day of Wednesday, May 9, I missed House votes in order to attend the college graduation of my daughter, Elisa. Up to this point, I was proud to boast a 100 percent voting record in the Second Session of the 112th Congress. However, if I had been present for these votes, here is how I would have voted:

Davis (IL) amendment rollcall No. 213 vote no; Grimm amendment rollcall No. 214 vote no; Huizenga amendment rollcall No. 215 vote yes; Johnson (GA) amendment rollcall No. 216 vote no; Flake amendment rollcall No. 217 vote yes; Westmoreland amendment rollcall No. 218 vote yes; Scott (GA) amendment rollcall No. 219 vote yes; Black amendment rollcall No. 220 vote yes; Blackburn amendment rollcall No. 221 vote yes; Broun amendment rollcall No. 222 vote yes; Southerland amendment rollcall No. 223 vote yes; H.R. 2072 rollcall No. 224 vote no; H.R. 4133 rollcall No. 225 vote yes; Chaffetz amendment rollcall No. 226 vote yes; Tierney amendment rollcall No. 227 vote no; Blackburn amendment rollcall No. 228 vote yes; Duncan (SC) amendment rollcall No. 229 vote yes; Garrett amendment rollcall No. 230 vote yes; Schweikert amendment rollcall No. 231 vote yes; Webster amendment rollcall No. 232 vote yes; Flores amendment rollcall No. 233 vote yes; Flores amendment rollcall No. 234 vote yes.

STATEMENT ON SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT RECONCILIATION ACT

HON. DAVID RIVERA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Mr. RIVERA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I am going to vote in favor of the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012 (SRRA) because I firmly believe the government's budget deficit is far too big, bad for the economy, and compromises our Nation's future. Additionally, the automatic across-the-board sequestration enacted last year is not targeted and does not reflect good policy.

Most proposals to reduce the deficit are painful measures, requiring tough choices and trade-offs. On the whole, this legislation is a step in the right direction. It sends an important message about our seriousness in righting the Federal fiscal ship, and includes supportable measures.

But one provision of the bill in particular is inadvisable. The provision that would cut the Federal share of Medicaid in the territories approximately two-thirds through Fiscal Year 2019 should not be included in any budget legislation.

The Federal government already underfunds Medicaid in Puerto Rico and other territories, as the Republican Governors Association has recognized. The territories' Medicaid programs have not provided all services provided in the States and do not cover people who would otherwise be eligible in the States. If Puerto Rico were treated as a State, the Federal share of its Medicaid program would be about 80 percent. The unwise proposal in SSRA would cut the federal share of Puerto Rico's program by 65 percent, with the territory left to cover the bulk of the program with local funds. This inequitable treatment would not stand in any of the 50 states, and it should not be imposed on Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico and other territories do not have votes in the Federal system. This imposes on us a responsibility to ensure that their needs are met.

While I will be casting a yes vote for the SRRA today, I urge removal of this provision unfairly treating Puerto Rico's Federal Medicaid Funding. 4 million American Citizens in Puerto Rico deserve equal treatment as those living in the States.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Lewis-Johnson amendment to H.R. 5326, the Fiscal Year 2013 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill. This amendment prevents funds in the FY13 CJS Appropriations bill from being used to shut down the regional Department of Justice Antitrust Division Offices in Atlanta, Dallas, Cleveland, and Philadelphia. These closures will have a serious adverse effect upon antitrust enforcement in 21 states including Texas, and my district in particular. The Dallas Antitrust Office has been responsible for approximately $1 billion in criminal fines to date. It has been a priority of this Administration to reign in waste, fraud, and abuse, and that is exactly what the Dallas Antitrust office has been doing.

Mr. Chair, I would ask to submit into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my April 23, 2012, letter to Attorney General Holder highlighting the critical role the Dallas Field Office serves upholding vital antitrust laws in our region and the United States.

APRIL 23, 2011.

Hon. ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr.,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In October 2011, the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) announced its plans to close the Dallas Antitrust Division Field Office. The Dallas Field Office is joined by three other offices planned for closure in Atlanta, Cleveland, and Philadelphia. I strongly oppose this proposal and believe that millions of Americans and many U.S. companies across multiple states stand to be severely impacted by this closure.

The Dallas Field Office serves Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, and Oklahoma in enforcing antitrust laws. By closing the Dallas Field Office and reassigning those enforcement positions to the remaining field offices, the Department is seriously curtailing the government's ability to enforce lawful business practices. DOJ's Antitrust Division has an extensive history of promoting fair competition in the marketplace. Shuttering the Dallas Field Office will significantly undo the progress that has been made during this Administration, paving the way for future corruption and abuse.

In DOJ's October 2011 press release, you cite the potential cost savings of nearly $8 million as one of the primary factors behind this decision. I respectfully reject any arguments for cost savings in this context, particularly because there is a failure to consider the millions of dollars that the Dallas Field Office has brought in through criminal fines. While the Dallas Office costs roughly $3.5 million to operate each year, it has returned approximately $1 billion in criminal fines to date. These gains do not include criminal fines levied through the Atlanta, Cleveland, or Philadelphia field offices. Thus, closure of the Dallas Field Office is short-sighted for both long-term enforcement of federal antitrust laws, and the lost revenues that criminal penalties bring back to the American people.

Another aspect of your reasoning centers around consolidating offices in order to focus on larger international investigations. Aside from the obvious implications that this would have for local or regional enforcement of antitrust laws, history has demonstrated the ongoing need to keep that focus at home in a similar, if not greater, capacity. The Dallas Field Office has served a vital role in numerous cases here in the U.S., while still managing to have an effective international presence, as demonstrated in the case of Hoffman-LaRoche. The $500 million fine paid by the global healthcare company still represents the largest criminal fine ever collected by the Antitrust Division or Department of Justice.

Understanding this, I am respectfully requesting additional insight into the agency's rationale behind this proposal. The Dallas Field Office serves a critical role in upholding vital antitrust laws in the United States. Closing this office will open the doors for further violations of federal antitrust and competitive bidding laws.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact Justin Maturo of my staff at Justin.Maturo@mail.house.gov or (202) 225–8885.

Sincerely,

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETTY SUTTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of the Export-Import Bank, I regret that I was delayed in a constituent meeting and unable to reach the floor to cast my vote on rollcall No. 224, and I am glad to see it passed overwhelmingly, as I have advocated for. Had I not been delayed, I would have voted "yes," consistent with my position of working to create jobs and economic opportunities for working families.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference.