Slovenia on the twentieth anniversary of the country’s independence; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. VITTER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COUBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CLEVERLY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. JOHNSTON of Wisconsin, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUDIO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHEELY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. Res. 213. A resolution commending and expressing thanks to professionals of the intelligence community; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 56

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 56, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve access to advanced practice nurses and physician assistants under the Medicaid Program.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Delaware...
At the request of Mr. RINGMAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 343, a bill to amend Title I of Pub. L. 99-658 regarding the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Palau, to approve the results of the 15-year review of the Compact, including the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Palau Following the Compact of Free Association Section 432 Review, and to appropriate funds for the purposes of the amended Pub. L. 99-658 for fiscal years ending on or before September 30, 2024, to carry out the agreements resulting from that review.

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 418, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a Pancreatic Cancer Initiative, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 418, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to better protect, serve, and advance the rights of victims of elder abuse and exploitation by establishing a program to encourage States and other qualified entities to create jobs designed to hold offenders accountable, enhance the capacity of the justice system to investigate, pursue, and prosecute elder abuse cases, identify existing resources to leverage to the extent possible, and assure data collection, research, and evaluation to promote the efficacy and efficiency of the activities described in this Act.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 528, a bill to provide driver safety grants to States with graduated driver licensing laws that meet certain minimum requirements.

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 354, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain small producers.

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for the establishment of regional educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to increase implementation of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports and early intervening services in order to improve student academic achievement, reduce the number of students with disabilities in schools, and to improve coordination with similar activities and services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to establish a grant program to benefit victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 652, a bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and new job creation through the establishment of an American Infrastructure Financing Authority, to provide for an extension of the exemption from the alternative minimum tax treatment for certain tax-exempt bonds, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 679, a bill to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation.

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 726, a bill to rescind $45 billion of unobligated discretionary appropriations, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 755, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an offset against income tax refunds to pay for restitution and other State judicial debts that are past-due.

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Ms. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

At the request of Mr. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 797, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 800, a bill to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to reauthorize and improve the safe routes to school program.

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve education and prevention related to campus sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 946, a bill to establish an Office of Rural Education Policy in the Department of Education.

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 951, a bill to improve the provision of Federal transition, rehabilitation, vocational, and unemployment benefits to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. POPPEN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. LUGAR) were added as co-sponsors of S. 1025, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the National Guard, enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and improvement of Federal-state military coordination in domestic emergency response, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to ensure that all users of the transportation system, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, children, older individuals, and individuals with disabilities, are able to travel safely and conveniently on and across federally funded streets and highways.

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 768, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.
BROWN) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. Mikulski) were added as co-sponsors of S. 1088, a bill to provide increased funding for the reinsurance for early retirees program.

S. 1094
At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as co-sponsors of S. 1094, a bill to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-416).

S. 1067
At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1067, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the diagnosis and treatment of hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) were added as co-sponsors of S. 1189, a bill to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) to provide for regulatory impact analyses for certain rules, consideration of the least burdensome regulatory alternative, and for other purposes.

S. 1211
At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1211, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antibiotics used in the treatment of human and animal diseases.

S. 1214
At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1214, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, regarding restrictions on the use of Department of Defense funds and facilities for abortions.

S. 1224
At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1224, a bill to amend Public Law 106-392 to maintain annual base funding for the Upper Colorado and San Juan fish recovery program through fiscal year 2023.

S. J. RES. 17
At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a co-sponsor of S. J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

S. J. RES. 19
At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGAN) were added as co-sponsors of S. J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

S. CON. RES. 23
At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a co-sponsor of S. Con. Res. 23, a concurrent resolution declaring that it is the policy of the United States to support and facilitate Israel in maintaining defensible borders and that it is contrary to United States policy and national security to have the borders of Israel return to the armistice lines that existed on June 4, 1967.

S. RES. 80
At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAUKSON) was added as a co-sponsor of S. Res. 80, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha’i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 211
At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as co-sponsors of S. Res. 211, a resolution observing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day.

AMENDMENT NO. 405
At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, his name was added as a co-sponsor of amendment No. 405 proposed to S. 782, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 440
At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a co-sponsor of amendment No. 440 proposed to S. 782, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 476
At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a co-sponsor of amendment No. 476 proposing to S. 782, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):
S. 1240. A bill to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Professional Development Institutes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation, along with my colleague from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL, which will strengthen the unpaid internships and professional development opportunities for our present K-12 teacher workforce. Our goal with this legislation, like any education legislation I support, is to ultimately raise student achievement.

The Teachers Professional Development Institutes Act would establish up to eight new Teachers Professional Development Institutes throughout the nation each year over the next 5 years based on the successful model that has been operating at Yale University for over thirty years. Every Teachers Institute would consist of a partnership between an institution of higher education and the local public school system in which a significant proportion of students come from low-income households. These Institutes will strengthen the present teacher workforce by giving each participant an opportunity to gain more sophisticated content knowledge and develop curriculum units with other colleagues that can be directly applied in their classrooms. We know that teachers gain confidence and enthusiasm when they have a deeper understanding of the subject matter that they teach and this translates into higher expectations for their students and an increase in student achievement.

The Teachers Professional Development Institutes are based on the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute model that has been in existence since 1978. For over 30 years, the Institute has offered, five or six 3 session seminars each year, led by Yale faculty, on topics that teachers have selected to enhance their mastery of the subject areas they teach. The subject selection process begins with representatives from the Institutes soliciting ideas from teachers throughout the school district for topics on which teachers feel they need to have additional preparation. Topics that will assist them in preparing materials they need for their students, or topics that will assist them in addressing the standards that the school district requires. As a consensus emerges about desired seminar subjects, the Institute director identifies university faculty members with the appropriate expertise, interest and desire to lead the seminar. University faculty members, especially those who have led Institute seminars before, may sometimes suggest seminars they would like to lead. These ideas are circulated by the representatives as well. The final decisions on which seminar topics are offered are ultimately
made by the teachers who participate. In this way, the offerings are designed to respond to what teachers believe is needed and useful for both themselves and their students.

The cooperative nature of the Institute seminar process ensures its success. Institutes offer seminars and relevant materials on topics teachers have identified and feel are needed for their own preparation, as well as what they know will motivate and engage students. Teachers voluntarily and enthusiastically take part in rigorous seminars they have requested, and practice using the materials they have obtained and developed. This helps ensure that the experience not only increases their preparation in the subjects they are assigned to teach, but also their participation in an Institute seminar gives them immediate hands-on active learning materials that can be used in the classroom. All of this is a very empowering experience for teachers.

The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute conducted a National Demonstration Project from 1999–2002 that showed that similar Institutes could be created rapidly at diverse sites with large concentrations of disadvantaged students. After conducting research and planning and based on the success of that project, the Institute in 2005 launched the Yale National Initiative to strengthen teaching in public schools, a long-term endeavor to assist with the establishment of Teachers Institutes of this specific type in most states. As a result, new Institutes already have been established in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Charlotte, North Carolina, and New Castle County, Delaware. Nine other school districts in 6 states, including California, Arizona, Oklahoma, Illinois, Virginia, and Georgia, are currently participating in the Initiative to learn how to develop a new Institute.

The teachers surveyed for the National Demonstration Project reported that student motivation, student interest, and student mastery were higher during the Institute-developed unit than during other work. Subsequently, the findings of a 2009 Report on Teachers Institute Experiences found that teacher participants out of desires to obtain curricula that suited their needs, increased subject mastery, and motivated students. Mr. President, 96 percent of the teachers rated the Institute seminars as useful, partly due to the rapid increase in knowledge and in raising expectations for their students.

A retrospective study showed that over 5 years, Teachers Institute participants were almost twice as likely as non-participants to remain teaching in the district 5 years later. Research has shown that longevity in a district leads to increased teacher effectiveness.

Many agree that teacher quality is the single most important school-related factor in determining student achievement. High-quality teacher professional development programs that focus on subject and pedagogy knowledge are a proven method for enhancing the effectiveness of a teacher in the classroom. A recent review of professional development studies by the Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences found that, and I quote, “There is substantive professional development, an average of 49 hours in the 9 studies, can boost their students’ achievement by about twenty-one percentile points.”

The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute model enhances teachers’ basic writing, math, and presentation skills. It increases expectations of student achievement and enthusiasm for teaching while developing skills for motivating students. These are key features that research suggests are effective in producing gains in both teacher knowledge and practice and student achievement. The Teachers Institutes lead to student achievement gains through a proven approach distinguished from both conventional professional development offerings of school districts and from traditional continuing education and outreach programs of colleges and universities.

Education Secretary Arne Duncan said recently, and I quote, “the practices of high-performing countries show clearly that America in particular has a great deal to learn from the teaching profession, from the recruitment and training of teachers to their evaluation and professional development.”

This is precisely what the Teachers Professional Development Institutes Act strives to accomplish. The need for effective teachers with deep content knowledge is most apparent and urgent in schools and school districts that enroll a high proportion of students from low-income families, exactly the schools and school districts that Teachers Institutes target.

The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has already proven to be a successful model for teacher professional development as demonstrated by the high caliber curriculum unit plans that teacher participants have developed and placed on the web, and by the evaluations that support the conclusion that virtually all the teacher participants felt substantially strengthened in their mastery of content knowledge and their teaching skills. The finding that Institute participants were almost twice as likely as non-participants to remain teaching in high-need schools is especially encouraging. Our proposal would open this opportunity to many more teachers in high-need schools throughout the nation. I urge my colleagues to act favorably on this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 2161. SHORT TITLE.

This subpart may be cited as the ‘‘Teachers Professional Development Institutes Act’’.

SEC. 2162. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) Findings.—Congress makes the following findings:—

(1) Teaching is central to the educational process and the ongoing professional development of teachers in the subjects they teach is essential for improved student learning.

(2) Attaining the goal of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001—having a classroom teacher who is highly effective in every academic subject the teacher teaches—will require innovative approaches to improve the effectiveness of teachers in the classroom.

(3) The Teachers Institute Model focuses on the continuing academic preparation of beginning teachers and the application of what the teachers study to their classrooms and potentially to the classrooms of other teachers.

(4) The Teachers Institute Model was developed initially by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute and has successfully operated in New Haven, Connecticut, for more than 30 years.

(5) The Teachers Institute Model has also been successfully implemented in cities larger than New Haven.

(6) In the spring of 2009, a report entitled ‘‘An Evaluation of Teachers Institute Experiences’’ concluded that—

(A) Teachers Institutes enhance precisely those teacher qualities known to improve student achievement;

(B) Teachers Institutes exemplify the crucial characteristics of high-quality teacher professional development; and

(C) Teachers Institute participation is strongly related to teacher retention in high-poverty schools.

(b) Purpose.—The purpose of this subpart is to provide Federal assistance to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Institutes for local educational agencies that serve significant low-income student populations in States throughout the Nation, in order to—

(1) improve student learning; and

(2) enhance the quality and effectiveness of teaching and strengthen the subject matter mastery and the pedagogical skills of current teachers through continuing teacher preparation.

SEC. 2163. DEFINITIONS.

In this subpart:

(1) SIGNIFICANT LOW-INCOME STUDENT POPULATION.—The term ‘‘significant low-income student population’’ means a student population of which not less than 40 percent of the students included are eligible for free or reduced price lunches under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act.

(2) TEACHERS INSTITUTE.—The term ‘‘Teachers Institute’’ means a partnership or joint venture—

(A) between or among—

(i) 1 or more institutions of higher education; and

S. 1240

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

SECTION 1. TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘Subpart 6—Teachers Professional Development Institutes’’.

SEC. 2161. SHORT TITLE.

‘‘This subpart may be cited as the ‘‘Teachers Professional Development Institutes Act’’.

SEC. 2162. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) Findings.—Congress makes the following findings:—

(1) Teaching is central to the educational process and the ongoing professional development of teachers in the subjects they teach is essential for improved student learning.

(2) Attaining the goal of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001—having a classroom teacher who is highly effective in every academic subject the teacher teaches—will require innovative approaches to improve the effectiveness of teachers in the classroom.

(3) The Teachers Institute Model focuses on the continuing academic preparation of beginning teachers and the application of what the teachers study to their classrooms and potentially to the classrooms of other teachers.

(4) The Teachers Institute Model was developed initially by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute and has successfully operated in New Haven, Connecticut, for more than 30 years.

(5) The Teachers Institute Model has also been successfully implemented in cities larger than New Haven.

(6) In the spring of 2009, a report entitled ‘‘An Evaluation of Teachers Institute Experiences’’ concluded that—

(A) Teachers Institutes enhance precisely those teacher qualities known to improve student achievement;

(B) Teachers Institutes exemplify the crucial characteristics of high-quality teacher professional development; and

(C) Teachers Institute participation is strongly related to teacher retention in high-poverty schools.

(b) Purpose.—The purpose of this subpart is to provide Federal assistance to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Institutes for local educational agencies that serve significant low-income student populations in States throughout the Nation, in order to—

(1) improve student learning; and

(2) enhance the quality and effectiveness of teaching and strengthen the subject matter mastery and the pedagogical skills of current teachers through continuing teacher preparation.

SEC. 2163. DEFINITIONS.

In this subpart:

(1) SIGNIFICANT LOW-INCOME STUDENT POPULATION.—The term ‘‘significant low-income student population’’ means a student population of which not less than 40 percent of the students included are eligible for free or reduced price lunches under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act.

(2) TEACHERS INSTITUTE.—The term ‘‘Teachers Institute’’ means a partnership or joint venture—

(A) between or among—

(i) 1 or more institutions of higher education; and

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
“(ii) 1 or more local educational agencies that serve 1 or more schools with significant low-income student populations; and

(B) that improves the effectiveness of teaching, learning, and the quality of teaching and learning, through collaborative seminars designed to enhance both the subject matter and the pedagogical resources of the seminars.

**SEC. 2164. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to award grants under this subpart in order to encourage the establishment and operation of Teachers Institutes. The Secretary may contract with the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute to provide all or part of the technical assistance under this subsection.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may reserve not more than 50 percent of the funds allocated to carry out this subpart to provide technical assistance to facilitate the establishment and operation of Teachers Institutes. The Secretary may consult with the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute to provide all or part of the technical assistance under this subsection.

(c) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting Teachers Institutes to support through grants under this subpart, the Secretary shall consider—

(1) the extent to which a proposed Teachers Institute has the capacity to serve schools having a significant low-income student population;

(2) the extent to which a proposed Teachers Institute will follow the understandings and necessary procedures described in section 2168;

(3) the extent to which each local educational agency participating in the Teachers Institute is a partner in the capacity of teachers who are unprepared or underprepared to teach the core academic subjects the teachers are assigned to teach; and

(4) the extent to which a proposed Teachers Institute will receive a level of support from the community and other sources that will ensure the requisite long-term commitment to the success of a Teachers Institute.

(d) CONSULTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating applications using the criteria under subsection (c), the Secretary may request the advice and assistance of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute or other Teachers Institutes.

(2) STATE AGENCIES.—If the Secretary receives 2 or more applications for grants under this subpart from local educational agencies within the same State, the Secretary shall consult with the State educational agency prior to awarding the applications.

(e) FISCAL AGENT.—The fiscal agent for the receipt of grant funds under this subpart shall be an institution of higher education participating in a Teachers Institute or other Teachers Institute.

(f) LIMITATIONS.—A grant under this subpart shall—

(1) provide grants funds for a period of not more than 5 years; and

(2) be in an amount that is not more than 50 percent of the total costs of the eligible activities supported under the grant, as determined by the Secretary.

**SEC. 2165. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.**

“Grant funds under this subpart may be used—

(1) for the planning, development, establishment, and operation of a Teachers Institute;

(2) for additional assistance to an established Teachers Institute for its further development, and for the support of the planning, development, establishment, and operation of a Teachers Institute under paragraph (1);

(3) for the salary and necessary expenses of a full-time director for a Teachers Institute to plan and manage the Teachers Institute and to act as a liaison between all local educational agencies and institutions of higher education participating in the Teachers Institute;

(4) to provide suitable office space, staff, equipment, and supplies, and to pay other operating expenses, for the Teachers Institute;

(5) to provide a stipend for teachers participating in the collaborative seminars conducted by the Institute in the sciences and humanities and to provide remuneration for the work of the Teachers Institute; and

(6) to provide for the dissemination, through print and electronic media, of curriculum units prepared in the seminars conducted by the Teachers Institute.

**SEC. 2166. UNDERSTANDINGS AND PROCEDURES.**

“A grantee receiving a grant under this subpart shall abide by the following understandings and procedures:

(1) PARTNERSHIP.—The essential relationship of a Teachers Institute is a partnership between a local educational agency and an institution of higher education. A grantee shall demonstrate a long-term commitment on behalf of the participating local educational agency with the goal of higher education leading the seminars; and

(2) to provide for the dissemination, through print and electronic media, of curriculum units prepared in the seminars conducted by the Teachers Institute.

(2) SEMINARS.—A Teachers Institute sponsors seminars led by faculty of the institution of higher education partner and attended by teachers from the local educational agency partner. A grantee shall provide participating teachers the ability to play an essential role in planning, organizing, conducting, and evaluating the seminars and in ensuring the future participation of other teachers.

(3) CURRICULUM UNIT.—A seminar described in paragraph (2) uses a collaborative process, in a collegial environment, to develop a curriculum unit for use by participating teachers that sets forth the subject matter to be presented and the pedagogical strategies to be employed. A grantee shall enable participating teachers to develop a curriculum unit, based on the subject matter presented, for use in the teachers’ classrooms.

(4) ELIGIBILITY AND REMUNERATION.—Seminars are open to all partnership teachers with teaching assignments relevant to the seminar. Teachers receive remuneration for their work and participating teachers receive an honorarium or stipend upon the successful completion of the seminar. A grantee shall provide seminars lessening and participating teachers with remuneration to allow them to participate in the Teachers Institute.

(5) DIRECTORS.—The operations of a Teachers Institute are managed by a full-time director who reports to both partners but is accountable to the institution of higher education partner. A grantee shall appoint a director to manage and coordinate the work of the Teachers Institute.

(6) EVALUATION.—A grantee shall annually review the activities of the Teachers Institute and disseminate the results to members of the Teachers Institute’s partnership community.

**SEC. 2167. APPLICATION, APPROVAL, AND AGREEMENT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—To receive a grant under this subpart, a Teachers Institute, or a partnership or joint venture described in section 2163(2)(B) that is proposing to establish a Teachers Institute, shall submit an application to the Secretary.

(1) meets the requirement of this subpart and any regulations under this subpart;

(2) includes a description of the operation the grantee intends to use funds provided under the grant;

(3) includes such information as the Secretary may require; and

(4) contains such other information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

(b) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall—

(1) promptly evaluate an application received for a grant under this subpart; and

(2) notify the applicant, within 90 days of the receipt of a completed application, of the Secretary’s determination of eligibility.

(c) AGREEMENT.—Upon approval of an application, the Secretary and the applicant shall enter into a comprehensive agreement covering the entire period of the grant.

**SEC. 2168. REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.**

(a) REPORT.—Each grantee under this subpart shall report annually to the Secretary on the progress of the Teachers Institute in achieving the purposes of the grant.

(b) EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate the activities funded under this subpart and submit an annual report of the evaluation to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives. The Secretary shall broadly disseminate successful practices developed by Teachers Institutes.

(c) REVOCATION.—If the Secretary determines that a grantee is not making substantial progress in meeting the purposes of the grant by the end of the second year of the grant, the Secretary may take appropriate action, including revocation of further payments under the grant, to ensure that the funds available under this subpart are used in the most effective manner.

**SEC. 2169. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**


“*There are authorized to be appropriated, for grants (including technical assistance and technical assistance under this subpart, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2012 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.**"
The abortion debate is that parental involvement of parents in abortion decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, it is an honor to stand alongside Senator HATCH today as we introduce the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act. This bill, which would help States enforce laws requiring that parents be notified before their child has an abortion, is supported by many pro-life groups and organizations. But most importantly, it is supported by a broad majority of parents, who are in a much better position to help children with tough decisions than virtually anyone else.

Many States require that a parent be notified before a minor has an abortion, while even more require the consent of a parent before a physician can legally perform an abortion. Unfortunately, these laws are undermined and circumvented by those simply willing to travel to a State without these restrictions.

This important legislation would put an end to this practice permanently by simply enabling States to enforce their existing laws which are designed to protect our children and defend parents’ rights. While this legislation serves that goal, it also promotes a culture of life in our nation that is critical to ensuring we continue to cherish and defend the self-evident, fundamental right to live, especially as it applies to the unborn.

Specifically, this bill has two parts: First, it prohibits the act of knowingly taking a minor across State lines with the intent of obtaining an abortion if this action evades the parental involvement law in her home State. Second, it would require abortion providers to notify a parent of an out-of-State minor before performing an abortion.

Sadly, many are willing to circumvent State law and shuttle young girls across State lines in order to avoid parental notification laws. With the help of my Senate colleagues, we will put a stop to this and ensure that parents are aware of profound medical operations involving their children. With that thought in mind, I ask you to support this legislation to help keep parents informed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am proud to stand with my friend from Florida, Senator Rubio, as he introduces an important piece of legislation, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act. This bill, which today is being introduced in the House by Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida, is based on the belief that children should not make profound life-changing decisions by themselves and that parents are generally in the best and most responsible position to help them.

One of the many disturbing ironies in the abortion debate is that parental consent is needed for such things as tattoos or school fieldtrips but not always for abortions that will end one life and change another forever. Abortion advocates say that abortion should be treated as any other surgical procedure, but many of them oppose requiring the same parental consent for abortion that is required for any other procedure.

What is worse, there are individuals and organizations out there who appear to care more about money than about kids. They are willing to help young girls get abortions by any means necessary, including taking them to other States without the knowledge or consent of their parents. Mind you, those same parents will be responsible for the aftermath, for the physical, emotional, and spiritual consequences of the abortion. If parents are to be responsible at the end, they have the right to be there at the beginning.

If it were possible, just for a moment, to take the abortion politics out of the picture, every parent knows that kids have to develop over time the judgment and maturity to make decisions. No one is more committed to them, no one has more love for them, no one has more responsibility for them than their parents.

This bill has two parts. First, it prohibits taking a minor across State lines for an abortion if doing so evades the parental involvement law in her home State. In the 109th Congress, this portion of our bill passed the Senate with 65 bipartisan votes. More than 80 percent of our fellow Americans support it. Second, this bill requires abortionists to notify parents of an out-of-State minor before performing an abortion. Fifty-seven Senators voted for cloture on this combined bill in 2006.

I urge my colleagues to read the bill. It does not apply when an abortion is necessary to save a girl’s life or if the girl is a victim of abuse or neglect. Again, please read the bill. It is carefully drafted with the appropriate exceptions and in order to focus on what unites the vast majority of Americans, that parents should be involved before their child has an abortion.

The majority of States have laws requiring parental involvement and, with its interstate component, this bill is a legitimate and constitutional way for Congress to help protect children and support parents.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1242. A bill to provide for the treatment of certain hospitals under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I, along with my colleague Senator MANCHIN, rise today to introduce the Fair Competition for Hospitals Act of 2011, legislation that will level the playing field for a handful of hospitals in the Northern Panhandle of West Virginia who are paid significantly less than comparable hospitals in neighboring States serving the same patient population. This legislation will adjust the wage index determination for these hospitals to make sure they are treated the same as the nearby facilities in other States. It will also help hospitals in other areas of the country facing a similar situation.

Medicare’s hospital wage index system was created to reflect the disparity in the price of labor across the country. Usually, hospitals in different States are located far enough apart that they do not compete for the same patients or workforce, within the same geographic area. However, this is not the case in the Northern Panhandle of West Virginia. West Virginia presents a unique situation; with a geographic area as little as 6 miles wide, hospitals in West Virginia are much more akin to hospitals in Ohio and Pennsylvania, on either side of the panhandle. Therefore, this small group of hospitals is competitively disadvantaged because of wage index differences across state borders. This competitive disadvantage is causing these hospitals to struggle under the weight of providing the same care for a lower payment and making it more difficult to continue the high level of care for which they have become known.

These hospitals are vital cornerstones to the people in their communities. They employ more than 4,000 people and provide health care for tens of thousands more. As an essential part of the community, they should not be significantly disadvantaged by a payment structure that does not take into account the unique makeup of this area.

The solution I am introducing today is budget neutral and fair. It will make sure that these hospitals in my State are treated on a level playing field with their competitors and not disadvantaged by an economically meaningless State border. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 1243. A bill to require that certain Federal job training and career education programs give priority to programs that provide an industry-recognized and nationally portable credential; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to reintroduce a very important piece of legislation to accelerate job growth across America, the American Manufacturing Efficiency and Re-training Investment Collaboration Achievement Works Act, also known as the AMERICA Works Act. This bill is the final piece of the solution our Nation’s economic and unemployment problem.

We all know that American families, as well as the manufacturing industry, have faced difficult times over the last few years. But the truth is that the manufacturing industry will always be a key part of our Nation’s economy.

The national unemployment rate has stabilized somewhat, but almost 14 million Americans remain out of work. We still have a long way to go. In my home
State of North Carolina, unemploy-
moment hovers at 9.7 percent, with sev-
eral counties facing double-digit unem-
ployment rates. Job creation is my num-
er one priority and this legisla-
tion is an innovative way to get Ameri-
cans back into the workforce.

The United States needs a strong tech-
technical workforce. The AMERICA
Works Act would encourage national
industries, such as biotechnology, con-
struction, and machinery, to come to-
together and agree on the skill sets they
value most in prospective employees.
Community colleges would participate,
creating the appropriate curricula to meet
these needs. Students who com-
plete the programs would receive an
industry-recognized credential. Workers
who carry these industry-backed creden-
tials would be able to market them-
selves in any area of the country. busi-
nesses could count on the fact that
workers with these credentials have the
expertise and skills they are look-
ing for.

The AMERICA Works Act would re-
quire certain Federal job training and
career development education pro-
grams to give priority to programs that
provide an industry-recognized and
nationally portable credential. This
credentialing system starts out with
basic competencies that prepare
individuals for the workplace. Once
basic competencies are completed, in-
dividuals can work toward high per-
formance technical competencies and
then progress further to highly skilled
technical management competen-
ties. The credentialing levels are
stackable, allowing workers flexibility
along their career tracks. Stackable
credentials provide straightforward
paths, with clear entry and exit points,
for workers to advance their careers
and attain high quality jobs.

In North Carolina, we have an ad-
vanced manufacturing skills program
at Forsyth Technical Community Col-
lege in Winston-Salem. Forsyth Tech is
participating in the National Associa-
tion of Manufacturers’ Manufacturing
Skills Certification System, which of-
eres credit programs toward nationally
recognized credentials. Individuals
may have had hundreds of students enroll
in their programs. Forsyth Tech has al-
ready collaborated with state and local
businesses to begin the process of in-
corporating these credentials into job
descriptions. They believe that intro-
ducing graduates with skill certifi-
cations into the local workforce will
help improve the hiring process, and
the nationally recognized credentials
will improve employment opportuni-
ties.

When the President’s Jobs Council
met earlier this month in North Car-
olina, a leading topic of discussion, and
something the President himself men-
tioned, is the need to improve job
training for American industries so
that our workers can be competitive in
the global economy.

The AMERICA Works Act will help
job seekers and employers keep Amer-
ica competitive in every industry, from
textiles to aerospace, high-tech to
biotech, and connect programs like
those offered at Forsyth Tech with em-
ployers in the community, region, and
across the United States. As I men-
tioned before, job creation is
my number one priority. I want to do
everything I can to create jobs and
make sure our workers have the skills
necessary to help our businesses grow
and thrive. By incentivizing industry-
recognized, nationally portable, stack-
able credentials, we can ensure
that America has the best businesses,
with the best-trained workers leading
the world.

I urge my colleagues to join me in
supporting this important bill to ex-
pand employment opportunities for
hardworking Americans.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 212—CON-
GRATULATING THE PEOPLE AND
GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC
OF SLOVENIA ON THE TWEN-
TIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
COUNTRY’S INDEPENDENCE
Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mrs.
SHAHEEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr.
BARRASSO, Mr. Brown of Ohio, and Mr.
PORTMAN) submitted the following res-
olution; which was considered and
agreed to:

S. RES. 212

Whereas, on December 23, 1990, the people of Slovenia voted overwhelming in favor of independence from former Yugoslavia in a national referendum;

Whereas, on June 25, 1991, the Republic of Slovenia declared itself as an independent and sovereign nation;

Whereas, on December 23, 1991, the par-
liament of Slovenia adopted a constitution based on the rule of law, respect for human rights, and democratic ideals;

Whereas, during its 20 years of independ-
ence, Slovenia has been an important United States ally in Central Europe and a strong advocate of democracy, the rule of law, and the merits of an open, free market economy;

Whereas the Government of Slovenia
has made important contributions to inter-
national efforts to promote peace, stability, and development in Southeast Europe, Af-
ghanistan, and elsewhere;

Whereas the Government of Slovenia
serves as a leader in efforts to remove de-
structive land mines in parts of Southeast Europe and in other parts of the world;

Whereas Slovenia has become an active
member of international organizations, in-
cluding the United Nations, the Organization
for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the
council of Europe, the World Trade Organi-
ization, the European Union, the North At-
tlantic Treaty Organization, and the Organiz-
ation for Economic Cooperation and Devel-
opment; and

Whereas Slovenia has further consolidated
its international role through successful
chairmanship of the Organization for Secu-
rity and Cooperation in Europe in 2005, and,
as the first new member from Central and
Eastern Europe, the presidency of the Coun-
cil of the European Union in 2006. Now,
therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby—
(1) congratulates the people and the Gov-
ernment of Slovenia as the country celebrates 20 years of independence on June 25, 2011;

(2) commends the people of Slovenia on the
significant progress made in the last 20 years;

(3) recognizes the important role of the
people and Government of Slovenia in the United States to promote partnership and cooperation be-
tween the two countries; and

(4) encourages the Government of the Re-
public of Slovenia to continue its important
work in the transatlantic alliance, and the
efforts to further peace, stability, and pro-
spersity in Southeast Europe and elsewhere.

SENATE RESOLUTION 213—COM-
MENDING THE GOVERNMENTS TO
THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY
Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr.
CORNYN, Mr. VITTER, Ms. AYotte, Mr.
BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr.
BURRE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS,
Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRAPO,
Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH,
Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr.
ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of
Wisconsin, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEE, Mr. Mc
CONNELL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH,
Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SEDSHELL, Mr. THUNE,
Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROBERTS,
Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr.
ALEXANDER) submitted the following res-
olution; which was referred to the
Select Committee on Intelligence:

S. RES. 213

Whereas since the attacks on September
11, 2001, the United States intelligence com-
munity has gathered critical information
that has helped to prevent additional at-
tacks on United States soil;

Whereas the Central Intelligence Agency
(hereinafter referred to as the “CIA”) plays a
vital role in United States intelligence col-
lection;

Whereas the importance of the CIA’s work
was exemplified by the successful operation
against Usama bin Laden;

Whereas, as authorized by the President
and in accordance with guidance provided
by the Department of Justice, the CIA
lawfully detained and interrogated certain
high-value suspected terrorists;

Whereas information from high-
value detainees who had been detained
and interrogated by the CIA was essential
determining the organizational structure, key
operatives, modus operandi, and other rele-
ant information on al-Qaeda operations;

Whereas information obtained from high-
value detainees who had been detained
and interrogated by the CIA was crucial
to tracking down Usama bin Laden;

Whereas Michael Hayden, a former Direc-
tor of the CIA, wrote, “Let the record show that
when I was first briefed in 2007 about the
brightening prospect of pursuing bin Laden
through his courier network, a crucial com-
ponent of the briefing was information pro-
generated by the Central Intel-
ligence Agency that has helped to prevent addi-
tional attacks on United States soil; and

Whereas the importance of the CIA’s work
was exemplified by the successful operation
against Usama bin Laden;

Whereas, as authorized by the President
and in accordance with guidance provided
by the Department of Justice, the CIA
lawfully detained and interrogated certain
high-value suspected terrorists;

Whereas information from high-
value detainees who had been detained
and interrogated by the CIA was essential
determining the organizational structure, key
operatives, modus operandi, and other rele-
ant information on al-Qaeda operations;

Whereas information obtained from high-
value detainees who had been detained
and interrogated by the CIA was crucial
to tracking down Usama bin Laden;

Whereas Michael Hayden, a former Direc-
tor of the CIA, wrote, “Let the record show that
when I was first briefed in 2007 about the
brightening prospect of pursuing bin Laden
through his courier network, a crucial com-
ponent of the briefing was information pro-
generated by the Central Intel-
ligence Agency that has helped to prevent addi-
tional attacks on United States soil; and

Whereas the importance of the CIA’s work
was exemplified by the successful operation
against Usama bin Laden;

Whereas, as authorized by the President
and in accordance with guidance provided
by the Department of Justice, the CIA
lawfully detained and interrogated certain
high-value suspected terrorists;

Whereas information from high-
value detainees who had been detained
and interrogated by the CIA was essential
determining the organizational structure, key
operatives, modus operandi, and other rele-
ant information on al-Qaeda operations;

Whereas information obtained from high-
value detainees who had been detained
and interrogated by the CIA was crucial
to tracking down Usama bin Laden;
not have made substantial use of the trove of information derived from CIA detainees, including those on whom enhanced techniques were applied. 

Whereas on May 30, 2005, Department of Justice memo stated, “In particular, the CIA believes that it would have been unable to obtain critical information from numerous detainees, including KSM [Khalid Sheikh Mohammed] and Abu Zubaydah, without these enhanced techniques. . . . Indeed, before the CIA used enhanced interrogation techniques in its interrogation of KSM, it had not been able to obtain any answers to questions about future attacks, simply noting, ‘Soon, you will know.’”

Whereas such May 30, 2005, memo further indicates that after using enhanced interrogation techniques, high-value detainees became cooperative stating, “since the use of enhanced techniques, KSM and Abu Zubaydah have been pivotal sources because of their ability and willingness to provide their analysis and speculation about the capability, bullies methodologies, and mindsets of terrorists.”

Whereas mastermind of the attacks of September 11, 2001, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed disclosed to CIA interrogators that the al-Qaeda terrorist organization Jemaah Islamiyah had hijacked and crash a airliner into the Library Tower in Los Angeles.

Whereas Khalid Sheikh Mohammed gave CIA interrogators information that led to the capture of Hambali bin Mohd. Trong, as Hambali, the leader of the Indonesian terrorist organization Jemaah Islamiyah.

Whereas al-Qaeda senior operational planner Abu Zubaydah and Khalid Sheikh Mohammed supplied important intelligence about Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and his terrorist network, aiding United States operations against al-Qaeda in Iraq.

Whereas in a May 2011 interview, Leon Panetta, the Director of the CIA, in response to a direct question about enhanced interrogation and the explicit belief that information obtained from such techniques enabled the United States to defeat al-Qaeda and al-Qaida, stated that, “Obviously there was some valuable information that was derived through those kinds of interrogations.”

Whereas, although the President issued an Executive Order in January 2009 that effectively ended the CIA’s interrogation and detention program, the Administration has yet to establish clear policies for the detention and interrogation of suspected high-value detainees, particularly those captured overseas by foreign governments.

Whereas in 2009, the Attorney General launched a preliminary review into whether Federal laws were violated in connection with the use of specific techniques, even though career prosecutors had previously considered and rejected filing criminal charges in those cases; and

Whereas the preliminary review initiated by the Attorney General will determine whether CIA employees involved in the detention and interrogation of terrorists should be prosecuted for alleged violations of Federal law. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) commends the professionals of the United States intelligence community for their dedication;
(2) expresses thanks to the employees of the Central Intelligence Agency for their selflessness;
(3) recognizes that continued investigation of employees of the Central Intelligence Agency for their involvement in a detention and interrogation program that helped to save lives by averting terrorist attacks on the United States is unwarranted and will likely have a negative effect on the critical work of their colleagues and other United States national security professionals;
(4) urges the President and the Attorney General to immediately cease the Department of Justice’s ongoing investigation, and decline future prosecution, of Central Intelligence Agency employees for actions related to the interrogation of detainees at overseas locations, including the use of enhanced interrogation techniques on detained terrorists at such locations; and
(5) urges the President to develop and implement policies allowing for the long-term detention and interrogation by the intelligence community of high-value detainees, including detainees who are captured overseas or are in the custody of foreign countries.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 494. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 434 submitted by Mr. GRASSLEY and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 782, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 495. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 496. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 23. PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION OF EB-5 REGIONAL CENTER PROGRAM.

SA 497. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
The second undesignated paragraph of paragraph 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting at the end the following: “If the matter on which cloture is invoked is a nomination, the period of time for debate shall be 2 hours.’’

SA 498. Mr. CASEY (for Mr. CONRAD) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 202, designating June 27, 2011, as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day”: as follows:

On page 2, beginning on line 4, strike “urges” through “working” on line 5 and insert “supports the efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 4:15 p.m. in room S-216 of the Capitol.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 10 a.m., to conduct hearing entitled “Cybersecurity and Data Protection in the Financial Sector.”

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 2:30 p.m. in room 226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate to conduct a hearing entitled “Senior Hunger and the Older Americans Act” on June 21, 2011, at 10 a.m. in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 3:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Cybersecurity: Evaluating the Administration’s Proposals.”

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs’ Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “Inspiring Students to Federal Service.”

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Shelby Clark and Dan Majewski from Senator Bingaman’s office be given the privileges of the floor for Tuesday, June 21, 2011.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Danielle DeFant, a fellow with my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the 112th Congress.

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

NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS DAY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 202 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A resolution (S. Res. 202) designating June 27, 2011, as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be considered; the Conrad amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, after unanimous consent, and any statements related to the matter be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 498) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the resolution)

On page 2, beginning on line 4, strike “urges” through “working” on line 5 and insert “supports the efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense.”

The resolution (S. Res. 202), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. Res. 202

Whereas the brave men and women of the United States Armed Forces proudly serve the United States, risk their lives to protect the freedom of the United States and deserve the investment of every reasonable resource to ensure their lasting physical, mental, and emotional well-being;

Whereas 2.4 percent of servicemembers returning from deployment to Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom are clinically diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder (referred to in this preamble as “PTSD”) and up to 17 percent of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom veterans exposed to sustained ground combat report PTSD symptoms;

Whereas up to 10 percent of Operation Desert Storm veterans, 30 percent of Vietnam veterans, and 8 percent of the general population of the United States suffer or have suffered from PTSD;

Whereas the Department of Veterans Affairs reports that more than 438,000 veterans were treated for PTSD in 2010 alone;

Whereas many cases of PTSD remain untreated, undiagnosed, and untreated due to a lack of awareness about PTSD and the persistent stigma associated with mental health issues;

Whereas PTSD significantly increases the risk of depression, suicide, and drug- and alcohol-related disorders and deaths, especially if left untreated;

Whereas the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs have made significant advances in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of PTSD and the symptoms of PTSD, but many challenges remain; and

Whereas the establishment of a National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day will raise public awareness about issues related to PTSD and help ensure that those suffering from the invisible wounds of war receive proper treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 27, 2011, as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day”;

(2) supports the efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to educate servicemembers, veterans, the families of servicemembers and veterans, and the public about PTSD, its symptoms, and treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder; and
WHEREAS, on December 23, 1990, the people of Slovenia voted overwhelmingly in favor of independence from the former Yugoslavia in a national referendum;

WHEREAS, on December 23, 1991, the Republic of Slovenia declared itself as an independent and sovereign nation;

WHEREAS, on June 25, 1991, the parliament of Slovenia adopted a constitution based on the rule of law, respect for human rights, and democratic ideals;

WHEREAS, during its 20 years of independence, Slovenia has been an important United States ally in Central Europe and a strong advocate of democracy, the rule of law, and the merits of an open, free market economy;

WHEREAS the Government of Slovenia has made important contributions to international efforts to promote peace, stability, and development in Southeast Europe, Afghanistan, and elsewhere;

WHEREAS the Government of Slovenia serves as a leader in efforts to remove de-structive land mines in parts of Southeast Europe and in other parts of the world;

WHEREAS Slovenia has become an active member of international organizations, including the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Council of Europe, the World Trade Organization, the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and

WHEREAS Slovenia has further consolidated its international role through successful chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in 2005, and, as the first new member from Central and Eastern Europe, the presidency of the Council of the European Union in 2008: Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate hereby—

(1) congratulates the people and the Government of the Republic of Slovenia as the country celebrates 20 years of independence on June 25, 2011;

(2) commends the people of Slovenia on the significant progress made in the last 20 years;

(3) recognizes the important role of the Slovenian community in the United States to promote partnership and cooperation between the two countries; and

(4) encourages the Government of the Republic of Slovenia to continue its important work in the transatlantic alliance, and the efforts to further peace, stability, and prosperity in Southeast Europe and elsewhere.

CONGRATULATING THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 212, which was submitted earlier today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 212) congratulating the people and Government of the Republic of Slovenia on the twentieth anniversary of the country’s independence.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 212) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. Res. 212

WHEREAS, on December 23, 1990, the people of Slovenia voted overwhelmingly in favor of independence from the former Yugoslavia in a national referendum;

WHEREAS, on December 23, 1991, the Republic of Slovenia declared itself as an independent and sovereign nation;

WHEREAS, on June 25, 1991, the parliament of Slovenia adopted a constitution based on the rule of law, respect for human rights, and democratic ideals;

WHEREAS, during its 20 years of independence, Slovenia has been an important United States ally in Central Europe and a strong advocate of democracy, the rule of law, and the merits of an open, free market economy;

WHEREAS the Government of Slovenia has made important contributions to international efforts to promote peace, stability, and development in Southeast Europe, Afghanistan, and elsewhere;

WHEREAS the Government of Slovenia serves as a leader in efforts to remove de-structive land mines in parts of Southeast Europe and in other parts of the world;

WHEREAS Slovenia has become an active member of international organizations, including the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Council of Europe, the World Trade Organization, the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and

WHEREAS Slovenia has further consolidated its international role through successful chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in 2005, and, as the first new member from Central and Eastern Europe, the presidency of the Council of the European Union in 2008: Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate hereby—

(1) congratulates the people and the Government of the Republic of Slovenia as the country celebrates 20 years of independence on June 25, 2011;

(2) commends the people of Slovenia on the significant progress made in the last 20 years;

(3) recognizes the important role of the Slovenian community in the United States to promote partnership and cooperation between the two countries; and

(4) encourages the Government of the Republic of Slovenia to continue its important work in the transatlantic alliance, and the efforts to further peace, stability, and prosperity in Southeast Europe and elsewhere.

CONGRATULATING THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE SMITHSONIAN FOLK LIFE FESTIVAL

HON. SAM JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues and members of their staffs to attend a free musical event that will be held this afternoon (Tuesday, June 21, 2011) from 1:00–2:00 p.m. on the West Front Lawn of the United States Capitol. This event will feature music performed by the David Pernell Ensemble as a preview to the Smithsonian’s annual Folklife Festival. This year, one of the Folklife Festival themes is Rhythm and Blues: Tell It Like It Is.

The 2011 Smithsonian Folklife Festival will celebrate the people and culture of R & B music in the United States. R & B encompasses jump, soul, funk and more contemporary styles and is recognized throughout the world as one of the most identifiable American forms of popular music. The Festival program will explore the social and cultural history integral to the development of R & B and will present not only performances, but also conversations and discussions with some of the artists, songwriters, radio personalities, and others who have worked behind the scenes to produce the music.

From June 30th–July 4 and from July 7–11, the Rhythm and Blues: Tell It Like It Is program will consist of two large covered stages on the National Mall and a smaller discussion/narrative stage, highlighting select styles associated with African American urban centers in the United States. Through performance and narrative presentations, Festival visitors will discover exciting connections between different forms of musical performance, social dance, the recording industry, and broadcast radio—all of which accompanied and contributed to shaping the musical heritage of R & B. The program is being produced in partnership with the Smithsonian’s Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, the Folklife Festival, and the National Museum of African American History and Culture.

I encourage my colleagues and their staff to take a few minutes and enjoy some great R & B music as a preview to the Smithsonian’s 2011 Folklife Festival.

REMEMBERING LAURENCE BUTLER DILLARD

HON. ERIC CANTOR
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and legacy of an individual that served this body, the Commonwealth of Virginia and our Nation tirelessly for many, many years. Mr. Laurence Butler Dillard, who most of us came to know simply as Larry.

I had the pleasure of meeting Larry many years ago, during the early days of my own journey in public service. Larry proudly served the people of Virginia’s 3d Congressional District in the office of my friend and colleague, BOBBY SCOTT. With Larry’s passing, Congress—man Scott’s office has lost not just an employee, but a friend, and I offer my condolences to Representative Scott and his entire staff.

Larry’s quest for knowledge and genuine appreciation for history, especially Virginia’s history, and culture, was infectious to all that had the pleasure of interacting with him.

In an environment that is often described as unyieldingly partisan, Larry’s approach to the legislative system and constituent service was indeed refreshing. His unique ability to overcome differences, backed up by his positive and enthusiastic personality, bridged the parties together and remains a model for all of us. And that’s how Larry was—never deterred, no issue insurmountable, always finding that common ground. He devoted his life to the service of others.

I hope this body will join me in offering sincere condolences to Larry’s wife Sherry, his son Brandon, his brother Randy, Congressman Scott and his staff and Larry’s many family members and friends. Larry Dillard’s contributions to this institution will always be remembered.

PROCLAMATION FOR COLTON BULLARD, RECIPIENT OF THE ‘2011 LITTLE LEAGUE INTERNATIONAL’S GOOD SPORT OF THE YEAR AWARD’

HON. FRANK C. GUINTA
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 2011, Colton Bullard, from Rye, NH will be receiving the “2011 Little League International’s Good Sport of the Year Award.” Colton has exceptional work ethic and drive as well as a deep passion for the sport of baseball. His dedication to his team and to improving his skills is known and witnessed by all. Colton not only is a huge asset on the team but he is the epitome of what this award represents.

This award is a testament to his spirited and dedicated commitment to the ideals and goals of the Little League program. Colton has become a true student of the game and is always listening and learning. Everyone who knows Colton recognizes his humble and modest personality and consider him to be the “best kid on the field.” He is a shining example of all that is positive and beneficial through participating in Little League.

I congratulate Colton for receiving this award and for his outstanding sportsmanship. I wish him the very best in his athletic career and for a bright future.

IN HONOR OF HENRY L. MEYER III

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Henry L. Meyer III and his leadership of KeyCorp on the occasion of his retirement. Henry L. Meyer began his long career with KeyCorp in the summer of 1970, when he worked as a teller. After receiving a Bachelor of Arts degree in econometrics from Colgate University in 1972, Mr. Meyer joined KeyCorp, formerly Society National Bank. In 1978, he received a Master of Business Administration degree from Harvard University. In 1994, Mr. Meyer relocated for his position with Society National Bank to Dayton, but moved back to Cleveland in 1987 after being elected Executive Vice President of Society Corporation and Senior Executive Vice President of Society National Bank. In 1990, he was elected as Society National Bank’s President and Chief Operating Officer, and became the Chief Executive Officer in 1993. After Society National Bank became KeyCorp in 1994, Mr. Meyer became the Chief Executive Officer in February of 2001. In May of 2001, he was elected as KeyCorp’s Chairman of the Board.

In addition to his career, Mr. Meyer is involved in his community. He serves on a number of civic and cultural boards in the Cleveland area, including the Northeast Ohio Council on Higher Education, Law Enforcement Foundation, Inc., ideastream (WVIZ/PBS and WCIP), United Way of Greater Cleveland, University School, the Greater Cleveland Partnership, University Hospitals Health System, Inc., and University Hospitals of Cleveland. Mr. Meyer is also on the Federal Advisory Council of the Federal Reserve System and serves as a director of Continental Airlines, Inc.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor of a hardworking and worthy individual, Mr. Henry Meyer. We should reflect on his good deeds and his admirable work ethic.

THE OFFICIAL FEDERAL HOLIDAY OF GEORGE WASHINGTON’S BIRTHDAY

HON. FRANK R. WOLF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to reestablish the legal public holiday for Washington’s Birthday from the third Monday of February to the actual date of George Washington’s birth on February 22. I have long admired President Washington and have found inspiration in public service from studying his life. Unfortunately I have found that students today have a dearth of knowledge about our nation’s beginnings and
The man from Virginia who led the colonies to form the union known as the United States of America.

Two-time Pulitzer Prize winning history author David McCullough recently observed, “We’re raising young people who are, by and large, historic duds.” The 2010 National Assessment of Educational Progress, or Nation's Report Card, in U.S. history underscores that concern. Students in grades 4, 8, and 12 participated in the assessment. At each grade, students responded to questions designed to measure their knowledge of American history in the context of the nation’s changing demographics, technological and economic changes, and America’s changing world role. The levels—Basic, Proficient, and Advanced—measure what students should know and be able to do at each grade assessed. At all grade levels, less than one-quarter of students performed at or above the Proficient level in 2010. Only 20 percent of fourth-graders, 17 percent of eighth-graders, and 12 percent of twelfth-graders performed at or above the Proficient level on the 2010 U.S. history assessment.

It is unfortunate that Congress has unwittingly contributed to this lack of historical understanding by relegating Washington’s Birthday to the third Monday of February to take advantage of a three-day weekend. We need to change the focus from celebrating sales at the mall to celebrating the significance of President Washington’s birth to the birth of our nation.

There is a reason the birthday of President George Washington is the only legal federal holiday observed for a president of the United States. He is called the “father of our country” because he is without compare in our nation’s history. We need to reestablish Washington’s Birthday on the actual date of his birth to honor his legacy and in doing so call upon schools across the nation to focus on Washington as the soldier, legislator, and president who shepherded our young nation through war, political turmoil, rebellion and expansion as no other single individual was capable of doing.

Washington’s Birthday has been celebrated since the final days of the Revolutionary War. French troops paraded through Newport, Rhode Island, in 1781 and celebrations were held in Richmond, Virginia, in 1782. Organized by French General Rochambeau and others who knew him personally, these celebrations drew special attention to the bravado, courage, leadership and perseverance of the Revolutionary War hero.

From the beginning of our country, the importance of this day has been recognized. As President James Buchanan said in 1860, “...when the birthday of Washington shall be forgotten, liberty will have perished from the earth.” Conspiring President Rutherford B. Hayes signed legislation in 1879 that made Washington’s Birthday a holiday for District federal workers. The holiday was extended to all federal workers in 1885.

This legislation is supported by George Washington’s Mount Vernon Estate and its executive director James Rees. A copy of his letter appears below.

Mr. Speaker, it is only right that we hold February 22 as a date of reverence to commemorate the unique person without whom the tide of American history may well have taken a different turn. I urge my colleagues to join in cosponsoring this legislation to forever honor President George Washington’s Birthday.

GEORGE WASHINGTON’S MOUNT VERNON, MOUNT VERNON, VA, June 21, 2011.

HON. FRANK WOLF, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: I would like to thank you for introducing legislation to restore the nation’s official observance of George Washington’s Birthday to February 22, the actual date of his birth 279 years ago. We are writing today in strong and enthusiastic support of your effort.

Today many states, the media, advertisers and the general public have abandoned recognition of Washington’s Birthday and replaced it with a commercial “shopping holiday” that leaves American history and patriotism by the side of the road. The holiday
was far more meaningful when it revolved around George Washington, and schools were able to focus on his sterling example of character and leadership. We look forward to the day, when February 22 is marked by patriotic festivity and lessons about the life of George Washington, which can teach and inspire American leaders of today and tomorrow.

As our nation’s foremost founding father, Washington is relevant to each new generation because his prominent character traits—undaunted courage, unshaken patriotism, reasoned judgment, a profound sense of civic responsibility, and a deep, selfless commitment to country—never go out of style. Research among children about the life and leadership of George Washington is an important investment in the future of our nation.

Your efforts are particularly important because as noted author and historian David McCullough has said many times, we are “raising a generation of historically illiterate children.” Surveys and focus groups over the years tell us that most Americans—particularly young Americans—know the face of Washington because they see it every day on their dollars and quarters, but they don’t know much more about him.

Why should we be concerned? Because George Washington was the most important, the most effective, the most powerful leader of our nation’s founding era, and the shining example of his life is needed today more than ever.

To those like you who know and respect George Washington, it is crystal clear that many today have drifted so far from his standards of leadership that there is a real cause for concern for the future of our nation. We believe that George Washington is the best example of leadership and character the nation has known; therefore, it is our duty, our responsibility and our privilege to teach today’s leaders and young people about George Washington’s leadership with the hope that they will follow in his footsteps. Your legislation will be a significant step in that direction.

For example, a most compelling lesson for young people today is that George Washington served in the three most important leadership roles in the founding era. Quite remarkably, the Father of Our Country was selected for each of these jobs unanimously, and, contrary to the common practice of the day, he gave up power and walked away from each position despite strong support for him not to do so.

First, as Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army, he surmounted incredible odds, never took a day off in eight years of battle, and emerged victorious. But perhaps Washington’s greatest moment came when he halted an attempt by his officers to overthrow the civilian government and make him king. He then resigned from the military entirely and returned to his life as a farmer at Mount Vernon.

With this resignation, Washington actually established a new definition of power. Before George Washington the road map was for great leaders to gain as much power as possible and keep it. But Washington truly believed in the concept of liberty—where the power rests with the people. He taught the world how to relinquish power—what he saw as an important lesson for the leaders of today.

Less than four years after his return to Mount Vernon, Washington was drafted to be President of the Constitutional Convention because only he could bring the delegates together. He was elected as our first President and after serving two terms—he exited. He could have returned again and again, but he peacefully transferred power demonstrating that democracy really works.

Celebration of George Washington’s Birthday on February 22 will help restore the position of the Father of Our Country as “First in War, First in Peace, and First in the Hearts of His Countrymen,” as Light-Horse Harry Lee said so many years ago. George Washington’s sterling example of character and leadership provides the opportunity to gather and inspire our country as we face formidable challenges both at home and abroad.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. REES,
President.

IN HONOR OF JAMES H. TROUT
HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor James H. Trout who is being honored as a 2011 Father of the Year by the Father’s Day Council of Northeastern Ohio and the American Diabetes Association.

Mr. Trout is the Executive Vice President of Acme Fresh Market Stores, serving on its Board of Directors and its Executive Committee. He has been with Acme Stores since 1973, working in a number of different capacities in increasingly important roles, serving as Director of General Merchandise, Senior Director of Merchandising, and Vice President of Sales and Merchandising.

Mr. Trout and his wife, Debbie, are the proud parents of two children—Jennifer, 31, and Jeff, 29—and one grandchild. Jim and Debbie currently reside in Madison, where they are active in their community. Mr. Trout, former President of the Suffield Jaycees, also serves as a trustee for the F.W. Albrecht Family Foundation.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring James H. Trout, a hardworking and industrious man, and a wonderful husband, father and grandfather, on the occasion of his recognition as Father’s Day Council’s Father of the Year 2011.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF MS. CONNIE FERRIS BAILEY
HON. TAMMY BALDWIN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career and achievements of Ms. Connie Ferris Bailey, Executive Director of Operation Fresh Start, OFS, as she retires from her esteemed position after 34 years of service.

OFS was founded in 1970 and provides young offenders and high school dropouts with opportunities to learn basic work skills, prepare for high school equivalency exams, and secure employment. Furthermore, OFS stresses the importance of giving back to the community by renovating housing into safe, energy-efficient, affordable homes for low-income families. Over the past forty years OFS has built over 215 quality homes.

It is undoubtedly because of Connie’s tireless leadership and energy that OFS is what it is today. In 1979, three years after joining OFS, Connie assumed the role of Executive Director. Under her tutelage OFS expanded annual enrollment to over 150 youth and focused on helping participants achieve self-sufficiency and become contributing citizens of the community. Connie’s dedication to building a sustainable future and continuing to provide services and to OFS her OFS to begin providing conservation and stewardship services in and around Dane County in 1980. Additionally, since 2005, OFS builds new homes to meet or exceed Wisconsin Energy Star standards.

Connie transformed lives of at-risk youth in Madison, Dane County, and across Wisconsin. To date, OFS has served over 7,000 people. Eighty-five percent of participants are between the ages of 16–24 and 80 percent complete the goals of the program. Studies show that an astounding 60–65 percent of graduates remain self-sufficient. These numbers only begin to explain why the OFS model that Connie helped shape is so successful. It is not surprising that, in 1998, then Governor Tommy Thompson was eager to work with Connie to extend Wisconsin Fresh Start, WFS, a network of non-profit agencies operating under the OFS model that provides services aimed at increasing self-esteem and self-sufficiency of troubled youth. Today, WFS includes 9 agencies in 12 communities around the state and OFS continues to provide technical assistance to WFS.

Over the years, Connie held every employable title within OFS, highlighting how vital each position is to the program’s overall success. It is an understatement to say that Connie has been and forever will be an invaluable part of OFS and our community as a whole. Her emphasis on the value of hard work, respect, and self-worth and her recognition of potential in each and every person makes her an inspirational role model. Thankfully, although Connie is retiring, she will continue to provide essential technical assistance to new Youthbuild USA programs throughout the Midwest. People like Connie and programs like Operation Fresh Start are yet another reason I am so proud to represent the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin. I join the residents of Wisconsin’s 6th District, and our great Nation in thanking Ms. Connie Ferris Bailey for her lifetime of service.

CONGRATULATING GEORGE DAWSON MIDDLE SCHOOL ON BEING RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE NATION’S TOP 100 SCHOOLS TO WATCH
HON. KENNY MARCHANT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise today to recognize and congratulate George Dawson Middle School in Southlake, TX for being recognized as one of the Nation’s Top 100 Schools to Watch. George Dawson was chosen for its academic excellence, development of leadership skills, opportunities for students with disabilities, and having the resources, teachers and support they need.

Sponsored by The National Forum To Accelerate Middle Grades Reform, the Schools
to Watch program looks at schools that have the whole picture of education. After a written application is approved, state teams observe schools and conduct numerous interviews. Those who pass expectations are then approved to be Schools to Watch for three years. High-performing teachers, strong leadership, and a commitment to bring about continuous improvement are but a few of the strict criteria George Dawson met to receive this prestigious honor.

Educational success is the result of many factors, including hard work, innovation and a supportive community. I am proud to represent such a community, and especially a school that is reaching and surpassing all expectations. On behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating George Dawson Middle School on its recognition as one of America's Top 100 Schools to Watch.

IN HONOR OF KENNETH A. LANCI
HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kenneth A. Lanci who is being honored as a 2011 Father of the Year by the Father's Day Council of Northeastern Ohio and the American Diabetes Association.

Mr. Lanci, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Consolidated Graphics Group, Inc., is also the Chairman of Project Love and Purple America. While Consolidated Graphics, Inc. is a leader in graphic art technology, Purple America is a leader in uniting Americans through shared values. Its mission is to create new forums to share beliefs, engage young people in meaningful dialogue, and connect all Americans through shared American ideals.

Purple Love is a character-building program that has trained thousands of American teens and their educators to build a culture of kindness, caring and respect in their schools.

Mr. Lanci has also brought OneSight to Cleveland's Municipal School District, a non-profit organization which has given free eye exams and eye glasses to thousands of children in the area.

Mr. Lanci's good work extends to his family as well. Mr. Lanci is a devoted husband to his high school sweetheart, father to his three children, and grandfather to his six grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Kenneth Lanci, a man of great honor and spirit, a wonderful husband, father and grandfather, on the occasion being recognized as Father's Day Council's Father of the Year 2011.

RECOGNIZING THE DALLAS HISPANIC YOUTH INSTITUTE
HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding students who are participating in this week's Dallas Hispanic Youth Institute. Each year, the Hispanic College Fund hosts this empowerment event to help inspire Hispanic high school students in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex to overcome barriers to higher education and pursue careers that only a college education can provide.

By attending the Hispanic Youth Institute, these students have shown their desire to continue their educational attainment and take proactive steps to achieve those dreams. Despite being the largest minority group in the United States, Hispanics have the lowest rate of higher education completion. As the Hispanic population in Texas and throughout the United States continues to grow, ensuring opportunities and success for all is essential to our economy and welfare. We cannot continue to compete globally as a country if we let millions of bright minds slip through the cracks.

The Hispanic Youth Institute connects disadvantaged Hispanic high school students with local Hispanic professionals, college admissions officers, mentors, and other inspirational speakers. By providing informational seminars at on-campus settings, the Hispanic Youth Institute helps students build confidence and receive practical tools to help achieve a pathway to college.

Many of the students at this week's Hispanic Youth Institute will become the first person in their family to attend and complete college. This is an important step for these young people, as well as the next generation who will look towards their example. They will become the role models of tomorrow, and I hope that this week's event will inspire them to give back.

I would like to recognize the Social Security Administration for its commitment to volunteerism at the Hispanic Youth Institute under the direction of Raul Garduño. Additionally, I'd like to recognize Raul Magdaleno and all of the other individuals who have worked to make the Hispanic Youth Institute a success.

Raul Magdaleno is the Chair of the Dallas Hispanic Youth Institute and has served as a key advocate for the program and Hispanic students since its inauguration in 2009. Each year, Raul inspires through his story of overcoming extreme adversities to obtain a higher education by teaching students that the “number one ticket we have to fight poverty is education.”

I am confident that this year's Dallas Hispanic Youth Institute will be a great success, and wish the 200 student participants best wishes in their studies and attaining their goals.

IN HONOR OF MR. BRIAN E. HALL AND MR. WILLIAM D. HALL
HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. William D. Hall and Mr. Brian E. Hall who are being honored as a 2011 Father of the Year by the Father's Day Council of Northeastern Ohio and the American Diabetes Association. This father-son duo demonstrates the long-lasting, positive effect that one father can have on another.

Mr. William D. Hall is the founder of Hall's Trucking, which later became Industrial Transport, Inc. and later, Industrial Inventory Solutions. He also founded the Holly Development Company. Mr. Hall has been active in public policy as well as redeveloping neighborhoods. Despite Mr. Hall's many successful endeavors, his greatest source of pride remains his two children and ten grandchildren.

Mr. Brian E. Hall is the son of William D. Hall. He is the current Chairman and CEO of Industrial Inventory Solutions, where he has helped the business grow into a national comprehensive logistics firm. Mr. Hall also holds many other positions, including Secretary and Governance Chairman for the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, Chairman of the President's Council Foundation, Trustee of the University of Cincinnati Foundation and Trustee of University Hospitals. Brian E. Hall's main commitment, however, is to his three children.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in recognizing Mr. William D. Hall and Mr. Brian E. Hall who exemplify model citizens and outstanding fathers. I wish Mr. William D. Hall and Mr. Brian E. Hall the best in all of their future endeavors.

HONORING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SERVICE ACADEMY SELECTION BOARD
HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my Service Academy Selection Board, an exemplary group of selfless, dedicated Washingtonians who have served our country and have been so generous to continue their service by helping me select nominees to the United States Service Academies. Although academy nominations and appointments are attributed to me, they are not, by any means, my singular effort. Most of the work, involving careful vetting and painstaking evaluation of each applicant, as well as encouragement and recruitment, is done largely by my Service Academy Selection Board.

The work of the Service Academy Selection Board is so critical to our nation that I ask the entire House to join me in recognizing and thanking the members of the District of Columbia's Service Academy Selection Board, who recommend to me the nominees from whom the academy selects appointees: Cdr. Kerwin E. Miller, USN (Ret), Chair, U.S. Naval Academy, Class of 1975, attorney in private practice; George R. Keys, Jr., immediate past Chairman of Air Force Academy, Class of 1970, Rhodes Scholar, partner with Jordan & Keys LLP; Wesley Brown, Chair Emeritus, U.S. Naval Academy, Class of 1949, Academy's first African-American graduate, for whom the Academy's new field house is named; Steven Bliss, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Class of 1971, President of the Institute of International Containers, former Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission; Capt. Karen Courington, USAFR, Air Force Academy Admissions Liaison Officer, C-17 pilot, employee of Federal Express, and former employee of "Veterans on Wall Street" initiative; Daniel Grainger, U.S. Air Force Academy, Class of 1977, Senior Procurement Executive of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Department of the...
Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Congresswoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, I have introduced the Department of Defense Energy Security Act of 2011. As many of you know, Congresswoman GIFFORDS has been a staunch advocate of energy alternatives and its impact on national security. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, she has worked on a number of initiatives since she arrived in Congress, and many of those proposals have been included in the committee’s annual defense authorization bill. The bill that I am introducing for her today continues this legacy.

The Department of Defense Energy Security Act of 2011 is a comprehensive bill that seeks to move the Department forward on energy security. It includes a number of initiatives based on input from various national security and energy organizations, the Department of Defense, and industry.

These include initiatives such as: Joint Concurrency Base Resource Security Pilot Project; Tactical Vehicle Efficiency Report; Conversion of Non-Telecommunications Alternatives of AARPs Contracting Authority; Designation of an Executive Agent for Alternative Fuel Development; Energy Test Bed Initiative; Energy Conservation Investment Program; Report on ASHRAE Building Standards; Continually-updated List of Energy Technologies for DOD Facilities; Energy Manager Certification; Energy Management Data Needs; Interim Renewable Electric Standard (RES) Goals; Remove Technology Bias in Permissible Land Use; Strategic Plan for Renewable Energy Development; Report on Cross-Agency Renewable Energy Development Efforts; Elimination of Approval Requirement for Long-Term Contracts for Energy/Fuel at Military Installations; Report on Energy Security and Renewable Energy Opportunities; and Report on Installation Energy Security and Societal Impacts.

Several of the provisions proposed in the bill, already have been included in H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I am pleased to assist Congresswoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS in her efforts to continue to improve the energy security of the Department of Defense.

HONORING ROCKY RUN MIDDLE SCHOOL’S “THE LATEST GENERATION MEETS THE GREATEST GENERATION” PROGRAM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I recently attended a wonderful event at Rocky Run Middle School in Chantilly, Virginia. The program brings World War II veterans together with 7th grade students for one-on-one interviews about the veterans’ experiences during war.

The event was initiated 10 years ago by history teacher Jamie Sawatzky and for his efforts, he was selected as the Fairfax County Public Schools Teacher of the Year. Rocky Run Middle School is the only school in the region with this type of program.

The event was attended by 125 World War II veterans, representing all branches of the Armed Forces and nearly every theater of the war. I was touched to hear the recollections from so many members of the “Greatest Generation” who sacrificed so much to protect our nation’s freedom. Students got to hear from Edward Connor, who served with the U.S. Army Air Corps in Papua, New Guinea, and Guadalcanal; Richard Poor, and collects non-perishable goods for local food pantries.

I am proud to honor Sarah Zabel in recognition of her achievements, admirable leadership, and superior contributions to her local community. As she heads to Xavier University in the fall, I wish her the best of luck for a bright and successful future.

IN HONOR OF MARY ANNE CRAMPTON

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mary Anne Crampton to acknowledge her tremendous service to the Northeast Ohio community.

A native of Pittsburgh, Mary Anne relocated to the Cleveland area to begin her career and has prospered in various organizations since. She has been credited with transforming the downtown area of Lakewood, Ohio, into a lively, historic area.

Mary Anne served as the Executive Director of LakewoodAlive, an economic development organization that strives to facilitate economic stability and growth in the Lakewood area, since its inception. She was recognized as the 2011 Business Person of the Year. Her unwavering devotion to furthering economic development in Lakewood has proven beneficial.
for the Cleveland suburb. Prior to working for LakewoodAlive Mary Anne was Manager of Marketing and Public Relations at Cleveland Sight Center, a nonprofit organization that works to enhance the lives of blind persons.

In addition to her career, Ms. Crampton is a dedicated and involved member of the Northeast Ohio community. Mary Anne is a member on the board of the Lakewood Hospital Foundation where she serves on the governance committee. She is a board member of the Lakewood Chamber of Commerce where she serves on the economic development committee, and she chairs the board resources committee for the Beck Center for Cultural Arts.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, Mary Anne Crampton has proven herself a very valuable citizen of the Cleveland community and surrounding areas. Her exceptional passion to better the lives of the members of her community truly is a blessing. Mary Anne’s vision and hard work make her one of Northeast Ohio’s most remarkable citizens.

WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM CONSERVATION SEMIPOSTAL STAMP ACT OF 2011

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN
OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 2236, the Wildlife Refuge System Conservation Semipostal Stamp Act of 2011. This bill would let Americans donate to the upkeep of the National Wildlife Refuge System by purchasing semipostal stamps. There are 553 refuge sites in or nearby almost every congressional district in this country; and those refuges need financial help.

Last month, Chairman FLEMING of the Natural Resources Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs held an oversight hearing on the National Wildlife Refuge System. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which manages the System, testified that it has $3.3 billion in unmet operational needs and deferred maintenance projects.

A semipostal stamp could help—at least in some small way—to pull the Refuge System out of that deep hole. Semipostal are post-age stamps sold at a premium, with the difference going to fund a cause of national interest. The stamps have proven successful. The Breast Cancer Research Stamp has raised over $71 million since it was authorized in 1998.

Now, in times of budget constraint, Americans are looking for ways to revitalize the wildlife refuges in their backyards without increasing the demand on taxpayers. The semipostal stamp authorized in H.R. 2236 would provide Americans a way to support their 553 refuge sites without increasing taxes or taking funds from other important government services.

The National Wildlife Refuge System was created in the administration of President Roosevelt and today it is the world’s premier system of public lands and waters set aside to conserve fish, wildlife and plants. In my district, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Volcanic Unit and the Mariana Trench Unit of the Mariana Trench Marine National Monument are parts of the National Wildlife Refuge System. The Volcanic Unit is an arc of undersea mud volcanoes and thermal vents where exotic animals thrive in some of the harshest conditions imaginable. This is an area of cutting-edge scientific scrutiny, and awakening and discovery of deep-sea exploration and discovery in us all.

In almost every state and territory wildlife refuges are similarly important. They provide recreational opportunities. By exposing our young people to the natural world, refuges inspire the next generation of scientists and researchers. And the wildlife refuges are economic assets. Every year, the Refuge System attracts 44 million tourists, generating $1.7 billion in sales and sustaining 27,000 jobs.

Despite the value of the National Wildlife Refuge System, it remains drastically under-funded—unable to keep up with basic operations and maintenance costs. My bill would help alleviate that problem. H.R. 2236 brings a fresh source of income to the National Wildlife Refuge System without drawing on taxpayers or increasing the national debt. The bill gives Americans the choice to contribute to a program deeply important to our Nation and I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2236.

TRIBUTE TO BILL HAWKINS

HON. ERIK PAULSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a true leader from my home State of Minnesota, William A. Hawkins. Bill has recently retired as Chairman and CEO of Medtronic, the world’s leading medical technology company. He has been an insightful leader and his legacy includes the launch of important new technologies, major investments in quality and innovation, and the successful navigation through an increasingly challenging environment.

Bill’s years at Medtronic have been filled with competition and innovation—serving with unwavering commitment to global growth, encouraging and acquiring technology, and growing the ability to meet patient needs in emerging markets. Under his guidance, Medtronic became a chronic disease management and not just a medical technology company.

As Co-Chair of the Medical Technology Caucus, I am a major proponent of advancing life-saving technologies for patients. I have worked with Bill for a number of years in support of the medical technology industry on many issues such as trade, tax, payment, regulatory and research policies. Minnesota is one of the top med-tech epi-centers in the country. It remains one of few industries in the U.S. that exports more products than it imports—approximately $36 billion annually. Our work helps to ensure that the medical technology industry continues to play a major role in the positive economic growth of our State and Nation.

I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the residents of the 5th District of Texas, to thank Lieutenant Ludwig and his family for their service to this country. We are

HON. JEB HENSARLING
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize Lieutenant George Robert Ludwig for his heroic service to our country. Lieutenant Ludwig entered the Army Aviation Flight School at Fort Rucker, Alabama in 1963 and served in Vietnam and Bien Hoa.

Lieutenant Ludwig was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for heroism while participating in aerial flight. He was flying his aircraft with the mission of providing radio relay and acting as an artillery observer. When word was received that the United States compound at Dong Xoai was under heavy attack by a regiment of Viet Cong, Lieutenant Ludwig, who was flying the only aircraft in the immediate area, unhesitatingly volunteered to act as forward air controller for United States fighter bombers en route to the area. During the five-day period following the Viet Cong attack, Lieutenant Ludwig flew numerous radio relay and artillery adjustment missions, successfully and accurately directing many air strikes in support of the besieged compound.

Lieutenant Ludwig also received twenty Air Medals, two Medals of Valor and was the only Army pilot in the Vietnam War to receive the Distinguished Flying Cross by the United States Air Force.
eternally grateful for our service men and women, past and present, who have fought to preserve liberty for our generation and generations to come.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY OF WAYS TO IMPROVE THE ACCURACY OF THE COLLECTION OF FEDERAL OIL, CONDENSATE, AND NATURAL GAS ROYALTIES ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Study of Ways to Improve the Accuracy of the Collection of Federal Oil, Condensate, and Natural Gas Royalties Act, which successfully passed the House in the last Congress as an amendment to the Consolidated, Energy, and Aquatic Resources (CLEAR) Act. I thank original cosponsors Representatives HINCHEY and GRIJALVA for their support.

At a time of record high gas prices, it is vital to ensure the American taxpayer is fairly and accurately compensated for energy resources extracted from leased federal onshore and offshore lands. This legislation would commission the National Academy of Engineers to study if the production volume measurement of oil, condensate, and natural gas collection on federal lands (including submerged, deep water, and inland leases) could be improved with alternative methods.

In April 2010, the Government Accountability Office released a study showing the management of production from oil and natural gas leases has been inconsistent and inadequate in past administrations. With revenues from leases amounting to billions of dollars, it is important that American taxpayers accurately know the amount of oil and gas that is extracted on leased federal lands.

A better understanding of the best extraction measurement methods could ultimately result in increased revenue for the federal government. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation in the 112th Congress.

HONORING PAUL E. LANDERS, JR.
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize Major General (Retired) Paul E. Landers, Jr. for his heroic service to our country. General Landers served as deputy chief of staff, operations and transportation at Headquarters Air Mobility Command on Scott Air Force Base, Illinois.

General Landers was a command pilot, logging more than 5,600 flying hours. His military awards and decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, Distinguished Flying Cross with oak leaf cluster, Meritorious Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, Air Medal with 15 oak leaf clusters, Air Force Commendation Medal and Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with two silver stars. While commander of the 437th Military Airlift Wing, he was awarded the Order of the Sword, the highest honor bestowed by the enlisted force.

I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the residents of the 5th District of Texas, to thank General Landers and his family for their service to this country. We are eternally grateful for our service men and women, past and present, who have fought to preserve liberty for our generation and generations to come.

HONORING CHAD OBERMILLER’S IRONMAN

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Chad A. Obermiller, an integral member of my staff and a proud member of an elite group of athletes—athletes who compete in the phenomenon known only as “The Ironman.”

Few sane individuals voluntarily sign themselves up to compete in such a harrowing and humbling experience. For Chad, he has made such a decision three times, and will be crossing the line this Sunday, June 26, 2011 in Coeur d’Alene, Idaho, to complete his third Ironman.

A 2.4 mile swim, followed by a 112 mile bike, and capped by a full marathon—yes, a 26.2 mile run—that phrase has been coined specifically to describe those who drag themselves to the finish line following this arduous task: “The Crawl.”

But, I have complete confidence that Chad will cross that line proudly and upright, as he has promised both my staff, as well as me, that he intends to win.

To quote one of Chad’s greatest heroes, Lance Armstrong: “Life, to me, is a series of false limits and my challenge as an athlete is to explore those limits.”

Chad, may you know no limits in Coeur d’Alene.

HONORING RICHARD E. DWELLE

HON. JEB HENSARLING
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize Captain Richard E. Dwelle from Athens, Texas for his heroic service to our country.

In 1942, Mr. Dwelle joined the United States Army Reserve and in 1944, he was commissioned for active duty as a 2nd Lieutenant. In December of 1944, Mr. Dwelle arrived in Europe and was assigned as a replacement officer to C Company, 329th Regiment, 83rd Infantry Division where he received a promotion to 1st Lieutenant. Following his valorous service at the Battle of the Bulge and during the Rhine Campaign, Mr. Dwelle was discharged from active duty in July of 1946 and promoted to Captain in the Reserve. Mr. Dwelle later resigned from Reserves after a decade of service.

Mr. Dwelle and his wife Peggy have been an integral part of Henderson County, Texas serving on numerous charitable boards. Mr. Dwelle was named Citizen of the Year in Athens in 1971 and was inducted into the Rice University Sports Hall of Fame in 1997.

I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the residents of the 5th District of Texas, to thank Mr. Dwelle and his family for their service to this country. We are eternally grateful for our service men and women, past and present, who have fought to preserve liberty for our generation and generations to come.

RECOGNIZING MORTON MUSEUM OF COOKE COUNTY

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of the Morton Museum of Cooke County in Gainesville, Texas. I am proud to announce that this small local history museum, which has been serving the historical curiosity of the public since 1968, is one of the newest participants in the 2011 Conservation Assessment Program (CAP), a program administered by the Heritage Preservation and funded through the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

CAP is a technical assistance program that, for over twenty years, has been helping small museums that lack conservators or building experts of their own to improve their collections care efforts in terms of their individual budget, staffing, and fundraising capacities. The Morton Museum is one of only five museums in Texas selected for this prestigious grant, and one of only one hundred museums nationwide. With its participation in the Conservation Assessment Program, the museum will receive a professional site visit for assessment and prioritized recommendations for improvements. Together, CAP and the Morton Museum are working hard to ensure an enriching experience for all who visit the museum.

It is not only an honor for the Morton Museum to be selected to participate in this program, but it is also an honor for me to have the opportunity to represent the museum and the people who work so hard to maintain its tradition of excellence in the 26th District of Texas. I commend the Morton Museum’s continuing efforts to improve and serve the people and visitors of Cooke County.

SALUTING WELCOME HOME A HERO

HON. SAM JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a 29-year Air Force veteran and a former Prisoner of War for nearly 7 years, more than half of that time in solitary confinement, it gives me great joy to request that the U.S. House of Representatives formally recognize and commemorate the 7th anniversary of the
“Welcome Home a Hero Program” at Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW) International Airport. I especially want to thank the kind folks at DFW, the North Texas Commission, and the USO for their efforts to recognize and show their appreciation to the brave men and women who serve our country.

“Welcome Home a Hero” is a volunteer program to encourage and support our deployed military and greet troops at DFW International Airport as they return home for two weeks of R&R. Anywhere from 150 to 275 troops come through DFW each day, with one flight arriving daily and one flight departing daily. Volunteers gather each day to welcome these troops off their flight, thanking and encouraging them for their service to our great nation.

This wonderful program started in the summer of 2004 when the U.S. military selected DFW to begin receiving the daily 20-hour flights from Kuwait. Once the flights began, grassroots groups, schools, churches, Scouts and veterans organizations began to greet the troops on a daily basis. DFW fire trucks welcome every military charter on the runway with a “shower of affection” to begin the celebration.

In fact, “Welcome Home a Hero” has greeted more than 1 million troops during the course of the program by dedicated volunteers who greet troops daily. I had the privilege of attending the welcoming of a millionth warrior ceremony at DFW and let’s just say that there wasn’t a dry eye in the place.

If you want to experience the best America has to offer—respect for freedom, gratitude for service and sacrifice and a deep, deep love of country—just head on down to Terminal D or Terminal B depending on the day. You’ll witness the show of support from volunteers from across North Texas and the unbridled joy and emotional high of a family embracing a returning warrior. Cheerful and faithful patriots of all ages and stages wearing their finest red, white and blue attire show up so that they can let complete strangers who dedicate their lives to our armed forces know that we love them, we care about them, we pray for them and we appreciate them.

You see, humble veterans from wars gone by who know that freedom is not free. You’ll meet Vietnam veteran Bert Brady who makes a point of ensuring that this generation of soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines returns with honor and a warm welcome—unlike the men who came home from Vietnam. You’ll feel a sweet embrace from the “hugging and kissin’ grandmas” who make it a habit of planting a big one on digi-cammie clad warriors. Each volunteer offers a sweet smile, a love of country and respect for service that truly welcomes our troops with the way they deserve to be treated.

As a combat veteran who witnessed the ultimate low for returning warriors from Vietnam, I made a promise to myself that when, not if, I escaped my captivity in Vietnam, I would do anything and everything in my power to treat our men and women of the United States Armed Forces with the respect and honor that they deserve. “Welcome Home a Warrior” is a shining example of that golden homecoming and showcases how much North Texans—and Americans—support our troops.

If people in America find themselves traveling through DFW, I encourage them to call the R&R update line 972–574–0392 to learn of the next arrival ceremony and to see if they may participate in a truly heartwarming and uplifting welcome home celebration for our armed forces. They also may go to www.dfwairport.com/heroes.

On this day, I respectfully request that the United States House of Representatives reaffirm our unwavering commitment to actively promote and support the “Welcome Home a Hero Program” and its invaluable importance to the morale and welfare of those men and women who serve our country.

Make no mistake—America remains the land of the free because of the brave. God bless America.

RECOGNIZING BROOKS BYERS OF FLOWER MOUND

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of our youth who show an outstanding capacity for service. In particular, I would like to commend the achievements of Brooks Byers of Flower Mound, Texas. Mr. Byers is the newest winner of The Congressional Award Gold Medal, Congress’s only and very prestigious award for youth.

Earning the Gold Medal requires great commitment and devotion to service; each award-winning must spend two or more years completing more than 400 hours of community service. Mr. Byers’s service projects included organizing youth tennis camps and gift-wrapping fundraisers to raise more than $3,000 for Susan G. Komen for the Cure, tutoring at-risk children each week and raising money for their after-school program through a book drive, and organizing homecoming celebrations for soldiers each weekend as part of the Welcome Home a Hero Program.

Mr. Byers’s accomplishments do not end here. The Congressional Award Gold Medal also requires participants to complete 200 hours of personal development and physical fitness activities, which Brooks fulfilled through a junior golf league and his high school’s tennis team. For the Expedition part of the Gold Medal program, Brooks planned a trip to enrich his understanding of ancient European history in Scotland and France.

The Congressional Award Gold Medal recognizes youth who show great initiative and an inspiring ability to reach complex, self-imposed goals. This experience, what Mr. Byers himself calls “transformative”, shows an incredible commitment to excellence and the principles of our country’s future leaders. It is fitting for me to have the opportunity to recognize and represent Mr. Brooks Byers.

HONORING CAROLE M. WATSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary career of Carole M. Watson as she retires from over 30 years of nonprofit management, including the last ten years as Chief Community Investment Officer with the United Way of the Bay Area, UWBA. I join our community in celebrating the many ways in which her life’s work has contributed to the success and well-being of countless people throughout the Bay Area and beyond.

As President and CEO of Norwegian American Hospital, José was the Senior Vice President of the Generations + Northern Manhattan Health Network, one of the largest health care networks in the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation. During his tenure, he oversaw three acute care hospitals of which two were level one trauma centers, and 34 community-based health centers in East Harlem, Central Harlem and the South Bronx in New York City.

José is the architect of the Urban Health Conference, an annual national forum in existence since 2001 that attracts more than 300 health care providers to focus on the disparities in health care for minority populations and strategies to eliminate them. He serves as Chairman of the East Harlem Business Capital Corporation Board of Directors, which provides microlending and business development services for community businesses. In addition, he is a member of the Board of Boricua College in New York. The college was designed to serve the educational needs of Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics. In October 2009, José was named among the “Most Influential Latinos” in the United States by Hispanic Business Magazine, a New York Times Co. syndicated publication.

José has been a licensed social worker since 1979. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from the City College of New York and a Master of Social Work from Adelphi University. In 2002, he was conferred an honorary doctorate degree from the New York College of Podiatric Medicine. This honor recognized his measurable accomplishments and steadfast commitment to improving the health status of the poorest and most disadvantaged populations in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. José R. Sánchez for his extraordinary accomplishments and his spirit that reflect the best our nation has to offer.

HONORING JOSÉ R. SÁNCHEZ
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize José R. Sánchez.

José R. Sánchez, is President and Chief Executive Officer of Norwegian American Hospital, Chicago’s only Latino hospital. Jose has a 30-plus year career as a health care executive and possesses a wealth of knowledge of the health care industry.

As President and CEO of Norwegian American Hospital, José is dedicated to enhancing the quality of services provided to more than 112,000 patients. Among his first priorities was to lead the management executive team to critically assess and refine the quality of all systems, structures and services that are currently in place. José is committed to pursuing collaborative and innovative solutions to compete and lead the health care charge of the communities the hospital serves: Humboldt Park, West Town, Wicker Park, Logan Square and Austin.

Before joining Norwegian American Hospital, José was the Senior Vice President of the Generations + Northern Manhattan Health Network, one of the largest health care networks in the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation. During his tenure, he oversaw three acute care hospitals of which two were level one trauma centers, and 34 community-based health centers in East Harlem, Central Harlem and the South Bronx in New York City.

José is the architect of the Urban Health Conference, an annual national forum in existance since 2001 that attracts more than 300 health care providers to focus on the disparities in health care for minority populations and strategies to eliminate them. He serves as Chairman of the East Harlem Business Capital Corporation Board of Directors, which provides microlending and business development services for community businesses. In addition, he is a member of the Board of Boricua College in New York. The college was designed to serve the educational needs of Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics. In October 2009, José was named among the "Most Influential Latinos" in the United States by Hispanic Business Magazine, a New York Times Co. syndicated publication.

José has been a licensed social worker since 1979. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from the City College of New York and a Master of Social Work from Adelphi University. In 2002, he was conferred an honorary doctorate degree from the New York College of Podiatric Medicine. This honor recognized his measurable accomplishments and steadfast commitment to improving the health status of the poorest and most disadvantaged populations in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. José R. Sánchez for his extraordinary accomplishmments and his spirit that reflect the best our nation has to offer.
Felicia Lemons is a Human Rights Specialist for the New York City Commission on Human Rights. She spent her formative years growing up in Linden Plaza, Brooklyn, New York. Her family then moved to Cambria Heights, Queens where she expanded upon the value of family and love of community. Both her parents, Hank and Sadie Lemons emphasized the importance of education, social justice and helping one’s neighbor. 

During a bible study meeting at the House of the Lord Church in Brooklyn, the Rev. Dr. Herbert Daughtry approached Felicia with an opportunity to work in his outreach ministry. He recruited her to advocate for formerly incarcerated women, as well as minister the gospel of Jesus Christ to the community at large. While under the mentorship of Pastor Daughtry, she trained in all matters of social justice, gender discrimination and serviced the “least of these” in the neighborhood. Also while in training, Felicia attended Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus. Felicia was on the Dean’s List for seven consecutive semesters and is a member of the Alpha Chi Honor Society. Graduating Magna Cum Laude, she earned a Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree.

From Long Island University under the advisement of Pastor Daughtry and Rev. Dr. Syl Shannon-Norton, she was named “Chaplain for Alpha Phi Alpha, Felicia pursued a Masters in Divinity Degree from Duke University. While working on her Masters, she served marginalized communities as a volunteer for Center for community Help in Durham, North Carolina. Felicia returned to New York to work for Commissioner Patricia Gatling at the NYC Commission on Human Rights. Serving as a Human Rights Specialist, she directs her talent and passion to educated and advocate for people transitioning back into the community from prison. In doing so, she works closely with organizations such as Alpha School Programs, Brooklyn Women’s Prison Association, Young Women’s Leadership program of Durham. In 1999, she received the Equal Rights Alliance Foundation’s Family Strength Award, co-sponsored by the Northern California Grant Makers and Association of Fund Raising Executives in 2006. Ms. Watson was also recognized as the 2006 San Francisco Boy Scouts of America’s Whitney M. Young Community Leader.

Ms. Watson’s dedication to improving the lives of children, youth and families through economic development is evident from her countless community affiliations and activities. Whether serving as a liaison to the United Way World Wide Income Advisory Group, creating a $6 million portfolio with a Community Investment Team and Community Project staff, comprising over 20 members. And in 2002, she was voted the esteemed UWBA’s Percy C. Moore Employee of the Year by her colleagues. The recipient of numerous honors and accolades, Ms. Watson received the National Philanthropy Day Foundation Professional Award co-sponsored by the Northern California Grant Makers and Association of Fund Raising Executives in 2006. She was also recognized as the 2006 San Francisco Boy Scouts of America’s Whitney M. Young Community Leader.

On behalf of the residents of California’s 9th Congressional District, Ms. Carolle M. Watson, I salute you for three decades of outstanding service in assisting families to achieve financial stability and secure future success. I congratulate and thank you for your unparalleled service to our community. You have touched many lives in profound ways throughout your career, and we wish you and your family continued prosperity and happiness as you transition to this exciting new chapter of life.

A TRIBUTE TO FELICIA LEMONS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Felicia Lemons.
A TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER BANKS
HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Christopher Banks.

Christopher Banks is the Executive Director and CEO of the East New York United Concerned Citizens, Inc. Born twenty-seven years ago in Brooklyn, NY to immigrant parents from Trinidad and Tobago, his first-hand witness to the struggles of disenfranchised individuals in his community greatly influenced his dedication to public service and advocacy.

Mr. Banks attended the New York City High School for Leadership and Public Service, and CUNY John Jay College of Criminal Justice where he pursued a degree in political science. He founded the East New York United Concerned Citizens, Inc. making his dream of creating a social service and non-profit organization a reality.

Over the past ten years, Mr. Banks has focused his advocacy on the areas of youth, seniors, block associations and tenant associations to provide services to the East New York community. He has worked in partnership with organizations such as NYC Citizens Committee, East New York Development Corporation, Linden Houses Tenant Association, Emerald Green Tenants Association, The Justice Fund, The East New York Council for the Aging, the National Association of Black Business and Professional Women’s Brooklyn Club, and a host of other organizations.

Mr. Banks was appointed to Community Board #5, serving as one of the youngest members in the capacity of Executive Board Member and Chair of the Transportation Committee. He also served as Co-Chair of the Youth Services Committee, Co-Chair of the Aging Committee and Public Safety Committee. He is currently President of his Block Association, has previously served as President of the Black Business Professional Women’s Youth Club and as an Advisory Member of the Pink House Cornerstone Program. Additionally, Mr. Banks has worked for organizations over the past eight years such as the Italian American Civil Rights League and the Federation of Multicultural Programs, and has served as an Adolescent Services liaison for the Youth Services Department. Mr. Banks is a proud member of Changing Lives Christian Center.

He is an innovative, charismatic and dynamic young man, on a mission to empower and change the dynamics of his community and the world at large.

A TRIBUTE TO ALAN D. COHEN
HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alan D. Cohen.

Alan was born and raised in Brooklyn, New York. He is one of four siblings and is a proud graduate of the New York City school system. He received his bachelor’s degree from Brooklyn College, a Master’s of Science, Special Education from New York University. He is a Cahn Fellow at Columbia University. Alan has 34 years of educational experience having filled many roles as a teacher, administrator and principal for the New York City Department of Education. He is currently a Network Leader providing support and supervision for principals in 32 New York City schools and prior to that completed seven years as principal of P.S. 69 in the Bronx. In the past he has had various responsibilities in the New York City system, including teaching, mentoring teachers and aspiring principals, high school admissions and supervising student support services. He also implemented a Reggio Emilia inspired early childhood program and spent time in Italy studying as a member of the North American Reggio Emilia Alliance and International Association Friends of Reggio Children.

Recently, he has spent his mummers as a group leader at the Principal’s Center Summer Institute of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. He also serves as an advisory board member at the Principal’s Center. He is also the recipient of the 2007 Time Warner Principals of Excellence Award and the 2006 Outstanding Educator of the Year Award from Education Update.

Alan’s focus is on enhancing a dynamic child-centered curriculum, fostering professional development and creating a strong sense of community. He will be returning to his passion as a building principal in September, at the Portledge School in Locust Valley, New York. Alan is the ideal educator to build on the foundations and foundations and has the professional background and the enthusiasm to establish Portledge as a leader in early childhood and elementary education.

Alan looks forward to a long future of educating the children who will be our leaders of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. Alan D. Cohen for his extraordinary accomplishments and his spirit which reflect the best our nation has to offer.

RECOGNIZING 2011 APPOINTEES TO THE UNITED STATES SERVICE ACADEMIES
HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the United States Service Academies, an outstanding group of young Washingtonians who have a combination of academic and athletic prowess, dedication, and leadership, as they leave their families to embark on their new lives in service to the nation: William Westbrook Moore, Atticus Lee Sawatzki, William Guy Merkle, and James David Rice.

William Westbrook Moore is my appointee to the United States Military Academy. He graduated from the Polytechnic as he was a varsity athlete and founder of the school’s chess club. Atticus Lee Sawatzki departs for the United States Merchant Marine Academy. He is an alumnus of St. Anselm’s Abby School, was a lifeguard for the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation and is an alumnus of the Episcopal Church, K Street. William Guy Merkle, whom I have twice had the pleasure of nominating to the United States Air Force Academy, is an alumnus of St. Anselm’s Abby School. Bill is a thespian, crack shot, and an Elder in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He returns to the Air Force Academy after completing his two year mission for his church in Japan. James David Rice leaves for the United States Naval Academy Prep School. He graduated from The Bullis School, where he was both a varsity athlete and an honors student.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these young men in advance for their service, in wishing them success, and in offering them the hearty congratulations of the House of Representatives.

CONGRATULATING SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT R. GERALD TURNER
HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Southern Methodist University (SMU) President R. Gerald Turner for receiving a quadrangle on the SMU Campus named in his honor. This week current and former members of the SMU board of trustees approved the naming of the R. Gerald Turner Centennial Quadrangle. This project is currently under construction and will be complete in the fall so SMU students, faculty and campus visitors can enjoy this gathering place for many years to come.

SMU is currently celebrating its Centennial Celebration, and I commend President Turner on his accomplishments and vision for the century ahead. I am a proud alumnus of SMU, and have greatly appreciated President Turner’s service and leadership. He and his wife Gail Turner have made tremendous contributions to the university and this honor is well deserved.

SMU has made amazing strides over the past century, rising from a small rural college to an internationally renowned university. From its founding in 1911 till today, SMU has graduated more than 100,000 alumni. The outstanding achievement and leadership of those alumni serves as a testament to SMU’s tradition of success. With seven different schools, SMU ranks in one of the best universities in the nation. The Cox School of Business routinely ranks in the top 25 business schools in the United States. In addition to twelve alumni who are past and present Members of the
U.S. Congress, SMU has graduated such notable individuals as: John Tyson, CEO of Tyson Foods; former First Lady, Laura Bush; Lamar Hunt, founder of the American Football League; Harriet Miers, former White House Counsel and Supreme Court nominee; James Cronin, Nobel Prize winning physicist; Mary Ellen Weber, NASA astronaut; and Karen Hughes, former Under Secretary of State.

For these well-known alumni, myself, and thousands of former and current students, SMU holds a special place in our hearts. There is a strong sense of pride amongst the SMU community, and the values we learned in school have stayed with us throughout our lives. We were and always will be SMU Mustangs.

With an eye towards the next generation, SMU is not only celebrating the past, but planning for the future. This Centennial Celebration will serve as a time to ensure the next hundred years are even more successful than the first one hundred. I am confident that under President Turner’s leadership, SMU will continue to thrive as a center of excellence not only for Dallas, but for the world.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. CORNEGY, JR.

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Robert E. Cornegy, Jr. Rob is married to his beautiful wife Michelle, and he is the father of six wonderful children (Robert E. Cornegy III, Nicholas Ethan, Nia Imani, Nala Catherine Ellen, Noah and N’Kosi).

As a dedicated and passionate community advocate, Rob recognized the needs of the community and used his own funds to purchase and rehabilitate a brownstone where he created “The Cornegy Residence”: an 18-bed shelter for men suffering from substance abuse and mental health issues.

Rob has a long history of service implementation and delivery focusing on mental health, substance abuse, and homelessness. He gained valuable hands-on experience by implementing a service-delivery program that increased the number of inmates serviced dramatically while working at the Rikers Island Prison Complex. Rob holds a Professional Certificate in the treatment of individuals suffering from substance abuse issues; earned a Bachelor's degree in Organizational Management and holds a Master's degree in Organizational Leadership from Mercy College. He is currently a member of Cornerstone Baptist Church and is the former Director of the Christopher Wallace memorial foundation and Director of the Regional Resource Convention Center for the Children’s Aid society.

Rob is also an adjunct professor of Marketing at Brooklyn College. Rob is a community organizer, advocate, and political activist with more than 20 years experience working in underserved communities around New York. He has also worked in various high-capacity political roles ranging from Campaign Manager to Chief of Staff for numerous elected officials in the New York State Assembly and Senate.

In 2009 Robert ran for City Council for the 36th District serving Bedford Stuyvesant and Crown Heights. Currently, Rob is State Committeeman/District Leader of the 56th Assembly District serving Bedford Stuyvesant, Crown Heights and parts of Bushwick.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. Cornegy for his extraordinary accomplishments and his spirit that reflect the best our Nation has to offer.

HONORING ROCKY RUN MIDDLE SCHOOL’S “THE LATEST GENERATION MEETS THE GREATEST GENERATION” PROGRAM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I recently attended a wonderful event at Rocky Run Middle School in Chantilly, Virginia. The program brings World War II veterans together with 7th grade students for one-on-one interviews about the veterans’ experiences during war.

The event was initiated 10 years ago by history teacher James Rottjakob and for his efforts, he was selected as the Fairfax County Public Schools Teacher of the Year. Rocky Run Middle School is the only school in the region with this type of program.

The event was attended by 125 World War II veterans, representing all branches of the Armed Forces and nearly every theater of the war. I was touched to hear the recollections from so many members of the “Greatest Generation” who sacrificed so much to protect our nation’s freedom. Students got to hear from Edward Connor, who served with the U.S. Army Air Corps in Papua, New Guinea, and Guadalcanal; Lucas Dugan, who served aboard a U.S. Navy destroyer in the north Atlantic guiding supply convoys; Donald Graul, a paratrooper with the 82nd Airborne Division who parachuted into Normandy on D-Day and was captured by the Germans, spending the rest of the war in a POW camp; and Richard Graff, who marched with the Army through France, Belgium, and Holland and met the Russian Army at the Elbe River.

These men, and many more, volunteered their time to share their views with today’s students. With few and fewer World War II veterans still living, I applaud the efforts of these and all veterans who share this living history and make their memories part of children’s learning experience and the historical record. I also want to draw attention to the Rocky Run students, who recognize the importance of learning from previous generations. Knowing about one of the most traumatic episodes in world history and the sacrifice it required of all Americans, these students will have an appreciation of what it takes to preserve our nation’s freedom.

In 2009 Robert ran for City Council for the 36th District serving Bedford Stuyvesant and Crown Heights. Currently, Rob is State Committeeman/District Leader of the 56th Assembly District serving Bedford Stuyvesant, Crown Heights and parts of Bushwick.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. Cornegy for his extraordinary accomplishments and his spirit that reflect the best our Nation has to offer.

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Israel Velazquez. As founder and President of Velazquez Associates, Inc., and its subsidiary Velazquez Accounting Services, a New York based accounting and nonprofit development consulting firm that bears his name, Israel Velazquez has worked tirelessly to develop partnerships with community leaders, development corporations, and other public and private partners.

For the past thirty years, Mr. Velazquez, known as “Izzy” to many, has assembled public-private partnerships in the areas of local community issues, affordable housing and economic development projects in urban cities throughout the United States of America and in several Caribbean islands.

Mr. Velazquez holds a Master’s in Taxation from Long Island University in Brooklyn, NY and a Bachelor of Science in Accounting and Mass Communications from C.U.N.Y., Hunter College. In 2009, Mr. Velazquez was designated an adjunct Professor in the Gates Foundation and Warren Buffett Enterprises Fellows Program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating Mr. Velazquez’s extraordi-

LIBERTY HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS VARSITY SOCCER TEAM

HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize the outstanding achievement of the Liberty Lady Jays Varsity Soccer team on defeating Ursuline Academy, by a score of 2–1, to win the Class 3 State Championship for the second straight season.

The Lady Jays finished their incredible season by posting a strong record of 27–3, while scoring a total of 147 points and only allowing 29 points. In the Championship game, they finished spectacularly by scoring the winning goal with one second left on the clock of the first overtime period. The dedication and team work displayed by the Lady Jays is impressive and evident in their success.

I want to recognize the great leadership of the team, including Head Coach Tom Rotjakob and the work of his assistant coaches. I also want to recognize the work of the school administrators, Superintendent Mike Brewer, Principal April Adams, and Athletic Director Jason Cahill, as additional keys to success.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in congratulating the achievement of the Liberty
President Obama had the strength and wherewithal to see that pledge through to fulfillment; and
Whereas, Legislators in Texas reaffirm the solemn creed of freedom, justice, and God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all, who stand strongly behind the president with respect to these several issues as he confronts the grave problems of national and international security; now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the House of Representa-
tives of the 82nd Legislature of the State of Texas hereby commend the intelligence per-
sonnel who diligently and quietly toiled for years to uncover the whereabouts of bin Laden and whose achievement, while his-	oric, may never be fully known to the pub-
ic; and, be it further
Resolved, That the House of Representa-
tives of the 82nd Legislature of the State of Texas hereby commend the members of the armed forces who successfully and heroically carried out a mission with no military losses and with a minimal loss of civilian lives; and, be it further
Resolved, That the chief clerk of the Texas House of Representatives forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Senate, to the governor of Texas, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be of-
icially entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011
Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:
H.R. No. 1694, Resolution
Whereas, On September 11, 2001, Osama bin Laden, a sworn enemy of the United States of America, coordinated a series of mon-
strous and cowardly terrorist attacks that resulted in the tragic loss of 2,977 innocent lives, leading to an engagement in a war on terrorism across many fronts; and
Whereas, On May 1, 2011, after nearly 10 years of bin Laden’s evasion of military and intelligence seeking his capture, President Barack Obama declared to the na-
tion and the world that bin Laden had fi-
nally been killed, and that “Justice has been done.”;
and
Whereas, The president’s patience, leadership, wisdom, and determination have led di-ectly to Bin Laden’s most wanted man in the world and have hardened this nation’s resolve to defeat the forces of malevolent fa-
nicatism, and by destroying the mastermind behind the worst terrorist attack on Amer-
ican soil he has struck a significant and his-
toric blow against Al Qaeda; and
Whereas, Following the death of the perpet-
ua of the attacks, the family members and friends of those who lost their lives in the attacks on September 11 are able to achieve a greater sense of closure; and
Whereas, After months of meetings of the National Security Council, led by President Obama, who directed intelligence officials to zero in on bin Laden’s whereabouts, intel-
ligence officials devised and carefully carried out a clandestine operation, which had fre-
quently been rehearsed in an effort to mini-
imize casualties, both civilian and military; and
Whereas, As commander-in-chief of our great nation, he boldly gave the final author-
ization to commence the operation to brave and highly trained members of our nation’s armed forces; and
Whereas, Upon hearing the news of bin Laden’s elimination, in an impressive show of unselfishness and dedication of the fanatics who still today seek to destroy our free way of life, jubilant citizens expressed pride in our nation and our president by spontaneously celebrating the news in cities across the country, singing “The Star Spangled Ban-
er” and loudly chanting “U-S-A,” and
Whereas, Bin Laden, a sworn enemy of the United States of America, coordinated a series of monstrous and cowardly terrorist attacks that resulted in the tragic loss of 2,977 innocent lives, leading to an engagement in a war on terrorism across many fronts; and
Whereas, On May 1, 2011, after nearly 10 years of bin Laden’s evasion of military and intelligence seeking his capture, President Barack Obama declared to the na-
tion and the world that bin Laden had fi-
nally been killed, and that “Justice has been done.”;
and
Whereas, The president’s patience, leadership, wisdom, and determination have led di-ectly to Bin Laden’s most wanted man in the world and have hardened this nation’s resolve to defeat the forces of malevolent fa-
nicatism, and by destroying the mastermind behind the worst terrorist attack on Amer-
ican soil he has struck a significant and his-
toric blow against Al Qaeda; and
Whereas, Following the death of the perpet-
ua of the attacks, the family members and friends of those who lost their lives in the attacks on September 11 are able to achieve a greater sense of closure; and
Whereas, After months of meetings of the National Security Council, led by President Obama, who directed intelligence officials to zero in on bin Laden’s whereabouts, intel-
ligence officials devised and carefully carried out a clandestine operation, which had fre-
quently been rehearsed in an effort to mini-
imize casualties, both civilian and military; and
Whereas, As commander-in-chief of our great nation, he boldly gave the final author-
ization to commence the operation to brave and highly trained members of our nation’s armed forces; and

HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
HONORING KYLE DOWELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011
Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Kyle Dowell. Kyle is a very special young man who has ex-
emplified the finest qualities of citizenship and lead-
ership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

HONORING RYAN WIST
HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011
Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ryan Wist. Ryan is a very special young man who has ex-
emplified the finest qualities of citizenship and lead-
ership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

HONORING RYAN WIST
HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011
Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ryan Wist. Ryan is a very special young man who has ex-
emplified the finest qualities of citizenship and lead-
ership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.
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Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ryan Wist. Ryan is a very special young man who has ex-
emplified the finest qualities of citizenship and lead-
ership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.
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Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ryan Wist. Ryan is a very special young man who has ex-
emplified the finest qualities of citizenship and lead-
ership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.
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Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ryan Wist. Ryan is a very special young man who has ex-
emplified the finest qualities of citizenship and lead-
ership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.
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Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ryan Wist. Ryan is a very special young man who has ex-
emplified the finest qualities of citizenship and lead-
ership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.
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Tuesday, June 21, 2011
Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ryan Wist. Ryan is a very special young man who has ex-
emplified the finest qualities of citizenship and lead-
ership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.
his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE BRAZOSWOOD BUCCANEERS

HON. RON PAUL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 11, 2011, the Brazoswood Buccaneers baseball team won $335 million of State Champions at the Dell Diamond in Round Rock, TX. It is with great pleasure that I extend my congratulations to the players and coaches of the Brazoswood Buccaneers baseball team on their outstanding victory. The Brazoswood Buccaneers baseball team finished the playoffs with an undefeated 12-0 record, which put their season-ending winning streak at fourteen. Their hard work and dedication to the sport was rewarded with Brazoswood’s third State Championship. Winning this title is not only a major accomplishment for the Buccaneers, but also for Houston 5A baseball. The Buccaneers have brought the championship back to the Greater Houston area for the first time in three seasons. The 2011 Buccaneers are part of proud tradition in the Houston area as Houston 5A teams have won seventeen out of thirty State Championships.

Mr. Speaker, my grandson Michael Pyeatt is a member of this team. I am extremely proud of my grandson and his teammates accomplishments, and inspired by their steadfast efforts to achieve their goal. It is therefore my pleasure to once again extend my congratulations to the players and coaches of the Brazoswood Buccaneers baseball team on the occasion of being named the Texas State 5-A Champions.

HONORING HAYDEN WHITE

HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Hayden White. Hayden is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout. Hayden has been very active with his troop, and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. Hayden has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Hayden renovated and constructed extra storage space in the basement of the Dillingham-Lewis Museum in Blue Springs, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Hayden White for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

SPEECH OF
HON. LAURA RICHARDSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Chair, I am compelled to rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2112, the Fiscal Year 2012 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for three reasons.

First, the bill makes draconian cuts to necessary conservation programs that protect our country’s water supplies and manage critical natural resources.

Second, this substantially reduces funding for the Commodity Futures Trading Corporation, the watchdog agency designated by Congress to protect consumers from Wall Street greed and predatory conduct. Madam Chair, the funding reductions in this bill will adversely affect every American. For example, the $285 million slashed from the Food and Drug Administration will be a devastating blow to the agency tasked with ensuring food safety standards. The FDA is our country’s first and most important line of defense against diseases such as E.coli and Salmonella, and with outbreaks of these illnesses on the rise, this cut endangers everyone in America.

In my home state of California, agriculture is a $36.6 billion industry that generates at least $100 billion in related economic activity. Any threat to the quality of our produce jeopardizes the economy of our state and the health of all who enjoy our products.

Madam Chair, this bill recklessly cuts funding for the Commodities Futures Trading Corporation, the watchdog agency under President Obama’s request by 23 percent, this bill also makes draconian cuts to necessary conservation programs that protect our country’s water supplies and manage critical natural resources.

Third, this substantially reduces funding for the Commodity Futures Trading Corporation, the watchdog agency designated by Congress to protect consumers from Wall Street greed and predatory conduct. Madam Chair, the funding reductions in this bill will adversely affect every American. For example, the $285 million slashed from the Food and Drug Administration will be a devastating blow to the agency tasked with ensuring food safety standards. The FDA is our country’s first and most important line of defense against diseases such as E.coli and Salmonella, and with outbreaks of these illnesses on the rise, this cut endangers everyone in America.

In my home state of California, agriculture is a $36.6 billion industry that generates at least $100 billion in related economic activity. Any threat to the quality of our produce jeopardizes the economy of our state and the health of all who enjoy our products.

Madam Chair, this bill recklessly cuts funding for the Commodities Futures Trading Commission by 44% below the President’s budget request. The CFTC was established to improve market efficiency and combat price speculation in futures, and derivatives markets. The reduction in funding obviously is intended to deprive the CFTC of the resources needed to detect, deter, and prevent the abusive practices that culminated in the economic collapse of 2008. Crippling the CFTC will leave Wall Street speculators free to drive up the price of oil and other commodities while making it more difficult to protect the pension plans of hard working Americans from the effects of another economic downturn.

Madam Chair, this bill also hurting our international good will to our allies around the world and promoting a positive image of America abroad. Given all the President and Secretary of State have done to improve our international standing, it makes no sense for Congress to undo this good work by lessening its commitment to combat world hunger.

I, disturb me than in their short-sighted rush to cut spending, my Republican colleagues would take food from the weakest and the poorest among us while preserving the Bush-era tax cuts for the super-rich. The American people do not accept this trade-off. My constituents in the 37th Congressional District reject this trade-off. I urge my colleagues to join them and me in voting against this unfair and ill-considered legislation.
Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation authorizing the limited use of United States forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya. This resolution is a companion to a Senate joint resolution introduced today by Senators JOHN KERRY, JOHN MCCAIN, BENJAMIN CARDIN, and RICHARD DURBIN.

Since Libyan dictator Muammar Qaddafi responded to peaceful demonstrations by attacking Libya's own citizens, the United States has been actively engaged with our international allies in thwarting the ability of the Qaddafi regime to visit violence, murder, and destruction upon the people of Libya. This past February, the United States imposed economic sanctions on Libya and froze the assets of its leadership, promising to hold Qaddafi, his family, and the government of Libya accountable for its human rights abuses. Qaddafi responded by increasing his assaults on civilians. As Libyan forces approached the city of Benghazi, in which Qaddafi vowed to show "no mercy" to opposition forces which had captured the city, the United Nations promptly passed Resolution 1973, mandating "all necessary measures" to protect civilians in Libya, implementing a "no-fly zone," and enforcing an arms embargo. On March 19, the United States Armed Forces and our coalition partners launched Operation Odyssey Dawn in an effort to enforce the Security Council resolution. That mission has since come under NATO command and is now called Operation Unified Protector.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that the United States is engaged in hostilities in Libya. Our Armed Forces have assisted in combat operations including providing intelligence, aerial refueling, targeting, and other aspects of NATO's daily bombardment of Libyan forces loyal to Qaddafi. The President engaged in these hostilities without an authorization from Congress, and has anyway exceeded the 60-day War Powers limitation on the use of force without congressional consent. It is high time that Congress asserts its authority and engages proactively with the administration on this most serious question of war.

But the solution, Mr. Speaker, is not to simply cut off funds. Instead, Congress must limit and closely monitor the President's commitment of forces. This resolution authorizes the use of force in Libya for one year from the date of enactment, limiting the President's ability to engage our Armed Forces indefinitely. This resolution bans the use of ground forces and requires the President to continually report to Congress on the progress of our military operations, the plans to achieve our stated goals, and the changing situation on the ground. We must also make an effort to put Libya's frozen assets to good use, returning funds to the Libyan people and using some of that money to offset the cost of NATO's operations.

It is too late to debate whether we should be involved or not; we already are. What we must do is ensure that the legislative and executive branches are working in harmony to maintain a military commitment that is limited and brief, and that best serves the people of Libya. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.
TRIBUTE TO AL LIPSCOMB

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 18, 2011, the people of Dallas, Texas and the United States suffered a great loss with the passing of Al Lipscomb. Al Lipscomb was a strong community leader, businessman and a devoted public servant. He was never afraid of controversy; he was a true advocate for peace, racial justice, and social equality. He was 86 years old.

Mr. Lipscomb was born in East Dallas. He was educated in the Dallas public schools, attending Booker T. Washington High School and graduating from Lincoln High. He joined the Army Air Force in California with the military police in 1943. He returned to Dallas in 1950, married and became the head waiter at the executive dining room of the First National Bank. He was reprimanded by his boss after going to the courthouse to watch Thurgood Marshall file a Dallas school desegregation case.

In 1966, he became a neighborhood organizer for the Dallas Community Action Agency. He was also an organizer for the Dallas chapter of Dr. King’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Al Lipscomb is known for filing a groundbreaking lawsuit that forced Dallas to elect council members by individual districts. He served on the city council for 15 years and was the first black person to run for Dallas mayor.

In 1972, Mr. Lipscomb opened the South Dallas Information Center on Pennsylvania Avenue, where he handled a constant stream of phone calls and questions from passersby seeking assistance. The center was supported by donations. He also kept a high profile by making the rounds at public meetings, asking tough questions, and offering suggestions.

In 1984, he was elected to the City Council and became a vocal critic of the Dallas Police Department’s treatment of minorities. And in the late 1980s, Mr. Lipscomb and Ms. Diane Ragsdale—the only black members of the council—drew national media attention and local death threats. Despite the hostilities toward him, he remained both a critic and a skeptic of the city he loved. “I see a great change,” he said. “I see a great change, a change for the better.”

Al was a man of great commitment. He provided tremendous support for me as a public official. I am deeply grateful for his counsel, support, assistance, and unquestionable trusted friendship.

I remember him as being extremely affable, charismatic, and passionate about the needs of community. For all of us he was as one of the most accessible elected officials, always available to listen and reach out to us in addressing complex issues in a hands-on and collaborative fashion.

Today, Texas’ 30th Congressional District salutes and honors Al Lipscomb. We thank Mr. Lipscomb’s wife, Lovie, his children, and his great-grandchildren for sharing his exuberant and compassionate spirit with us. His family was always supportive and understanding of his commitment. His fight for justice and equality should not, can not, and will not be forgotten.

HONORING NATHAN CHARLES DARRAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Nathan Charles Darrah. Nathan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 692, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Nathan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Nathan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Nathan has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project, Nathan reclaimed and built over a mile of hiking trail around Lake Jacomo in Jackson County, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker. I proudly ask you to join me in commending Nathan Charles Darrah for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATED SERVICE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL DONALD C. WURSTER, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

HON. JEFF MILLER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Lieutenant General Donald C. Wurster upon his retirement from the United States Air Force.

For over 38 years of service to our nation, Lieutenant General Donald Wurster lived the core values of Integrity First, Service before Self, and Excellence in All We Do. On June 24, 2011 General Wurster relinquishes command of Air Force Special Operations Command and leaves behind a hallmark of accomplishments generated through his leadership of some of America’s finest men and women.

Since his graduation from the United States Air Force Academy, he has been a part of some of the most dynamic changes in airpower’s history. Along the way, General Wurster’s vision and leadership helped usher airpower’s history. This calculated return comes with the support of national interests and objectives.

Let it be recognized that in a time of persistent combat and other military operations, the United States Air Force had the right guy, in the right place, at the right time. Furthermore, his leadership and framework for success has helped build a strong following of talented warriors ready to protect our nation.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am honored to congratulate General Wurster on his retirement. My wife Vicki and I wish him and Ronda all the best for continued success.

AGE NOT AN ISSUE FOR BASEBALL’S JACK MCKEON

HON. HOWARD COBLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, many senior citizens who travel to Florida are doing so to enjoy the retired life after years of working while filling their days with hours spent on the beach. Jack McKeon, from the Sixth District of North Carolina, crushes this stereotype as he begins his second term as manager of baseball’s Florida Marlins.

McKeon has the full support of his family to leave his home in the town of Elon to return to the world of professional baseball, a move that makes him the second-oldest manager in history. This calculated return comes with pressure as McKeon led the Marlins to the 2003 World Series championship. His age is sometimes criticized, but the 80-year-old McKeon said, “I look at it this way—why should experience get penalized? I’ve managed since I was 14 years old. I’ll probably manage until I’m 95.”

Marlins president of baseball operations, Larry Beinfest, said, “It’s good to see [McKeon] back. He never really left. We turned to him to help us at a time.” The Florida Marlins seem to be in need of McKeon after a recent 10-game losing streak and the resignation of former manager Edwin Rodriguez. McKeon is passionate and optimistic about his return and has high hopes for the upcoming season. “I don’t need this job,” McKeon said, “but I love it.”

From one octogenarian to another, and on behalf of the citizens of the Sixth District of North Carolina, we congratulate Jack McKeon on resuming his duties as manager of the Florida Marlins and wish him the best of luck for the remainder of this season and for however long he wishes to manage. We know that whenever he retires for good, we are sure that it will be in the Sixth District of North Carolina.

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to rise today to mark the 50th Anniversary of the founding of the Village of Orland Hills, Illinois. Orland Hills is nestled in the southwest corner of Cook County in the 1st Congressional District. Its growth speaks to the dynamic and dedicated leaders who have built Orland Hills with an eye towards the connectedness that is the true definition of community. At a time when social networking via technology has increasingly replaced face to face interaction, the real life network that exists among the residents of Orland Hills should be seen as a model for us all.

Originally founded on June 30, 1961 as the Village of Westhaven, residents held their first Village Board Meeting on August 3, 1961. A president, Raymond Pecor, was elected. Shortly afterwards, the village annexed 10 acres at the southeast corner of 167th Street and 94th Avenue. A Zoning Commission was formed and a Planning Commission was appointed to prepare a zoning ordinance and a zoning district map. Over the years, as the village’s population continued to grow, annexations of adjacent land took Westhaven south to 171st Street. In 1970, the U.S. Census Bureau set the population at 470. Today the name is Orland Hills and the population is more than 7,000 and growing. During difficult economic times, village leaders found a way to build roads, schools, churches, shopping centers and beautiful homes. Racial and ethnic diversity occurred on its own as people found themselves feeling welcomed, accepted and at home with others who shared the American dream of building community through determination and hard work.

As the village continued to grow its reputation as a family friendly community with modest to low property taxes also grew. The village began to celebrate itself. In 1993 the first Orland Hills Jamboree became a success. That same year, it’s fair to say another very important event took place. A man who, over the years has grown to be a very dear friend of mine, Kyle R. Hastings, was elected to serve as the Mayor of Orland Hills.

As history would have it, 1993 was also the year I was first sworn in as the U.S. Representative for Illinois’ First Congressional District. And, while there are many things I could say to describe the leadership that Mayor Hastings has brought to this thriving community his own words best describe his dedication to public service. In an interview he gave to the Chicago Tribune in May 2004 Mayor Hastings said “I’m like the DePaul Basketball Coach Ray Meyer of mayors. If someone needs something, I’m there to help ‘em, and we’re always winning.”

In that same story, the newspaper reported that under Mayor Hastings’ leadership, the village had balanced its budget for 10 consecutive years. It built lighted ballfields, greatly expanded its recreational programs and resurfaced about half its streets. Orland Hills also spent more than $4.5 million building a Village government complex, a public works facility and a recreation/senior center without issuing bonds or increasing property taxes. The report also noted Hastings’ ability to attract a Walmart and other small businesses to a strip mall, a decision that, today, continues to bring tax revenue and jobs into the Orland Hills community.

Mr. Speaker, I must also take a moment to highlight the Village’s Administrator, John A. Daly, whose effective leadership played a decisive role in securing a $6,000 Local Tourism Grant from the Chicago Southland Convention & Visitors Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons and more, it is my sincere honor to enter into the Congressional Record this heartfelt tribute to the residents of Orland Hills, their Honorable Mayor Kyle R. Hastings, the trustees and appointed leadership of Administrator John A. Daly, and the Chairman of the 50th Anniversary Committee, an Orland Hills Trustee and the Mayor’s son, Kyle R. Hastings II. I also want to pay tribute to the thousands of Orland Hills residents who spend significant social capital every day to make their village a true social network . . . a real place to live and work and raise families.

At a time when so much of our nation is beset with tough budgets or less than stellar policy and political leaders, the Village of Orland Hills has much to celebrate. I am deeply proud to serve the interests of this thriving community and I pray for the good health and prosperity of its citizens—and good weather this weekend—as thousand assemble to take part in a festive atmosphere of family, food and fun from June 24 through 26, at Kelly Park at 16675 S. Haven Avenue in Orland Hills. It will be a true American celebration, not of bricks and mortar but of the power of people and the spirit of sharing that makes our nation great and makes Orland Hills a place of pride for us all.

May God continue to bless and keep this community, the state of Illinois and our nation. Amen.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS TO HELP THE UNEMPLOYED

HON. RON PAUL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two pieces of legislation to help the increasing number of Americans who, because of the Government-created recession, have lost their jobs. The first piece of legislation, the Unemployed Tax Relief, makes a laid-off worker’s last paycheck tax free.

The second bill, the Unemployment Assistance Act, allows the unemployed to make penalty-free withdrawals from accounts such as Roth IRAs or 401(k)s, to cover routine living expenses, health care expenses, or to help pay for education and job training. Those who make these penalty-free withdrawals while unemployed will be able to replenish their accounts once they have started a new job.

Mr. Speaker, while we may disagree on the best solutions to the economic crisis gripping the Nation, I hope my colleagues will at least agree on these common-sense measures and cosponsor the Unemployed Tax Relief Act and the Unemployment Assistance Act.
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Measures Introduced: Seven bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1237–1243, S.J. Res. 20, and S. Res. 212–213.

Measures Reported:

- Report to accompany S. 1103, to extend the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. (S. Rept. No. 112–23)
- Report to accompany S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation. (S. Rept. No. 112–24)
- H.R. 872, to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters.

Measures Passed:

- **National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day**:
  Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 202, designating June 27, 2011, as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day”, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: Pages S3978–79
  Casey (for Conrad) Amendment No. 498, to improve the resolution.

- **Republic of Slovenia 20th Anniversary**: Senate agreed to S. Res. 212, congratulating the people and Government of the Republic of Slovenia on the twentieth anniversary of the country’s independence.

Measures Considered:

- **Economic Development Revitalization Act**: Senate resumed consideration of S. 782, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: Pages S3962–64

  Pending:
  - DeMint Amendment No. 394, to repeal the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.
  - Paul Amendment No. 414, to implement the President’s request to increase the statutory limit on the public debt.
  - Cardin Amendment No. 407, to require the FHA to equitably treat homebuyers who have repaid in full their FHA-insured mortgages.
  - Merkley/Snowe Amendment No. 428, to establish clear regulatory standards for mortgage servicers.
  - Kohl Amendment No. 389, to amend the Sherman Act to make oil-producing and exporting cartels illegal.
  - Hutchison Amendment No. 423, to delay the implementation of the health reform law in the United States until there is final resolution in pending lawsuits.
  - Portman Amendment No. 417, to provide for the inclusion of independent regulatory agencies in the application of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).
  - Portman Amendment No. 418, to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) to strengthen the economic impact analyses for major rules, require agencies to analyze the effect of major rules on jobs, and require adoption of the least burdensome regulatory means.
  - McCain Amendment No. 412, to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act.
  - Merkley Amendment No. 440, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an Energy Efficiency Loan Program under which the Secretary shall make funds available to States to support financial assistance provided by qualified financing entities for making qualified energy efficiency or renewable efficiency improvements.
  - Coburn Modified Amendment No. 436, to repeal the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit.
Brown (MA)/Snowe Amendment No. 405, to repeal the imposition of withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities.

Inhofe Amendment No. 430, to reduce amounts authorized to be appropriated.

Inhofe Amendment No. 438, to provide for the establishment of a committee to assess the effects of certain Federal regulatory mandates.

Merkley Amendment No. 427, to make a technical correction to the HUBZone designation process.

McCain Amendment No. 441 (to Coburn Modified Amendment No. 436), to prohibit the use of Federal funds to construct ethanol blender pumps or ethanol storage facilities.

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action: By 49 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 94), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the bill.

Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation, at 11 a.m., on Wednesday, June 22, 2011, and that the Tuesday, June 21, 2011 vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, be postponed until Wednesday, June 22, 2011, at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Republican Leader, and that if cloture is invoked, time post-closure be counted as if cloture was invoked at 6 p.m., Tuesday, June 21, 2011.

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 64 yeas 35 nays (Vote No. EX. 92), Michael H. Simon, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

By a unanimous vote of 100 yeas (Vote No. EX. 93), Leon E. Panetta, of California, to be Secretary of Defense.

Messages from the House:

Enrolled Joint resolutions Presented:

Executive Communications:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Amendments Submitted:

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S 3977–78

Privileges of the Floor: Page S 3978

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—94) Pages S 3952, S 3962–63

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:30 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 22, 2011. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S 3979.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee ordered favorably reported H.R. 872, to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters.

CYBERSECURITY AND DATA PROTECTION IN THE FINANCIAL SECTOR

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine cybersecurity and data protection in the financial sector, after receiving testimony from Pablo A. Martinez, Deputy Special Agent in Charge, Criminal Investigative Division, Secret Service; Kevin F. Streff, Dakota State University Information Assurance Center, Madison, South Dakota; and Stuart K. Pratt, Consumer Data Industry Association, Leigh Williams, BITSS, on behalf of the Financial Services Roundtable, and Marc Rotenberg, Electronic Privacy Information Center, all of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of John Edgar Bryson, of California, to be Secretary, who was introduced by Senators Feinstein and Boxer, and Terry D. Garcia, of Florida, to be Deputy Secretary, both of the Department of Commerce, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt, Michael H. Corbin, of California, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates,
Matthew H. Tueller, of Utah, to be Ambassador to the State of Kuwait, Kenneth J. Fairfax, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kazakhstan, and Susan Laila Ziadeh, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the State of Qatar, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

INSPIRING STUDENTS TO FEDERAL SERVICE

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine inspiring students to Federal service, focusing on efforts taken to ensure effective campus recruitment, after receiving testimony from Christine M. Griffin, Deputy Director, U.S. Office of Personnel Management; Michael C. Kane, Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy; Carolyn M. Taylor, Chief Human Capital Officer, Government Accountability Office; Timothy McManus, Partnership for Public Service, Laurel McFarland, National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), and Witold Skwierczynski, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, all of Washington, D.C.; and Anne Mahle, Teach for America, New York, New York.

SENIOR HUNGER AND THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT


CYBERSECURITY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism concluded a hearing to examine cybersecurity, focusing on evaluating the Administration’s proposals, after receiving testimony from Representative Langevin; James A. Baker, Associate Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice; Greg Schaffer, Acting Deputy Undersecretary of Homeland Security for National Protection and Programs Directorate; and Ari Schwartz, Senior Internet Policy Advisor, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

---

**House of Representatives**

**Chamber Action**

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 26 public bills, H.R. 2243–2268; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 67; and H.Res. 317–319 were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

- H. Res. 316, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2021) to amend the Clean Air Act regarding air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf activities, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1249) to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform (H. Doc. 112–111).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Simpson to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Recess: The House recessed at 12:32 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m.

Recess: The House recessed at 2:07 p.m. and reconvened at 5:31 p.m.

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

- **Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office Designation Act**: H.R. 1632, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5014 Gary Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, as the “Sergeant Chris
Davis Post Office”, by a 2⁄3 yea-and-nay vote of 396 yea with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 460;  

Marine Sgt. Jeremy E. Murray Post Office Designation Act: S. 349, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4865 Tallmadge Road in Rootstown, Ohio, as the “Marine Sgt. Jeremy E. Murray Post Office”, by a 2⁄3 yea-and-nay vote of 397 yea with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 462;  

Schertz Veterans Post Office Designation Act: H.R. 771, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1081 Elbel Road in Schertz, Texas, as the “Schertz Veterans Post Office”, by a 2⁄3 yea-and-nay vote of 398 yea with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 461; and  

Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office Designation Act: S. 655, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 95 Dogwood Street in Cary, Mississippi, as the “Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office”.  

Recess: The House recessed at 6:05 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m.  

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of the men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our nation in Iraq and Afghanistan, their families, and all who serve in the armed forces and their families.  

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow for morning hour debate, thereafter to resume its session at 11:30 a.m.  

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:  


Recess: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on page H4367.  

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4344–45, H4345–46, H4346. There were no quorum calls.  

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:05 p.m.  

Committee Meetings  

DUAL-ELIGIBLES: UNDERSTANDING THIS VULNERABLE POPULATION AND HOW TO IMPROVE THEIR CARE  

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Dual-Eligibles: Understanding This Vulnerable Population and How to Improve Their Care.” Testimony was heard from Melanie Bella, Director of the Federal Coordinated Health Care Office, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); Billy Millwee, Associate Commissioner for Medicaid/CHIP, Texas Health and Human Services Commission; and public witnesses.  

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES  

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Economy held a markup of legislation regarding the “Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act.” The bill was forwarded without amendment.  

HATCH ACT: THE CHALLENGES OF SEPARATING POLITICS FROM POLICY  

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Hatch Act: The Challenges of Separating Politics from Policy.” Testimony was heard from public witnesses.  

JOBS AND ENERGY PERMITTING ACT OF 2012; AND AMERICA INVENTS ACT  

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by a vote of 7 to 2, a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2021, the “Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2012”. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of H.R. 2021. The rule provides that H.R. 2021 shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in H.R. 2021. The rule makes in order only those amendments to H.R. 2021 printed in Part A of the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. Provides that each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in Part A of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit H.R. 2021 with or without instructions.
The rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 1249, the “America Invents Act,” under a structured rule. The rule provides for 20 minutes of initial debate confined to the question of constitutionality of the bill equally divided and controlled by Representative Smith (R–TX) and Representative Kaptur (D–OH) or their designees. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of H.R. 1249. The rule makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill as an original bill for purpose of amendment, which shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those amendments to H.R. 1249 printed in Part B of the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. Provides that each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in Part B of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit H.R. 1249 with or without instructions. The rule provides that upon receipt of a message from the Senate transmitting H.R. 1249 with a Senate amendment or amendments thereto, it shall be in order to consider in the House a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee that the House disagree to the Senate amendment or amendments and request or agree to a conference with the Senate thereon. The rule waives all points of order against the motion. The rule provides one hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.


**Joint Meetings**

**GROWING THE ECONOMY**

**Joint Economic Committee:** Committee concluded a hearing to examine spending less, owing less, growing the economy, after receiving testimony from John B. Taylor, Stanford University Hoover Institution, Stanford, California; Simon Johnson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Sloan School of Management, Cambridge; and Kevin A. Hassett, American Enterprise Institute, and Chad Stone, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, both of Washington, DC.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 2011**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

**Senate**

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to hold hearings to examine outside witness statements, 10:30 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Finance, to hold hearings to examine preventing overpayments and eliminating fraud in the unemployment insurance system, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, to hold hearings to examine the next steps for securing rail and transit, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine transforming lives through diabetes research, 1:30 p.m., SD–G50.

Committee on the Judiciary, to hold an oversight hearing to examine intellectual property law enforcement efforts, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Christopher Droney, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Robert David Mariani, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, Cathy Bisson, and Mark Raymond Hornak, both to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and Robert N. Scola, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

**House**

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, hearing on Agricultural Program Audit: Examination of Conservation Programs, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, markup of the First Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 112th Congress. 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing on the evolution of the terrorist threat, 1:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.
Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, markup of the following: H.R. 2218, the “Empowering Parents through Quality Charter Schools Act”; and the Report on the Activities of the Committee on Education and Workforce for the First Quarter of the 112th Congress. 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.


Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled “Reforming FCC Process.” 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, markup of the following: the Report on the Activity of the Committee on Financial Services for the 112th Congress; H.R. 2072, the “Securing American Jobs Through Exports Act of 2011”; H.R. 1070, the “Small Company Capital Formation Act of 2011”; H.R. 1082, the “Small Business Capital Access and Job Preservation Act”; H.R. 33, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act; H.R. 1062, the “Burdensome Data Collection Relief Act”; and H.R. 940, the “United States Covered Bond Act of 2011.” 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing on Piercing Burma’s Veil of Secrecy: The Truth Behind the Sham Election and the Difficult Road Ahead, 12:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, markup of the following: Consideration of the Committee Activity Report for the First Quarter of the 112th Congress; and H.R. 901, the “Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Security Authorization Act of 2011.” 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing entitled “Opportunities for Outdoor Recreation on Public Lands.” 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Affairs, hearing on H.R. 1158, to authorize the conveyance of mineral rights by the Secretary of the Interior in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1560, to amend the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act to allow the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo Tribe to determine blood quantum requirement for membership in that tribe. 11 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, business meeting, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.


Subcommittee on TARP, Financial Services, and the Bailout of Public and Private Programs, hearing entitled “The Changing Role of the FDIC.” 1:30 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on Adoption of the Activity Report for the First Quarter of the 112th Congress; and H.R. 2219, the “Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012.” 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing on Examining NOAA’s Climate Service Proposal, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn. Prior to the start of the hearing there will be a Full Committee Business Meeting: Adoption of the 1st Semiannual Report of the Activities of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The State of Small Business Access to Capital and Credit: The View from Secretary Geithner.” 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup of the following: H.R. 1073, to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the “R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse”; H.R. 1264, to designate the property between the United States Federal Courthouse and the Ed Jones Building located at 109 South Highland Avenue in Jackson, Tennessee, as the “M.D. Anderson Plaza” and to authorize the placement of a historical/identification marker on the grounds recognizing the achievements and philanthropy of M.D. Anderson; H.R. 1791, to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 101 South United States Route 1 in Fort Pierce, Florida, as the “Alto Lee Adams, Sr., United States Courthouse”; H.R. 2018, the “Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act of 2011”; and the Summary of Legislative and Oversight Activities Committee Report. 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing on the Committee print “Competition for Intercity Passenger Rail in America.” 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on the recently released 2011 Annual Report of the Boards of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, 9:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Joint Committee on the Library, organizational business meeting to consider committee’s rules of procedure and budget for the 112th Congress, 11:30 a.m., SC–6, Capitol.

Joint Committee on Printing, organizational business meeting to consider committee’s rules of procedure and budget for the 112th Congress, 11:30 a.m., SC–6, Capitol.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, to hold hearings to examine addressing ethnic tension in Kyrgyzstan, focusing on the report of the International Commission of Inquiry into the events in Southern Kyrgyzstan in June 2010, 1 p.m., 2118, Rayburn Building.

Joint Economic Committee, to hold hearings to examine manufacturing in the United States, focusing on why we need a national manufacturing strategy, 10:15 a.m., SH–216.
Next Meeting of the Senate
9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 11 a.m.), Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 679, Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act.

Next Meeting of the House of Representatives
9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 22

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of the bills (H.R. 2021) to amend the Clean Air Act regarding air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf activities and (H.R. 1249) to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform (Subject to a Rule).
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