United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2011 No. 84

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 13, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM MCCLINTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

On this day we ask Your blessing on the men and women, citizens all, whose votes have populated this people's House. Each Member of this House has been given the sacred duty of representing them.

O Lord, we pray that those with whom our Representatives met during this past week in their home districts be blessed with peace and an assurance that they have been listened to.

We ask Your blessing as well on the Members of this House, whose responsibility lies also beyond the local interests of constituents while honoring them. Give each Member the wisdom to represent both local and national interests, a responsibility calling for the wisdom of Solomon. Grant them, if You will, a double portion of such wisdom.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. RIGELL 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.

EXPRESSING DEEP CONCERN OVER THE PRESIDENT'S STANCE ON JOB CREATION

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, recently the President said this about our most recent new jobs numbers that were greatly disappointing: ''People and the markets are still skittish and nervous, and so they pull back because they're still thinking about the traumas of just 2½ years ago.''

Mr. Speaker, I want the President to know that American entrepreneurs and job creators are not looking to the past. Entrepreneurs and job creators by their very nature are looking to the future, and all they see, Mr. Speaker, is the perfect storm of uncertainty based on the President's fiscal policies: They see an EPA that is a hindrance—not a partner—in job creation; they see a nationalized health care that's creating uncertainty about health care costs and where that's going; they see a mountain of debt that continues to grow each and every day; and they see local bankers who aren't hiring local account executives to reach out to small business owners, but they're hiring those account executives to go out and look at regulations that are just continuing to pour down on our small banks.

Thomas Friedman wrote this in the New York Times this weekend; he said: The epidemic of uncertainty is one of the principal problems undermining U.S. job growth today.

We can do better, Mr. Speaker. Let's support and unlock the greatest job-producing engine the world has ever known: the American small business owner.

HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY PROMOTES 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 of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Friday marks the 1-year anniversary of the current administration's ''Recovery Summer.'' The 3-month ''victory lap'' was designed to celebrate the fabricated success of the so-called ''stimulus'' plan. The reality of this victory lap is failure. Since passage of the stimulus, America has lost 1.6 million jobs.

Sadly, earlier this month, the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced more families are without jobs. The failed economic policies of this administration, with skyrocketing gas prices promised by the President, have slowed the growth of small businesses. These are America's primary job creators, especially the hospitality industry of hotels and motels which have promoted job opportunities for millions of persons across the country.

Tragically, over 14 million Americans are now without jobs. House Republicans presented the ''Cut and

Printed on recycled paper.

Grow'' congressional plan. It's common sense. First cut spending, then the economy will grow. That is the best way to produce jobs by small businesses.

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

CONGRESSIONAL PAY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

(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, I rise today to ask whether Congress can raise itself to the standard of accountability of your home State, the State of California, that was set there recently.

On April 15 of this year, I introduced the Congressional Pay Accountability Act of 2011, a bill that requires Congress to pass a budget and appropriations bills before the beginning of the fiscal year. If we don't, we don't get paid.

I introduced this bill because if Congress is unable to perform its basic fundamental duties—to pass the budget and appropriations bills—we aren't doing our job and should be held accountable and should not get paid.

Recently, I read that California voters approved a ballot measure that requires the same thing of their State legislators—pass a budget or don't get paid. California voters, facing one of the worst budget crises in U.S. history, spoke up and said that they wanted to hold their elected officials accountable.

As America faces the worst debt crisis in its history, I hope Congress can stand up and declare that we, too, want to be held accountable.

Ask yourselves: If California can do it, why can't Congress do it?

□ 1410

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2055, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2055.

□ 1412

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. MCCLINTOCK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 2, 2011, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment from page 2, line 8, through page 60, line 9.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICA

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

Page 9, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(decreased by $25,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor this afternoon to present an amendment that would transfer $25 million from one of the accounts, that is the NATO Security Investment Program, to the Military Construction Army National Guard Account. I take this action for several reasons.

First, in our State of Florida, we have at least two projects that are very important to the operation of the National Guard. Our men and women who belong to the National Guard, not only in Florida but across the Nation, deserve an upgrade in their facilities. We have several projects that have gone on for years and years. One of the projects I understand has had difficulty in the contract falling apart. Nonetheless, whether it is in Florida, again, in south Florida, central Florida, or in any State, we should adequately fund the account that protects and provides the accommodations necessary for the facilities for our National Guard. So here we want to plus-up by $25 million from the NATO Security Investment Program to our National Guard facilities. Across the country I hear the same thing—that National Guard facilities, many of which are two or three times older than those who are serving there, need replacement.

So this is a general amount, $25 million, but I believe that it can help boost up the facilities account that is so important for Florida and for the Nation. I am willing to work with the committee in any fashion to plus-up this account. I am not trying to pick on NATO, although I believe that there is room in their budget to transfer these funds without doing any damage. I would ask my colleagues to consider this amendment.

I thank the committee. I usually don't get into other folks' turf, particularly military construction. I deal mostly with transportation in the House, and I understand the difficulty sometimes when other Members come in and try to manage some of the important dollars that are made available. I know the difficult choices that the committee has in trying to assign appropriate dollars, particularly for defense facilities construction.

Again, I won't just take up the House's time in unnecessary conversation, but it is a simple matter. We transfer $25 million from the NATO security investment account to fund military construction for our National Guard. We have the need across the Nation. It is evident in every State where we have National Guard activities. This isn't a great amount, but I think it can make a significant difference on a number of projects throughout the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would decrease the NATO Security Investment Program by $25 million and increase the Army National Guard account by $25 million. We support the Guard and our Reserves wholeheartedly, but I want to join Chairman CULBERSON in some concerns that I have about the amendment.

The MilCon portion of this bill for the most part is flat-funded, and the resources provided in this title were distributed, we believe, in a very judicious manner. The bill funds the Guard account at the budget request level, which makes the needed investments in Guard facilities.

In addition, I am concerned that the offset that the gentleman has chosen could cause shortfalls in the NATO Security Investment Program, which in turn could cause further delays in the NATO Security Construction Program. The Security Investment Program provides support for many of the important operations that we are involved in, including our current operations in Afghanistan. I believe that we have to get the NATO program back on track because it will ultimately save us money in the long run.

□ 1420

While I agree with the spirit of the amendment, I do have some concerns about the gentleman's amendment. I won't oppose it at this time, but I hope that we will be able to work through those concerns as we work through this process and as the bill goes to the Senate and it comes back and we can deal with these concerns in conference.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Florida, our distinguished chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, that we need to do everything we can to support our National Guard. I look forward to working with the gentleman in conference.

We will accept the amendment, again, as an expression of our support for making sure that our National Guard and Reserve components have all the support they need. But we'll work with the chairman in conference to see if we can find the best source of funding for this addition plus-up on the National Guard. We, of course, want to make sure that they're not only taken care of in the State of Florida but around the Nation.

I know the chairman shares my concern with border security. The National Guard plays a vital role in helping our Border Patrol agents and in helping all of our law enforcement and Homeland Security folks in securing the border. So we want to make sure those elements of the National Guard's role in securing our Nation's borders are fully funded as well.

So we will accept the amendment at this time.

Mr. MICA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Thank you.

Again, I want to thank Mr. CULBERSON for his leadership and for his willingness to work with us, both sides of the aisle. Again, if it is necessary to take funds from another account—and we chose NATO in this instance for this amendment—we would welcome any assistance in plussing-up our National Guard facilities and construction accounts.

So, again, thank you so much for your leadership—I know you have difficult choices and I know the people that serve in our National Guard are grateful for your leadership—and also for accepting the amendment at this time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, again, we accept the amendment and move its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 414. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, or to make a grant to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal or State law within the preceding 24 months.

SEC. 415. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce Executive Order 13502 (41 U.S.C. 251 note), FAR Rule 2009–005, or any agency memorandum, bulletin, or contracting policy that derives its authority from Executive Order 13502 or FAR Rule 2009–005.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, strike lines 16 through 21.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. This is a simple, straightforward amendment.

During the committee markup of the Military Construction bill, under the able leadership of the subcommittee chairman, an amendment was offered by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona to deny funding to the President's Executive order dealing with project labor agreements. The matter was accepted by voice vote. It was accepted by voice vote because, quite frankly, I couldn't rustle up enough votes in the committee to overturn it.

However, this continues a pattern that we've seen in this Congress. I believe we've had on the floor four votes on whether or not Davis-Bacon should be the law of the land. In each one of the cases, the proponents of Davis-Bacon have been successful, the last one garnering 52 Republican votes. This would be the third vote by those who would wish to do away with project labor agreements that will occur on the House floor. In the previous two, again, the proponents of project labor agreements have prevailed. In the last instance, 28 Republicans were, in fact, supportive of project labor agreements.

Mr. Chairman, basically, project labor agreements are those agreements wherein someone who is doing a construction project determines that they want to have an all-encompassing universal agreement that covers the construction from start to finish. If union labor is involved, it denies unions the ability to strike. It denies the contractor the ability to lock out. Wages are set. Terms are set. Conditions are set. And, quite frankly, the project labor agreements have been resounding successes.

As a matter of fact, project labor agreements, 90 percent of them are used by private industry. Some of the biggest users of project labor agreements are the Disney Corporation and, in fact, Walmart. So neither of those companies have ever been sort of identified as big labor-loving organizations.

Now, this is a backdoor piece of language in line 16 to 21 because it doesn't attack project labor agreements. What it does is, if you go back and look in February when President Obama enacted this Executive order, he said: I don't know which is going to be better and which is going to be cheaper, based upon the size of the project, where the project is located, what it is we want to get done.

So funds are appropriated to the agencies. Say it's the Department of Veterans Affairs and they're going build a new hospital. You say, Department of Veterans Affairs, you study which is going to bring that project in at the best quality, the best price, on time, and giving the taxpayer the best bang for his or her buck.

Well, this amendment strikes that funding. And so it doesn't say you can't use project labor agreements. What it does say is that the agency can't make that comparison. And if you're not making that comparison to find out which is better for the taxpayer, which is in fact going to cause the project to come in at the lowest cost and with the best quality and under time, then it has nothing to do with saving the taxpayer money.

We hear a lot about these are tough times and we have to tighten our belts. I agree with that. I voted for that consistently. But that is just union bashing. This is just saying we don't want to know whether a project labor agreement can develop a project that is cheaper, of better quality, and under time.

Quite frankly, although there are studies on both sides, there is an organization called ABC. They have a study that shows that it adds so much cost. You have a study by organized labor that says it reduces so much cost. I choose not to look at either of those because each of those folks and organizations, quite frankly, have some skin in the fight and have some incentive, if you will, to look at the data one way or another.

I would go with our nonpartisan, bipartisan Congressional Research Service, which last October was asked to study this issue, and they indicated, quite frankly, that the jury is out and, if anything, the data indicates that they really can't say and they can't find any convincing data as to whether or not project labor agreements save money or don't save money, which really is the genius of the President's Executive order because it says you should study it.

Quite frankly, the CRS goes on to indicate that in those areas of the country where there's a lot of organized labor, the project labor agreements tend to bring these projects in on time, under cost, with better quality. In those areas of the country which aren't heavily unionized, the opposite is, in fact, true.

So with the jury being out and all of us wanting to achieve the greatest savings for the taxpayer and build good, quality projects in the military construction account which benefits our men and women in uniform, why would we deny the departments the opportunity to study which way is cheaper, better, more effective, and with a better quality? So there's only one reason. It's to continue this constant drumbeat of: We hate unions. And that's not a good reason to have this language in the bill.

I urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. This is a straightforward vote to the House about whether or not we will, on behalf of American taxpayers, vote to impose union collective bargaining requirements on any private company doing business with the Federal Government. The Executive order that our bill does not fund and the amendment attempts to strike, language in our bill which does not fund this Executive order, the Executive order says that ''in awarding any contract in connection with a large-scale construction project, the administration may require the use of a project labor agreement.''

□ 1430

A project labor agreement, under the Executive order's own definition, means a pre-hire collective bargaining agreement with one or more labor organizations. So the Obama administration through this Executive order is attempting to unionize any private company in America that wants to do business with the Federal Government. That's just an outrage.

Again, in looking at a Wall Street Journal editorial from April 14 of 2010, it reiterates data that is widely available and that has been repeatedly verified: that only about 15 percent of the Nation's construction workers are unionized. So from now on, under this Executive order, the other 85 percent of America's construction workers will have to give up the opportunity to work on a Federal project, or not be unionized.

This is just a blatant attempt by the Obama administration to impose union collective bargaining on any private company in America that wants to do business with the Federal Government. If indeed the idea were to reduce the costs, that's fine. We are in an era of austerity unlike anything this Nation has ever experienced. We confront record debt, record deficit, record public debt held by foreign nations. This is unlike anything we have ever seen before.

As I showed when we debated this bill earlier, just before the break, every single dollar of Federal revenue that comes in the door is already spent on existing social welfare programs. In fact, 104 percent of Federal income is obligated to pay for the existing social safety net. Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, veterans' benefits, and interest on the national debt consume 104 percent of our Nation's income. Therefore, America is living on borrowed money, and it is our obligation as stewards of the Treasury to ensure that we do not waste any of these precious dollars and that we cut spending everywhere we possibly can so that we do everything within our power to limit the atrocious debt burden that we are passing on to our children and grandchildren. This is an unacceptable direction the Nation is taking because of uncontrolled spending by previous Congresses.

Why would we voluntarily, knowingly, allow our kids and grandkids to pay, as The Wall Street Journal points out and as the Veterans Administration discovered, and why would we voluntarily pay 12 to 14 percent more for construction contracts? In a study they did, the VA discovered, when they looked at the construction costs for hospitals in three of five markets, the cost of construction would jump by as much as 9 percent. The Beacon Hill Institute at Boston Suffolk University in 2006 said, when you impose these project labor agreements, it will increase school construction costs by 12 to 14 percent. Why would we voluntarily do that?

This amendment must be defeated. This amendment is an effort to prevent Congress from saving precious tax dollars. If this amendment passes, the Obama administration will be able to impose collective bargaining on any private company that wants to do business with the Federal Government. I strongly urge Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, as much as I agree with many of the objectives expressed by the chairman in his discussion just a few moments ago, particularly that we want to make the most efficient use of taxpayer dollars, I think the very arguments that he makes support why we need to have project labor agreements.

This has nothing to do with union or nonunion workforce standards. The project labor agreements do not mandate or predetermine that a workforce has to be union or nonunion. It allows for the project owner, such as the government or a private sector entity, to establish workforce standards that both union and nonunion workers have to meet in order to be hired by contractors and subcontractors under the project labor agreements.

This is a model that increases the efficiency and the quality of construction projects. Of course the ultimate objective is that we will have a workforce that will ensure construction projects are built correctly the first time so that we won't have cost overruns, so that they are built on time, so that we won't have to extend the contracts, and so that we won't have safety problems because of having unskilled workers. Basically, in the awarding of these contracts, these project labor agreements will make sure that the government's money is spent well. We want to get the most bang for taxpayer bucks. We want to make sure we make the most efficient use of taxpayer dollars.

There has been study after study after study that illustrates how the use of these project labor agreements does not extend costs to the taxpayers or to other projects—rather, that they often save money. In fact, in most cases, they do save money because, as a result of having a higher skilled workforce, they don't have to worry about equipment being broken; they don't have to worry about the waste of resources and materials; they don't have to worry about the contracts not being performed on time. It's to the contrary. If you're worried about protections, project labor agreements will prohibit strikes or work stoppages by any kind of construction workers on the project. They will establish a single procedure for handling workforce disputes.

It is a tool for ensuring that large and complex projects, as many of our government projects are, are completed on time. It allows for the employment of local citizens. And right now, with the unemployment rate as it is and with so many of our skilled workers out of work, it allows for flexibility.

The Executive order, which seems to be the source of the complaint, really does not require that they be used. It gives the government the option of making a decision that is in the best interest of the American taxpayers. Certainly, we want to do everything that we can possibly do to make sure that we come in on budget or under budget, with the highest quality, with the safest work environment, and that we are able to employ the people in our communities to get the job done. As much as we need to improve employment, to increase the number of people who are working, these project labor agreements just add another tool to allow, in the awarding of taxpayer funded contracts, the most efficient use of those dollars. So I join the gentleman in support of this amendment. I think it is well thought out and that it's a benefit to the taxpayers.

With all due respect to my colleague on the other side who is opposed to this amendment, I think, when it is all said and done, the bottom line is these project labor agreements in this Executive order, while not requiring the use of project labor agreements, will be an added tool in our arsenal to get the most bang for taxpayer bucks to enhance what we do for our country, for our citizens whom we put to work, and to make sure that the conditions and terms of their employment and the work that they do is done with appropriate standards.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank my colleague from Ohio for introducing this amendment and, once again, for this dialogue on an important issue.

I will remind my colleague that, although he brings up the fact that this has been decided in the Chamber twice already in other similar circumstances, it's not really the same because, last Friday, of course, we found out that our unemployment rate is rising in the country. It's now 9.1 percent again. We only created 54,000 jobs, not the 200,000 jobs we'd hoped we would create and certainly much fewer than the 150,000 jobs we need to create in order to get back to full employment. That's how many we need to create every month.

What this amendment means, very simply, is that we are going to have to spend 10 to 20 percent more on every single project that ends up in a project labor agreement—and more projects will. If more projects wouldn't, then the advocates wouldn't care about whether we put this provision in. It clearly will result in project labor agreements, so let's review what a project labor agreement does.

First and foremost, it increases the cost 10 to 20 percent on every project. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you or I or people in my congressional district were going to contract to build something around their homes, they wouldn't put a provision in normally that says that we're only going to hire union contractors.

□ 1440

They will go out. They will get the bids. They will go out. They will seek to find out what the reputations of the bidders are, and then they will make the decision based purely on price and quality and value whether or not to make that deal, not whether someone is a member of a union or hires union laborers; but that's what a project labor agreement does.

So let's talk about jobs a little bit. What is our important role here in Congress? Our role in Congress is to try to get our unemployment rate up. Well, if we save 10 to 20 percent on every job, we certainly can do more construction jobs. I just met over lunch with one of the people in my district who is an electrical contractor and he's not unionized, and he asked me to come down here and he said, please, go to the floor today and ask so that those 80 percent, or 7 percent, of us who are contractors who are not unionized can get a piece of that pie so that we don't have to fire our employees.

Mr. Chairman, it's simple. If we can save 10 to 20 percent on every project, we can hire 10 to 20 percent more people to do more projects. And again, the sad fact is our unemployment rate is 9.1 percent. It's going up, not down. The number of new jobs created last month, 54,000, going down, not up. We've got to reverse that, and we've got to do it by being efficient and being smart with our dollars, and one way is to not require project labor agreements.

Finally, let me address the issue of local citizens. I want these contracts to go into the First Congressional District of Maryland; but, Mr. Chairman, I don't have a lot of union contractors in my district. There are a lot of districts that don't have a lot of union contractors. So if we want local contractors to be employed, if we want local citizens to get jobs, our local unemployment rates to go down, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest we defeat this amendment, which will frequently require that in order to qualify for a contract you have to hire out of district. You may have to go to another State. That's not good for anyone, certainly not good for the folks in the First Congressional District of Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, again, I want to thank my colleague from Ohio for bringing this issue up, but we do need to revisit this issue because we don't live in the same world we lived in one week ago. We live in a world where the talk of the double-dip recession is sincere and it's serious and our unemployment rate going up, not down; the number of jobs going down, not up. The last thing we should do is to take those hard-earned taxpayer dollars and to use them, and I will say to waste them, in some circumstances, on project labor agreements.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. The gentleman's amendment would strike the provision in the bill prohibiting the use of project labor agreements on any project funded in this bill. PLAs are a benefit to both employers and unions. They provide uniform wages, benefits, overtime. A PLA sets the terms and conditions of employment for all workers on site, including work conditions and rules. In addition, a PLA prohibits strikes and work stoppages. A PLA provides a single collective bargaining unit which allows for easier management of a project.

Executive order 13502 only encourages executive agencies to consider the use of project labor agreements. There is no requirement to use a PLA. It should be up to the agency and project manager if the use of a PLA is appropriate for their particular project. And I was pleased that the chairman, Mr. CULBERSON, read the language and it says ''may,'' not ''shall.''

Two weeks ago during the consideration of the FY 2012 Homeland Security appropriations bill, an amendment was offered to prohibit the Department from allowing project labor agreements, and it was defeated. We should support the option on the use of PLAs.

I urge the adoption of the LaTourette amendment.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the distinguished ranking member very much; and, you know, Mr. HARRIS from Maryland is a wonderful new Member, and I enjoyed his remarks very much and his passion, and it would be a compelling argument if his facts were correct.

The difficulty is no one on this floor would support project labor agreements if the evidence was that project labor agreements increased the cost of a construction project by 10 to 20 percent. The study cited by Mr. CULBERSON, the chairman of the Subcommittee, by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, concluded that the effect of PLAs on construction costs was strongly influenced by the degree of unionization in an area. In highly unionized cities, the costs of a PLA are less and the project comes in under cost, under time, better quality. And those that don't have, as apparently the First District of Maryland doesn't have as many unions, the evidence does, in fact, come in; in some of those cases costs can increase by 5 to 9 percent, not 10 to 20.

But the problem with this language is, it doesn't condemn project labor agreements. This is an appropriations bill. What this amendment does is deprive the agency of the funds to study in your area—my area happens to be heavily unionized, so Cleveland, Ohio—prevents the VA from studying whether or not use of the PLA would save the government money or cost the government money.

And I've got to tell you, if the conclusion is that it's going to cost the government money, it's like ''I Love Lucy'' and Ricky Ricardo. I mean, I'm sure that somebody is going to ask the head of that agency, you know, you've got a lot of explaining to do why you went with a program that's going to cost the government more money.

That isn't what this is about. This is union bashing. This isn't costing or saving money. It's just we don't like unions, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment, and I completely agree with him. I don't think there's any evidence that except for some of the people like the Wall Street Journal who say this, I don't see any evidence of it; and as the gentleman says, if there was evidence, Congress would not approve of project labor agreements.

So I, again, rise in strong support of the LaTourette amendment and urge that it be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm here today in opposition to this amendment, and I've heard a lot of the compelling arguments here today as to why this amendment should be adopted.

Well, first, let me remind the Members that the Appropriations Committee passed the language that's in this bill right now that restricts funding from going to projects that require

project labor agreements. That's all this does, and I think we should all be for it. We should all be for free markets. We should all be for capitalism, for the best contractor competing against the best contractor and putting up the best price for the project.

Now, they said that there were reports cited in The Wall Street Journal, and I just happen to have what The Wall Street Journal cited, and they did cite the independent study that was commissioned by the Department of Veterans Affairs that says in the study, the Obama project labor agreement would likely raise the VA construction costs for hospitals by as much as 9 percent in three of the five markets. So it's clear that there is a study by an independent organization there that says costs will go up.

Now, can we not accept that as evidence enough that we do not need project labor agreements as a mandate to receive the funding for projects throughout this Nation? I mean, we live in a day and a time in which the debt and deficit are out of control, and it seems to be what we spend our arguments about and our debates about is spending, and that's an important topic. But the number one issue facing this Nation right now is the economy and the job losses.

Mr. HARRIS, he was so eloquent as he was talking about unemployment, 9.1 percent now. We all know that. We're here on the celebration of the 1 year since the beginning of the summer of recovery, and yet we don't see any recovery.

These project labor agreement requirements by the executive order were placed in effect in 2009; and as Mr. BISHOP referenced, you know, this was good for jobs, good for creating local jobs. Well, where are the jobs? They do not exist. In essence, we've had 2 years of a failed experiment, Mr. Chairman; and I think it's time to say, you know what, look, the experiment didn't work, let's put it up on the shelf, and let's try something new. Let's go back to what we know works and that's empowering the private sector, empowering the free markets, allow competition to thrive, allow costs to come down and the quality of goods to go up.

I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, when I go home, it pains me to see the new ''For Sale'' signs that are up, the new ''For Rent'' signs that go up each and every time, and I'm sure we see it in each and every one of our districts as we go home. And oftentimes previously, 4 or 5 years ago, you might see a vacancy in a shop because they had moved out, because they had expanded their operations and they were moving up. But now it's just the opposite. We know that businesses are not moving out and expanding as much as they once did. Instead, they're shutting down and closing the doors and that ''For Rent'' or ''For Sale'' sign goes up.

It's time to reverse that back, and we know how to do that. It is so simple; it is so clear. Why it binds this Congress up, I have no idea, when our Nation was founded on such great principles as we have been founded on and yet over the years we feel like we can manipulate the marketplaces, just like the project labor agreement requirements are going to do as well.

Mr. Chairman, I say we defeat this amendment, and we think about that 1-year anniversary here of that summer of recovery declaration from last year. And I know there was a lot of hope that that summer of recovery would occur; but the one thing that is true, Mr. Chairman, is you cannot change the facts, and the facts are clear. Americans are ready to be empowered with new jobs and employment. The only way we can do that, though, is to empower the private sector, and let's get government out of the way to do it.

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

□ 1450

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the LaTourette amendment. But before I get into the details, I would like to speak to the comments that were just made.

I happen to have the privilege of serving currently on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and I would say to any Member of Congress who would like to know about the thousands of jobs that were, in fact, created and maintained through the American Recovery Act, I would be more than happy to give them a copy of that document. Let me move into, though, the topic that is at hand, which is really the LaTourette amendment, which is not in reference to the American Recovery Act.

I strongly speak in support of this amendment because, one, it protects American jobs; two, it completes projects safely; and, three, it oftentimes saves the taxpayers money. The LaTourette amendment ensures that funds for large-scale construction projects utilize the most cost-effective and efficient process for the awarding of Federal contracts. Section 415 of H.R. 2055 prohibits agencies from being able to use all available methods to ensure that Federal contracts are cost efficient, including the utilization of project labor agreements.

Our ranking member, Mr. DICKS, just recently spoke a few moments ago about section 415, and I will only reiterate two points: One, section 1, subsection (b) says, ''Accordingly, it is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage executive agencies to consider requiring the use of project labor agreements.'' Section 3, subsection (a) says, ''In awarding any contract, executive agencies may, on a project-by-project basis.'' And then finally, section 5 says, ''This order does not require an executive agency to use a project labor agreement.''

So, if we're going to speak on the floor of this House, it's important, if we're going to talk about facts, let's actually say those facts. So this dispels the myth that Executive Order 13502 makes requirements in the awarding of Federal contracts.

Now let's talk a little bit about those project labor agreements.

There is no substantial evidence that says that PLAs decrease the number of bidders on a project or increase the costs of construction projects. In fact, project labor agreements promote cost-effectiveness and efficiency in those construction projects. Having project labor agreements prevents labor disputes; it eliminates project delays and, thereby, helps us to get the projects done.

We can all talk about facts and figures and dates and sections, but I would like to talk about what's happening in my district. I know from firsthand experience that project labor agreements work. In California, we have seen project labor agreements negotiated and implemented with incredible success.

There have been many who have talked about project labor agreements. Here are just a few of the many examples of successful project labor agreements in California:

One, the construction of the L.A. Metro's Blue Line; number two, the expansion and renovation of the Los Angeles World Airports; the recent Middle Harbor Project at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, which are the largest ports in this country; and then, finally, the $2.2 billion Alameda Corridor Project. That was a project that was completed on time and under budget.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask respectfully that Mr. LATOURETTE's amendment would be found in order and that all of our colleagues will join in support of it.

Finally, I would just like to say, for those who say that PLAs drive up the cost of construction, if they would say that, then we would simply ask: Why is it that Walmart is increasingly using PLAs and Toyota Motor Corporation has built every one of its North American manufacturing facilities under a project labor agreement?

So, when we talk about this, Mr. LATOURETTE has been a leader on this issue. I strongly support his amendment. I stand in lockstep.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. First of all, I want to thank the gentlewoman very much. I want the body to know that Ms. RICHARDSON was going to offer this amendment and, over the weekend, permitted me to offer it as a member of the committee. I appreciate that very much. She is certainly a champion of PLAs.

I want to address the gentleman from Georgia's observations because he is

exactly right, and it doesn't change anything that I said.

The VA said that you should study both PLAs and non-PLAs based upon the area of the country. Now, he is correct. The VA study said that in three of the five that they studied, PLAs would have increased labor costs. It doesn't say anything about the benefit from having increased quality, on time, and all that other business.

But what happened to the other two? In 40 percent of them, the answer is either there was no difference or they reduced costs, which is exactly the point. The amendment strikes out the language inserted in the bill by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) that would prevent an agency from studying which way gets you the bigger bang for the buck. Why would we want to do that?

I thank the gentlelady.

Ms. RICHARDSON. All of us in Congress are looking for ways to rein in the deficit.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I strongly support the LaTourette amendment.

PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENT ACTIVITY IN CALIFORNIA 1984 THROUGH MARCH 2010

This is a working list maintained by Kevin Dayton, Government Affairs Director of Associated Builders and Contractors of California. Identification comes from primary documents as well as secondary sources that include web sites, union publications, and newspaper articles. PLAs on private projects are often not publicized, so this list may not include all PLAs imposed on refineries, power plants, industrial facilities, and housing projects.

LARGE INFRASTRUCTURE

IMPLEMENTED

Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority—Blue Line—1984.

San Joaquin Hills Transportation Corridor—1993.

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California—Eastside (Domenigoni) Reservoir Project—1994.

Contra Costa Water District—Los Vaqueros Reservoir Project—Three Components—1994–1995.

Contra Costa Water District—Ralph D. Bollman Water Treatment Plant Upgrade—1995.

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California—Inland Feeder Project—1996.

San Francisco International Airport Expansion and Renovation—1996.

U.S. Department of Energy—Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories—National Ignition Facility—1997.

Sacramento Regional Transit District—South Corridor Extension—1998.

Alameda County Transportation Authority—Alameda Corridor Project—1998.

Los Angeles to Pasadena Metro Construction Authority—Gold Line—1998.

Los Angeles Department of Public Works—Hyperion Full Secondary Treatment Plant—1998.

Port of Oakland Maritime and Aviation Expansion and Renovation—1999.

Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation District—Seismic Retrofit Phase I—1999.

San Diego County Water Authority—Emergency Storage Project—1999.

Los Angeles World Airports Expansion and Renovation—2000.

Contra Costa Water District—Multi-Purpose Pipeline Project—2000.

Los Angeles Department of Public Works—East Central Interceptor Sewer and Northeast Interceptor Sewer—2000.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—Pier 400 Phase II—2002.

San Jose International Airport Expansion and Renovation—2002.

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California—Capital Program—2003.

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District—Affholder, Inc. (a general contractor) signed for Lower Northwest Interceptor Northern and Southern Sacramento River Tunnel Crossings—2004.

San Diego County Water Authority—Policy to Consider PLAs for Projects Over $100 Million—2005.

Contra Costa Water District—Brentwood Water Treatment Plant—2005.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—Berths 90–91 Cruise Terminal Baggage Handling Building—2006.

Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District—Three contractors signed for Napa River Flood Protection Project—2006.

City of San Francisco—Measure A—Water System Improvement Program (Hetch Hetchy)—2007.

Contra Costa Water District—Alternative Intake Project—2007.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—Berth 408 Liquid Bulk Petroleum Terminal—2008.

Port of Long Beach—Middle Harbor Project—2010.

NEGOTIATIONS APPROVED

East Bay Municipal Utility District—Supplemental Water Supply Project—1999.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—All Future Projects on Port Property—2008.

PROPOSED

Temperance Flat Dam—Madera/Fresno Counties—2002.

Contra Costa Water District—Los Vaqueros Reservoir Expansion—2003.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—Berth 93C–94 Boardwalk—2003.

San Francisco International Airport—West Field Cargo Redevelopment Project—2003.

City of Santa Paula—Wastewater Treatment Plant—2008.

City of Long Beach—Airport Expansion—2009.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority—Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension—2009.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED

Los Osos Community Services District—Wastewater Project—2003.

San Diego County Water Authority—Twin Oaks Valley Water Treatment Plant—2005.

Palmdale Water District—All Work—2007.

Central Marin Sanitation Agency—Wet Weather Improvement Project—2007.

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority—Terminal 2 Expansion—2009.

PROHIBITED BY PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDER 13202

Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation District—Seismic Retrofit Phase II—2001.

East Bay Municipal Utility District—Walnut Creek-San Ramon Valley Improvement Project—2001.

Sacramento Regional Transit District—Folsom Line Extension—2001.

Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Agency—Interstate 405 Improvements—2006.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—Highway Improvements to Harry Bridges Boulevard—2010.

MUNICIPAL

IMPLEMENTED

City of Los Angeles—Convention Center—1990.

Contra Costa County—Merrithew Memorial Regional Medical Center—1994.

City of West Sacramento—Palamidessi Bridge—1995.

City of Concord—Police Station—1995.

City of Sacramento—Sump 2 Improvement Project—1998.

City of Concord—Concord Avenue Parking Garage—1999.

Contra Costa County—Family Law Center—2001.

Contra Costa County—All Work Over $1 Million (revised—original policy never implemented)—2002/2003.

Solano County—Government Center and Parking Garage—2002.

City of San Jose—City Hall/Civic Center—2002.

Contra Costa County—Two Small Renovation Projects in Richmond and Antioch—2002.

Contra Costa County—New Discovery House Facility—2003.

City of San Mateo—New Main Library—2004.

Santa Clara County—Valley Specialty Center Bid Package 2—2004.

City of Carson—All General Contracts over $125,000, All Specialty Contracts over $25,000—2005.

City of Santa Cruz—West Coast Santa Cruz Hotel and Conference Center Redevelopment—2005.

Santa Clara County—Gilroy Valley, Fair Oaks, and Milpitas Health Centers; New Crime Lab—2005.

Santa Clara County—Required Staff Analysis of PLA Benefits for Projects Over $10 Million—2005.

Los Angeles Department of Public Works—New Police Headquarters, Metro Detention Center, Harbor Area Police Station and Jail Facility, Fire Station 64, Hollenback Police Station, Main Street Parking/Motor Transport Division and Aiso Street Parking, Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC) Systems—2005–2009.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—2005–06, 2006–07 Site Improvements—2005.

City of San Fernando—All General Contracts over $150,000, All Specialty Contracts Over $25,000—2005.

City of San Mateo—New Police Station—2005.

El Camino Hospital District—Measure D—Hospital Bldg. Replacement and Central Utility Plant—2005.

City of Milpitas—New Library, Parking Garage, and Other Midtown Projects—2006.

Solano County—All Work Over $10 Million (Threshold Increased from $1 Million Estab. in 2004)—2007.

City of Richmond—Civic Center—2007.

San Joaquin County—New Administration Building—2007.

City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency—All Work—2008.

City of Milpitas—Senior Center—2008.

City of Brentwood—Civic Center—2009.

Solano County—321 Tuolumne Street/Solano Justice Center and 355 Tuolumne Street Renovation—2009.

City of Vallejo—Downtown Parking Garage—2009.

Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District—Future Capital Improvement Projects—2010.

City of Brentwood—Parking Garage—2010.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District—Corporation Yard—2010

NEGOTIATIONS APPROVED

City of Long Beach—All Work—2005, 2007.

Alameda County Medical Center—Highland Hospital Acute Care Tower Replacement—2008.

Alameda County—All Work—2008.

Santa Barbara County—All Work—2010.

PROPOSED

City of San Diego—New Central Library—1999.

City of San Jose—Convention Center Expansion—2002.

City of Union City—Intermodal Station Mixed Use Development Project—2002.

City of Alhambra—West Main Street Corridor Redevelopment—2005.

City of South El Monte—All Work—2007.

City of Los Angeles—All Work—2004, 2008.

City of San Leandro—All Work—2009.

Various Projects in Ventura County (Santa Paula, Fillmore, Oxnard, Piru)—2009.

City of Long Beach—Airport Expansion—2009.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED

City of Sacramento—Sewer Maintenance Building—1996.

City of Pinole—City Hall—1996.

City of Redding—Civic Center—1998.

City of Sacramento—All Work—1998.

City of San Francisco—All Work—1998.

City of West Hollywood—All Work—1999.

City of San Diego Convention Center Expansion—1999.

City of Fresno—All Work—2000.

Sacramento County—Sacramento International Airport Parking Garage—2000.

City of Sacramento—Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant Replacement Intake—2000.

City of Santa Rosa—The Geysers Recharge Project—2000.

City of Santa Rosa—Downtown Hotel and Convention Center—2000.

City of West Sacramento—City Hall/Civic Center—2001.

City of San Diego—SeaWorld Hotel and Expansion—2002.

City of Cupertino—New Library—2003.

City of Watsonville—Civic Center—2004.

City of Gardena—Gardena Transit Facility Project—2006.

City of Fairfield—All Work—2007.

Washington Township Health Care District—Measure FF—Central Plant and Hospital Expansion—2007, 2008.

Imperial County—Green Retrofit Program—2009.

TERMINATED

San Francisco Housing Authority—All Work—1994–2003.

Orange County—All General Contracts over $225,000, All Specialty Contracts over $15,000—2000–2005.

Solano County—All Work Over $1 Million (Threshold Increased to $10 Million on 5/22/07)—2004–2007.

PROHIBITED BY PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDER 13202

City of Richmond—Former Ford Motor Assembly Building.

City of Richmond—Bay Area Rapid Transit Village.

City of Richmond—Former Port Terminal One.

City of Vallejo—Downtown Parking Garage (not built during Bush Administration)—2000.

Orange County—Resurfacing of Santiago Canyon Road.

Los Angeles County/USC Medical Center Replacement Project—2003.

San Mateo County Youth Services Center—2004.

City of Pasadena City Hall Restoration—2004.

Orange County—Glassell Street Bridge Replacement Project—2004.

City of Hayward—Water Pollution Control Facility Improvement Project—Phase 1—2005.

Union City—Union City Intermodal Transit Village—2006.

Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District—MetroBase Project—2006.

PROHIBITED

City of Fresno—All Work (ordinance)—2000.

City of Antioch—All Work (sense of the council resolution)—2002.

Orange County—All Work (ordinance)—2009.

San Diego County—All Work (ordinance)—2010.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR ABANDONED PROHIBITIONS

Riverside County—All Work (ordinance)—2010.

PROPOSED PROHIBITIONS

City of Chula Vista—All Work (June—2010 ballot initiative for proposed ordinance)—2009.

City of San Diego—All Work (qualification for Nov. 2010 ballot initiative for charter amendment)—2009.

City of Oceanside—All Work (June 2010 ballot initiative for new charter)—2009.

City of Roseville—All Work (proposed June 2010 ballot initiative for proposed charter amendment)—2009.

EDUCATIONAL

IMPLEMENTED

Los Angeles Unified School District—Proposition BB, Measure K, Measure R, Measure Q—1999–2009.

West Contra Costa Unified School District—Measure E, Measure M, Measure D—2000–2005.

Vallejo City Unified School District—Measure A—2001.

Los Angeles Community College District—Proposition A—2001.

Rialto Unified School District—District High School #3—2001.

San Mateo Community College District—Proposition C—2002.

San Mateo Union High School District—San Mateo High School Modernization Phases I and II—2002.

Rancho Santiago Community College District (Orange County)—Measure E—2003.

East Side Union High School District (San Jose)—Measure G, Measure E—2003,—2008.

Solano County Community College District—Measure G—Certain Larger Projects—2004.

Oakland Unified School District—Measure A after February 2004 (adopted by administrator)—2004.

Peralta Community College District—Vista Campus (Measure E)—2004.

Hartnell Community College (Salinas)—Measure H—Five Small Contracts—2004.

Pittsburg Unified School District—All Work Over $1 Million/Measure E—2005.

City College of San Francisco—Proposition A after February 2005—2005.

Albany Unified School District—Measure A—2005.

Rio Hondo Community College District (Whittier)—Measure A—2005.

Compton Unified School District—Remainder of Measure I—2005.

Sacramento City Unified School District—Remainder of Measures E and I—2005.

San Jose/Evergreen Community College District—2006.

Mt. Diablo Unified School District—Pilot Project—Prototypical Classrooms 2006 Groups 1 and 2—2006.

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District—Seven Projects Funded by Measure B—2006.

San Leandro Unified School District—Measure B—2007.

Mt. Diablo Unified School District—Certain Projects Over $2 Million for One Year—2007.

Foothill-DeAnza Community College District—Measure C—2008.

College of Marin—Two Large Projects Funded by Measure C—2008.

San Francisco Unified School District—Proposition A (2006)—2008.

Mt. Diablo Unified School District—Classroom Projects and HVAC Work—2008.

John Swett Unified School District—Measure A—2009.

San Mateo Union High School District—Half of Measure M—2009.

San Diego Unified School District—Proposition S (Original and Revised Versions)—2009.

Alum Rock Union Elementary School District (San Jose)—Measure G—2009.

Fremont Union High School District—All Outdoor Atheletic Facilities—2009.

Hayward Unified School District—Measure I—2009.

Peralta Community College District—Berkeley City College Build-Out, Phase 2—2009.

Sacramento City Unified School District—All Projects More Than $1 Million—Four-Year Renewal—2009.

Riverside Community College District—Remainder of Measure C—2010.

NEGOTIATIONS APPROVED

Alisal Union School District (Salinas)—New High School—Not Built.

Contra Costa Community College District—Measure A (2006)—2006.

Centinela Valley Union High School District (Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Lennox)—Measure CV—2009.

San Gabriel Unified School District—Future Construction—2010.

PROPOSED

West Valley-Mission Community College District—Measure H—2005, 2008.

San Juan Unified School District—Measure C—2005.

New Haven Unified School District—Measure A—2005.

Konocti Unified School District—Measure G—2005.

Allan Hancock Joint Community College District—Future Construction—2005.

Natomas Unified School District—Measure D—2006.

Napa Valley Unified School District—Measure G—2007.

Jefferson Union High School District—Measure N—2007.

Sweetwater Union High School District—Proposition O—2007.

San Diego Community College District—Proposition N—2007.

Alisal Union School District—Measure A (2006)—2008.

Southwestern Community College District (Chula Vista)—Measure R—2010.

San Bernardino City Unified School District—Future Construction—2010.

Pasadena Unified School District—Future Construction 2010.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED

San Diego Unified School District—Proposition MM—1999.

Sacramento City Unified School District—Six Summer 2000 School Projects—2000.

Grant Joint Union High School District (Sacramento)—2001.

Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District—2001.

Sonoma County Junior College—Measure A—2002.

John Swett Unified School District (Crockett)—New Elementary School—2002.

University of California at Merced—New Campus—2002.

Ohlone Community College District—Measure A—2002.

Oakland Unified School District—Measure A through February 2004—2002.

Contra Costa County Community College—Measure A (2002)—2002.

Ventura County Community College District—Measure S—2003.

Foothill-DeAnza Community College District—Measure E—2003 (?).

San Jose Unified School District—Measure F—2003.

Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District—Measure C after February 2004—2004.

Berryessa Union School District—2004.

Rialto Unified School District—Measure H—2004.

San Joaquin-Delta Community College District—Measure L—All Work—2004, 2010.

Hartnell Community College (Salinas)—Measure H—CALL Building—2004.

City College of San Francisco—Proposition A through February 2005—2002.

Washington Unified School District—Measure Q—2004.

Cabrillo Community College District (Aptos)—Measure D—2004.

Chino Valley Unified School District—Measure M—2004.

Napa Valley College—Measure N—2004.

Mt. Diablo Unified School District—Summer 2005 School Projects Funded by Measure C—2005.

Sonoma County Junior College—Measure A after May 2005—2005.

San Francisco Unified School District—Proposition A Work at least through January 2007—2004.

San Joaquin-Delta Community College District—Measure L—One Pilot Project in 2007—2005.

Montebello Unified School District—Measure M—2006.

Del Norte Unified School District—New and Modernization Projects—2009.

Mendocino-Lake Community College District—Measure W—2009.

TERMINATED

Santa Ana Unified School District—Measure C—2000–2005.

PROHIBITED BY PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDER 13202

East Side Union High School District—Network Upgrades at Three High Schools—2005.

Los Angeles Unified School District—Networking Projects at Various Schools—2001–2005.

MUNICIPAL POWER PLANTS

IMPLEMENTED

Sacramento Municipal Utility District—Carson Ice-Gen Plant—1993.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District—Proctor & Gamble Company Generation Plant—1995.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District—Campbell Soup Cogeneration Plant—1996.

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power—Valley Generating Station—2001.

City of Santa Clara—Pico Power Project—2003.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District—New Cosumnes Power Plant—2003.

City of Burbank Magnolia Power Project—2003.

City of Pasadena Glenarm Power Plant—2003.

City of Vernon/Malburg Generating Station—2003.

Kings River Conservation District (Fresno) Peaker Plant—2004.

City of Roseville—Roseville Energy Park—2004.

Imperial Irrigation District—Niland Gas Turbine Plant—2007.

City of Vernon Power Plant—Cancelled.

City of Palmdale Hybrid Power Plant—2009.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District—Solano Phase 3 Wind Project—2010.

PROPOSED

Kings River Conservation District (Fresno)—Community Power Plant—2007.

Northern California Power Authority—Lodi Power Plant—2008.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED

Modesto Irrigation District Electric Generation Station—Ripon—2004.

Turlock Irrigation District—Walnut Energy Center—2004.

City of Riverside Acorn Peaker—2004.

City of Victorville Solar Hybrid Power Plant—2007.

City of Riverside Energy Resource Center—Units 3 & 4—2008.

PRIVATE PROJECTS

IMPLEMENTED

Alameda 1 and 2 Residential and Commercial Developments, Alameda

Alameda Point Community Partners Housing and Office Development, Alameda

Alexandria Parking Structure, S.F. Redevelopment Agency (Alexandria Real Estate Equities)

ARCO Refinery Project, Carson (Cherne Contracting Corp.)

Ballpark District, East Square Village, San Diego

Buck Center for Research in Aging, Novato

Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians Casino (City of Ione, Amador County)—Proposed.

Carson Terminal Expansion Project (Kinder Morgan Energy Partners)—2004.

Chevron El Segundo Refinery Project (Cherne Contracting Corp.)

Chevron Richmond Refinery Upgrade

CIM Downtown Redevelopment, San Jose—2002.

Coast Santa Cruz Hotel Renovation—Not Built.

Community Health Systems Downtown Campus, Fresno

ConocoPhillips 66 Refinery Project, Rodeo

ConocoPhillips 66 Conversion to Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel, Rodeo—2004.

Cypress Walk Development, Pacifica (The Olson Company)—Proposed.

Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Dry Cask Storage (PG&E)—2006.

Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project (SGT)—2008.

Diablo Grande Golf Development, Patterson

Dixon Downs Racetrack and Development (Magna Entertainment Corp.)—Rejected.

Downtown Vallejo Redevelopment Project

East Housing/Fleet Industrial Supply Center, Alameda (Catellus Development Company)—2007.

Equilon Refinery Project, Wilmington (Cherne Contracting Corp.)

Estrada de Santa Barbara

Ethanol Plant, Goshen (Phoenix Bio Industries)—2005.

Ethanol Plant, Madera (Pacific Ethanol)—2005.

Ethanol Plant, Pixley (Calgren Renewable Fuels)—2005.

Ethanol Plant, San Joaquin County/Stockton (Pacific Ethanol)—2006.

Ethanol Plant, Stanislaus County (Cilion)—2006.

Exxon Clean Fuels Project, Benicia

Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria Casino (Sonoma County)—Proposed.

Genentech Phases I and II, Vacaville

The Getty Center, Los Angeles

Kern River Pipeline Expansion (Williams Gas Pipeline/MidAmerican Energy Holdings)

L.A. Live (Anschutz Entertainment Group)—2005.

Lagoon Valley Development, Vacaville (Triad Communities)—Proposed.

Long Beach Memorial Medical Center Expansion—2005.

Lytton Band of Pomo Indians Casino (City of San Pablo)—Proposed.

Marina Hotel Renovation, Los Angeles Harbor (San Pedro Ownership, Inc.)—2005.

Marine World, Vallejo

Mission Bay Project (Catellus Development Company), San Francisco

Motorplex at Yuba County—Not Built.

Myers Development Retail/Commercial, Bay Area

Pacific Bell Park, San Francisco Giants Baseball Stadium

Pacific Commons (Catellus Development Company), Fremont

Pacific L.A. Marine Terminal, Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach, Pier 400—Berth 408—2009.

Park Station Lofts, South San Francisco (James E. Roberts, Obayashi Corporation)—2006.

Petco Park, San Diego Padres Baseball Stadium (cost $474 million; received $300 million subsidy from City of San Diego)

Playa Vista Development, Los Angeles

Poseidon Resources Corporation—Carlsbad and Huntington Beach Desalination Plants—Proposed.

Providence Holy Cross Medical Center (Mission Hills) Expansion—2010.

River Islands at Lathrop (Cambay Development Group)—Proposed.

Roman Catholic Diocese of Los Angeles—Cathedral of Our Lady of Los Angeles

San Diego Ballpark Development Project (JMI Realty and Lennar-San Diego Urban Division)—2005.

San Mateo Marriott Addition (Tarsadia Hotels)

Santee Court, Downtown Los Angeles (MJW Investments)—2005.

Shell Clean Fuels Project, Martinez

Sheraton Grand Hotel, Sacramento (received subsidy from City of Sacramento)

Signature Properties Oak to Ninth Street Project, Oakland

616 East Carson Street Project, Carson (Community Dynamics)—required by city council—2009.

655 Broadway, San Diego (Lankford & Associates)

Staples Center, Los Angeles (cost $375 million; City of Los Angeles borrowed $38.5 million for it)

Station District Family Housing, Union City (Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition)—2009.

Sutter Health—Sacramento Medical Center Expansion

Taco Bell Discovery Science Center, Santa Ana

Tongva Casino, Compton—Gabrielino-Tongva Tribal Council

Tosco Refinery Upgrade (Bechtel)

Trans Bay Cable Project, Pittsburg (Babcock & Brown Power Operating Partners)—2007.

United Spiral Pipe Manufacturing Plant, Pittsburg—2007.

Uptown Project, Oakland (Forest City)—2006.

Valero Improvement Project—Refinery Upgrade, Benicia

Westfield San Francisco Center (Westfield Corporation and Forest City)—2005.

Westfield Roseville Galleria Expansion—2006.

Wild Goose Storage, Inc. Natural Gas Storage Expansion Project and Pipeline, Butte County—2002.

Yerba Buena Project, San Francisco

PROPOSED

Roman Catholic Diocese of Oakland Cathedral—2000.

Roman Catholic Diocese of San Bernardino—All Work—2002.

Sutter Health—San Francisco, San Mateo, Vallejo Facilities—2002.

Mitsubishi Liquified Natural Gas Terminal—Los Angeles Harbor—2003.

HCA Regional Medical Center San Jose—2003.

San Diego Chargers Football Stadium—2004.

BHP Billiton Cabrillo Port Liquified Natural Gas Deepwater Port (off Ventura County coast)—2004.

Wood Street/West Oakland Train Station Development, Oakland—2005.

Treasure Island, Treasure Island Development Authority, San Francisco—2005.

Chula Vista Bayfront Redevelopment—Gaylord Entertainment Co.—Abandoned.

Tesoro Refinery Coker Upgrade, Martinez—2006.

Anaheim NFL Stadium—2006.

Orange County Great Park—Lennar Corporation—2006.

New Sacramento Kings Arena—Maloof Sports & Entertainment—2006.

MacArthur BART Transit Village Project (receiving subsidy from City of Oakland)—2006.

Grand Avenue Redevelopment Project, Los Angeles—2006.

Target Store, City of Davis—2006.

Universal City Vision Plan (NBC Universal)—2006.

Hunters Point Development, San Francisco (Lennar/BVHP)—2007.

Candlestick Point Development, San Francisco (TopVision)—2007.

La Bahia Hotel, Santa Cruz (1999—King Ventures, 2007—Barry Swenson Builder)—1999, 2007.

Alameda Street Redevelopment between First & Temple Streets, Los Angeles—2007.

Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Placer County—2007.

Lane Field Development, San Diego (Woodfin Hotels)—2007.

Marriott Convention Hotel at Ballpark Village (JMI Realty)—2007.

Greenbriar, City of Sacramento (AKT Development and Woodside Homes)—2008.

CityWalk in Oakland (The Olsen Company)—2008.

Douglas Park, Long Beach (Boeing Realty Corporation)—2008.

Santa Ana Renaissance Plan—2008.

TrePac Terminal Expansion, Berth 136–147, Port of Los Angeles—2008.

Placer County Developments: Riolo Vineyards, Curry Creek—2008.

City of Roseville Developments: Creekview, Sierra Vista, Placer Ranch, Brookfield—2008.

Sacramento County Development: Cordova Hills/University of Sacramento (Conwy LLC)—2008.

Sutter Health—Elk Grove Facility—2008.

Primafuels, Inc. Biofuel Plant, West Sacramento—2008.

Drexel University New West Coast Campus and Related Development, Placer County—2008.

Delta Shores, City of Sacramento (M&H Realty Partners LLC)—2009.

San Leandro Crossings/Cannery Court (BRIDGE Housing) (receiving subsidy from San Leandro)—2009.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED

Raley Field—Sacramento River Cats AAA Baseball Stadium—1999.

Roman Catholic Diocese of Sacramento—Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament Renovations—2002.

Save Mart Center—Fresno State University—2000.

Thunder Valley Casino—United Auburn Indian Community (Placer County)

Casino—Upper Lake Band of Pomo Indians (West Sacramento)—Cancelled.

Bay Street Emeryville, Phase II

Las Lomas (Los Angeles)—Rejected.

Flying J/Big West Refinery Upgrade (Bakersfield)—Cancelled.

Sacramento Railyards Project (Thomas Enterprises)—2007.

Sonoma Mountain Village (Codding Enterprises)—2009.

Pomona Valley Hospital Medical Center Upgrade Phase 1—2010.

PRIVATE POWER PLANTS

IMPLEMENTED

The State Building and Construction Trades Council of California claimed on April 30, 2003 that ''of the 35 power plants that have been licensed for construction, 34 have signed Project Labor Agreements for their construction.'' As of November 1, 2009, the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California claims that since 1999, developers of 57 of the 63 power plants larger than 50 megawatts built in California have signed PLAs.

Blythe, Blythe (Caithness)—Completed.

Colusa, Colusa County (Reliant Energy)—Not Built.

Costa Costa, Antioch (Mirant)—On Hold.

Delta Energy Center, Pittsburg (Calpine/Bechtel)—Completed.

East Altamont Energy Center, Alameda County (Calpine)—On Hold.

Elk Hills, Kern County (Sempra/Occidental)—Completed.

Fourmile Hill Geothermal Project, Siskiyou County (Calpine)

Hanford, Hanford (GWF Power Systems)—Not Built.

High Desert, Victorville (Constellation Power)—Completed.

High Winds Energy Center expansion, Collinsville (Florida Power & Light)

Inland Empire Energy Center, Romoland (Calpine)—On Hold.

Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System (BrightSource Energy/Bechtel)—Proposed.

La Paloma, Kern County (PG&E/NEG)—Completed.

Los Medanos Energy Center, Pittsburg (Calpine)—Completed.

Metcalf, San Jose (Calpine/Bechtel)—Under Const.

Midway-Sunset, Kern County (Edison)—On Hold.

Morro Bay, San Luis Obispo (Duke Energy)—On Hold.

Moss Landing, Monterey County (Duke Energy)—Completed.

Mountainview, San Bernardino (Edison)—On Hold.

Nueva Azalea, South Gate (Sunlaw)—Not Built.

Orange Grove Energy Peaking Power Plant (J-Power USA Development)—Proposed.

Otay Mesa, San Diego (Calpine)—On Hold.

Palomar, Escondido (Sempra Energy)—Under Const.

Pastoria, Kern County (Calpine)—Under Const.

Rio Linda, Rio Linda (Florida Power & Light)—Not Built.

Russell City, Hayward (Calpine/Bechtel) Calpine/General Electric)—On Hold.

Salton Sea Six Geothermal Plant (CE Obsidian Energy)—Approved.

San Joaquin Valley Energy Center, San Joaquin (Calpine)—On Hold.

Stirling Energy Systems Solar Two Project, Imperial County—Proposed.

Sunrise Cogeneration, Kern County (Texaco and Edison Mission)—Completed.

Sutter Power, Yuba City (Calpine)—Completed.

Tesla (Florida Power & Light)—On Hold.

Three Mountain, Burney (Ogden Energy)—On Hold.

Tracy Peaker Project (GWF Energy)—Completed.

United Golden Gate, San Mateo County (El Paso Merchant)—Not Built.

PROPOSED

Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area expansion (Florida Power & Light)

Solar Thermal Power Plant, San Luis Obispo County (Ausra)—Cancelled.

Beacon Solar Energy Project (Florida Power & Light)—Proposed.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED

Huntington Beach Units 3 and 4 (AES)—Completed.

Valero Energy Corporation Cogeneration Unit I—Completed.

Sun Valley Energy Project, Romoland (Edison Mission)—Under Const.

HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

IMPLEMENTED

Bay Area (Kaufman & Broad)

Brentwood (Pulte Homes)—496 houses—2002.

Foster City (Summerhill Construction)—160 houses

Foster City (Webcor Builders)

Half Moon Bay (Ailanto Builders)—145 houses

Hercules (Hercules Victoria and subsequent developers)—Victoria by the Bay—plumbers & elect.

Oakley Magnolia Park Project (Pulte Homes)

Pacifica (Ryland Homes)—43 houses

San Francisco (HMS Gateway Office).

San Francisco (Waterford Associates)—21 houses

San Francisco (Western Pacific)—74 houses

San Francisco (Saddle Mountain Estates)—74 houses

San Francisco (Greystone Homes)—212 units

San Francisco (Parkside Homes Developers)—156 condos

San Pedro—Pointe Vista (Bisno Development Co.)—Proposed.

Vacaville Southtown Project (Western Pacific Housing)—2004.

PROPOSED

Sebastopol (Schellinger Brothers)—157 units—2002.

San Rafael-St. Vincent School for Boys Development (Shappell Industries)—2002.

IMPLEMENTED THEN DECLARED ILLEGAL BY NLRB

Anatolia-Sacramento County (Sun Ridge)—2714 houses—2002–2004.

PUBLIC/PRIVATE HYBRID PROJECTS

Contra Costa Community College District—San Ramon Valley Center—2004.

This project is covered by the Windemere Development private PLA with U.A. Local 159 Plumbers and Steamfitters Union. The college board of trustees did not vote on this PLA.

Brentwood Union School District (Pulte Homes—Magnolia Park Project)—2004.

This project is covered by the Pulte Homes private PLA with three unions.

West Roseville Specific Plan (Westpark Property)-Roseville City School District—2005.

This development is covered by the Signature Properties private PLA with three unions. The district board of trustees voted to cut language in their documents ratfiying the PLA.

Rio School District—RiverPark East Elementary School—2005.

This project was covered by a Shea Homes private PLA.

PROPOSED

City of San Diego Civic Center Complex—2009.

Leading prospective bidder Gerdling Edlen has indicated intent to sign a PLA.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED

Rio School District—RiverPark East Intermediate School—2006.

This project was initially covered by a Shea Homes private PLA.

Solar Project at Fresno Yosemite International Airport—2007.

World Water & Solar Technologies Corp. is building this private project to serve the airport and rental car facilities at the airport.

UNION-ONLY LANGUAGE IN BID SPECIFICATIONS

IMPLEMENTED

Capitol Park Safety and Security Improvements—2005.

State Compensation Insurance Fund (State Fund)—Fresno District Office Automation System—2008.

REJECTED

Arvin-Edison Water District—North Canal Spreading Works—1999.

South San Joaquin Irrigation District—South County Water Supply Program Turnout Facilities—2003.

Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District—MetroBase Project Parking Garage—2005.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 416. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MEEKS

Mr. MEEKS. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to declare as excess to the needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs or otherwise take any action to exchange, trade, auction, transfer, or otherwise dispose of, or reduce the acreage of, Federal land and improvements at the St. Albans campus, consisting of approximately 55 acres of land, with borders near Linden Boulevard on the northwest, 115th Avenue on the west, the Long Island Railroad on the northeast, and Baisley Boulevard on the southeast.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment I have regarding the St. Albans VA Hospital in New York.

First of all, this is clearly a bipartisan bill. I have the support of my good friends PETER KING and MICHAEL GRIMM of New York to stop the enhanced lease process for the St. Albans VA in my district. There is rarely a time that you have an issue where everybody has come together, and, clearly, here is an issue where members of the community and the veterans have spoken with one voice to say that what is being proposed there is against the best wishes of the veterans and the needs of the veterans and against the wishes of the community, basically changing the whole complexity of the community so that the people that live there would have a terrible injustice and disservice.

Now, I know that the EUL process works in certain areas because part of it is supposed to be where the EUL process works with the community and veterans and everybody agreeing and working together. That is not the case in this scenario.

In this scenario, we have veterans from all over—in fact, we have the Queens County Council of VFWs. We have the Vietnam Vets of America. We have the New York Vets Advocacy Group. We have the Department of New York District 1 VFW, United Council for Veterans Rights, Nassau County VFW, Vets Helping Vets, Inc., all of whom are supportive of this amendment saying that this is not in the best interests of veterans.

The VA has come up with the idea of putting together a facility that doesn't even include a full-service hospital and is not based upon the number of vets that we have coming back from Afghanistan and Iraq. Now, they have put everything on the line for them, and here we have the opportunity to make sure that we do the very best that we can for our veterans. And here the whole community surrounds us, and we want what the veterans want. We want to stand behind them in 100 percent lockstep. And it seems as though, to some at the VA, there is a deaf ear in regard to that.

So we will continue to fight. And what this bill says is that we will stop the EUL process in New York at the St. Albans facility because it is not what is needed. It is not what the vets want. It just seems to me that, instead of working with the community, the VA has chosen to go out and do a high-density residential area, residential building in this facility that is not even just for veterans, which will then have a devastating impact on the local community.

So we're saying no, that shouldn't happen. You can't destroy the very fabric of a great community, and you can't produce something that does not benefit the very vets that we're supposed to be here to help.

So, Mr. Chair, I urge support of this amendment regarding the St. Albans VA Hospital. I urge that we support our veterans who are absolutely united on this matter.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. We will accept Mr. MEEKS' amendment because it's vitally important that all Federal agencies, the VA included, understand that the Member of Congress representing that district, he's their voice.

I represent Houston, Texas. I'm proud to do so. I have an obligation, obviously, to look after the entire Nation. But first and foremost, I am the Representative of the people of District Seven in Houston, Texas, as Mr. MEEKS is the Representative of his constituents in New York. And I think it's vitally important that every Federal agency understand that they need to work with and earn the support of the Representative of that district before they move forward with a major project of any kind.

And as Mr. MEEKS has said, the community is opposed to the direction the VA is taking. And I would join with my friend, Mr. BISHOP. And we strongly support the VA looking to the private sector to partner with the private sector to find innovative, cost-effective ways of providing better services to our veterans by partnering with the private sector.

And certainly, the committee does not want to discourage in any way the VA's expansion of private partnerships to give better service to veterans. We encourage it. We want the VA to look for ways to save money, to provide better service to our veterans, to use the extraordinary expertise of hospitals and medical communities like the Texas Medical Center, which I represent. The work that Mr. BISHOP is doing with Fort Benning and the VA in his district has created a marvelous partnership with private physicians to provide better services. We want the VA to continue that effort.

But it is absolutely essential that the VA understand that they have to earn the support and approval of the community. That means they have to earn the support and approval of the Representative for that district. And in this instance, I hope the VA is tuned in and listening. The VA needs to earn the support and approval of Congressman MEEKS before they move forward with this effort.

So for that reason, we will accept the amendment. And I want to know that the VA is not only returning Mr. MEEKS' phone calls, but they are listening to, responding to, and satisfying the needs of the community, the needs of his constituents, the needs of the veterans that he represents; and that the VA, once they have earned the support of the community, they are going to have the support of Mr. MEEKS. And when Mr. MEEKS comes to the subcommittee and says that the VA has earned his support, the community has earned his support, then the committee will be prepared to move forward and support the VA work at St. Albans.

So for those reasons, we will accept the amendment. And I am looking forward to the day when Mr. MEEKS comes

and tells us the VA is in his office and earning his support and the support of the community.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Meeks amendment, which not only affects his district, but affects at least 11 congressional districts that surround his district, all in support of our veterans and fighting men and women who have returned from wars overseas, some of them severely injured and in need of our care, concern, and support at this very moment.

For 7 years now, the Department of Veterans Affairs has pursued a perhaps well-intentioned but a stubbornly wrongheaded plan for the St. Albans Primary and Extended Care facility which is located in the county of Queens. I am very concerned that the VA is proceeding full speed ahead with its plans to lease a property for 34 years, property currently dedicated exclusively for veterans. And what are the veterans supposed to do for the next 75 years without this facility, when there is a rising demand among our veterans for medical services?

The justification—you have to hear this—the justification for the VA's decision stems from an absurd outdated report that relied on data from 2003, 8 years ago, when we were only at the beginning of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. We have, unfortunately, seen tremendous increases in veterans homelessness, foreclosures, divorce, substance abuse, PTSD and, yes, suicides.

And yet the VA report from all those years ago projected at that time, almost a decade ago, that mental health services for our veterans was going to decrease over the next 20 years. It's been 8 years since that report. And what have we seen during the 8 years alone? And there's 12 years more to go. We've seen increases in all of these problems among our veterans. And yet they cling stubbornly to the data in that report, thinking that these things are going to go down among our veterans. And this, everybody knows, is certainly not going to be the case.

All evidence suggests that returning veterans are going to require a greater significant increase especially in VA mental health services. A Rand Center report alone found that already 18.5 percent of all U.S. servicemembers who have returned already from Afghanistan and Iraq currently suffer from PTSD or depression, and that 19.5 percent suffer from traumatic brain injury.

Where is the Veterans Administration's common sense? To give away this property, which is intended and secured right now for our veterans, is a huge mistake, based on a report that is already discredited by the facts. This is something that we can't allow to continue.

These are veterans who have sacrificed so much. We have to stand here today on the floor. And I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, colleagues in the majority especially, for seeing through the politics of this and understanding that these are our veterans that we are fighting for; that we, as Members of Congress, understand our constituencies and our needs and their needs.

I want to personally thank Representatives GRIMM and KING, who are among our delegation, as well as the rest of the Democratic members of the delegation in our region, and thank Representative MEEKS for his dynamic and great leadership in bringing this to our attention so that we could stand together as patriotic Americans all, at least on this issue, and fight for the needs of our veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to administer or enforce the wage-rate requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, popularly known as the ''Davis-Bacon Act.''

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, the Davis-Bacon Act requires nearly all Federal construction contracts to pay a prevailing wage determined by the Department of Labor. Under the law, construction contractors and subcontractors may not pay their own workers wages lower than the department's pay rate, even if the workers bargain for a wage below the government-set rate.

My amendment blocks application of Davis-Bacon to the Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs appropriations bill. There are two main reasons why the House should block Davis-Bacon.

First, Davis-Bacon wastes taxpayer dollars on overpriced contracts. A recent study showed that, on average, nationwide, the government-set rate is 22 percent higher than the true market rate. For example, if sheet metal workers in Long Island, New York, are paid $28.79 per hour, while the government-set rate for that area is $45.40, factoring in the cost of materials and other supplies, studies suggest that the Federal Government overpays for construction contracts by between 10 percent and 15 percent.

Second, Davis-Bacon gives an unfair advantage to union employees. Small businesses, many of which are nonunion, lower their prices to compete against larger union firms. The tradeoff for nonunion employees is a lower-wage rate but more work. We should not disadvantage nonunion employees who are willing to perform more construction for less money. By eliminating government-mandated wages, we can better allocate resources, increase efficiency, and put hardworking Americans back on the job.

Providing for our national defense and the care of our veterans are critical priorities. Construction projects in the appropriations bill include VA facilities, family housing, schools and infrastructure for our National Guard troops stationed on the border. We owe it to our constituents to stretch every taxpayer dollar and spend wisely.

Blocking Davis-Bacon's application to military construction and VA projects will honor our commitment to fiscal responsibility and to our veterans. Let's let competition determine wages, not the Federal Government. Please support my amendment to block Davis-Bacon.

□ 1510

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for bringing this important amendment. I strongly support this amendment and urge the House to adopt the gentleman's amendment because it will save, again, our children and grandchildren a significant amount of money.

We are in an era of austerity unlike anything America has ever experienced. We are living on borrowed money. Every dollar the Federal Government brings in goes right out the back door to pay for the existing social safety net. Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the national debt and veterans' benefits consume 104 percent of America's revenue. Therefore, all the money we appropriate for the entire year for military construction, for the VA, for transportation, for homeland security, for the Defense Department, all of it, is borrowed. Therefore, we need to do everything we can to cut, to save money, to eliminate fraud, waste and abuse and to avoid spending more money than we should.

Here, very straightforward, the gentleman's amendment would save American taxpayers a significant amount of money. It depends on what study you're looking at, but my very capable staff has looked at this and analyzed a whole variety of studies that indicate that there's a whole range of savings. The Chamber of Commerce believes that Davis-Bacon, or paying union prevailing wages in, for example, a free market environment like in Texas, we don't pay prevailing wage. We in Texas on a highway project pay the competitive free market wage.

First of all, not only are we going to save money, but why would we discourage competition? Why, in this terrible

economy, would we prevent contractors, businesses, from coming in and competing for a job?

As on the last amendment, the LaTourette amendment, which I hope the House defeats, that amendment we need to defeat so that we could encourage companies to come in and compete for Federal contracts, this amendment needs to be adopted to encourage businesses to come in and compete for Federal contracts. This would expand the universe of companies that could compete and apply for work. As in Texas, for example, on a highway project, we pay the competitive, best price for bids, and in the Chamber of Commerce's opinion, if we eliminate the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage, it would save about 15 percent on average on project construction. The Cato Institute estimates a 10 percent savings.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you very much.

If I could, Mr. Chairman, point out that the Heritage Foundation estimates that there will be a 22 percent savings to taxpayers by eliminating the Davis-Bacon requirement. The Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University in Boston estimates a 10 percent savings.

This whole variety of savings, if you line them up, for example, we'll just say, for the sake of argument, that there is about a 10 percent savings in construction costs, we as a Nation living on borrowed money should not voluntarily, willingly pay 10 percent more. It makes no sense.

The gentleman's amendment is extraordinarily important. It will save taxpayers a significant amount of money on every construction project. On average, you're going to wind up saving, under the gentleman's amendment, about 10 percent. Ten percent goes a long way on a lot of these massive construction projects. The gentleman's amendment is vitally important in this economy. The adoption of the gentleman's amendment will increase the number of jobs available for people to work on Federal projects. The gentleman's amendment will create jobs and save money for taxpayers. In an era of record debt, record deficit, and record burden that we simply cannot pass on to our kids, it is vitally important that the House approve the gentleman's amendment, and I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Davis-Bacon Act is a pretty simple concept, and it's a fair concept. What it does is to protect the government as well as the workers in carrying out the policy of paying decent wages for government contracts.

I noticed that the previous speaker was really concerned about the possibility that Davis-Bacon would raise the cost of the performance of these contracts, but it only requires that prevailing wages in the area where the contract is going to be performed is maintained. For example, if in some of the urban areas where labor costs are very, very high and the prevailing wages are there, the standard of living and the wage payment for that area would be consistent. If it was in a lower wage area, then Davis-Bacon wages would be the wages that were paid in that market. So basically it just allows the workers to be paid at a rate consistent with where the project is being conducted.

The act requires that every construction contract that the Federal Government participates in in excess of $2,000 has to have this provision defining the minimum wage. It was taken up by this House just a few days ago, and, of course, three times this House has defeated attempts to repeal this Davis-Bacon requirement. It would appear to me that this House has exercised great wisdom three times in this session in preserving the right of workers to earn the wages that are paid in the area where the project is being constructed. That just makes sense. We want our workers to be paid fairly. We don't want the government to overpay. So we won't pay higher wages in an area where prevailing wages are lower. We won't pay lower wages in an area where the prevailing wages are higher, where the cost of living is higher, where the cost of doing business is higher, where the cost of doing the construction would be higher. We want the government to get the best bang for the buck.

These amendments are probably very well-intentioned. We want to save the taxpayers' dollars, but we cannot and we should not be penny-wise and pound-foolish. The repeal of Davis-Bacon, I think, and I think that this House has stated on at least three occasions on this floor during this session of Congress, would be pound-foolish.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I join the gentleman from Georgia in opposing this amendment and associate myself with his remarks.

The Federal Government is in a different position from a private company having construction done, for two reasons: First, one of the greatest social problems we face in this country is the eroding wages of middle class families. We see that even in times when there are sufficient jobs, the average American doesn't make any more on an inflation-adjusted basis than a decade or two decades ago. The Federal Government should not play a role in pushing down people out of the middle class. We have a social responsibility to work to a return to what used to be the American norm, and that is that each generation does better than the last.

But the second, even from a crudely proprietary position, the Federal Government is in a very different position than a private homeowner, private property owner. I know I was tempted the last time we fixed our home, maybe I should go with the slipshod, cheapskate company. After all, I'm only going to live there a few more years. Even many private owners, they're only going to own the building for a few years.

So many of us in our daily lives use government-constructed projects from the 1930s. When the government builds something, it is normally going to be owned and operated by the government and used by our citizens for many, many decades. Why do we want slipshod construction? Why do we want those who are not looking to have skilled craftsmen and craftswomen but, rather, are looking to slap it up there in the cheapest possible way?

□ 1520

Our public works need to be built by those with the proper construction skills; it's not a matter of just hiring as many hands as you can as cheaply as possible.

And so I support the gentleman from Georgia and his comments, and I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Some in the minority continue to try to repeal Davis-Bacon, despite the House being on record supporting the protection of labor standards.

Two weeks ago, the full committee voted to strip the anti-Davis-Bacon provision that was added by the chairman of the subcommittee. A similar amendment repealing Davis-Bacon was offered during the consideration of the FY 2012 Homeland Security appropriations bill. It failed on a vote of 183–234.

I have been a longtime supporter of Davis-Bacon's prevailing wage requirements. It helps ensure that local projects provide local jobs with affordable middle class wages. The law protects the government from contractors trying to win Federal contracts by bidding too low to attract competent workers. I strongly oppose this amendment.

I point out, if there is a problem here, it's because we do not do the wage surveys on a continuing and consistent basis. That is a real problem. That rests with the Department of Labor, and we need to make sure that they're doing their part of the equation.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that the Davis-Bacon Act prevents competition for construction contracts from artificially depressing local labor standards. The Davis-Bacon Act will prevent subverting the prevailing wage laws, which will lead to shoddy construction and substantial cost overruns.

Under the prevailing wage laws, contractors are forced to compete on the basis of who can best train, best equip, and best manage a construction crew, not on the basis of who can assemble the cheapest, most exploitable workforce, either locally or through importing labor from outside.

The Davis-Bacon Act does not require a union wage; it requires prevailing wage based upon surveys of wages and benefits that are actually paid to various job classifications of construction workers, such as iron workers in a community, without regard to whether they belong to a union or not.

According to the Department of Labor, a whopping 72 percent of prevailing wage rates issued in 2000 were based upon nonunion wage rates. A union wage prevails only if the Department of Labor survey determines that the local union wage is paid to more than 50 percent of the workers in that job classification.

Now higher wages and skills result in greater productivity and lower cost. It's so much greater among high-wage, high-skill workers that projects that use high-skilled workers and high-paid workers often cost less than those that use the low-wage, low-skilled workers due to repairs, revisions, and lengthy delays.

The opponents who claim that the government could save billions by eliminating the Davis-Bacon protections ignore the productivity, quality, safety, community development and other economic benefits which contribute to the real cost effectiveness of Davis-Bacon. A study of 10 States where nearly half of all of the highway and bridge work is done in the United States showed that when high-wage workers were paid double the wage of low-wage workers, they built 74.4 more miles of roadbed and 32.8 more miles of bridges for $557 million less.

Driving wages down will not help balance the budget. The Davis-Bacon Act will improve our local economies and it will result in increased productivity.

I am convinced that, again, we have people with good intentions that want to save us money, but if you pay cheaper wages, you will have to employ less skilled workers. If you hire less skilled workers, they will, in all likelihood, have to have work redone that will have to be repaired. It will extend the cost, it will extend the time, and ultimately it will cost our taxpayers more money, and we will not get the efficiencies that each and every tax dollar should have because they are hard-earned tax dollars, and our taxpayers don't give them up lightly. But when we do pay our taxes, everybody in this body and across this country wants to make sure that we get the best bang for the buck. Davis-Bacon would give us that result. It has proven that. The studies show that.

I would submit that this amendment is ill-advised and should be defeated.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. May the Clerk read the amendment?

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I had the Clerk read the amendment because it's a simple one-sentence amendment. It says that none of the money in this act can be used deliberately by the President to violate the law, in particular, the War Powers resolution, often referred to as the War Powers Act, which is found in title 50 of the United States Code.

This is the same amendment I offered to the Homeland Security appropriations bill. Some 208 Members of Congress voted for that amendment. The only argument against the amendment at that time was that it wasn't exactly appropriate or relevant to the Homeland Security bill. After all, I was preventing the funding of violation of the War Powers Act with the funds provided to the Department of Homeland Security.

Now that I offer this amendment to the MilCon bill, it is relevant. This is a bill that provides tens of billions of dollars for the Defense Department. And it is necessary and appropriate, if we are going to adopt a policy that says that money is not going to be appropriated for deliberate violation of our law, that we apply this amendment not only to the Defense Appropriations bill, but to this second bill that funds the Pentagon.

Why is this amendment necessary? Because so many administrations have embraced the idea of an imperial Presidency, the idea that a President can send our forces into battle for unlimited duration, for any purpose, unlimited in scope. This is not what the Constitution and the law provides.

The War Powers Act is the law of the land, and it says the President may indeed commit our forces, but the President must seek congressional authorization and must withdraw within 60 days if that authorization is not provided by the affirmative vote of both Houses of Congress.

In Libya, we face not an attack on the United States, not an attack on our allies. But even in this circumstance, this President, like others, claims that he does not have to follow the law.

□ 1530

The administration has implied that there are substitutes for congressional authorization; they have implied that resolutions by the United Nations, the Arab League or NATO can be a substitute for congressional authorization; and they implied that consulting congressional leaders, a lunch with leadership, is a substitute for the affirmative vote of both Houses of Congress. It is time for us to stand up and say, No, Mr. President, you actually have to follow the law.

Obviously, this amendment is even more apropos to the Defense appropriations bill, but we will be dealing with that weeks from now. The President has been violating the War Powers Act for many weeks. It is time to act today.

Moreover, if we put this amendment only on the Defense appropriations bill and don't put it on this bill, then we invite the administration to try to figure out clever accounting ways to use the billions of dollars provided to the Defense Department in this bill to carry out operations in Libya. We should not invite a loophole hunt. We should put the same restriction on both of the bills that fund the Defense Department.

Now, if we can pass the amendment, the President will, I hope, request an authorization from Congress to take action in Libya, and he will have to accept an authorization that will, I expect, be limited in time and scope. Perhaps it will say that only air forces and not ground forces can be committed. Perhaps it will require renewal every 3 or 6 months. There may be conditions on funding sources. For example, perhaps we use some of the $33 billion that Qadhafi was stupid enough to leave invested in the United States in ways that we could find and that we have frozen rather than use taxpayer dollars.

Congress will ask some tough questions. And we may put some conditions requiring certain action also by the Benghazi transitional government. We would ask why the Benghazi government has refused to disassociate itself from the al Qaeda fighters and the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group men who are in their midst and why they will not remove from that transitional government those that have American blood on their hands from Iraq and Afghanistan.

This is not just the issue of an aggrandizing President. It is also the issue of a derelict Congress. Continuing military action in Libya should be conducted only consistent with American law. If Congress habitually appropriates funds knowing that those funds will be used to violate the law of the land, then we are complicit in undermining democracy and the rule of law in the United States. The question is not democracy and the rule of law in Libya; the question is democracy and the rule of law in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, and I will happily accept it, because it is evident that the administration is in direct violation of the War Powers Act, which requires the President to either certify to the Congress that the United States has been attacked or there is a national security interest of the United States at stake, and, if not, then we need to be notified. I think we are still waiting for the administration to talk to us, to justify, to explain the involvement of U.S. forces in Libya. Now we read over the weekend that the administration may send U.S. forces, our young men and women, into harm's way in Yemen. What are we going to do, Syria next?

The Congress of the United States has an obligation to make sure that, in the stewardship of our precious tax dollars and the responsibility we have to ensure the protection of our men and women in uniform and the people of this Nation, that we are enforcing the War Powers Act, that we are directly involved as a partner in the defense of the United States.

The administration has persistently and consistently refused to involve the Congress in these decisions to send our men and women into Libya and whether or not we are going to go into Yemen. Mr. SHERMAN's amendment is very reasonable and points out that, simply, we are not going to spend any money in violation of the law, we are not going to spend any money in violation of the War Powers Resolution.

The distinguished Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House is unable to speak, but I have to say that Mr. MCCLINTOCK's editorial, the positions that the gentleman from California has taken, I agree with completely.

The action in Libya, as Mr. MCCLINTOCK has said, there could not be a more clear violation of the War Powers Act than the President's involvement of American Armed Forces in Libya. The Congress has never been notified. There has been obviously no attack on the United States. There is no strategic interest of the United States at stake in Libya or in Yemen. Where else is he going to send our troops without notifying the Congress and the people of the United States as required by the War Powers Act?

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I want to rise in support of Mr. TOM MCCLINTOCK of California's eloquent defense of the War Powers Act, and I urge the House to adopt Mr. SHERMAN's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for a project or program named for an individual serving as a Senator in the United States Senate or as the President of the United States.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, at the start of this Congress, the House made important changes to the way the institution operates. We began by ending earmarks. Americans understood that the practice favored Representatives' pet projects while the taxpayer was left to foot the bill. Earmarks diverted our constituents' hard-earned money to low-priority projects and, even worse, appeared corrupt. Americans started to lose confidence in their government when they saw their Representatives using public funds for personal gain.

In a similar vein, this Congress continued last Congress' prohibition on ''monuments to me.'' Like earmarks, when House Members name Federal programs and buildings after themselves, Americans can't be sure whether the programs are funded because they are worthwhile or because they benefit a House Member personally.

The appropriations bill we are considering today has a prohibition on ''monuments to me'' that mirrors the House rules and bans naming programs and buildings after current House Members. My amendment extends that same prohibition to current Senators and the President.

Ending ''monuments to me'' is an important step to preventing the waste of taxpayer dollars and to ensuring that our appropriations are in the best interests of the public, not the personal interests of elected representatives. I ask you to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

I certainly agree with the gentleman's sentiment. It is important that we as Members of Congress don't spend any money to name anything after ourselves. It is inappropriate. It just ought not be done.

I know that my colleague from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) has also been working on this to prevent the use of taxpayer funds from being spent on monuments built at taxpayer expense to Members of Congress that are still living. This rule is in place for the House of Representatives. It ought to be in place for the Senate and the President of the United States.

POINT OF ORDER

Unfortunately, the gentleman's amendment imposes a duty on Federal agencies in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI, so I regret reluctantly I have to raise a point of order against the gentleman's amendment in that it proposes to change existing law, Mr. Chairman, and therefore constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI, and that the amendment seeks to impose additional duties on a Federal agency or entity.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination by the relevant executive branch official of the current membership of a body in the legislative branch. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

□ 1540

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 4____. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and

Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is quite simple. During the 110th Congress there was a section added to the Energy Independence and Security Act that bans Federal agencies from entering into contracts for procurement of alternative fuel sources unless the ''lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions'' are less than or equal to such emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources. This amendment would simply prohibit the government from enforcing this ban on Federal agencies funded by the underlying bill.

I was not yet in Congress when the Energy Independence and Security Act was considered, but section 526 raises concerns over national security, economic security, and it creates bureaucratic uncertainty. Section 526 was added to this bill to stifle the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based—or ''coal-to-liquids''—jet fuels. Environmentalists allege that this coal-based fuel will ultimately produce more greenhouse emissions than would traditional petroleum resources. This allegation is uncertain at best and does not account for ongoing improvements in carbon-capture technologies in association with CTL technology.

My amendment prohibits funds in the bill from being used to enforce section 526. Section 526 makes it more difficult for our Defense Department to become energy independent and to rely on more domestic and more stable sources of fuel instead of sources located in more unstable, volatile parts of the world. This is very problematic for our Defense Department by creating uncertainty about what fuels DOD can procure, and it discourages development of new sources, particularly reliable domestic sources of energy supplies for the Armed Forces. Section 526 opens DOD up to court or administrative challenges for every fuel purchase it makes. Per a July 9, 2008, letter to Senator JAMES INHOFE from the Pentagon, ''Such a decision could cause significant harm to the readiness of the Armed Forces because these fuels may be widely used and particularly important in certain geographical areas.''

Not only have extreme environmental views, policies, and regulations like section 526 burdened American families, hurt job creation, and hurt American businesses, but they are now potentially causing significant harm to the readiness of the Armed Forces. The Defense Department should not be wasting its time studying fuel emissions and should not have to be stifled by the arguments over how to interpret a small section of an energy law. This is an unacceptable burden to continue to place on our Nation's military, and it is an unacceptable precedent set in regard to America's energy policy.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment.

The United States is the Saudi Arabia of coal. We've been blessed by the good Lord with extraordinary resources. We have, apparently, the world's largest supply of shale gas, shale oil. Yet the administration is doing everything in their power to prevent us from even finding or locating additional shale oil or gas. The administration is doing everything in their power to prevent us from drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, which we've done for decades cleanly, safely, economically.

We could create hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of high-paying jobs in the United States if the administration would simply get out of the way and let Texans run Texas, and let the gulf States and the energy community unleash American ingenuity to do what they do best—produce domestic oil and gas cleanly and safely. The jobs that are produced in the Gulf of Mexico in the energy industry across the United States are safe, high-paying, high-quality jobs that the economy and the people of America desperately need.

Mr. FLORES has brought a very important amendment to the floor which would expand the use of petroleum derived from coal. The United States is blessed with abundant amounts of coal. This Federal law, section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act, discourages the production of liquefied gas or fuel from coal—and that's a vital part of our energy future. We understand, as constitutional conservatives, as the new majority in the House, that the United States needs to continue to invest in alternative technologies for the future. We are all in support of finding new ways to generate electricity to move the United States into the next era of energy beyond petroleum. But in the meantime, in the short term, we need to drill here and drill now. We need to use every available resource that the good Lord has blessed this Nation with in a way that's obviously clean, safe, ecologically friendly. We've done it in Texas for years.

Mr. FLORES has extensive experience in the energy industry. I'm proud to represent the energy corridor of Texas. Houston is to the energy industry what California and Silicon Valley are to the computer industry. We've proven time and time again that we can produce oil and gas safely, cleanly. We desperately need to open up drilling in the gulf. This administration has deliberately and systematically shut down drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, which increases our dependence on foreign oil, while the administration has used our tax dollars and its influence in the International Monetary Fund to attempt to prop up and support Brazilian exploration for oil and gas, discouraging American development of oil and gas. It's a policy that continues to drive up the unemployment rate and drive down the production of American oil and gas. Mr. FLORES' amendment will allow us to expand the production of one vital American resource that we have in abundance—and that's coal.

So I strongly support the gentleman's amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I rise today in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is intended to ensure that any alternative fuel that is introduced to replace conventional petroleum-based fuels must have greenhouse gas emissions that are less than or equal to the fuel it is replacing. That is a commonsense approach. The Department of Defense alone is the single largest energy consumer in the world. Its leadership in this area is critical to any credible approach to dealing with energy independence issues. Section 526 provides an opportunity for DOD to play a substantial role in spurring the innovation needed to produce alternative fuels which will not further exacerbate global climate change.

I would like to congratulate Secretary Mabus, Secretary of the Navy, for his energetic approach to trying to find alternative fuels. I think he, as Secretary, has done an outstanding job. He has put the Navy on a path towards energy independence and reducing the amount of petroleum products that we're using today.

So I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this very shortsighted amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. The amendment I've offered the past week would simply reduce the information technology account in the VA by $70 million and increase the same account by $70 million.

□ 1550

My intention is to make it clear to the Department of Veterans Affairs that we must see progress on efforts to integrate the Department of Defense's and the VA's electronic medical records.

It is unthinkable that as we seek to make the transition from the military back to the homeland as seamless as possible we have a system as befuddling as the one we have, where a servicemember literally needs a paper copy

of his or her medical records to ensure information isn't lost in transitioning between the two systems. When severely injured patients are released and transferred from Walter Reed to the VA center at Mountain Home in Johnson City, Tennessee, all the information regarding their injuries and transfers can be terribly difficult to access. That shouldn't be the case.

This is why I support Chairman CULBERSON's report language, which recommends that the Department of Veterans Affairs set aside $70 million of the overall $3.25 billion in the Information Technology account for the Virtual Lifetime Electronic Medical Record system. I would, in fact, like to strengthen this language by putting it in the underlying bill to ensure this money gets spent on integration.

The VA and DOD maintain the two largest health care systems in the Nation, providing health care to 6 million veterans and to over 1.5 million active duty servicemembers respectfully. Within the VA alone, there are over 1,500 different facilities that provide care to veterans. To provide this care, the DOD and VA both rely on electronic health record systems to create, maintain, and manage patient health information; but the two agencies for years have operated different systems that can't talk to each other.

Let me give you an example: Ten billion dollars has been spent. A soldier leaves the military, and his records can't be transferred electronically to the VA. I had someone in my office just before I walked over here on the House floor who showed where an electronic medical records system would have prevented the delay in treatment of a veteran.

This general lack of cooperation between the two Departments has occurred for years at the collective cost of billions of dollars. I first became aware of this problem when I arrived in Congress and didn't realize it had been worked on for years.

I applaud the Appropriations Committee for highlighting the need for the VLER in its committee report, and I think this language should be put in the bill to ensure the VA spends the money for this purpose. A lifetime electronic health records system would improve the delivery of care to servicemembers who are transitioning from military to civilian life.

As a physician myself, I know the importance of having an organized and efficient electronic medical records systems. In fact, I helped put an electronic medical records system in my office for over 70 providers and tens of thousands of patients. I do understand the difficulties, and I know how hard it is to be done, but I know the importance of it. I hope the committee will adopt this amendment and work on strengthening it in the final bill to ensure we make clear to the VA that this integration must be a priority.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. We are trying to vote on the Flores amendment. Could you have waited until we had voted on the amendment to make your 5-minute speech? This is totally irrelevant to this debate.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I apologize to the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COFFMAN OF COLORADO

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide disability compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to any veteran for post-traumatic stress disorder if the required in-service stressor claimed by the veteran is related to the veteran's fear of hostile military or terrorist activity and the places, types, and circumstances of the veteran's service did not include a combat zone.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I stand with the American people in wanting to make sure that our returning servicemembers from Iraq and Afghanistan are taken care of.

The signature wound in this war has emerged to be post-traumatic stress disorder. Since 2008, almost 100,000 claims for disability based on post-traumatic stress disorder have been awarded at a tremendous cost; but the concern is, again, that these veterans are taken care of. In July of last year, new rules were promulgated as to the eligibility criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder. What they did was to no longer require the servicemembers to relate a specific combat occurrence or occurrences to their post-traumatic stress disorders.

It is my belief that these rules are too loosely written and that what we ought to have is more definition to say that someone who has never served in a combat zone should not be eligible for post-traumatic stress disorder disability benefits—not treatment. Certainly, one would be eligible for treatment, but I understand that this amendment will require the Veterans Administration to create a definition and to make decisions on something they currently don't do, which is: service in a combat zone.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I certainly can appreciate the concerns that the gentleman raises that have caused him to offer the amendment. Yet I want to remind the gentleman of the awful incident that occurred at Fort Hood in Texas. There were a lot of our servicemembers who were present who experienced that awful, awful situation. Under this amendment, it would prevent the veterans and servicemembers, once they're discharged, from being able to take advantage of the benefits of the Department of Veterans Affairs because they were at Fort Hood as opposed to Afghanistan or Iraq or in some other place of hostility.

Also, I would remind the gentleman that the servicemembers who operate our unmanned aerial vehicles, such as the Predator, which has great capability for causing destruction in war—it's one of our great weapons—actually can see on video, in realtime, the death and the destruction and the dismemberment that is caused by the utilization of that, although they're in Nevada and the weapon is actually making its impact in Afghanistan. Of course, because of that, they would be disqualified.

Under this amendment, I think the gentleman's point is well taken in wanting to make sure that only those people who are entitled to veterans benefits in fact get them, but I think that perhaps there are some problems in the artful drafting of the amendment, which should be clarified. Because of that, I am reluctant to support it, and of course must oppose this amendment.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Reclaiming my time, the chairman has raised a similar issue. I certainly agree with him and understand about the issue of expanding the definition in this amendment to reflect terrorist activity that would be beyond a combat zone. Again, certainly, treatment would be available. We're not talking about that. We're merely talking about disability compensation. I probably disagree with you, as a combat veteran myself, on the ground side of your UAV example.

I realize that the amendment is out of order because of the fact that it really impedes on authorizing versus appropriating. Certainly, it is my intent—and I'd be happy to work with the gentleman from Georgia as well as with the gentleman from Texas—to come up with a definition that makes sure that we take care of those veterans who are most in need.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract using procedures that do not give to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans (as that term is defined in section 3(q)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)(3)) that are included in the database under section 8127(f) of title 38, United States Code, any preference available with respect to such contract, except for a preference given to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans (as that term defined in section 3(q)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)(2)).

□ 1600

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would level the playing field for our Nation's veterans when it comes to contracting with the Federal Government.

After putting their lives on the line and at times their families and careers on hold in the service of our Nation, America's veterans deserve every consideration we can give them to adjust to life once they return. Veteran-owned small businesses are part of the American fabric; and as a government and a people, we must do all we can to encourage them.

Here are a few facts: According to the most recent census, over 2.4 million of our Nation's veterans are now small business owners. Veteran-owned companies now make up 9 percent of all U.S. firms. The Small Business Administration now estimates that one in seven veterans are self-employed or a small business owner. And, finally, nearly a quarter of veterans say they're interested in starting or in buying a small business.

Despite these encouraging numbers, the truth of the matter is veterans are unemployed at a higher level than any of us find acceptable. For instance, the unemployment rate for young veterans returning from Afghanistan and Iraq reached a staggering 22 percent last year. Mr. Chairman, this number is simply unacceptable. We must work to reduce this number, and it should be the explicit, stated policy of all government agencies to assist veteran entrepreneurs.

As our Nation struggles to achieve an economic recovery, we should be looking to utilize the talent, expertise, and leadership skills of our Nation's veterans. These men and women volunteered to selflessly serve our country and, in order to succeed, must display self-discipline and leadership. It is characteristics and character traits like these that should be nurtured and fostered to help our economy grow again and put people back to work.

Veterans have served our Nation nobly across the world. Now, their innovation and expertise can help lead our American recovery. Ultimately, we must all be focused on putting our constituents back to work, and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will help to do that.

This amendment will give veteran-owned small businesses preferences for contracts in this bill equal to any group eligible for preferred consideration, except for service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses. The practice of the Federal Government providing preferences to encourage government to do business with certain groups is well established. This amendment does not diminish preferences to any other group. It simply extends to veteran-owned small businesses the same level of consideration.

The amendment would apply to all Federal contracts authorized by the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Act and would be attached to any portion of State and local projects funded with Federal dollars.

To preserve the integrity of the program, small businesses are considered those defined by the Small Business Administration, and eligible businesses must be registered veteran-owned businesses with the Department of Veterans Affairs. The VA's Center for Veteran Enterprise maintains a database of certified registered veteran-owned businesses. In many cases, this amendment will simply be codifying existing practice and ensure that it will continue to be the policy of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, veterans have sacrificed much for our Nation. It is only fair that, if any group is given preferential contracting status, that veterans receive it as a well. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. I want to express the committee's strong support for the gentleman's amendment.

We are all in agreement that the Nation needs to look first to attempt to hire our veterans who have served this Nation, to attempt to encourage the businesses that are developed and built by veterans to thrive and to prosper; and the gentleman's amendment is a great way to encourage veteran-owned businesses to thrive.

We should, in the work the Federal Government contracts out, do everything we can to encourage the development of, and hiring of, small businesses owned and operated by veterans; and we strongly support the gentleman's amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Let me just say that the gentleman's amendment is very, very well taken. I fully support it; and it works in tandem with some other legislation, some authorizing legislation that I think the chairman, Mr. CULBERSON, and I, along with Mr. DICKS and Mr. YOUNG and many, many others, on a bipartisan basis, have often called the Hiring Heroes Act, which basically supports our veterans as they come back to make sure that they can be gainfully employed and that they are duly allowed to participate in the economy, to work and to engage in gainful employment.

I think that this amendment, as far as small businesses go, as far as veterans preferences, is very well taken, and I think that we ought to do that, as well as everything else we can possibly do, to make sure that the transition from full-time active service to the civilian population of our country on the part of our veterans is fully supported by this Congress and by the people of the United States.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. Veteran-owned companies are a great asset that we should be further encouraging. These businesses obviously play a positive role in the economy by providing not only jobs, goods, and services, but also are reducing unemployment amongst veterans who are already struggling with the unemployment rate greater than that of the general populace.

Furthermore, the government has done poorly in reaching its 3 percent contracting goal for veterans. For example, agencies' contract awards were below 1 percent from 2003 to 2006. The most recent figures for 2009 show agencies awarded only 1.98 percent to service-disabled veterans. We must do more to ensure that our veterans are transitioning from soldiers to civilians and we are actively encouraging new opportunities for vets.

I believe this amendment will help the Department of Defense and VA to do better. I support this amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) brought a matter to our attention that is very, very important and significant, and I think it's appropriate that we ought to at least examine that in the form of a

colloquy here on the floor as we consider this Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, many veterans have returned home from Iraq and Afghanistan with severe disabilities; and when their service results in a disability, we have a duty to help them. And one way that veterans receive this help is through the use of guide dogs. Now, the way the process works, veterans are assessed and they're trained for orientation and mobility. If a veteran needs a guide dog, information on how to contact guide dog schools is provided. Essentially, the veteran is referred to a nonprofit. There's no funding provided directly from the VA to these nonprofits; and with the costs associated with training these dogs, it takes time to raise the money which, in turn, causes a backlog for veterans, as well as for nonveterans.

□ 1610

We have to look at this issue and see what it is that the Veterans Administration can do to help because these dogs mean so much to those who need them.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the ranking member yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. BISHOP, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has raised a very important matter that we need to look into in the subcommittee as we move into conference. And I want to reassure the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the subcommittee and I will work diligently with him to look further into this issue to find ways that we can help make sure that the veterans who need guide dogs and service dogs get them.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. FATTAH and other Members will be very, very appreciative of you. We thank you for your comments, and we look forward to working with all of our colleagues to support our veterans and their families.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I just want to mention a program called Pets for Patriots. I happened to have attended an event here just about a week ago where there is a national organization being created to get pets for our returning veterans and especially for some of those who have very serious injuries. So I think there is a real need for this, and I think it's been demonstrated. And I commend Mr. FATTAH for his diligence and for your help in raising this issue.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Thank you very much for your comments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LANKFORD) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2055.

□ 1832

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. WESTMORELAND (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 61, line 2.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

The amendment by Mr. LATOURETTE of Ohio.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. SHERMAN of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 204, noes 203, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

AYES—204

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

Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—203

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—25

Bachmann
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Butterfield
Cardoza
Dingell
Engel
Eshoo
Giffords
Grijalva
Higgins
Huizenga (MI)
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
Lee (CA)
Paul
Rokita
Rush
Shimkus
Slaughter
Speier
Stivers
Tsongas
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 5 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1854

Messrs. BASS of New Hampshire and ROYCE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. MEEKS, CHANDLER, and DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 413, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 232, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

AYES—178

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Walberg
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—232

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—22

Bachmann
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Butterfield
Cardoza
Dingell
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Giffords
Higgins
Lee (CA)
Paul
Rokita
Shimkus
Shuster
Slaughter
Speier
Stivers
Tsongas
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1900

Messrs. VISCLOSKY, CUMMINGS, and CARNAHAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. BROOKS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 414 the Amash amendment on H.R. 2055, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yes" when I should have voted "no."

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 414, the Amash amendment, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BACA was allowed to speak out of order.)

CHARITABLE GOLF TOURNAMENT

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, today we had an event, and it was on behalf of the wounded warriors, sponsored by Disabled Sports USA. These are many of our men and women who are fighting for us, have come back, and we appreciate everything that they've done for us.

On behalf of ANDER CRENSHAW, my co-captain on the Republican side, and myself, we want to thank all of the Members who participated, both Members and former Members, and all of the sponsors and individuals involved. It was a tournament for a good cause.

There were no losers. The winners were the wounded warriors and the disabled sports vets who will get an opportunity to revamp their lives, enjoy golf.

This was a match between the Republicans and the Democrats. And I know that last year the Republicans won and retained the cup then, but today, the Democrats ended up winning and retaining the cup.

On behalf of all the Democrats here and the players who participated, thank you very much.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Florida, ANDER CRENSHAW, my co-captain.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let the record reflect that's a small trophy that you just held up. But I certainly want to congratulate the Democratic team. It was a great day to make some friends among the serving Members. It was great to see some of the former Members come back and visit with them. As has been pointed out, the real winners were the wounded warriors and the organizations that work every day to help them rebuild their lives.

I want to again congratulate the Democratic team members and thank everybody for their involvement. It was a wonderful day.

Mr. BACA. Thank you very much. With that, it says Speaker's Trophy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 163, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

AYES—248

Adams
Akin
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Capuano
Carnahan
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kingston
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nugent
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sutton
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—163

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Barletta
Barrow
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Calvert
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Ellmers
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Gonzalez
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Himes
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Sessions
Sewell
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Van Hollen
Walz (MN)
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Woodall

NOT VOTING—21

Bachmann
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Butterfield
Cardoza
Dingell
Engel
Eshoo
Giffords
Higgins
Lee (CA)
Paul
Rokita
Shimkus
Slaughter
Speier
Stivers
Tsongas
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1907

Ms. MCCOLLUM changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the last three lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012''.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) having assumed the chair, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 288, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 288, the question is on retaining the title of the bill beginning on page 25, line 14 relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The question is, Shall that title be retained?

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 409, noes 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

AYES—409

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—1

Griffith (VA)

NOT VOTING—22

Bachmann
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Butterfield
Cardoza
Dingell
Engel
Eshoo
Giffords
Herger
Higgins
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Paul
Rokita
Shimkus
Slaughter
Speier
Stivers
Tsongas
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner

□ 1926

So the question was decided in the affirmative, and title II of the bill was retained.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my votes this evening. Had I been present to cast my votes, I would have voted "yes" on the amendment offered by Mr. LATOURETTE and "yes" on the amendment offered by Mr. SHERMAN. I would have voted "no" on the amendment offered by Mr. AMASH, and finally I would have voted "yes" on retaining title II, the Department of Veterans Affairs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on official business and missed rollcall vote Nos. 413, 414, 415 and 416. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 413, "nay" on rollcall No. 414, "aye" on rollcall vote No. 415 and "aye" on rollcall vote No. 416. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the permanent RECORD immediately following this vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2055 is postponed.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor to H.R. 1380.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2112, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–103) on the resolution (H.

Res. 300) providing for consideration of 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from H.R. 1380.

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

There was no objection.

POLITICAL IED IN IRAQ

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from Iraq with other Members to see our military, we further met with Prime Minister Maliki. We discussed the killing of the 35 freedom-seeking Iranian dissidents at Camp Ashraf by Iraqi authorities. The United States has turned over the protection of these people who oppose Iranian dictator Ahmadinejad to Iraq. The Prime Minister's candid position was that the dissidents were responsible for their own deaths and the Iraqi Government was not to be blamed for their recent demise.

Upon requesting that we wished to visit the camp to hear from the people who actually saw what happened, you would have thought a political IED had gone off. The Prime Minister curtly rejected that request. In an effort to fairly get at the truth, the statements from the ones actually present at the homicides was important. It is disturbing that the Prime Minister refused us access to the Iranian dissidents he promised the United States he would protect.

What does the Iraqi Government have to hide? Maybe the truth. Meanwhile, 35 innocent people are dead and hundreds of others are wounded by this new ''free'' democracy in Iraq.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING DALLAS MAVERICKS ON WINNING 2011 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Dallas Mavericks on winning the 2011 National Basketball Association Championship. This is the organization's first NBA world championship title, and I congratulate the team owner, Mark Cuban, Coach Rick Carlisle, his staff, and the entire Mavericks organization on this great accomplishment. I also congratulate the team's captain, Dirk Nowitzki, on being named the recipient of the NBA Finals Most Valuable Player Award, so much deserved.

The Mavericks also display a strong commitment to the Dallas community through its foundation. The Dallas Mavericks Foundation is dedicated to inspiring and motivating our youth to take their education seriously and to strive for healthy bodies and minds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating each member of the 2011 NBA Championship Dallas Mavericks for their very many victories, but their very first championship, the champions of our community.

□ 1930

CREATING JOBS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLORES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to some of my friends here. We are going to spend some time talking tonight about the difficulty this country is having in terms of unemployment and job creation. We have got a big challenge ahead of us, and the Republicans here in the House have a lot of good ideas about how we can get this economy going, how we can take the regulatory burden off of small businesses, how we can reform the Tax Code for individuals and for businesses so we can be competitive.

I would like to yield to my friend from Illinois, ADAM KINZINGER.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing some pretty tough times in our country. I remember the days when we had very low unemployment, and if you wanted a job you had multiple offers when you got out of college, and everybody needed you and the economy was thriving. And now we are creeping back up in the unemployment.

I remember when we passed an $800 billion spending package out of the House of Representatives—$800 billion—and we were told that if we pass this spending package, unemployment will not exceed 8 percent, and we approached 10 percent. Thankfully, unemployment began to go down, but now it is stalled out, and it is beginning to go up again.

What we have is this idea of we need to spend, we need to borrow, and we need to tax our way to prosperity. And what does that do? Well, I will tell you what it does. It raises our taxes, and it just piles burdens on our children and grandchildren—and us. Yes, we all care about our children and grandchildren, but even this generation now is swimming in debt.

Think about this: If you combine the cost of the war in Iraq and the cost of the war in Afghanistan, you combine them this year, do you realize that is less expensive than what we are paying just in interest on our national debt? Just in interest. And that is going to continue to grow. As we add more and more debt, that interest is going to continue to get bigger and bigger. And do you know what? We have another year of deficits, so the interest is bigger, and we have another year, so the interest is bigger.

Meanwhile, the job creators, the people who really get this economy rolling, the people who we are going to rely on to take individuals who are unemployed and take them from recipients of tax dollars—where they don't want to be—to taxpayers, the small business owners and these factory owners that we want to get manufacturing back, they are the ones that have to say, look, I have to invest for 10 and 15 and 20 years in the future, and all I see is a future of debt, doubt, and despair.

I think my colleagues will agree with me when I say that we live in the greatest country in the world, and I think they will agree with me when I say there is absolutely no reason, there is no reason that Americans should begin to accept the fact that we are in decline.

America doesn't have to be a nation in decline. America is a world leader, and we can retain our position as the world leader, but it is not going to be through what is done in government. It is not going to be by passing more regulations. It is not going to be by passing more taxation. It is not going to be by more and more rules and redtape. No. It is going to be done by restoring that entrepreneurial spirit that made our country so great in the first place.

I remember as a kid watching cowboy movies and seeing the old West and how America built the country that we have today, and learning about the Industrial Revolution and learning about those folks that worked long hours to make what we have, and being very proud of what I saw, every moment. But we began to accept that is no longer in our DNA. Ladies and gentleman, that is not true. That is in our DNA. That is who we are.

We can recover from this massive debt we are seeing, and we can do it easily. Well, we have got to cut spending, but we have got to get people back to work.

My home State of Illinois, the President's home State of Illinois, is a shining example of what not to do to create jobs. In Illinois, we just increased the individual tax rate. Well, that was probably not overly brilliant, because now people are leaving Illinois at an even faster rate than they were prior.

But then we did something especially crazy—we increased the corporate tax rate in Illinois. So now you have our neighbors in Indiana that are really

having a field day with businesses coming over to them. You have our friends in Texas and in the South, like my friend from Arkansas, that are begging folks to come over and bring their businesses from Illinois. In fact, The Wall Street Journal just came out with an article that said while Illinois has raised $300 million in receipts from this tax increase, they have given away $240 million just to keep businesses there that were leaving because of the tax increase. Then we even contemplate in these halls increasing taxes on job creators again.

Debt, doubt, and despair and big bloated bureaucracy is in our future right now. It doesn't need to be. Our future is the future of the America that when you remember your parents and grandparents working hard, that is what we are going to be again.

The situation we are in is not fun. The situation we are in right now is very difficult. It is going to take a lot of hard work. It is going to take tough proposals. We put forward a budget plan to begin to get us out of the deficit and balance the budget. But you know what we got from the other side of the aisle, as my colleagues can attest to, is just demonization. No, not an alternative that we can take our budget and their budget and try to come up and meet in the middle somewhere, which the American people want. They want both sides to talk and come to a conclusion. But we didn't get that. We got television commercials. We got attempts to frighten senior citizens. We got politics as usual.

I don't think it is any doubt if you are watching, I am a young guy. I can tell you that the generation today believes in an America that I believe in. We see people go overseas all the time to Iraq and Afghanistan and defend freedom and stand for what they believe in. And do you know what? Some of these people going overseas today were 8 years old when 9/11 happened, but they know what we represent.

I will not accept second place. My colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle will not accept an America in decline, because we will maintain our position as the greatest country in the world. But, ladies and gentlemen, to do that, we have got to make tough decisions. It can't be about the next election anymore. It has got to be about the next generation. It can't be about 2012. It has got to be somewhat about 2011—right now.

So I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for organizing this opportunity to just talk to the American people and say, look, we want to get people back to work, but you can't spend, you can't tax, and you can't borrow your way to prosperity. Never accept second best. We will continue to maintain our role as the greatest country in the world, and I kind of like being in that position.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman.

I hear a lot of folks who talk about the problem that we have economically, the debt problem, all of the many things that we have been trying to address here in the House, and I hear them say, well, if we can just get to where we need to be after the next Presidential election, after the next President, whoever that President is, after that President is sworn in in January of 2013, if we can just get to that point in time, then we can really address the problems.

□ 1940

That scares me because I don't think we can wait anywhere near that long. In fact, I think we are already living on borrowed time in terms of the crisis that this country is facing. We know for a fact President Clinton appointed a Medicare commission over a decade ago, a bipartisan Medicare commission.

Why did he do that? He did it because we had a problem then. We had a problem then in 1998, and we still have that problem now. We have a problem with the insolvency of Medicare. We have a problem with rising health care costs. We have a problem with our debt and the deficits that we run year after year after year. We have a problem with too much regulation—too much government regulation—which stifles job creation. We have a problem with our Tax Code. If you're talking about our business Tax Code and business taxes, we have a problem there. Why? Because it's hard to compete with other countries when you've got the highest corporate tax rate in the world.

It's not about whether you like big business or small business. It's about job creators. And our Tax Code discourages job creation. If you're talking about individual income tax, we've got a problem there, too. We've got one of the most complicated Tax Codes.

So what have we done about it here in the House? Well, on all of these counts we have acted. We have acted. And we've been passing legislation that addresses the jobs issue, our spending issue, Medicare, the Tax Code, overregulation. This is what we've been doing day in and day out since we got here.

And I would like to yield to some of my friends. Before I do, I would just like to say this: we're the only one with a plan. Where's the Senate's plan? Where's the President's plan?

So as we discuss here tonight, I just ask us all to think about where is the other plan that we can compare ours to. There's not one. In fact, a former Democratic National Committee chair who's running for Senate now in Virginia, Tim Kaine, said today, It's a pretty bad deal when the Senate hasn't even passed a budget. The U.S. Senate doesn't have a plan. The President doesn't have a plan. This House has a plan. And we're working hard every day to execute it and implement it.

I would like to yield now to the gentlelady from Washington.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Thank you. I appreciate my friend's work here on the floor.

I just came back from a week in my home district in southwest Washington. It's a tremendous place. It's where I grew up. Some of my fondest memories are in and around southwest Washington, whether it was lakes or rivers or streams or working my first job at the Vancouver Mall. It's not even called the Vancouver Mall anymore. I had a lot of opportunities—a lot of opportunities that I am very worried the next generation of Washingtonians are not going to have. And let me tell you why. Our unemployment has been over double digits going on 3 years now.

Let me read this to you because this is important. These aren't just empty numbers. These represent families and lives: Clark County, 10.2 percent; Cowlitz County; 11.9 percent; Lewis County, 13.2 percent; Pacific County, 12.5 percent; Wahkiakum, 11.8 percent; Skamania, 12.9 percent; and Thurston County is at 8 percent.

Let me compare those numbers quickly. I'm not happy about 8 percent. I'm not happy about 13 percent. But there's a slight difference in the reason that the Thurston County numbers are lower than the other counties, and that's because that's where the State government is housed.

So there are more government jobs, more public sector jobs in that area. But the rest of the district and even in Thurston County is based on small businesses. These are the hearts and souls of our economy. Small business owners, entrepreneurs, mom-and-pop shops.

I got to tour Somarakis Vacuum Pumps. He is an engineer that started a small little company. Built it up. He's passing it on to his son. He's now expanded into two counties. He has a vision to grow and hire people. In fact, he has been able to stay afloat these last few years because a lot of the trade that he's done, he deals with other corporations and other countries across the world, which is one of the reasons he's been able to remain competitive.

You know what he told me this last week when I was home and I was touring his new facility? He said, JAIME—I wish I could give you his Greek accent, but I can't—he said, JAIME, I'm a proud American. I built this company because I believe in the entrepreneurial spirit of America. I believe in this country. But you in Washington, D.C.—and he's speaking to the governing class here—are making it harder for me to function. You're making it harder for me to survive: the unpredictability, the high taxes, the new energy proposals, some of which the President has supported.

He said, JAIME, if that cap-and-trade bill went into effect or if you increase my energy taxes through the EPA, I will be out of business. I will not be able to hire the next generation of engineers and pass this company on.

And other small businesses around our whole region and around our Nation are saying the same thing: can

you give us some predictability, quit raising our taxes, get the EPA off our backs. We all want to protect our way of life, but what's happening right now is small business owners, the job creators, are being squeezed. And why?

I was reflecting on, it's true, neither the Senate nor the President has put forward a really strong governing jobs agenda this year. When we got to meet with the President a couple of weeks ago, he pointed to some of the bills that they passed last year, and some of the plans. If I reflect on the $700 billion-plus bailout or the $800 billion stimulus or the health care bill that was over a trillion dollars, one would think if we spent that kind of money, we would have the jobs to show for it.

But where are the jobs? I just read you the unemployment numbers for southwest Washington State. They have actually not gone up in tremendous rise. So, clearly, borrowing and spending more has, at the very least, a negligible effect. We can do better. We have to do better. The way we do that—stop bailing out big corporations, banks, auto dealers. Right? Stop spending more money.

Fast fact: I had some job creators in my office a couple of weeks ago, and they were asking for more investment. And I asked them about the stimulus—the $800 billion stimulus bill that the President and the Democrats here voted on and passed last year—how much that had actually stimulated job creation. You know what they told me? Less than 3 percent of that number actually went to build roads. Remember the shovel-ready hurrah that was talked about? We're passing this because we're going to build infrastructure. I'm one of those who believes infrastructure is important. Less than 3.5 percent was actually used to build roads.

Where is the rest of that money? My goodness, we borrowed almost half of that. We're going to pass the interest and the debt on to the next generation, and yet we didn't even use it on what we said we were going to use it on. That tells me that we're spending too much, we're borrowing too much. It's time to cut back.

Every family in southwest Washington and across this Nation has cut their own budget back in recent years. Every small business owner, job creators, they will tell you—I have several in my area who haven't even taken a paycheck in several years in order that they not lay anyone else off. And they're looking at us, saying, Why can't you live within your means? Well, guess what? We're going to. Not only are we going to make sensible cuts and reductions, we're also going to stimulate job growth.

Energy was one of the things I mentioned. In the last couple of months we have passed off this House floor several bills that allow us to drill for energy here in America, using American entrepreneurialism, American innovation, and creating American jobs. I call on our Senate to pass those bills and the President to sign them into law. They're saying thousands and thousands of jobs could be created here in America if we simply take advantage of the resources in our backyards. That will do several things. It will drive down the cost of gas, which is going to hit every family and every small business here in the next several months. That's one immediate step we can take, in addition to cutting back overspending. That's a jobs production bill.

□ 1950

We could also make sure that we allow for some predictability. With these Federal regulations that are coming out, small business owners call me regularly, and say, Good grief. I just barely get one rule under order, and you're sending me five new ones. I can't keep up.

Here is the difference. Small businesses, small business owners, they can't just hire someone who is not being productive and just dedicate that person's time to going through Federal regulations. Maybe a big corporation could, one which can retain lots of lobbyists or lawyers; but at the True Value Hardware on Main Street in Ridgefield, both the owners actually work the store, so they can't just waste money to jump through government regulations and government hoops. It has got to stop.

Last year, the EPA released 900 new regulations—900. Do you know what the EPA acting director for the water department told us on the Transportation Committee just 2 or 3 months ago? She basically said she didn't have to take into account any of those regulations and their impact on our economy. That wasn't her concern. I'm sorry. Since when does the government put forward regulations and rules and then say, ''We don't have any concern for what that's going to do to the economy''? That's why we're in the mess we're in now.

We can change it. We can take some steps to bring oversight to these regulatory agencies. Man, they're just going crazy. We're going to work to streamline those, and we're going to do it now because House Republicans believe and understand that job creators and job growth occur in the private sector when individuals and entrepreneurs have the freedom to grow and to develop, not when they're hampered, not when their wrists are tied, not when they're told, You have to jump through these hoops just to sell your product or just to hire someone. It has got to stop, which is why we're putting forward and why House Republicans are proud to put forward bills that are either going to pull back some of these regulations or streamline them, reform them or allow for more American job growth here in the United States.

So I appreciate that, and I look forward to hearing what my other colleagues have to say about this pro-growth agenda.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you.

Before I yield to my colleagues, I would like to just go through the plan that the House Republicans have put together that certainly includes addressing the debt, that certainly includes addressing our spending. It's a plan that we believe will help get us on the right fiscal path and help this country—the private sector—create jobs. There is much, much more to what we're trying to do here in the House to encourage private sector job creation, and I'd like to run through some of those.

As I indicated, certainly we need to deal with the debt. That's why we talk about reforming Medicare and saving Medicare for those on it and saving it for the next generation. We talk about that a lot because that directly relates to our debt, and we have to get our debt under control if we're going to have the type of job growth that we are accustomed to in this country: job growth based on technological advancement and innovation. So dealing with the debt is a critical component of encouraging private sector job creation.

Yet there are other parts to our plan, which include increasing energy development, maximizing energy production. We have passed numerous bills here in the House that will encourage drilling in the gulf and that will encourage drilling offshore so that we can create more jobs in energy production and become energy independent. It's not just a jobs issue. It's a national security issue.

There is also the issue of the Tax Code that I referred to earlier. We can't be competitive in this country if we don't reform the way we tax individuals and the way we tax businesses. Ultimately, when businesses decide to land somewhere, they look and they ask, Is that where I want to do business? Unfortunately, we have created an environment in this country that runs business off. We want businesses to look around the world and say, The United States is where I want to create jobs. That's the only place for me. In order to do that, we've got to make sure that we have rules in place that encourage private sector job creation.

I'd now like to yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for organizing tonight's conversation with the American people about what our plan for job creation is all about and how we're going to, once again, restore the greatness of this country by getting America back to work, by creating an economy for job creators.

The gentlelady from Washington reminded me of my visits throughout my district this past week in eastern Colorado and northern Colorado, Colorado's Fourth Congressional District. It's around 6 o'clock back home, and there are probably a lot of people who are just now coming home from work or

who are about to get off work. They're worried about how they're going to continue to pay for their daughter's education, how they're going to make ends meet, what they're going to do to afford that car payment.

I and every single person here tonight will assure them that we have a plan for jobs, that we have voted on our plan for jobs and that we will continue to pursue policies to create jobs in this country, not because they're created by government but because we get government out of the way and allow the private sector to flourish.

This last week in Colorado, I met with a number of businesses. I toured a number of businesses in northern and eastern Colorado, and I had the opportunity to talk to the leadership of those companies and to the people who work on the lines in the factories. I was struck by one statement, one statement by an individual who said, It's time that we let loose the innovators and the entrepreneurs in America.

What are we doing to let loose the innovators and the entrepreneurs in this great country?

I know what the Republicans have been doing to make sure that we're reducing regulations, to make sure that we have an energy policy that, instead of strangling the American working family, helps the American working family and that opens up our resources. We can do so in an environmentally responsible manner. We have done it, and we will continue to do it. We will continue to pursue tax policies that are fair and that don't chase businesses overseas but that allow those jobs to be created right here.

Another business owner in my State gave me a call last year, and said, You know what? My number one competitor just moved to Ireland, and I'm left with a choice. I can either stay headquartered here in Colorado and pay 30 percent more in taxes than they do or I can go overseas and find another place to do business and take those jobs with me.

That's not the kind of choice that we ought to be presenting in this country to the men and women who create business in the United States. Instead of deciding where to go, the question they ought to be asking is, How much can we grow right here in the U.S.? Along these lines, of the factories that I toured and of the manufacturing plants that I toured, I spoke with one employee who came up to me and said, I'm just glad this business is located in Colorado. I'm glad they chose Colorado.

It wasn't that long ago that I was a State legislator. I remember one of the debates that we were dealing with was a particular regulation that many small businesses were struggling with. They were trying to figure out whether or not they could survive under that regulation. While the debate in the Colorado State Legislature was taking place on whether or not this regulation was good for job creation or not, there was an advertisement on one of the State's largest radio stations from our neighbor to the north, the great State of Wyoming. Their Chamber of Commerce and one of their municipalities said, Come to Wyoming, a business friendly place. They said that because Colorado was forcing a regulation on its business owners that was going to put the men and women of our State out of business. They saw an opportunity. They said, Come to us. We'll take your jobs. We'll take your businesses. You can do it right here, and you'll be better for it.

That's not the kind of policy I want for Colorado, and that's not the kind of policy I want for the United States. The policy of this country should be this:

We will make sure our government gets out of your way to let you do what you do best—run your businesses, your families and your lives. We're not going to foster policies that force you to make a decision to go overseas because of an arbitrary decision in our Tax Code or a regulatory scheme that says, Don't do business here because we're going to make it too tough on you to do business.

Our plan for jobs in the 112th Congress is clear. Unfortunately, on the other side of the aisle, my colleagues on the Democratic side seem to have labeled their 112th Congress mission the ''kick the can down the road'' tour.

□ 2000

It is the kick the can down the road tour because they're not going to present solutions for Medicare. They're not going to present solutions to solve our energy crisis. They're not going to present solutions to solve our debt and deficit, but no, they're going to pass it on to the next generation. They're going to kick the can down the road and say, You know what? If you're 50 or 55, we're going to go ahead and put the burden all on you, all on you.

That is not a solution for this country. That is debt, doubt, and despair, as my colleague from Illinois just a few minutes ago so eloquently stated. Debt, doubt, and despair. I haven't heard a campaign theme of debt, doubt, and despair, but that is certainly what they are running on.

We can do better, and I'm glad to be part of the 112th Congress and the Republican majority that has said we will create jobs in this country, we will get back to economic opportunity, and we will start by taking care of future generations, and that work begins today.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his time.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you to the gentleman from Colorado.

I now yield to the gentlelady from Alabama.

Mrs. ROBY. I appreciate my colleague from Arkansas for giving us time tonight to talk about this most important issue, which is jobs.

It is the number one issue here, and what I see and we've all testified to tonight is that, as we travel throughout our districts, the number one thing that we hear from business owners all throughout the United States is the heavy hand of government has created so much uncertainty that the private sector, even those who have the ability to create jobs, are not doing so because they're fearful. They don't know what the Federal Government is going to do to them next, and this is so evident by the recent unemployment numbers that have come out.

Since the first day that this administration took office through the end of April of this year, the economy has lost 2.5 million jobs. That is an average of 3,044 jobs every single day. And unfortunately, and just to talk about the gentlelady from Washington's unemployment numbers, those numbers aren't even necessarily correct, because the rate is so much higher because so many job seekers are giving up and they are leaving the labor force.

I traveled, like you all did, throughout my district this week, and I found myself at Rand Manufacturing, and they manufacture water heaters. It's a household name. They have over 1,000 jobs in the city of Montgomery, and they brought me into a room that was used for research and development for their company, but it was an addition, a $1 million addition to their headquarters which is already over 700,000 square feet, but $1 million that they had to invest due to regulation alone. This is not a research and development facility to further their products. This is to keep up with the government regulations that they have to comply with.

How in the world can we expect the private sector to invest in job creation when every dime they have is going toward complying with government regulation? Companies in the United States of America are hitting the brakes on hiring and production. And to go back to the U.S. factory sector, the engine of our recovery, it had its biggest 1-month slowdown since 1984, and they showed private sector hiring dropped drastically.

You know, I'm a mom. I have two children, Margaret and George, who you hear me talk about often, and a lot of Members have their children up here this week with them. And as I look around the floor and I see these young people, I think: This is why we're here. And as was so eloquently said, it has to be about the future generation and not the next election. And when I look into my children's eyes, I am reminded about how important it is that we do all we can, which is what we are. We're leading. We're doing all we can to lift this heavy hand of government. And when I go to the grocery store and when I'm at the gas pump, we see it. We feel it. We know exactly what is going on.

In January of 2011, President Obama said entrepreneurs embody the promise of America, the idea that if you have a good idea and you are willing to work

hard and see it through, you can succeed in this country, and in pursuing this promise, entrepreneurs also play a critical role in expanding our economy and creating jobs. That was President Obama in January of 2011. The Obama administration has done nothing to encourage businesses to create jobs. They have been obstructionists, causing uncertainty, this growing uncertainty with this overreaching regulation. Economic growth has been stifled.

House Republicans have taken steps to reduce spending in a meaningful way by approving all the legislation that the gentleman from Arkansas talked about to decrease spending for the rest of the year, and we adopted a budget that will cut nearly $6 trillion over the course of the next 10 years.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle have done nothing to demonstrate their commitment to private job growth in this country. Increased spending, misguided attacks on the budget that we passed, raising the debt without deficit reduction, and burdensome regulations—this is the plan being offered by the other side of the aisle, and this is not what the American people sent us here to Washington to do for that future generation.

I ask the President and my Democrat colleagues to let us make sure that entrepreneurs continue to embody the promise of America. Enough is enough. More taxation, regulation, and litigation will not create more jobs in this country.

America is certainly at a crossroads. We have an opportunity here, and House Republicans are committed to taking every possible step to spur job creation and get our economy back on track so that Americans can do what they do best, that is, create and innovate and lead.

I again thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you to the gentlelady from Alabama.

You know, when I think about where we are in this country in terms of unemployment and I think about what we can do to encourage job creation, it's clear to me that we can fix this problem. This is something that is possible.

Sometimes I feel like this administration's solution to the unemployment problem is to go around and beg the private sector to invest, to beg the private sector to create jobs. That doesn't work.

There's a reason that folks in the private sector who have money to invest are not investing. They're sitting on the sidelines. Why? Well, it's a lot like investing in your own family situation. You want to be careful with your money. You've got a certain amount of money to invest. You want to invest it in something that's safe. You want to invest it in something where there's certainty. You certainly don't want to take this money that you have, this limited amount of money, and just gamble it on something risky. You want to make sure that what you're putting your money into is going to pay dividends.

And so what you have is you have a lot of businesses in this country who have money to invest but they're uncertain. We've heard that word ''uncertainty'' tonight. Well, it is not just a buzzword. It's a fact. When businesses don't know what's going to happen, job creators, when they don't know what's going to happen, they hold on to that money and they say, Well, I better wait; I better wait until I know how things, with more certainty, how things are going to shake out.

There's certainly always going to be some sort of uncertainty. Are the crops going to get rain? Well, that's not something we have control over. But some types of certainty and uncertainty we do have a control over, and it directly relates to policy.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN from Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

□ 2010

Mr. GARDNER. A group of us had the opportunity today to discuss with one of the Nation's leading economists job creation and what's happening to our businesses around the country. And he made the observation, he said, You know, there are a lot of businesses—exactly what you had said—there are a lot of businesses out there that have money on their rolls, but they're not investing into our economy because of what he called and used the term ''government activism,'' policies that relate to government activism. I said, What do you mean by government activism? I am assuming you are not talking about somebody going out from government with a picket sign. And he said, No, no, no. Government activism in terms of the policies that they are pursuing that result in uncertainty, whether it's a regulatory approach that is an activist approach that takes away the certainty business has for the tax structure, for business environment regulations. And the conversation you had was, If we could bring back certainty, if we could get this country back to a point where businesses know what's ahead tomorrow, they know what's ahead next year, then they can plan, and they won't be afraid to invest that money. They'll start creating jobs now. That's one of the Nation's leading economists who said exactly what my colleague from Arkansas is saying tonight.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And I think the debt is directly related to the issue of certainty or uncertainty. If you are an investor and you want to build a new plant, create a new business, do something that would result in job creation, whether you are from outside this country or here in the United States, you are thinking about investing, you look at the nervousness in the market, you look at the debt that we have, you think about the housing collapse in September 2008, and you sort of think to yourself, You know, this debt makes me nervous. I'm not sure where this is going. And they look and say, Is the government of the United States, led by the President, are they going to get their fiscal house in order so that if I invest, it's a safe bet? So if I invest, I can be certain that I'm investing in a country where the government has got their act together? Or am I looking to invest in a country that's going to just continue to raise that debt ceiling, see no limit?

I actually was in the Judiciary Committee a couple of weeks ago, and one of my colleagues on the other side made the argument that we just haven't spent enough money. If we only would spend another trillion or so, we might have some economic activity. I couldn't believe what I was hearing. And I said to myself, How high does unemployment have to go? How high does the debt have to go before we realize that we've got to get the spending under control?

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I yield to the gentlelady from Washington.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I was thinking through your comments here. And the gentleman from Colorado was talking about the uncertainty in investment. Why would you invest when you saw someone just burning through cash? You know, there's another reason that people wouldn't invest, and I think of a company in my district, Longview Fibre.

In southwest Washington, we have tremendous resources in our timber, sawmills, Holden paper companies, just tremendous renewable resources. And one of those energy sources that people have seemed to research is the ability to, through biomass, create energy. This is a green source of energy.

Let's talk about what uncertainty can do to a business. So in the last couple of years, the EPA has signaled—and then pulled back and then signaled—that they're not going to count biomass as green. So a company takes considerable time, energy, effort, and resources to put in play a biomass facility. And then the EPA steps in and says, Oh, time out, it doesn't matter how much money you have invested, it doesn't matter how much time and resources you have invested, we don't think that is going to count—and puts everything on hold.

Well, the EPA decided to stay its ruling for a little bit, meaning they're not really sure whether biomass is green or not. In an environment like that, what company would take the time and the energy and the resources to create a biomass facility? And for a moment there—let me explain. Biomass isn't chipping whole, new, old-growth trees—I guess that would be old trees. It's chips. It's the waste. It's the bark. It's actually fully using the resource of timber, right? It's properly managing that resource. But the EPA—actually, what I think it is is some bureaucrat in

the central planning office somewhere here in Washington, D.C., has said, Ah, we don't understand that. We think you are going to cut all your trees down. We're just going to go ahead and tie your hands. It ties up resources, capital, and jobs.

Longview Fibre is in Cowlitz County. Cowlitz County is upwards in double-digit unemployment. These are good-paying, family wage jobs. This uncertainty is killing us. You know, another thing you mentioned—actually, I think it was the gentleman from Colorado who talked a little bit about business is not hiring and why.

I'm a member of the Small Business Committee. And through testimony, I think it was about 2 weeks ago, we had a whole panel on—it had to do with health information technology. But interestingly, the Gallup organization was represented there, and they do nightly surveys. On some of the questions that they had asked, it showed small businesses, that small business owners were not hiring to capacity. In fact, there was about 40 percent more they could hire. So existing businesses could hire up to 40 percent more people if they weren't doing it. So, naturally, we asked ''Why?'' in the answer. Shoot, they didn't have the certainty to know whether or not they were going to have any kind of cash flow, or if they could make payroll if they did it. You know what was on the top of that list up there? Health care. Health care costs.

Our small business owners continue to be targeted by government-run health care schemes. And that's what they are. Because if we want to talk health care, we can talk health care. We can talk compromise in health care because that's a passion of mine. But the schemes that were passed target, unfairly, these small businesses. Now some are getting waivers. Some are not getting waivers. Shoot, why in the world would you hire more employees if you didn't know whether you are going to be targeted or not targeted? That's uncertainty, and it's got to stop.

It's time that we put people before politics. We think of the families who are at the pump, the moms who are trying to make ends meet, balance the checkbook, go get groceries, pick up the kids from school, make health care appointments. It's time we put them first, not agendas, not ideas. It's time we put people before politics, and that's exactly what we have been doing and that's what we are going to continue to fight for here on this House floor.

Mrs. ROBY. To add to that, again, the district work weeks, this new schedule that we have, which affords all of us more time with our constituents, which is so important for transparency and accountability to the people who elected us to be here, who we are making decisions for on their behalf, representing their interests. I can't tell you how many times in these meetings—just what you are saying—in preparation for full implementation of this health care law, we are seeing businesses sit around conference tables, throwing their hands up, having to spend lots and lots of dollars that could go toward creation of jobs. But they're spending all this money just trying to figure out how this law is going to affect them and their bottom line. And it is a huge travesty. And I'm sure that each of you have had similar situations. But we know that there are free-market solutions to driving down the cost of health care in this country, and that law does nothing to do that, to increase competition and to drive down cost. But yet what we do see every time we sit down at the table with these business owners is, we see how the costs associated with implementing the law is killing them.

So I just wanted to add that to the table. And on behalf of the folks in Alabama that I'm so grateful to have the opportunity to be here to represent, I can't say it strong enough and loud enough about the plan that we have here in the majority of the House to do all that we can to untie the hands of our business owners so that we can get this country back on track.

□ 2020

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you. You make some good points about health care. And one of the things that we have pursued here in the House is medical liability reform. And when we were meeting with the President at the White House, a little over a week ago, someone raised the issue of medical liability reform. He said, well, I'm for that. I'm for that.

It's one thing to say you're for it. It's another thing to advocate for this sort of legislation. We're going to send it over to the Senate from here in the House, and we need the President to get engaged on this issue.

Medical liability reform is one of many solutions, market-based solutions, that can help reduce the health care costs. And it's not enough for the President to say, well, I'm for that.

The President said in the State of the Union on the issue of business taxes, he understands that we're at a competitive disadvantage. He says he does. He says he would like to see us be more competitive with regard to business taxes. But no action, nothing, no leadership on the issue of business taxes.

If he wants to talk about competitiveness, let's talk about competitiveness. Let's talk about having a tax structure that welcomes job creators, not repels them.

If you want to talk about competitiveness, let's talk about trade agreements. On January 27 of 2010, President Obama said, ''If America sits on the sidelines while other nations sign trade deals, we will lose the opportunity to create jobs on our shores.''

Mr. President, opportunity lost. We've been waiting. We've got three free trade agreements just sitting on the shelf, one with Colombia, one with Panama and one with South Korea. And the estimates are that these trade agreements, if they were implemented, would increase U.S. exports by more than $10 billion. I've got to think that $10 billion in increased exports would equal some jobs. But no action from the President.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. And I too have heard the President talk about his desire to increase trade and the exports of this country. In fact, I believe I've heard the statistic quoted, something to the effect that if we could increase trade in this Nation by exports by 1 percent, we'd create tens of thousands of jobs.

We talk about what we're going to do to get this country moving forward again, how we're going to get this economy back, and there is a perfect example of what we can do, not only from my home State of Colorado, but for this country. The goods that we produce, to share them with the world, to make not just U.S. consumers, but world consumers of the excellence in manufacturing that this country used to be, can be, still ought to be and should be into the future.

And so again, I think you talk about the opportunities that we have missed. The other night we came to the floor, and there was a group talking about make it in America. Well, you know what we need to make it in America? We need a business environment that fosters job growth. We need a tax policy that doesn't penalize people for choosing to work in the United States.

To make it in America we need an energy policy that doesn't force people to pay $60, $70 every time they fill up a tank of gas just to get to work. To make it in America we need regulations that are pro-business, not anti-business.

To make it in America we need a government that actually represents the American working families, not just bureaucracy. That's what we need to make it in America. And when it comes to trade agreements, I believe that we can and we ought to make it in America, and we can sell it abroad.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. You make a good point. It's not just happenstance when a country has a good manufacturing base. You don't just happen to have job creation. It's a function of policies. It's a function of the policies that we adopt in the Congress, or that we don't adopt.

For example, we haven't reformed our business taxes in years. While other countries are making themselves more competitive, we're sitting on our hands. It's not happenstance.

I want to be so attractive in this country to job creators that manufacturers in other countries want to come here. I want manufacturers around the world to want to be in this country. And the manufacturers that we might have lost, I want them to say, hey,

they've changed their tune. I'm going back home. I want businesses, job creators around the world to say, that's the country where I want to create jobs because it's the best place to do business.

And we, the policies that we adopt here, the regulations that the administration puts forth, it all has an impact. It's not happenstance. It's by design. So we need to make sure that we're doing the things here that encourage the private sector job growth.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. And I couldn't agree more. I was just sitting here reflecting on the number of people who come up and talk to me in my district in southwest Washington about how hard it is to find work, how hard it is to find a good paying family-wage job.

I mentioned timber resources. In our neck of the woods we traditionally have had just a booming timber economy, resource-based economy; and a lot of those operations have either shut down or moved elsewhere to be more competitive.

We've got to allow job growth. I mean, it sounds simple. It really does. You know, the last time our country had the amount of spending that we see happening right now was actually in the lead up to World War II. And I've talked a lot about cutting and reducing government overspending and government growth. It needs to be done. In the last 3 years, the what we call discretionary spending, the money that has to be appropriated annually has increased by over 80 percent. Federal employment has increased by 10 percent in about that same time. So government spending has grown. And people are saying that the way to—not ''people''—my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the President are saying that the reason we have stagnant job opportunities is because we haven't spent enough.

Well, I listed earlier the stimulus, the bailouts, the auto bailouts, the health care bill, all this spending that's taken place; and we're still where we are now. And people say, well, it happened during World War II; we spent a ton of money and then coming out of that we grew jobs. The difference, the big difference was coming out of World War II, the last time our debt to GDP ratio was near where it is now, the difference was, and the thing that saved us, was the immediate cuts. Right?

We cut government spending back, but we grew jobs. We literally made things here in America. You know why? We had an environment that fostered job creation. We had an environment that cultivated entrepreneurs. We grew jobs here in America because we made things here. We produced things.

Again, in southwest Washington we had a roaring timber industry that has all but shut down, and the sad thing is if you don't manage the health of a forest, it deteriorates. Some of these folks who are here in these bureaucratic offices in Washington, D.C. I swear have never stepped foot in a real forest. They think you just tie a big ribbon around it and don't let anybody in or out, and that's how we protect our environment. They're wrong. You see, they think that our environment and our economy are mutually exclusive.

Man, that is such a low opinion of American researchers. That really must say that we don't think we can, our citizens, our people are intelligent enough to come up with new and innovative ways to both manage our timber and our timber economy and protect our environment.

So what we have now is shut off stands of trees ripe for beetle infestation, disease or worse, fire as we enter the summer seasons with a lot of dry foliage and underbrush. You know, it sure would be great if the EPA would have allowed some of those companies I mentioned in my district to create their biomass facilities, because then we could create jobs because we'd have a biomass facility up and running. We would be taking the remnants of trees. We wouldn't be taking full trees, but chips and bark, and using those in the biomass facility so we are creating green energy. We're fully utilizing a renewable resource, and we're creating jobs.

My goodness. That's a novel concept. We need to get there.

□ 2030

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentlelady.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just came back from our work week. I traveled better than 1,500 miles throughout Colorado. It was remarkable to me. At every one of our meetings, we found cities, counties, small businesspeople, talking about the opportunity to be able to get America back to work. But the problem, the obstacle that we are truly facing, it is not the American spirit but it is overregulation coming out of Washington, D.C. Rather than being the steppingstone, it has become a stumbling block, and we are going to be able to get this economy working and moving forward once again if we simply free up that American spirit.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from H.R. 1380.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from H.R. 1380.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROKITA (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SHIMKUS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of family reasons.

Mr. WEINER (at the request of Mr. CAPUANO) for a period of two weeks on account of personal matters.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on May 26, 2011 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1893. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 793. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12781 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in Inverness, California, as the ''Specialist Jake Robert Velloza Post Office''.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House also reports that on June 1, 2011 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 754. To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 14, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1882. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard [Docket

No.: NHTSA-2009-0069] (RIN: 2127-AK81) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1883. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting copy of the report entitled ''Auditor's Review of the Operations and Administration of the Office of Public Education Facilities Modernization'', pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1884. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone: Passenger Vessels, Sector Southeastern New England Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0864] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1885. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones: Fireworks Displays in the Captain of the Port Columbia River Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0997] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1886. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Charleston Race Week, Charleston Harbor, Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1152] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1887. 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.: 30119; Amdt. No. 3422] received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1888. 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.: 30780; Amdt. No. 3423] May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1889. 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.: 30775; Amdt. No. 3419 received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1890. 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.: 30774; Amdt. No. 3418] received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1891. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Federal Airways; Alaska [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0010; Airspace Docket No. 11-AAL-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1892. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30778; Amdt. No. 493] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1893. A letter from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commercial Driver's License Testing and Commercial Learner's Permit Standards [Docket No.: FMCSA-2007-27659] (RIN: 2126-AB02) recieved May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1894. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning the extension of waiver authority for Turkmenistan, pursuant to Public Law 93-618, section 402(d)(1) and 409; (H. Doc. No. 112—34); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1895. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2011-41] received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1896. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Administrative Exemptions to the Specified Tax Return Preparer Electronic Filing Requirement Under Internal Revenue Code Sec. 6011(e)(3) and Regulations Under Sec. 6011(e)(3) [Notice 2011-26] May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1897. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — The Mailing of Individual Income Tax Returns By Specified Tax Return Preparers in Calendar Year 2011 [Notice 2011-27] received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1898. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Industry Director's Directive #2—Employment Tax and the Employees on the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf [LB&I Control Number: LB&I-4-0211-005] received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1899. A letter from the Acting Chair, Social Security Advisory Board, transmitting a report entitled ''A Vision of the Future for the Social Security Administration''; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1900. A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology, transmitting a letter regarding Section 1340 of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011; jointly to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Foreign Affairs.

1901. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft bill entitled, ''Veterans Benefit Programs Improvements Act of 2011''; jointly to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and the Judiciary.

1902. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting proposed legislation to improve cybersecurity for the American people; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, Oversight and Government Reform, Homeland Security, and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 300. Resolution providing for consideration of 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 (Rept. 112–103). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2146. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 2147. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in Utah except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 2148. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend military commissary and exchange store privileges to veterans with a compensable service-connected disability and to their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HANABUSA:

H.R. 2149. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4354 Pahoa Avenue in Honolulu, Hawaii, as the ''Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.R. 2150. A bill to amend the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, including at least one lease sale in the Reserve each year in the period 2011 through 2021, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2151. A bill to facilitate nationwide availability of volunteer income tax assistance for low-income and underserved populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVIS of

Illinois, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. OLVER, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 2152. A bill to reauthorize the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, to provide assistance to Best Buddies to support the expansion and development of mentoring programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Ms. JENKINS):

H.R. 2153. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to protect employer rights; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2154. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Gasparilla Island Unit FL-70P; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2155. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit P16; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2156. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit P17; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 2157. A bill to facilitate a land exchange involving certain National Forest System lands in the Inyo National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. BACA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 2158. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14901 Adelfa Drive in La Mirada, California, as the ''Wayne Grisham Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H. Res. 301. A resolution expressing support for designation of June 20, 2011, as ''American Eagle Day'', and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H. Res. 302. A resolution expressing support for the designation of August 22, 2011, as Rose Brucia Stranger Safety Awareness Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 2147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 2148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Ms. HANABUSA:

H.R. 2149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 6, ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish Post Offices and post Roads;''

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 2150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 2152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact the Eunice Kennedy Shriver Act pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation introduces a clarification that limits the scope of an existing statute. As such, this bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 2157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7: To establish Post Offices and post Roads

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 10: Mr. BILBRAY and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 104: Mr. HIMES and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 198: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 333: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.

H.R. 389: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 452: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 456: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 458: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 459: Mr. AKIN and Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 512: Ms. NORTON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 539: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 589: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 607: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 614: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 633: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 674: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DOLD, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 676: Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 687: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 703: Mr. CRAVAACK.

H.R. 707: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 711: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 733: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 765: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 800: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 816: Mr. OLSON and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 860: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 880: Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 883: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 886: Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 905: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 942: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 997: Mr. AKIN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 1004: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1044: Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 1085: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1093: Mr. HOLDEN and Ms. BUERKLE.
H.R. 1112: Mr. PETERS and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1161: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1172: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1174: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1182: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 1206: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1236: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. STARK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DENT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1259: Mr. PENCE, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HURT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 1265: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 1293: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1296: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1327: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1331: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1332: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1350: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1351: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. COSTELLO, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1358: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1370: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 1380: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1391: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 1404: Ms. NORTON and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1418: Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 1425: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1426: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1465: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1466: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1498: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 1505: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1506: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 1515: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1527: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1546: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 1558: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1563: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1580: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1588: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 1596: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1606: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1617: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1639: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1646: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1663: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1683: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.R. 1692: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1705: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1739: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 1744: Mr. NUNES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1747: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1792: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1814: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1815: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 1826: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1829: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1836: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1852: Mr. BARROW, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1873: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1880: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1881: Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1931: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1932: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1938: Mr. LONG, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LANDRY, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. MACK.
H.R. 1958: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 1959: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1964: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1970: Mr. TONKO and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1974: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1975: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BACA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. MCKEON, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1985: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. FARR, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1987: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2008: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2040: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 2061: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2064: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 2082: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2104: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MORAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 2107: Mr. FILNER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 2110: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HIMES, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2115: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2129: Mr. FILNER.
H.J. Res. 62: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H. Con. Res. 58: Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H. Res. 19: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Res. 20: Mrs. LOWEY.
H. Res. 21: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Res. 111: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 134: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. FILNER.
H. Res. 177: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. OLVER.
H. Res. 247: Mr. POMPEO.
H. Res. 253: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. STEARNS.
H. Res. 256: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.
H. Res. 262: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H. Res. 266: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 268: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. BARROW, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MACK, Ms. FOXX, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. RIVERA, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. WEST, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LONG, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. CHU, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. BURGESS.
H. Res. 270: Mr. LAMBORN.
H. Res. 286: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H. Res. 296: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 1380: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. GARDNER.

AMENDMENTS

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

H.R. 2055

OFFERED BY: MR. FLORES

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

SEC. 4____. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

H.R. 2055

OFFERED BY: MR. MICA

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 6, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

Page 9, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(decreased by $25,000,000)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MS. FOXX

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food initiative of the Department of Agriculture.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MS. FOXX

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 45, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $75,000,000'').

Page 45, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,500,000'').

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $82,500,000'').

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUMENAUER

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide benefits described in section 1001D(b)(1)(C) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(b)(1)(C)) to a person or legal entity in excess of $125,000.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,000,000)''.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,000,000)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 49, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $104,019,800)''.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $104,019,800)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 50, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $180,000,000)''.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $180,000,000)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 56, line 18, insert ''231'' in place of ''461''.

Page 56, line 19, insert ''231'' in place of ''456''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 5, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $20,900,000)''.

Page 5, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $20,900,000)''.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,900,000)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 17, line 25, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,750,000)''.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,750,000)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 27, line 23, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 33, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $20,480,000)''.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,480,000)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 48, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $175,000,000)''.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $175,000,000)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. CHAFFETZ

AMENDMENT NO. 13: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who provide nonrecourse marketing assistance loans for mohair under section 1201 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. (7 U.S.C. 8731).

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. CHAFFETZ

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make (or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel in the Department of Agriculture to make) payments for the storage of cotton under section 1204(g) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8734(g)) or for the storage of peanuts under section 1307(a) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8757(a)).

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Page 8, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,312,000)''.

Page 13, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,312,000)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Page 8, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $400,000)''.

Page 12, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $400,000)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 48, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $17,500,000)''.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $17,500,000)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT NO. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close or dispose of (or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to close or dispose of) any Agricultural Research Service facility that conducts beef cattle research.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT NO. 19: Page 9, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 48, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MS. WOOLSEY

AMENDMENT NO. 20: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the directive in the committee report instructing the Food and Nutrition Service to issue a new proposed rule on implementing new national nutrition standards for the school breakfast and school lunch programs in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany H.R. 2112 of the 112th Congress (House Report 112–101).

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2011 No. 84

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, the center of our joy, Your word says You bless those who do not walk in the counsel of the ungodly. You also say that those who delight in Your word day and night are like fruitful trees planted by streams of water. Today, let Your word guide those who serve here on Capitol Hill. Infuse our Senators and their staffs with Your presence, power, and peace. Lord, make Your power available to them hour by hour so that they will have the physical, intellectual, emotional, and spiritual stamina to complete the duties of this day. And Lord, in the midst of the business of this day, allow them to experience Your peace that passes all understanding.

We pray in Your gracious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 13, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 6 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THUNE. I also ask unanimous consent I be allowed to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from Nebraska, Senator JOHANNS.

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

ETHANOL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will vote on a cloture motion that deals with an amendment that would do away with a tax provision that was enacted many years back by Congress but was extended just this last December. In fact, there were a whole series of tax extenders that were passed by the Congress in December of last year, but this particular one, the volumetric ethanol excise tax credit, was also extended. It was extended until the end of the year 2011. December 31 of this year is when it would expire with the amendment we will be voting on tomorrow—or at least the cloture motion we will be voting on is with regard to an amendment that would eliminate that and end it now. There are a number of problems associated with that approach, one of which is this issue of economic certainty. We have lots of people across this country who have made investments. We have lots of jobs that are impacted by this industry. In fact, if you look, there are 204 plants, ethanol plants, in America today, spread across 29 States and on the order of about half a million jobs—all of which, I might add, are American jobs—you have half a million American jobs impacted by this industry. The ironic thing, too, is coming on the heels of an announcement last week that Venezuela, Libya, and Iran will block OPEC from producing more oil to relieve gasoline prices, we continue to be held more and more hostage every single day by our addiction to foreign oil.

We send $1 billion a day outside the United States to purchase foreign oil—$1 billion every single day to purchase foreign oil. The ethanol industry, which now represents about 10 percent of the fuel mix in this country, displaces 445 million barrels of oil every single year. That is the equivalent of $34 billion that we don't send overseas—445 million barrels of oil displaced every single year, $34 billion that we don't have to spend purchasing foreign oil. So this is an issue that has a direct bearing on the issue of energy independence, the issue of continuing what I think is a very dangerous dependence on foreign sources of energy, foreign oil, and has a direct bearing as

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

well on the price consumers pay at the pump. Clearly, if you took 10 percent of the fuel mix out of production or out of that mix, you would put an additional pressure on the price that currently is being paid by consumers.

In fact, there was a study done by Iowa State University that said, in 2010, if you took away the contribution ethanol makes to the fuel mix in the country today, you would see gasoline prices increase by 89 cents per gallon. When you are already facing $4 gasoline prices in this country, which I think is having a profound impact on our economy and particularly on consumers who, day in and day out, are having to deal with these high prices, it seems ironic that we would be looking at legislation and policy that would further drive up the cost of gasoline. We ought to look at ways we can reduce it, and this clearly would have the opposite effect.

A few weeks ago there was a proposal to put additional taxes on oil and gas or at least to change some gas policy with regard to oil and gas which many of us argued would add to the cost of gasoline in this country. It would essentially, in effect, be raising taxes on gasoline.

This proposal would have the same effect. It would increase the cost of energy and obviously impact many of the jobs to which I just alluded. It would also break faith with the commitment made by this Congress last December when we extended the VEETC, the volumetric ethanol excise credit, for another year. We have a lot of folks who made investments, you have people across the country whose livelihoods and jobs depend upon this, and I think it makes sense, when we put policy in place and we say it is going to be in place for a certain period of time, that that be honored.

Having said that, I have been working closely with my colleague from Nebraska and others of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, on a proposal that would reform the VEETC and move us in a direction that puts us on a pathway or a trajectory into the future that will take greater advantage of this contribution that is being made by biofuels to our country's energy independence and also phase out the VEETC tax credit but that does it in a way that does not impact and disrupt in a way that this would, where you say you are going to end this today. As I said, you have lots of people who made investment decisions based on current policy. You would change that policy immediately and abruptly, but that is not the right way or correct way to go about this. There is a better way. That is what my colleague from Nebraska and I have been working on. I hope my colleagues in the Senate will vote tomorrow against this attempt to end this abruptly and to disrupt this market and do tremendous harm to an industry that is contributing, in a significant way, to America's move toward energy independence and is helping to keep gas prices lower than they would otherwise be were it not for the 10-percent contribution ethanol makes year in and year out to our energy.

So there are lots of reasons why we think it is a bad idea to move forward with the amendment that will be offered tomorrow and the cloture motion that would get on that amendment. I hope my colleagues will defeat that cloture motion so we can work on a more responsible, reasonable way that phases out the VEETC and, in a responsible way, that would allow those who have made investments to be able to plan accordingly.

I would simply say, as we get into that debate tomorrow, this is an issue which has ramifications for our economy because of the price of fuel and the impact ethanol has on the price of fuel in this country. It has an impact on the old issue of energy independence and whether we are going to continue to be held hostage and over a barrel by oil we have to import from other places around the world. Of course, it has implications as well for just the jobs that are created here at home, American jobs that could very well be lost if we move down a path that, in my view, would be very harmful for this industry and its ability to create jobs.

I have my colleague from Nebraska here as well this afternoon and I would welcome his thoughts on this subject and would like to enter into a dialog with him about the impact this industry has on his State of Nebraska—and not just the impact it has on Nebraska or South Dakota but the impact it has on this country by creating jobs, by lessening the dependence we have on foreign sources of energy, and by keeping gas prices at a more reasonable level than we would otherwise see if it were not for the contribution ethanol makes to our fuel mix.

I am going to yield to the Senator from Nebraska for his observations about this subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNS. I wish to start out thanking my colleague from South Dakota. He has been a very reasoned voice on this issue, and he has brought forward some ideas that I believe are the right approach to dealing with ethanol. If you think about it, about 50 percent of our oil is now imported from another part of the world. The more dramatic piece of that is that oftentimes the importation of that oil comes from parts of the world that do not share our philosophy, do not share our view of the world, are not democracies, and do everything they can to, in effect, fight against what we believe in. So not only are we dependent on foreign oil, we are dependent on a source of foreign oil that oftentimes is contrary to the values and beliefs of American citizens.

One of these days, I think we are going to learn the lesson of that dependency, and we are going to alter our course. We are going to do a whole host of things that make sense: more drilling, more exploration, more nuclear power plants, as Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER has advocated for, and just everything on the list. It is all a piece of the puzzle.

A piece of that puzzle is also renewable fuels. It could be biodiesel, it could be ethanol, it could be cellulosic ethanol, which I championed when I was Secretary of Agriculture. Again, I think it is going to be a whole host of things.

Ten or twenty years ago, if I were on the Senate floor making those statements, many would have looked at me and said: Well, MIKE, that is just a pipedream. But as the Senator from South Dakota points out, 10 percent of our fuel in the United States is now ethanol—10 percent. It did displace 445 million barrels of oil last year. There is nothing else going on out there that has had that kind of impact. We can report that $34 billion was kept in the U.S. economy. We often hear about this massive transfer of wealth that is occurring by us sending our hard-earned dollars to other parts of the world—again, parts of the world that do not share our values. In this case, with this product, we kept $34 billion here. At least one study indicates the average family saved $800 a year because of this. Our gas prices are about 89 cents lower per gallon than they otherwise would have been. Those are real savings to people who are out there trying to figure out how to pay for filling the tank.

Many years ago, when I was Governor of Nebraska, we took a long, hard look at our State. We wanted to know how we might best diversify our economy. Some of the things we did worked. I am very pleased to report our unemployment rate during this time never got over 5 percent. Today it is about 4.2 percent. I am also pleased to tell you we balanced the budget. We did not borrow money to do it. One of the things we did was we said: Look, ethanol is a piece of this puzzle in Nebraska, and so we actually created State programs to try to encourage the construction of ethanol plants.

I will tell you, at the time I was Governor, I thought maybe two plants would be built. Well, the marketplace responded and we built a number of plants. Today, Nebraska is the second largest producer of ethanol. We have 24 plants in the State. Those 24 plants produce 2 billion gallons per year, $4 billion of capital investment. It directly employs 1,300 Nebraskans in high-quality jobs. It also does some great things for our livestock sector because our cattle industry—well, they buy the distiller grains. They have real value if you are feeding cattle, which we do a lot in our State.

We have recognized in Nebraska, and I think across the country, that it is time to move to the next step when it comes to ethanol production. That is why I was pleased to sign on to Senator

GRASSLEY's bill when he introduced it. I was also pleased to work with Senator THUNE who has provided such excellent leadership in this area. Basically, what this plan does is it says: Let us take a thoughtful, measured approach. Let's not jeopardize someone's situation and cause them to pay higher fuel prices at the pump because we did something in a rash and hasty sort of way. It also helps to pay off some of the deficit. We are literally saying: OK, if we are going to make some changes, we will make a contribution to deficit reduction.

Well, let me wrap up my comments and say: Senator THUNE's approach is the right approach. It is an approach that says: Look, we are not going to take this industry, which has become such an important part of our energy strategy, and walk it off the cliff and just see how it lands. Instead, what we are going to do is, we are going to take a measured approach. We are going to build the infrastructure necessary. We are going to add some money to reduce the deficit, and we are not going to jeopardize somebody's price at the pump. It is already expensive enough. I am very pleased to support that approach. My hope is that our colleagues will listen to this approach, get behind it, and support it because it is the right approach. It is the right approach for Nebraska, but it is the right approach for the country.

With that, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his help.

I yield the floor to him.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if I might just say to the Senator from Nebraska, because I am wondering if perhaps in his discussions with farmers and ranchers in his State—I am sure the issue which he alluded to, which I think is an important one, comes out—I wonder if other people around the country realize, when we make a gallon of ethanol, we take a bushel of corn—which is a remarkable thing that we have gotten to, where the technology enables us to do that—we produce 2.7 gallons of ethanol from a bushel of corn. We have almost 3 gallons of ethanol from a bushel of corn which goes into our fuel supply and represents about 10 percent of all the fuel we use. I wonder if a lot of people realize that one of the byproducts of that, as the Senator from Nebraska has mentioned, is something called dried distillers grain. The DDGs, as we refer to it, is something that is then used to feed livestock.

Now, a lot of people think there is this whole corn debate about food versus fuel, but I don't think most Americans realize that only about 12 percent of our corn crop in this country actually ends up in foods. It is either consumed directly, such as corn chips, or indirectly, such as high fructose corn syrup. But one-third of the grain that goes into ethanol production comes out as dried distillers grain, these DDGs, and for each bushel of corn used in the ethanol-making process—as I said, the 2.7 gallons of ethanol—18 pounds of DDGs and 18 pounds of carbon dioxide.

If we took, let's just say, for example, 5 billion bushels of corn used for ethanol production in a year, the feed product equivalent of about 1.7 billion bushels of corn is returned to the livestock food chain as an ethanol byproduct. So we take about one-third of all of the grain that is put into the process to make ethanol, and that comes back in the form of something we feed to livestock and something that has been a great source of protein for livestock producers in this country. I don't think most Americans even realize we are not just talking about the fuel component; we are not just talking about that liquid we use to blend with petroleum products and get ethanol in this country; but there is also this other byproduct which is essential for livestock producers to feed their livestock.

I am wondering if, in the conversations the Senator from Nebraska, I assume, has with his farmers and ranchers—of course, they are very familiar with this—the average person around this country understands this.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, that is an excellent point. When I was Secretary of Agriculture, this whole debate started about food versus fuel. It was almost like there was this impression that you took that bushel of corn, you somehow burned it up to create ethanol, and that is all you got out of it. Then there was this big debate about whether that was worth it. As the Senator from South Dakota points out, a whole different process is occurring.

So in our State, it is not just the dried distiller grains because to dry them down takes some energy. We have the cattle yards in close proximity to the ethanol plants. So they buy the wet mash, which is what we call it. They ship it over, they feed it immediately, and it is a wonderful product to feed to cattle.

When we think about the approach the Senator from South Dakota has come up with, we realize it hits on all cylinders. It does reform the ethanol tax credit. Again, I believe the industry has come to the conclusion that is a thoughtful, reasonable step.

No. 2, it invests in the blender pumps. One of the challenges I had for a long time was with the flex-fuel vehicle. I am in the State that is the second largest producer of ethanol. Yet I could not get the E–85 unless we really went out and searched for it. What if we had a pump where I could literally pull up to it and dial it up to E–85 and put that in my vehicle? So it invests in the blender pumps.

It extends cellulosic tax credits for the small producers. Here is what I would say: The next generation is not going to be just corn-based ethanol. That will be a part of the picture, but I believe we will see the day—and we are already seeing the day—where we will have a cellulosic product converted into ethanol.

Then, finally, $1 billion is added to deficit reduction. The ethanol industry is saying: Look, we agree we need to do our share. We agree we need to start on this process of phasing this out.

So I think the Senator from South Dakota has hit all the right points. It does not take this industry and drop it off the cliff. It is a thoughtful, measured approach to dealing with this issue.

Again, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his leadership, and I yield to him.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in closing, I wish to, first of all, thank the Senator from Nebraska for joining us. He has a great wealth of experience, not only having grown up on a family farm in his early years but representing his State as a mayor, as a Governor, and then representing our Nation as the Secretary of Agriculture. I recall working with him when he was the Secretary of Agriculture on a lot of these issues.

One of the things that strikes me about where we are today relative to where we were then is the prosperity that has returned to the agricultural sector in our economy, to rural America. We can't say the biofuels industry has been solely responsible for that, but certainly a contributing factor. We have seen growth in the economy in the Midwest.

Again, what I would point out about this, which is so important for people to realize is that these are American jobs. This is our home-grown industry. We are either going to get fuel in the United States or we are going to buy it from some foreign country. That is what we have been doing, and that is what we continue to do to the tune of $1 billion every single day. So to the degree we can promote domestic energy production in this country and add to the supply in this country, which is what biofuels does, it is for the American consumer and, obviously, good for America's economy and America's dangerous dependence we currently have on foreign energy.

So the proposal the Senator from Nebraska is a cosponsor of and that he and I have worked together on and that we will file as a bill today will present an alternative to the approach that will be advanced, or that they will attempt to advance tomorrow, which is to just right now, in a very disruptive way, abruptly end something that we just voted on in December to put in place. We have people who have made investments in it, and it has made a tremendous impact on jobs in this country.

The approach the Senator from Nebraska and I are advocating I believe is a reasoned approach. It is forward looking in the sense that it promotes the next generation of biofuels, advanced biofuels, and cellulosic ethanol. In the same way the Senator from Nebraska mentioned, it gets us to where we have more choices for American consumers when they come into a filling station by investing in some of the

pumps out there and giving consumers more choices.

Then, finally, as the Senator from Nebraska said, it also puts money toward the debt, toward deficit reduction, and phases out the tax credit that is available today to ethanol producers in this country. It is a reasonable, responsible and, as the Senator said, measured way of dealing with this, not the way that is being proposed by the vote we are going to have tomorrow.

So I hope our colleagues will join us in working in a constructive way to continue to grow this industry and do it in a way that creates jobs for Americans and lessens our dependence on foreign nations.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVITALIZATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I am going to talk about the basic underlying bill we are debating, not the amendment my colleagues have just been talking about. As a way of framing the discussion about this bill, I will cite some statistics that I think will help us understand the nature of the problem our country faces right now and why, in my opinion, this particular legislation does not solve that problem.

According to official statistics, the unemployment rate in the U.S. has risen from 6.8 percent when President Obama was elected in November of 2008 to 9.1 percent in May of 2011. Between the end of 2008 and the year 2010, America experienced a net job loss in the nonfarm sector of almost 7 million jobs. So just since the end of 2008 through 2010, 7 million jobs lost. In that same time, the unemployment rate peaked at 10.1 percent—that was in October of 2009. It averaged 9.3 percent during 2009, 9.6 percent during 2010, and the 5-month average for 2011 so far is 9.1 percent, where we are right now.

We are not making progress. In short, since President Obama's stimulus was enacted, unemployment has averaged more than 9 percent a year, and that is up from 6.8 percent when he took office. This is not progress.

The May unemployment figures show that the U.S. economy added only 54,000 jobs—far fewer than the 150,000 needed just to keep pace with population growth, let alone to help dig us out of the recession. So we only had about one-third of the jobs created that we need just to stay even. We are getting deeper in the hole. In fact, the number of unemployed totals now almost 14 million Americans, and the long-term unemployed increased to 6.2 million.

Real growth in our economy, the GDP growth from the end of the recession in mid-2009 has been only about half as strong as it was during each of the previous nine recessions since World War II. So unlike previous times, we are not recovering as fast as we recovered from those earlier recessions.

On the TV program ''Meet the Press'' this weekend, the host, David Gregory, asked the chair of the Democratic National Committee, Representative DEBBIE WASSERMAN-SCHULTZ:

> Why should Americans trust Democratic governance right now on the economy, and particularly the president's?

Amazingly, the head of the Democratic National Committee answered:

> Because we were able to, under President Obama's leadership, turn this economy around.

Well, the economy has not turned around. The unemployment statistics I just cited demonstrate that it is getting worse.

Most observers recognize that the steps the President took to try to revive the economy have not worked. I think it is time we admit that our massive debt and deficit, which were exacerbated by the 2009 stimulus spending bill, have hurt our economy. It has made things worse.

Republicans are not recommending reductions in government spending just for the sake of austerity. We are pushing for the government to get its fiscal house in order so that the job creators in the private sector will have the confidence to begin hiring and expanding their operations. Right now, uncertain of their future tax liability, worried about the general fiscal path of this country and the increasing regulatory burdens imposed upon them, job creators are sitting on the sidelines. We need to cut government spending to keep our tax burden low, approve pending free-trade agreements, and make a serious effort to reduce red tape so our economy can begin growing again. In other words, we need to realize that the government does not create private sector jobs. What we can do in Washington is to create the environment where the private sector is free to grow and create jobs.

This bill we are talking about right now, the Economic Development Revitalization Act of 2011, is touted by some of its proponents as being a job creator. The bill is not a jobs bill. Calling it that doesn't make it so. The bill has 21 sections. The truth is, many of these provisions would have zero effect on facilitating the creation of American jobs. For example, section 16 moves the State of Montana from the Denver office to the Seattle office. That doesn't create any jobs. Most of the provisions of the bill don't have anything to do with creating jobs. There are only four that even mildly could be called related to job creation.

The central component is a reauthorization of the bill's amount of spending, and it would reauthorize it at $500 million a year—$½ billion a year. Remember that almost half of that has to be borrowed. We don't have the money to spend $½ billion a year, so we will have to go out and borrow the money from someone in order to be able to spend it.

Given the fiscal constraints facing our Nation today, we can't afford that. Ironically, even the White House is not shy about admitting the fact that this EDA bill is too expensive. Specifically, the President's budget for 2012 requested only $324.9 million for EDA, not $500 million. Additionally, the administration's Statement of Administration Policy declared:

> The bill would authorize spending levels higher than those requested by the President's budget, and the administration believes that the need for smart investments that help America win the future must be balanced with the need to control spending and reduce the deficit.

Well, this is one thing on which I agree with the administration. This bill would spend too much money. Hopefully, we will get a chance to vote on amendments, including one by the ranking Republican on the committee, Mr. INHOFE, to reduce this level to a more reasonable and realistic one.

The rest of the bill includes provisions, as I noted, that are of little importance. Section 11, for example, creates a $5 million-per-year grant program related to renewable energy and brownfields sites. Section 12 relates to energy and water efficiency and decreasing foreign oil competition. These are part of a green jobs fad and are not really going to provide significant job creation for our country. If we really want to decrease the consumption of foreign oil, of course, and create U.S. jobs, we should develop more of our own resources. I mentioned another meaningless provision—just moving one State from the jurisdiction of the Denver office to the Seattle office.

Again, these are things that are not going to produce jobs in our country. So it seems to me, rather than spending time on bills such as this EDA bill, which will not actually create jobs, we should actually be focusing on the big cliff we are heading for and begin preparing for the debt ceiling debate. This is where we can insist on a very large down payment of reduced spending, reform entitlements, and put a straitjacket on future congressional budgets—all of which will give businesses and markets greater certainty about our fiscal future. As a start, we should have a thorough debate and a vote on a constitutional balanced budget amendment, which would get us on the right path to a sound fiscal future.

In the long run, the only way for our economy to create jobs is for the government to spend, borrow, and tax less, thus freeing America's enterprises to do what they do best. I suggest we not wait any longer. It is time to begin this debate. Let's have a vote on a constitutional amendment, find ways to reduce spending, ensure we do not increase taxes, and create the climate in which America's businesses can get back to work and put their fellow Americans back to work.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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.

PATENT REFORM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I wanted to address the issue of patent reform—a bill the Senate has already passed by an overwhelming margin. It is my understanding the House of Representatives is expecting to pass a patent reform bill the House wants, and in the process the House wants the Senate to agree very soon thereafter and do it without a formal conference.

I want my colleagues to understand why I hope the House-passed bill will contain a provision that was not in our Senate bill but passed unanimously out of the House Judiciary Committee.

The House committee report recognized that the ''need to modernize patent laws has found expression in the courts'' but that ''the courts are constrained in their decisions by the text of statutes at issue.'' That is from the House committee report.

The House Judiciary Committee amendment that passed unanimously resulted from a recent Federal court case that had as its genesis the difficulty that the FDA—the Food and Drug Administration—and the patent office face when deciding how to calculate Hatch-Waxman deadlines. The Hatch-Waxman law was a compromise between drug patent holders and the generic manufacturers. Under the Waxman-Hatch law, once a patent holder obtains market approval, the patent holder has 60 days to request the patent office to restore the patent term—time lost because of the FDA's long deliberating process eating up valuable patent rights.

The citation for the case I am talking about is 731 F. Supp 2nd 470. The court case found:

> the FDA treats submissions to the FDA received after its normal business hours differently than it treats communications from the agency after normal hours . . . when notice of FDA approval is sent after normal business hours, the combination of the patent trade office's calendar day interpretation and its new counting method effectively deprives applicants of a portion of the 60-day filing period that Congress expressly granted them . . . an applicant could lose a substantial portion, if not all, of its time for filing a patent trademark extension application as a result of mistakes beyond its control . . . an interpretation that imposes such drastic consequences when the government errs could not be what Congress intended.

That is the end of the judge's statement on why he ruled as he did in this particular case. Congress did not intend those drastic consequences that happen as a result of a difference between whether you are making an application to or an application from an agency. In other words, there should not be any difference. Congress did not intend the consequences that come from such a different application of the law. So the court clarified the law so when FDA sends a notice of approval after normal business hours, the 60-day period requesting patent restoration begins the next business day. The House Judiciary Committee takes the court decision where common sense dictates: to protect all patent holders against losing patent extensions as a result of confused counting calculations.

I want to quote Ranking Member CONYERS of the House Judiciary Committee who sponsored the amendment and committee Chairmen SMITH who supported Mr. CONYERS. Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS stated during markup the amendment is needed to ''remove what amounts to a trap and would clarify the term 'business day' . . . and so, our attempt here is to make the congressional effort at patent reform more clear, more efficient.''

Chairman LAMAR SMITH also advocated passage of this amendment during markup in the House Judiciary Committee. I will quote him.

> I will recognize myself in support of the amendment. Now, the gentleman's amendment—

Meaning the Conyers amendment—

> clarifies the counting rules that are imposed on patent holders who must submit documents to the agency within statutory time limits. It has been established that the PTO has inconsistently applied these rules, which is not fair to various patent holders. The gentleman's amendment tracks the recent court case decided in favor of a patent holder that originally applied for an extension 10 years ago. My understanding is that there are not scoring problems with this provision and I support it.

That is what Chairman LAMAR SMITH of the House Judiciary Committee said.

This is a commonsense amendment. It improves our patent system fairness through certainty and clarity, and I hope the House will leave that in their bill when it sends it over here to the Senate.

My interest in this amendment is because I opposed it 2 or 3 years ago when it was first brought up. Because of the court decision, I am convinced the different application of the 60-day rule is very unfair. As ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I want the House Judiciary Committee to know that several Republican and Democratic Senators have asked me to support the Conyers language as well.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOZMAN. 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.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, the latest unemployment numbers indicate that nearly 106,000 Arkansans are unemployed. This 7.7 percent unemployment rate is higher than when the so-called stimulus passed that President Obama and Majority Leader REID promised would produce jobs for hard-working Americans. Although this rate is below the national average, the numbers show that out-of-work Arkansans continue to struggle to find gainful employment.

What is more alarming is that the President and the majority here in the Senate are resisting real change and insisting on more of the same borrow, spend, and tax policies that have given us record unemployment and a sluggish economy.

In November, Americans gave a clear sign that job creation needs to be a priority. Unfortunately, the Senate majority and President Obama have failed to prove that this is at the top of the agenda. Time and time again, the Senate and our President add to the uncertainty that is stifling job creation. Commonsense legislation that would create the conditions for job growth is not brought to the floor. It is not because the Senate has more pressing issues. There is no excuse as to why the Chamber avoids voting on legislative and policy items that will provide real relief for the unemployed, such as the stalled free-trade agreements.

As news reports have pointed out over the past several weeks, the business in this body is progressing at a historically slow pace. As the Washington Post reported last week, ''Quorum calls have taken up about a third of its time since January, according to the C–SPAN statistics.''

Americans are tired of the games. They need jobs, and it is our duty to help.

Linda from Mountain Home, AR, recently wrote to me asking the same thing millions of Americans want to know: ''Where are the jobs?'' She continued her e-mail asking what legislation Republicans introduced that will stimulate the economy and create jobs. I want to thank Linda for her letter and let her know my colleagues and I are on the side of the American worker, and that is evident by the legislation we have offered. These practical free market ideas will put Americans back to work, and, like the millions of Americans who are looking for jobs, we are anxious to vote on them and approve these measures.

In February, we introduced the REINS Act, of which I am a proud cosponsor. Too often, Federal agencies overstep their boundaries and enact expensive mandates that strangle investment and job creation without congressional approval. This commonsense legislation provides a check and balance between Congress and the executive branch and allows business to focus on growth instead of how to comply with burdensome regulations.

This starts with making changes to unfunded mandates by the Environmental Protection Agency. Unnecessary and burdensome regulations imposed on our businesses cost money and cost jobs. EPA has put a target on America's industrial, manufacturing, and agricultural job creators. Clean air, clean water, and conservation are all very important, but the heavy-handed regulations coming from this EPA have little or nothing to do with clean air or clean water. We are witnessing a Federal bureaucratic power grab on behalf of a radical, job-destroying agenda. These regulations are making food more expensive, energy more expensive, and gasoline more expensive, and they are driving jobs out of our country. Our competitors are taking our jobs and emitting far more pollution into our atmosphere and oceans than we would here in the United States. Again, it is all pain and no gain. As the administration works to drive up the cost of energy, they seem to forget that a prosperous country is a country that can invest in conservation and protect the environment.

The President still wants to blame his predecessor for our sluggish economy and lack of jobs. The blame game won't help the President politically, and it won't help turn our economy around. It is true that President Obama inherited a weak economy, but he made it worse. Before President Obama took office, the Federal Government was carrying out many policies that distorted the market and contributed to the meltdown. In 2008, we were spending too much money and running severe deficits. Now our deficit is three times as big. Sadly, President Obama has made each of our economic problems worse.

I believe it is important to provide American businesses with an equal opportunity to compete and succeed while opening new markets for American products. I strongly believe that when presented with a level playing field, American businesses and workers can outperform any in the world in terms of quality and value.

With three pending trade agreements on the table waiting for approval, we are wasting precious time and resources at our disposal to open foreign markets to U.S. products. The lack of action on the Colombia, Panama, and South Korea agreements is concerning. I believe we need to move forward as quickly as possible to ratify these policies. American companies and their workers are losing market share and are being denied valuable business opportunities. That is why one of the first pieces of legislation I cosponsored as a Member of the Senate was S. Res. 20, legislation that urges this Chamber to consider and approve the pending free-trade agreements with these countries.

On multiple occasions, President Obama expressed support for the implementation of all of these trade agreements in order to reduce our Nation's deficit and create American jobs for American workers. So far, there is still a failure to act on any of these agreements.

Americans deserve legislation that will promote job growth, but one of President Obama's legislative cornerstones, health care reform, actually costs jobs. We were told ObamaCare would create 4 million jobs, but reality tells a different story.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, there will be 750,000 fewer jobs. This legislation is bad for business. That is why we voted to eliminate the onerous 1099 reporting requirements included in this flawed legislation.

I will continue to fight for a full repeal of this law as we seek meaningful health care reform that provides quality, affordable access for all citizens based on free market principles.

The simple truth is there are 14 million Americans out of work and millions more who have been forced into retirement or gave up looking for a job. These 14 million Americans are calling for our help, yet the majority and the administration continue to ignore their pleas.

We have a plan that is ready to move, and the practical free market ideas it is based upon will put Americans back to work. Let's show Linda in Mountain Home and the millions of Americans looking for a job that we are working to change the direction our country is headed and be a job creator.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE ECONOMY

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I had the opportunity this morning to catch the CNBC program that had Jack Welch, former CEO of GE on, and I thought he made a number of valuable points. He is very worried about our economy. He believes we are facing serious troubles, and we need to take action to do something about it. As a corporate leader of great renown, one of the more respected corporate leaders in America at this time, he evidenced a real frustration at the lack of leadership this administration is showing with regard to our financial crisis.

He said a number of things. One of them was classic leadership, classic thought by a manager, a man who has managed a very large corporation worldwide with many moving parts. He said we have to have a strategy, and we have no strategy. I think that is correct. I do not believe the American people sense that this country is able to articulate a serious strategy to confront the difficulties with which we are now dealing.

He said everything needs to go through a screen, and in his opinion the screen should be what our strategy is and our strategy should be, in general, to create an economy that is productive, innovative, and growing; creating jobs, creating wealth, creating prosperity, and everything ought to be judged by that.

One of the points he mentioned was drilling for oil and gas in America. We have all kinds of government agencies here, all kinds of regulations and a permitorium, a blocking of the giving of permits, that has substantially reduced the ability of this Nation to produce oil and gas at home, a critical factor if we are going to be competitive and economically prosperous.

We need to quit buying so much abroad, sending wealth abroad, and keep it at home. He just threw that out as one of the things that would never get through a screen. Instead of helping this country to be more prosperous and create jobs and growth, it does just the opposite. Yet in this massive government, we take contradictory actions, and as a result we are muddling along at a very unhealthy rate, and the American people are worried about it.

Last week was the sixth consecutive week that the stock market fell. We were told in January, when things were progressing, that everything was just doing great and that we are creating a lot of jobs; we are creating jobs, and the market is doing better. But in fact it is not moving very well. If we read the financial pages, we see that the people who spend their lives dealing with the economic threats we face are uneasy about our future.

Just read those articles in Barron's that just came out over the weekend about the roundtable of worldwide economic experts. It was very troubling to me. Many of them had serious concerns about the future. Would we have a doubledip? Some seem to say yes. The Presiding Officer, Mr. COONS, is on the Budget Committee and knows the numbers we are dealing with and has heard the testimony that Mr. Bowles, former Chief of Staff for President Clinton, and Alan Simpson, in their Fiscal Commission Report, said we are facing the most predictable crisis in our history, and it could cause economic difficulties for us soon. Mr. Bowles said 2 years, give or take. Not just for our grandchildren, but soon.

This is why the experts say we have a problem. I do not believe we have from the White House any call to the kind of action necessary to alter the unsustainable debt trajectory we are on.

I do not think the American people fully understand, but they understood enough to punish the Congress in this last election. I am afraid they are going to punish us again because no Congress can defend itself from the criticism that we have presided over a government that is borrowing 40 cents

of every dollar and spending $3.7 billion and taking in only $2.2 billion and borrowing the rest. We are on a path that does not alter that. The President's budget is the most irresponsible ever submitted and would make our debt path worse rather than better, so I am worried about it. So the majority leader announces: Well, it would be foolish to have a budget. Senator REID said it would be foolish to have a budget, at a time when we have never faced a greater threat to the integrity of our economic system than we face today.

Let me repeat that. We have never been in a position in which the economy could do as much harm to our Nation as it can today. We are heading to the wall at warp speed. It is a dangerous circumstance. But we can get off this path. We have to do some things that are not very pleasant, but not impossible, that are being done by mayors and county commissioners and Governors all over America and in countries around the world. The British made some very substantial cuts to their overall spending program, far more than we are discussing, and some people pushed back and said, We are cutting too much. That debate will happen here, if we cut spending here.

The International Monetary Fund, certainly no bastion of conservative economic thought, said, No, U.K., stay the course. Don't weaken now. You set a good, tough path for constraining and reducing spending, and if you stay the course you will be more successful than if you give up and quit under the pressure that you might be under today.

So how do we get there? How do we get to the point where we deal with these issues? Harvard economist Alberto Alesina, drawing from his and others' research on large fiscal adjustments across multiple nations, said this:

> Spending cuts are far more effective than tax increases in stabilizing the debt and avoiding economic downturns. In fact, in several episodes, spending cuts adopted to reduce deficits have been associated with government expansions rather than recessions.

Goldman Sachs has also done a study that indicates that. We have empirical evidence that countries that have taken firm steps to get their financial house in order have found that, maybe almost to their surprise, they have had economic growth quicker than many had projected.

So where are we today? Apparently, we are not going to have any kind of regular budget process in the Senate, to my great disappointment. I believe Senator CONRAD, the chairman of the Budget Committee—I am the ranking Republican on that committee—was prepared to have a markup, but the Democratic leadership has decided not to. Senators can't call a Budget Committee markup; only the chairman and the leaders can do those kinds of things. They have decided not to. Under the Congressional Budget Act, the Budget Committee should have marked up and passed a budget resolution by April 1 of this year, and Congress should have passed it by April 15. We are now getting close to July 4 and we have had no real public discussion, no national debate, about the challenges this Nation faces.

First we had the Gang of Six. They have been meeting in secret, and I don't know who advised them. I don't think average Americans, in their struggles—maybe they have lost their job or haven't seen their pay increase or have seen their overtime eliminated—were in the room with them. They are good people. I was kind of getting anxious for a month or so to hear something from them. Maybe it would be a good deal. Maybe it would be something to get us moving. I don't know. I had my doubts about it, and I expressed that, but I expressed my support to see what they could produce. Maybe it would be worthwhile. I am withholding judgment. So now we are not hearing from them, although they apparently have enough work product—maybe even a plan—that they met with 10 other Senators, I understand, to discuss what they are planning on. They haven't let anybody else in on the deal.

But now we hear, Don't worry about the Gang of Six. If that doesn't work, we have the Vice President. President Obama has asked him to have meetings with a very small group of Senate and House leaders, and they are going to write us a budget. There are some good people meeting in that group, I don't have any doubt about that. But weeks have gone by. We had a week recess and apparently it was over 2 weeks that they didn't even meet.

The President is traveling around the world making speeches, raising money, and this country has not had a budget in 775 days. This Senate has not passed a budget in 775 days. The Budget Act requires us to pass a budget. It can't be filibustered. It can be passed with a simple majority. If it is going to be a partisan effort—and sometimes it is a purely partisan vote—53 Democratic Senators here ought to be able to pass a budget. We passed a budget when Republicans had a one-vote majority. Sometimes you can get a bipartisan agreement on a budget. That is the best thing. Sometimes it is done with a simple majority. So we have the potential to do that.

But, oh, no. Weeks have gone by and we are waiting on these meetings at the White House. Nobody knows exactly what is happening there. It is supposed to be secret. Normally a budget is brought up, it is brought before the Budget Committee, the chairman lays down the chairman's mark, everybody gets to offer complete substitutes, gets to offer their whole budget or technical amendments or significant amendments to that budget, and they get voted on, and the matter is discussed. The American people can get a copy of the chairman's mark and the amendments offered by the other members of the committee. That is how we do business in a democracy, the last I heard, and then we are accountable, right? By how much do you think we ought to raise taxes on the American people? By how much do you think we are going to cut spending? Are you going to dare to make any changes in Medicare? I will not vote for it if you make any change in Medicare. Or: You have to do something about these entitlements. You didn't do anything about the Medicare entitlements? You are going to let them go broke? Those are the kinds of good discussions we would be having, and the American people could see it. Then it comes to the floor of the Senate. It has an expedited process, but there is a real opportunity to have amendments—even hundreds of amendments—to offer to the Budget Act, and we then have something that at least is seen by the American people and at least they will know if their representatives voted for or against it. But I think this idea of doing it in some other order, not the regular order, is an unhealthy process, and I hope we can do better.

I wish to conclude by saying that in 775 days, I don't believe we have fulfilled our responsibility. We obviously have not fulfilled our statutory responsibility under the Budget Act, which says we should have a budget by April 15. It also says we should have held a markup by April 1. Well, it is tough business, standing before the American people in this crisis we are in, and proposing the kinds of severe actions that are going to be necessary to put our country on the right path—not the path to decline, not the path to debt crisis, but the path to prosperity. It is going to take some effort. It is going to be painful in some ways. But we are not moving in that direction at all.

What about the House of Representatives? They passed a budget. They passed a bold budget—a budget that goes 10 years and then even further, and it laid out a historic plan. It confronted the growth in entitlement programs that is a threat to their very viability. It encouraged economic growth. It reduced spending, which has surged in the last several years. Indeed, in the last two cycles, we have increased nondefense discretionary spending 25 percent. People act as though if we cut spending, we are going to sink in the ocean. That growth could be eliminated and we would be no worse off than we were 3 years ago.

So the House did their duty. And what happened? Our Democratic leader over here in the Senate, instead of producing his own budget, calls up the House budget and he wants to talk about how horrible it is and then vote on it. It got quite a number of votes in the Senate—certainly not enough to pass. We got a lot of votes. So I offered the President's budget, the one he submitted a couple months ago and that I call the most irresponsible budget ever to be presented to this Nation—and I

stand by that. We are in a systemic crisis that has to be confronted with serious decision making, and the President's budget comes nowhere close to doing that. So I offered it. The President's budget failed 97 to 0. Not one Member of this Senate, Republican or Democrat, voted for that budget.

I think this is irresponsible. We have seen 775 days pass. We didn't have a budget last year. We didn't pass a single appropriations bill last year. Everything was cobbled together in this monumental CR we heard about, the continuing resolution. It is a totally ineffective method of governing this country and spending money. Congress ought to do its 12 appropriations bills properly every year. First, they should have a budget that tells all the committees how much money they have to spend and then they should pass the 12 appropriations bills. Each one should be brought up subject to amendment and voted on.

We have been in this irresponsible circumstance. My request is to our colleagues who are working either in the White House with the Vice President or whatever they are doing over there, the Gang of Six or Five or whatever—whatever they are doing—how about getting busy. How about let's see some numbers so we can get to work. I don't think it is going to be well received by Members of the Senate to have plopped down in our lap, on the eve of some important matter such as the debt ceiling, a budget proposal that nobody has had a chance to study and that the American people don't know the details of. I thought that was one of the things we learned in the last election. I thought we learned the American people want transparency. They want accountability. They want to know what their representatives are doing, and they want to see them working in the light of day, not the dark of night. I think that is reasonable. That is the way our Congress was set up to work. That is what I wish to see.

I think it is time for these meetings to start wrapping up. I think it is time for us to start seeing some numbers. What are they going to do, wait for the last possible day to raise the debt ceiling and then waltz in here with some sort of agreement we are all supposed to rubberstamp in a state of panic? I don't appreciate that. I don't think the American people will either. It is not good government. If they have a plan, let's start seeing what it is. Let's bring it up and let's start having a public discussion on it and vote on it. I think that is the right way to go about our business.

I am very concerned that we have gotten away from the regular order. I believe we have gotten away from our august responsibility to pass a budget, to decide openly and publicly how much we think we can spend, how much we are going to tax, how much debt we are going to have. We ought to do that publicly and openly. I believe that will be held before the public and it will help the American people understand how deep a hole we are in. It is far deeper than most of us realize. I have looked at the numbers. They are very grim indeed. We need to get started sooner rather than later.

I thank the Chair.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ETHANOL

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senators COBURN and FEINSTEIN in offering an amendment to repeal the ethanol excise tax credit and the ethanol import tariff. These policies are fiscally irresponsible, environmentally unwise, and economically indefensible.

Historically, our government has helped a product compete in one of three ways: either we subsidize it, we protect it from competition, or we require its use. Right now, ethanol may be the only product receiving all three forms of support.

The ethanol tax break is extraordinarily expensive. The Government Accountability Office has found that the tax credit costs American taxpayers a staggering $6 billion annually. This is quite a sum to prop up a fuel that is causing land conversion for corn production, commodity and food prices to rise, and is barely putting a dent in our Nation's dependence on foreign oil.

With our amendment, which has an effective date of July 1, we have the opportunity to immediately save American taxpayers nearly $3 billion in just the 6 months remaining in this year.

The 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act requires the production of at least 36 billion gallons of biofuels in 2022, up from the original 2005 Energy Policy Act, which required 7.5 billion gallons by 2012. Collectively, the first generation biofuels industry will receive tens of billions in unnecessary subsidies through the year 2022.

If the current subsidy were allowed to continue for 5 years, the Federal Treasury would pay oil companies at least $31 billion to use 69 billion gallons of corn-based ethanol that the Federal Renewable Fuels Standard already requires them to use. We simply cannot afford to pay the oil industry for following the law.

The data overwhelmingly demonstrates that the costs of the current ethanol subsidies and tariffs far outweigh their benefits. The Center for Agricultural and Rural Development at Iowa State University estimated that a 1-year extension of the ethanol subsidy and tariff would lead to only 427 additional direct domestic jobs at a cost of almost $6 billion. That is roughly $14 million of taxpayer money per job.

While expanding our capacity to generate alternative domestic fuel sources is an important step toward becoming less dependent on foreign oil, I have serious concerns about the effects of increased ethanol use. There are other alternative sources of energy that make far more sense.

The energy, agricultural, and automotive sectors are already struggling to adapt to the existing ethanol mandates. I am disappointed the Environmental Protection Agency has issued a partial waiver for the use of E–15, a blend of gasoline containing 15 percent ethanol. Many residents in my State have already experienced difficulties using gasoline blended with 10 percent ethanol, finding that it causes problems in older cars, snowmobiles, boats, lawn mowers, and off-the-road vehicles. The EPA's E–15 waiver fails to adequately protect against misfueling and will add unnecessary confusion at the gas pump for consumers. We simply cannot place so many engines in jeopardy.

These first-generation biofuel mandates also present environmental concerns, as they could result in energy efficiency losses and increased emissions of air pollutants because the mechanical failures can jeopardize the effectiveness of mission control devices and systems installed on engines.

In addition, over recent years, we have seen food and feed prices increase as crops have been diverted to first-generation biofuel production. I think of it this way: We should be raising crops for food, not for fuel.

Senate Homeland Security Committee chairman JOE LIEBERMAN and I held a series of hearings in 2008 that examined the impact of corn-based ethanol on food prices, and we found that it certainly had a negative impact. For one thing, crops that had been grown to support other grains were being converted to produce corn. The land was being switched to corn production, and the corn was no longer available for the products that used corn for food, but instead was being diverted to the production of ethanol.

The bottom line is that we can no longer ignore the cost of this policy to our Nation and its taxpayers, particularly given our current fiscal crisis. At a time when we are projecting a deficit, this year alone, of $1.5 trillion, why in the world are we spending $6 billion subsidizing ethanol? Subsidizing the blending of corn-based ethanol into gasoline is simply fiscally indefensible.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Coburn-Feinstein amendment to repeal the ethanol excise tax credit and to eliminate the ethanol import tariff.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

MEDICAID

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, in 1964 President Johnson envisioned an America that ''rests on abundance and liberty for all.'' It was against LBJ's backdrop of the Great Society that we reignited a tradition of community. This was a little spillover of the 1960s and our flight to the Moon and all of that, but the Nation somehow came together, and we sensed that we were a community and that we had a mutual obligation to each other, and that is at the very least characteristic of the American people, more then than now. Programs such as VISTA, Peace Corps, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid were born in those few years, 1961 though 1964.

Sadly, nearly 50 years after LBJ's war on poverty, we have witnessed vicious attempts to roll back government programs designed to give low-income Americans a hand up in life. I do not mean just low-income Americans but disabled Americans, very poor senior Americans who qualify for both Medicare and Medicaid—such a difficult journey they have. What we want to do is not to give people a hand up but simply to be a safety net. That is what he said this country owed its people. That is true about defense, and that is true about social policy. We have responsibility, all of us, to do that, to make sure nobody is left out.

There is no question that we must reduce our deficit, and I have a whole series of ways that can be done in abundance, but we should not do so on the backs of working families still struggling under the weight of this recession. Oh, yes, we are in a recession, so everything that was true about people who were having a hard time before is a lot truer now. Yet bill after bill proposed by Republicans seeks to do exactly that.

The House Republican H.R. 1 was a direct attack on America's working families and the successful education, job-training, and community development programs designed to combat poverty.

The Republican budget proposal for next year goes even further. It attacks Medicare and Medicaid, the health programs on which over 100 million American people rely—some more than others, but all have to have that as a safety net.

At a critical moment in our economic recovery, Republicans are more focused on settling old scores—evidently from health care reform and the bitterness of that fight—than they are on creating jobs or protecting people. The Republican plan for getting our deficit under control amounts to an upside-down government. Instead of helping those who depend on government programs to support their families, the Republican plan would guarantee that millionaires, billionaires, and large corporations continue to receive trillions of dollars—to wit, $4 trillion under the new budget—in government subsidies, subsidies that will grow exponentially over time and substantially increase their benefit. They will do very, very well indeed were we to make the tragic mistake of accepting that.

Republicans are not for a fair or balanced approach to deficit reduction, and it is a great mystery to me. It is a quandary to me. I mean, you can say it is theological or whatever, you can make up all kinds of nasty political views of it, but nevertheless that is what it is. What they are there for is a government that only exists to support big business and wealthy Americans—kind of a perpetual TARP for their friends.

Well, I reject that notion, and the American people do too. In my estimation, there is no government program that more fully embodies our Nation's tradition of community than Medicaid, our sense of mutual obligation. Some people are born wealthy. Some people are born very poor. Some people are born in between. Some people are born wealthy and then become poor. Some people are born poor and then become wealthy. But while they are down, they have a safety net, and it is called Medicaid. You don't hear people talking about it very much, particularly, frankly—somewhat disappointedly—from my side of the aisle.

After almost 50 years, Medicaid is still a lifesaving part of what we do as a government, what we are meant to do as a government. Medicaid is simply too important to millions of people.

Nationally, there were 68 million people enrolled in Medicaid in 2010—68 million children, seniors, people with disabilities, pregnant women. These are families who are living on the edge and barely making it. They now have a safety net, more efficient than any private insurance program in existence. They have that.

In West Virginia, there were over 402,000 people enrolled in 2008, 152,000 of those aged and disabled and 191,000 children—children. So almost 50 years later, Medicaid is still a lifesaving part of our Nation's health care system. In West Virginia, Medicaid covers 50 percent of all births. That tells you something.

In our country, 40 percent of all births are taken care of by Medicaid. That says a lot.

Sixty-two percent of long-term care is Medicaid and, along with the Children's Health Insurance Program it covers 34 percent of the children in our country. There are a lot of people who fought very hard over a number of years to get the Children's Health Insurance Program that would insure more children who were not at that point eligible. Well, they are still getting it, but the House wants to get rid of that program altogether. That is 34 percent of the children in our country.

Medicaid provides an essential lifeline to families during difficult economic times, when people lose jobs that have provided them health insurance.

Medicaid is the health care program that helps States during crises—not just people but States—including, obviously, the September 11 attacks, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the recent floods and tornadoes in the South and the Midwest—all being helped by Medicaid.

Medicaid is part of the fabric of our great Nation, and to be clear at this point, I need to say that the House bill that was passed by the House—and who voted for it and who did not obviously is very much on record—would devastate Medicaid and government in general out of discretionary spending.

Anyway, people who are covered by Medicaid do matter. They are people. They are families. They have their needs, their wants, their ambitions, their dreams, their sadnesses, their depressions, whatever.

Darren Hale, from Princeton, WV, wrote me.

> I am a disabled West Virginian whose family relies on Medicare and Medicaid.

That may be a dual-eligible—you know, poor enough to be on Medicaid, old enough to be on Medicare, not able to survive simply on just one or the other.

> I hope and pray that these health programs won't be ended or totally changed. Please do not support Republican changes to these programs as a way of cutting costs to the taxpayer. The poor of West Virginia and elsewhere should not and cannot bear the burden of the deficit reduction that Republicans want.

We need to think very seriously about our priorities. That is what this conversation really leads me to.

Let's say I am a 10-year-old boy, and I am being brought up in West Virginia. My means are meager. I step out into a road, and I am hit by a car. I don't die, but perhaps my spine is fractured—probably—legs broken, and I am condemned to a life in a wheelchair.

Now, that child is not protected by the private enterprise system. That child, unless they are an unusual child from a fairly wealthy family who then can provide insurance—but they will spend themselves down, with that insurance being so incredibly important, and they will eventually qualify for Medicaid.

You know, when you are hit by a car, that is not something you plan on. It is not something you failed to do because you did not have a work ethic or whatever the common wisdom would be about that. It is just something that happened. But the fact remains that your health care is cut, your life is changed, and it grows more miserable because you have nothing in the way of a safety net if the Republican budget is passed, if we get too aggressive about cutting Medicaid.

I am troubled. Members of Congress and senior advocates have rightfully rallied in staunch defense of Medicare. You can find wonderful groups here in Washington who rise up in anger when people talk about cutting Medicare. They are for Medicare. They know

what it is. They know what it was intended to do. They know what it does. They know what a difference it makes. But aside from an occasional editorial or story, there has been an unsettling silence about Medicaid, even from members of my own party. This is despite the fact that the five main arguments made in support of Medicare, which seem to have had a rebirth recently, are also true of Medicaid.

No. 1, the public strongly supports Medicaid, just as they do Medicare. Sixty percent of people say they would prefer to keep Medicaid as it is now. That surprises me. I would have thought the figure would have been much lower. I will get into that in a moment.

No. 2, Medicaid also creates jobs, unlike tax cuts for oil companies and rich people, et cetera. Every $1 million in Federal Medicaid spending results in 17.1 new jobs. Sounds boring. Maybe it is, but not to the people who get those jobs. That is at hospitals, that is at nursing homes, community health centers, and doctors' offices because that is what Medicaid covers.

No. 3, a Medicaid block grant or a spending cap, which is proposed by some—the cap is proposed by some to get away from the words ''block grant,'' but the effect—don't be fooled by that—is the same. They would both reduce the Medicaid benefits and increase cost sharing for seniors—for all of the recipients on Medicaid from day one. Understand that clearly, I would say to my colleagues. Much has been said about a Medicare voucher system, but capping Medicaid spending would be just as bad for the 5.5 million seniors and 11 million individuals with disabilities enrolled in Medicaid.

No. 4, instead of reducing the deficit, the savings achieved by drastically cutting Medicaid would also be used to pay for more tax breaks for wealthy Americans and large corporations.

Here is where I come to what I just don't understand about what is going on in this body.

Evidently, it is not going on outside in America. Sixty percent don't want Medicaid touched. The fact that it is a majority in Medicaid is amazing and wonderful to me. I just don't understand, Mr. President. I think it is political. I think people know that poor people and the disabled—I run into them often and seek them out sometimes, the disabled. They gather in clusters of 30, 50, or 75 people in wheelchairs. They depend upon Medicaid. That is what they depend on. We see them in the Capitol. Do people stop to see them? Not particularly, no. They know that. They are not very good lobbyists. They cannot be because it is hard for them to get around. So is it political?

The Ryan budget cuts taxes on the wealthy, on big deal people and big deal corporations, by $4 trillion. But it cuts Medicaid. Is that an act of social conscience or budget wisdom, or is that a thought-through value system? Is it just political, basically because they know that poor people don't vote? That is what I think the answer is.

You get worried about Medicare real fast.

We saw the results. We saw the House back off from that. But Medicaid? Not so. And it won't be so unless people stand up for Medicaid because they don't have lobbyists; they cannot afford them. They don't even speak that much for themselves. I don't get as many letters from them as from others, by a factor of 10. They have a sense that life has it in for them. That is partly an Appalachian characteristic, and I think many other parts of the country. There is a certain fatalism in life—that God has a plan for you, and it is not necessarily very good. If people accept that—which I don't—as a theory, then they are not going to fight for what Lyndon Johnson gave to the Nation and passed overwhelmingly in 1965.

Cuts to Medicaid will also, to the pleasure of some, undermine the health care reform law that we just passed—which is still law. Medicaid is the underpinning of the entire coverage expansion of reform. We talk about 32 million people that we are going to cover. That goes way down, Mr. President, if these Medicaid cuts are made.

So I ask my colleagues, why is Medicaid so often treated like a second-class program? More to the point, why are people who are on Medicaid treated so often as second-class people? How does that work out? Is that a product of the American sense of justice, or is that a thoughtful America looking around them? We all have friends who have been on Medicaid, or are on it, and have made it out.

Unfortunately, sometimes those people forget their Medicaid background and turn away from it because they are on to a new and better life. Somebody has to fight for these people.

Is it the feeling that maybe they are an unwanted burden on society? We have a tendency in America to say if you don't work, it is because you don't want to. If you don't have a decent job and you have a shabby home, it is because that is what you sought, not what was given to you in your, at least, destiny of the moment.

Again, I think, is it because most of the people enrolled are low-income people and many do not vote? I think that sums it up pretty well. But it is more than that. You can't go into the hollows of Appalachia or Nebraska or many other places and organize poor people to vote because their sense is, why? What does it get me?

Decade after decade, a little bit—is there a little disdain on the part of the American people for those on Medicaid? It is a glorious program, but sometimes it is an inglorious word because it implies they don't want to better themselves.

I won't go through my experiences in West Virginia for the 58th time on this floor. But I have seen so many examples of people who are beaten down—not with a cudgel but because all economic opportunity vanished from their lives. The coal mines shut down, or there weren't any other jobs around. They didn't get to go to school because no schoolbus would come because they were too far away and county law said they don't have to be picked up.

So is the deck stacked against them? Yes, it is. Out of that group, there is one—I guess a guy who is about 40; I will not mention his name. He has a terrific job. He works with the CSX System as one of their railroad maintenance people. He has a good family and is a wonderful person. But his parents were killed in a vehicle crash, and his brothers have been fighting all kinds of problems. So it really takes something special to fight your way out of that self-defined position and make your move forward.

I must say to my colleagues, the point of a representative democracy is not to serve the few, not even to serve the many, but to serve all as best we can. Does that mean we don't touch anything in Medicaid? No, but does it mean that we keep Medicaid as a safety net? Yes, it does.

We are not here elected by some people with incomes above X amount of dollars. We are here for all people—even the people who didn't vote for us or didn't vote at all. I take that very seriously, and I take my experience in West Virginia very seriously.

Sixty-eight million people are enrolled in Medicaid. They deserve a voice in this debate, and I, for one, will speak out for them. It is because somehow we feel that Medicaid recipients are not worthy—and I have expressed that in different words—simply because they have fallen on hard times or were born in hard times.

How do you help the fact that your father or mother didn't work because there wasn't any work available? What do you do about that situation? Or you were born in the ghetto. Oh, you just rise above that. Barack Obama did, therefore, anybody can. Life doesn't work like that, and the Presiding Officer knows that very well.

Then I must ask of my colleagues, how could this be? We all have neighbors, friends, and family who have or do benefit from Medicaid—even perhaps in their distant past. In fact, nearly half of all Americans have a friend or a family member that has received Medicaid assistance at some point, and they are absolutely worthy of our support.

Is it because we believe Medicaid spending is truly out of control? Then I remind colleagues that Medicaid costs per beneficiary grew much lower over the past decade than costs for any private health insurance coverage. The administrative costs in Medicaid are between 1 and 2 percent. An average health insurance company is probably 10, 15, or 20 percent—and all of this despite the fact that Medicaid has more comprehensive benefits. They are much

larger benefits that cover more. They do more for people, and significantly lower cost sharing.

I fervently believe the American tradition of shared responsibility—everybody working together for the greater good—is a tradition worth upholding and that a government has an ongoing role to play in its preservation. It cannot play that role perfectly, but it can do it as best and most fairly as possible.

Instead of shortchanging Medicaid, we must have the courage to rein in tax breaks for corporate America and for people of great wealth. Medicaid does exactly what it was designed to do all those years ago: provide a safety net for low-income Americans. There are lots of worthwhile and positive ways we can improve the program, I grant you that. But trashing Medicaid, gutting Medicaid—especially if it is sort of flipping it aside for political gain—cannot be an option.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

ETHANOL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, tomorrow afternoon we will vote on Senator COBURN's amendment dealing with ethanol.

I come to the floor at this time to express my strong opposition to that amendment. Senator COBURN's amendment would raise the tax on domestic energy production. It would do this by repealing an incentive for the use of a home-grown renewable fuel called ethanol.

With conflicts in the Middle East and crude oil priced at $100 a barrel or more, we should be on the same side. Let me make that clear. We have Middle East problems. We have crude oil priced at over $100 a barrel. Oil interests and biofuels interests, if both are domestically produced, should be on the same side of the energy issue.

Why would anyone prefer less domestic energy production? In other words, why would anyone prefer importing more oil over domestically produced energy, whether it is fossil fuel or renewable? We should all be on the same side of more domestically produced energy.

The tremendous cost of America's dependence upon foreign oil has never been more clear. I support drilling here and drilling now. I support renewable energy. I support conservation. I support nuclear energy. The reason I support different forms of energy and why we have to support more energy is that if we are going to have an expanding economy and create more jobs, we are obviously going to use more energy.

Remember, I included conservation in my energy program. So the attacks on domestic energy are quite a remarkable thing happening right now, when gasoline is $4 a gallon. We are spending $835 million a day imported oil. So whether it is oil or renewable energy, we should not be fighting each other over any source of domestic energy. We should be fighting together against OPEC and these foreign dictators and oil sheiks—some of them hate the United States—from holding our economy hostage.

The author of the amendment has argued that the production of clean, home-grown ethanol is fiscally irresponsible. It is important to remember that the incentive exists to help producers of ethanol to compete with the oil industry—in other words, to have a level playing field for all forms of energy.

Remember, the oil industry has been well supported by the Federal Treasury for more than a century. The Senator from Oklahoma, the sponsor of the amendment, has touted with much fanfare a letter from oil companies that says they don't need or want the credit. It is my understanding that many of the oil refineries are no longer in the business of downstream ethanol blending and, subsequently, do not pay the excise tax on gasoline and do not benefit from the credit.

Now, isn't it easy to be advocating repeal of something when you don't benefit from it? It is even easier to advocate for repeal when doing so would undercut your competition.

It shouldn't surprise anyone that the oil refiners and Big Oil are advocating a position that would reduce the competitiveness of renewable ethanol. Refineries enjoy a cozy monopoly on our Nation's transportation fuel. They opposed the Renewable Fuels Standard because it cuts into their monopoly.

Alternatively, if the members of the National Petrochemical and Refiners Association say they don't want or don't need the credit, then it is pretty simple: Don't take it. It is a tax credit which they must apply for to the Internal Revenue Service. If they don't want it and they don't need it, they shouldn't file for that credit with the Internal Revenue Service. I would be glad to work with the Senator from Oklahoma in getting the members of the National Petrochemical and Refiners Association to return the credit to the Federal Treasury. No one is forcing them to take the credit. Since they seem eager to return it, perhaps Senator COBURN and I can work together to get them to return it.

If you like tight gasoline supplies and if you like $4 gasoline, join the campaign led by Big Oil and the National Petrochemical and Refiners Association. If you want less dependence on foreign oil and more use of home-grown, renewable fuels, support ethanol producers.

The fact is, the portion of the industry that blends ethanol and sells it to the consumers supports maintaining this credit. The Society for Independent Gasoline Marketers of America, or SIGMA, recently wrote to the Senate majority leader and minority leader opposing efforts to prematurely and abruptly eliminate the blender's credit:

On behalf of our client, the Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America, I write to you to oppose efforts in Congress to prematurely and abruptly eliminate the VEETC—that is the ethanol blenders credit.

Increasing the tax paid on ethanol-blended gasoline makes no sense at a time when consumer fuel prices are already high and the need to maximize domestic energy sources is so very critical.

Very true at the time when gasoline is $4 a gallon.

SIGMA's members account for 37 percent of the petroleum retail market. SIGMA works to promote competition in the marketplace to help keep consumer fuel costs down. This is contrary to the position of oil refiners who prefer no competition.

I have further words from that letter.

This incentive has been an extremely useful tool in helping the Nation's fuel marketers and chain retailers deliver fuels to the market at a competitive price.

By providing long-term price competitiveness for ethanol-blended fuels, VEETC also helps provide assurances to marketers and retailers that important infrastructure investments necessary to deliver these fuels will continue to provide returns, and not result in wasted improvements.

Simply put, SIGMA opposes recent moves to prematurely or abruptly end the subsidies without any consideration for future fuel and fuel-delivery costs.

To end this incentive immediately would no doubt result in an immediate spike in consumers' fuel costs.

SIGMA believes that a policy that provides an effective transition for the industry from the current tax structure is a better alternative to the slash and cut budget strategy being promoted by some Members of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Senator from Oklahoma also mentioned the total cost of the blender's credit as a reason for supporting repeal of VEETC. He claimed the American people will have spent $32 billion on this credit over the past 30 years. That may be the case.

Again, I don't believe we should be debating ethanol incentives by themselves or in a vacuum. For comparison's sake, I wish to inform my colleagues of the cost and duration of a few oil subsidies.

The Senator from Oklahoma has derided the 30-year-old ethanol blender's credit, arguing that the industry is mature. Well, what about our century-old oil industry? Don't forget, oil was discovered in Pennsylvania in 1859. We haven't had the incentives for that long, but according to the Government Accountability Office, the tax break allowing for the expensing of intangible drilling costs began in 1916, more than 95 years ago, and continues today. The percentage depletion allowance was enacted in 1926, 85 years ago, and it still exists today. After 95 years, is the domestic oil industry not mature?

I know my colleagues will be interested in how much these two subsidies

have cost the American people. A report issued by the General Accounting Office in the year 2000 looked at the subsidies for oil production. It reviewed the 32-year period between 1968 to 2000. During that timeframe, the intangible drilling subsidy cost the American people as much as $52 billion. The percentage depletion subsidy cost the American people $82 billion. So these two provisions, enacted nearly a century ago, cost the American people as much as $114 billion from 1968 through 2000. And this doesn't even include the subsidies during the past 11 years.

Last month, we had a vote here in the Senate to repeal a number of these oil and gas tax provisions. Opponents of repealing oil and gas subsidies argued then, and I presume would argue today, that doing so would reduce domestic energy production and drive up our dependence on foreign oil. Opponents at that time also argued it would cost U.S. jobs, and increase prices at the pump for consumers.

I happen to agree with those arguments. But if those arguments are good for oil, then they are good not just for ethanol but they are good for all sorts of green energy as well.

Prices at the pump are nearly $4 a gallon. All of our constituents are crying out for action to lower these prices, so it makes sense that Congress would consider steps to address the rising energy costs and work to drive down the cost to consumers at the pump.

That is not what the Coburn amendment would do. It would not drive down the cost at the pump at all. It would very likely lead to higher prices for consumers. It won't lead to the production of anymore energy. It won't create anymore jobs. It very well could lead to less domestic energy production and less employment in the U.S. energy sector; in other words, more unemployment and more dependence on foreign sources of energy.

At a time of $4 gas and 9.1 percent unemployment, why would we in this body consider an amendment that will increase the cost of energy production, reduce domestic energy supply, and lead to job losses?

Ethanol is reducing prices at the pump. A recent study by the Center for Agriculture and Rural Development found that ethanol is reducing the price at the pump by an average of 89 cents a gallon.

The fact is, this amendment is not about reducing prices at the pump. The amendment before us is not about reducing our dependence on foreign oil. This amendment is about raising taxes. And one thing is for certain: If you raise taxes on any activity, you get less of it. That is a common economic principle.

A taxpayer watchdog group considers a repeal of this tax incentive to be what it is, a tax hike. Americans for Tax Reform said, ''Repealing the ethanol credit is a corporate income tax increase.'' I agree.

Now is not the time to impose a gas tax hike on the American people. Now is not the time to send pink slips to ethanol-related jobs.

I know we all agree that we cannot and should not allow job-killing tax hikes during this time of economic uncertainty. What this Congress should be doing is increasing the domestic production of energy as a way to increase jobs, increase domestic investment, and lower prices at the pump. This amendment does none of those things, and actually it does exactly the opposite. A repeal of the ethanol tax incentive is a tax increase that will surely be passed on to the American consumers. Repealing incentives for ethanol would have the same exact result as a repeal of the oil and gas subsidies. We will get less domestically produced energy. It will cost U.S. jobs. It will increase our dependence upon foreign oil. It will increase prices at the pump for the American consumer.

So why do my colleagues want to increase our foreign energy independence when we can produce it right here at home? I wish to ask my colleagues who voted against repealing the oil and gas subsidies but support repealing incentives on renewable fuels, why the inconsistency?

Interestingly, the same oil and gas association that is lobbying for repeal of the ethanol incentive led the charge against raising taxes on the oil and gas industry. The president of the National Petrochemical and Refiners Association stated:

> Targeting a specific industry or even a segment of that industry is what we would consider punitive and unfair tax policy, and it is not going to get us increased energy security, increased employment and certainly not going to lower the price of gasoline.

That is the end of the quote from the president of the National Petrochemical and Refiners Association.

The fact is, it is intellectually inconsistent to say that increasing taxes on ethanol is justified but that it is irresponsible to do so on oil and gas production. If tax incentives lead to more domestic energy production and to good-paying jobs, why are only incentives for oil and gas important? It is even more ridiculous to claim that the 30-year-old ethanol industry is mature but the oil and gas industry, now over 100 years old, is not. Regardless, I don't think we should be raising taxes on any type of energy production or on any individual, particularly when we have a very weak economy. This amendment is a tax increase.

The Senator from Oklahoma also insists that because the renewable fuel is required to be used, it does not need an incentive. But with oil prices at $100 a barrel, oil companies are doing everything they can to extract more oil from the ground. There is not a mandate to use oil but oil already has a 100-year-old monopoly on our transportation infrastructure. They want to maintain as much of that 100-year-old monopoly as they can right now. Right now, because 10 percent of the energy used in cars is ethanol, they may only have a 90-percent monopoly, but they sure have a lot to say about what goes into your gas tank without competition.

When there is little competition to oil and it is enormously profitable, wouldn't that industry argue that the necessary incentives exist to produce it without additional taxpayer support? Oil essentially has a mandate today, and the economics of oil production are clearly in favor of producers.

It is still unclear to me why we are having this debate on this bill. This is not an energy bill. It is not a tax bill. Its prospects in the Senate are uncertain. Maybe most important, if this amendment were attached to this bill, the entire bill would be blue-slipped by the House because revenue bills under our Constitution must originate in the House of Representatives, and this is not a House revenue bill we are working on.

If we send it to the other body with this amendment, they will send it right back to us. It will be dead on arrival in the other body. So why are we having this debate on this bill? We should be debating this amendment in the context of a comprehensive energy plan. This debate should include a review of the subsidies for all energy production, not just for one of many renewable resources.

I could ask: Why are we talking about this subsidy on ethanol when we are not talking about the subsidies on oil? Why should we be talking about this subsidy on one alternative energy, which is ethanol, but not talking about the subsidies for wind and solar and biomass and geothermal and I suppose a dozen other alternative energy sources that we have? It boils down to the fact that we should not be singling out ethanol. Nearly every type of energy gets some sort of market-distorting subsidy from the Federal Government. I have indicated that at least for 95 years on one oil subsidy.

An honest energy debate should include ethanol, oil, natural gas, nuclear, hydropower, wind, solar, biomass, and probably a lot of others that do not come to my mind at this particular time. In December, 2010, Congress enacted a 1-year extension of the volumetric ethanol excise tax credit—that, for short, goes by the acronym VEETC—but this is also known as the blenders' credit.

This 1-year extension has allowed Congress and the domestic biofuels industry to determine the best path forward for Federal support of biofuels.

As a result of these discussions, Senator CONRAD and I introduced bipartisan legislation on May 4 that is a serious, responsible first step to reducing and redirecting Federal tax incentives for ethanol. Our bill will reduce VEETC to a fixed rate of 20 cents in 2012, and 15 cents in 2013. It will then convert to a variable tax incentive for the remaining 3 years based upon the price of crude oil. When crude oil is more than $90 a barrel, there will be no blenders credit. When crude oil is $50 a barrel or

less, the blenders credit would be 30 cents. The rate will vary when the price of crude is between $50 and $90 a barrel.

When oil prices are high, a natural incentive should exist in the market to drive ethanol use. The bill also would extend through the year 2016 the alternative fuel refueling property credit, the cellulosic producers tax credit, and the special depreciation allowance for cellulosic biofuel plant property.

Today, Senator THUNE and Senator KLOBUCHAR are introducing another bipartisan bill to immediately reduce and reform the ethanol tax incentive. It includes many of the same features as the bill I introduced last month, but it enacts the reforms this year. The approach of Senator THUNE also leads to significant deficit reduction.

The legislation we have introduced is a responsible approach that will reduce the existing blenders credit and put those valuable resources into investing in alternative fuel infrastructure, including alternative fuel pumps.

It would responsibly and predictably reduce the existing tax incentive and help get alternative fuel infrastructure in place so consumers can decide at the pump which fuel they would prefer. I know that when the American consumers have their choice, they will choose domestic, clean, affordable renewable fuel. They will choose fuel from America's farmers and ranchers rather than from oil sheiks and foreign dictators. Both of the ethanol reform bills I mentioned are supported by the ethanol advocacy groups. In an almost unprecedented move, the ethanol industry is advocating for a reduction in their Federal incentives. No other energy industry, whether it is fossil fuels or renewables, has come to the table to reduce their subsidies. No other energy advocate has come to me with a plan to reduce their Federal support.

In conclusion, I would like to address two points that ethanol opponents continue to make, despite facts to the contrary. First, ethanol and ethanol incentives are not a major factor in rising food and corn prices. The U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, Tom Vilsack, recently stated:

> During the great run-up in food and commodity prices in 2007 and 2008, biofuel production played only a minor role, accounting for about 10 percent of the total increase in global prices.

But going back to that time or even more recently, listening to the big food manufacturers that are part of this coalition attacking ethanol, you would think the entire blame for the increase in the price of food is because of ethanol, even though ethanol consumes only 3 percent of the coarse grain produced in the entire world. A recent report by the Center for Agriculture and Rural Development concluded that only 8 percent of the increase in corn prices from 2006 to 2009 was due to ethanol subsidies. Further, they concluded that because of this small impact, it ''. . . necessarily implies that the contribution of ethanol subsidies to food inflation is largely imperceptible in the United States.''

Second, ethanol reduces greenhouse gas emissions significantly compared to gasoline. The fact is, under the renewable fuels standard created in 2007, corn ethanol was required to reduce greenhouse gas emissions compared to gasoline by at least 20 percent. The fact is, corn ethanol exceeded that threshold. If you remove EPA's use of the murky science surrounding emissions from indirect land use changes, ethanol reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 48 percent compared to gasoline.

A recent peer-review study published in the Yale Journal of Industrial Ecology found that ethanol reduces greenhouse gas emissions by up to 59 percent compared to gasoline. Ethanol currently accounts for 10 percent of our gasoline fuel pool. A study found that the ethanol industry contributed $8.4 billion to the Federal Treasury in 2009. That happens to be $3.4 billion more than the ethanol incentive. Today, the industry supports 400,000 U.S. jobs. That is why I support homegrown, renewable, reliable biofuels.

I would rather our Nation be dependent upon renewable fuel producers across this country rather than relying on Middle Eastern oil sheiks or Hugo Chavez in Venezuela. None of those people like us, and some of them are using our own money to train terrorists to kill us. Instead, I would prefer we support our renewable fuel producers based right here in the continental United States. I would prefer we decrease our dependence on Hugo Chavez and not increase it. I certainly don't support raising the tax on gasoline during a weak economy.

I encourage my colleagues to vote no on the motion to invoke cloture on the Coburn amendment.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP,
Washington, DC, April 1, 2011.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADERS REID AND MCCONNELL: On behalf of our client, the Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America, SIGMA, I write to urge you to oppose efforts in Congress to prematurely or abruptly eliminate the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit or VEETC. Increasing the tax paid on ethanol blended gasoline makes no sense at a time when consumer fuel prices are already high and the need to maximize domestic energy sources is so critical.

As the national trade association representing America's independent fuel marketers and chain retailers, SIGMA represents an important and innovative part of the America's fuel marketing industry. SIGMA's approximately 270 corporate members command some 37 percent of the petroleum retail market, selling 64 billion gallons of motor fuel each year. For more than 50 years, SIGMA has supported the nation's fuel marketers by encouraging policies that promote growth, innovation, and fairness in the industry, and competition in the marketplace to help keep consumer fuel costs down.

As the leading marketers of ethanol-blended fuel at the retail level, SIGMA's members and customers are the beneficiaries of VEETC. This incentive has been an extremely useful tool in helping the nation's fuel marketers and chain retailers deliver fuels to the market at a competitive price. By providing long term price competitiveness for ethanol blended fuels, VEETC also helps provide assurances to marketers and retailers that important infrastructure investments necessary to deliver these fuels will continue to provide returns, and not result in wasted improvements.

Simply put, SIGMA opposes recent moves to prematurely or abruptly end the subsidies without any consideration for future fuel and fuel-delivery costs. To end this incentive immediately would no doubt result in an immediate spike in consumers' fuel costs. SIGMA believes that a policy that provides an effective transition for the industry from the current tax structure, is a better alternative to the slash and cut budget strategy being promoted by some Members of Congress.

I thank you in advance for your support in this regard. If you have any questions or wish to discuss this matter further, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

R. TIMOTHY COLUMBUS,
General Counsel to the Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the period for morning business be extended until 7 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 25 minutes.

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

ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, to the millions of Americans who are struggling to find jobs or make ends meet, this is simply stating the obvious, but I rise, a decade after we were told the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy would stimulate the economy and create jobs, to say they have done neither. A decade of the Bush tax cuts have proven what we knew from the beginning; that they disproportionately benefited the wealthy, shifted wealth, did nothing for the middle class, and nothing trickled down.

The tax cuts exploded the debt and continue to be an economic burden that has been twisted into a Republican mantra, an ironic rallying cry for what clearly is a failed economic policy. Yet adherence to the tax cuts for the wealthy is a Republican political litmus test, no matter how clear the evidence is that they have failed to deliver on the promise.

We again hear our colleagues on the other side of the aisle pursuing their ''my way or the highway'' approach to legislating. This time they are protecting these failed tax policies in the current debt limit negotiations, and they are putting tax cuts for millionaires ahead of poor seniors in nursing homes.

These are the very same tax cuts for millionaires that helped get us into this fiscal mess, and they should most certainly be on the table to help us get out. It is like my Republican colleagues have thrown a lavish dinner party for the past decade and now they want us to pick up the check. What we are saying is: Let's go dutch and share the tab.

Ten years later, it is abundantly clear that tax cuts for the wealthy are nothing more than an ideological and political pivot point, not a sustainable economic policy. Our Republican colleagues use this failed notion as a one-size-fits-all for political sleight of hand for all economic circumstances: tax cuts in bad times, tax cuts in good times, tax cuts in all types of economic circumstances. That is not policy, it is a convenient bumper sticker slogan.

Our Republican friends on the other side come to the floor prepared to end Medicare as we know it. They come to the floor prepared to slash government to the bone. But they are unwilling to even entertain revisiting this failed economic policy, unwilling to consider adding a single penny to the revenue side of the equation by limiting this blind giveaway to those who need it the least. They will not entertain asking the wealthiest to be part of the solution for America, and I believe if asked, they would be. They would not put tax cuts on the table but have made ending Medicare, as we know it, the centerpiece. They told us from the beginning that wealth will trickle down, tax cuts will lift all boats, those who get the benefit of the cuts will do what is right for America and its people and create American jobs for American families. Well, the facts do not suggest such an altruistic outcome. Tax cuts for the wealthy have turned out to be the greatest failed jobs program in American history. All of the grand promises aside, all of the rhetoric about job growth and economic stimulus, all of that lofty rhetoric aside, just 3 years after the Bush tax cuts in June of 2004, we lost almost 1 million jobs, more than 300,000 jobs a year for each year of 3 years.

The fact is this economic policy did not stimulate job growth at home, but it did create job transfers abroad. Factories closed, jobs went overseas, services were outsourced. The rich got richer and tax cuts produced no jobs in America for 3 years. None. In April of 2003, almost 2 years after the tax cuts were passed, President Bush stood before the American people and said:

These tax reductions will bring real and immediate benefits to middle income Americans. By speeding up the income tax cuts, we will speed up economic recovery and the pace of job creation.

He called the tax cuts ''a victory for fairness and a vote for economic growth.''

The fact is the Bush tax cuts coincided with the most anemic economic expansion of the postwar period. It exploded the deficit and the debt and concentrated wealth at the top unlike any concentration of wealth since the Gilded Age of the late 19th century. This, in addition to two wars unpaid for in Iraq and Afghanistan, a new entitlement program passed by Republicans unpaid for, and a marketplace that instead of being a free market was a free-for-all market created the excesses that brought us to the culmination of 2008's incredible economic challenge to this country on the verge of a potential new depression and drove so much of the debt the Nation faces today.

For all the rhetoric from the right, the Bush tax cuts have been the greatest failed jobs program and the most ineffective economic stimulus effort in our history, succeeding only in creating a new class of super-rich in America.

Let's talk about this shift in wealth from the last decade. As much as my Republican colleagues tried to twist themselves into knots and jump through elaborate hoops to disprove the obvious, the facts are clear. Ten years later and the Bush tax cuts have disproportionately widened the income gap to a point today where the wealthiest 1 percent of households in this country owns almost 40 percent of all private wealth in this country, more wealth than the bottom 90 percent of all Americans combined. Think about it. The wealthiest 1 percent of households in this country owns 40 percent of all private wealth, more than almost all of the rest of us combined. That is an extraordinary shift in wealth in the 10 years since the tax cuts were enacted that has cost this Nation $2.5 trillion in revenue with about 40 percent of the benefits going to households with incomes over $380,000. Yet our friends on the other side say no to a single mother who sits up in the middle of the night with a sick child wondering if she can afford to take that child to the doctor, praying she can afford the medicine that child needs and still put food on the table, hoping she will be able to keep her job and her health care plan.

All that wealth at the top and Republicans have said no to a young student who needs a Pell grant so he or she can get the education they need to succeed. All that wealth at the top and Republicans have said no to a mom-and-pop grocery store owner who cannot get the capital they need to make repairs or expand. Our friends on the other side have looked into the eyes of that mother, that student, that store owner and said, no; no to health care, no to education, no to small business capital. They even said no to extending unemployment benefits, but asking the wealthy to pay their fair share is off the table. The one thing they have said yes to is ending Medicare as we know it and leaving seniors to fend for themselves.

I have been visiting senior centers in my home State of New Jersey. I just came from, earlier today, to hear thoughts on the current budget discussions of Medicare. A typical 65-year-old at these meetings under the Republican budget proposal would pay an additional $7,000 by the year 2022. Right now over 140,000 seniors in New Jersey are paying more for their medications because they fall into that doughnut hole.

Under the Republican plan, those New Jersey seniors will pay an additional $80 million for prescription drugs next year, and by 2020 seniors currently in the doughnut hole will pay an additional $1.6 billion. Nationwide nearly 4 million seniors will pay $2.2 billion more for prescription drugs in 2012 alone under the Republican plan, a plan that would end Medicare and would also force at least 1 million seniors to pay over $110 million more for annual wellness visits in 2012. Then turning to Medicaid, looking to turn that into a block grant program, the Republican plan could cost America more than 2 million private sector jobs over the next 5 years and threaten our economic recovery.

That is not all. Nationwide the Republican plan could cut more than $503 billion in Medicaid funding for seniors, for the disabled, including lifesaving nursing home care, leaving us with the uncomfortable and unanswerable question I pose to my Republican friends: What will those fellow Americans do? Where will they go? What happens to them under the Republican budget plan? These are people, not budget numbers. What happens to them?

Something is wrong with that picture of America. It is not the America I know. Something is fundamentally wrong when we let seniors fend for themselves and enact policies that lead to inequalities in income and wealth that are the most skewed since the Gilded Age and the Great Depression. How many years are we going to buy into the failed negotiation of trickle-down voodoo economics that reward the winners and leave the middle class behind?

We all know we need to cut wasteful spending, we all know we need to balance the budget, and we have done it before. It wasn't that long ago that, in fact, during another Democratic administration we had budget surpluses as far out as the eye could see. How quickly we forget the day Bill Clinton left office he handed the incoming President a $236 billion surplus with a projected surplus of $5.6 trillion over the next 10 years. When President Bush left office, he turned a $236 billion surplus into a $1.3 trillion budget deficit with projected shortfalls of over $8 trillion over the next decade and handed the new President, President Obama, an economy headed off the cliff.

Now our Republican colleagues want to go back to the same failed policies. They want to give more tax cuts to millionaires and billionaires, continue subsidies to Big Oil while they end Medicare as we know it and gut Pell grants and all that they mean to our economic future. They insist on tax cuts that will cost $700 billion on the revenue side over the next 10 years and trillions more by slashing tax rates for the wealthy and the powerful.

Those making more than $1 million a year will see a windfall of $125,000 each from the tax cuts and tens of thousands of dollars more for proposed tax rate cuts while people in my home State lose $34 billion in health benefits and 400,000 New Jerseyans end up without health coverage at all. They want to shift the balance to millionaires and billionaires while making Draconian cuts to health care benefits for seniors.

Cuts do not reflect our value as a people or as a nation. Even a majority of tea partiers think it is a bad idea according to recent polls. I am reminded that our distinguished Republican colleagues are symbolized in their party by an elephant, a large animal that never forgets. Our Republican colleagues have forgotten what Vice President Cheney told America on national television as he was waging two wars, both unpaid for. He said, ''Deficits don't matter.'' Vice President Cheney: ''Deficits don't matter.''

Well, Republicans have apparently forgotten President Bush's own words on April 16, 2001, about the benefits of favoring the wealthiest Americans:

> Tax relief will create new jobs. Tax relief will generate new wealth, and tax relief will open new opportunities.

He was right about one thing; it created new wealth and new opportunities—all of them at the top. But show me the jobs. Show me the new opportunities for middle-class families. Show me what it did to keep our economy on track and protect hard-working families from losing their homes in mortgage schemes and hedge fund gambles that stole the wealth of middle-class families taking us to the brink of economic ruin.

Let's look at the simple facts about the Bush tax cuts 10 years later. The top one-tenth of 1 percent of American wage earners, those earning more than $3 million a year, received an average tax cut of $520,000 each—far more than most American families dream of making—a tax cut more than 450 times larger than the meager tax cut of an average middle-class wage earner. Those earning over $3 million benefited from lower tax rates on capital gains; lower tax rates on dividends, and lower marginal rates for the top two tax brackets.

From 2002 to 2007, the top 1 percent of American wage earners enjoyed 65 percent of the total income gains during that 5-year period. In those 5 years nothing trickled down. In fact, real hourly earnings fell by almost 2 percent for men in the bottom 10 percent of wage earners. It fell one-half of 1 percent for men in the middle of the 50th percentile but increased almost 3 percent for men in the top 10 percent. Nothing trickled down.

If the Bush tax cuts were designed as a stimulus, they failed again. Moody's has said making the cuts permanent would generate only 35 cents in economic activity per dollar they cost.

Under the American Recovery Act, the payback would be $1.17 for every dollar of the Making Work Pay credit and $1.38 for the child tax credit. Clearly, the stimulus effect of the Bush cuts was not a stimulus at all. As far as the debt is concerned, from 2001 to 2010 the cuts added $2.6 trillion to the debt, 50 percent of the total accrued during that 10-year period. The fact is the Bush cuts averaged out to lower revenue levels as a share of the economy than any previous decade since the 1950s, even as we have America's sons and daughters in two wars waging abroad, unpaid for. The extension of the cuts in the December tax bill is projected to decrease revenues by $432 billion, from 2012 to 2021, making the total costs more than $5 trillion over the next decade. Yet Republicans will not put any of that $5 trillion on the table, not even the tax cuts for millionaires, but they will happily end Medicare as we know it and kick poor seniors out of their nursing homes. This is something we cannot let happen.

So, Mr. President, as I have said before on the floor of the Senate, in their ideological haze they seem to have lost sight of the real people whose lives would be affected by the choices we make. The Republican vision of America is about the bottom line. It seems to me they failed to realize that budgets are not just about numbers, budgets are about people, their hopes, their dreams, their expectations for a better life for themselves and their children. They are about the promise of this country and the dream we have come to expect, the vision we have of safe, clean, vibrant communities in which to raise our families.

Budgets are a reflection of our values, not a faceless calculation of pluses and minuses just to reach an arbitrary number regardless of the impact on middle-class families looking to get back to work and pay the bills. All of us have a budget. Maybe it is not a formal budget, but we all have one. On the revenue side we have what we earn from gainful employment, investments, interest on savings. On the flip side we have our expenses, mortgage payments, groceries, utilities, and we have our contributions perhaps to our church or synagogue or donations to a favorite charity or a worthy cause. These are expressions of our personal values, just as the Nation's budget is an expression of its collective values.

We may not always think of the budget in those terms, but we should. It is about our values. The Bush tax cuts enacted a decade ago are antithetical to the values that we as a people and nation have. Middle-class families and seniors should not be left to pay the tab for a decade of lavish tax cuts that did nothing but make millionaires richer. Those tax breaks helped us to get into this mess, and they certainly should be on the table to help us get out of it. If we do that, then we have the wherewithal to do what we did once again under President Clinton: Balance the budget for the first time in a generation, create record surpluses, low unemployment, low interest rates, low inflation, and the greatest peacetime economy in over a generation. Those are the choices before the Senate and the country, and I hope we can get our colleagues to understand the right choice on behalf of the Nation's progress and prosperity.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

COBURN AMENDMENT

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from Oklahoma which we will be voting on tomorrow. Before I talk about the substance of the amendment, I wish to comment on the procedure through which it was offered. There was no warning to Senate leadership or to any of our colleagues. And while technically it wasn't in violation of Senate rules, it undermines the basic comity that makes this body work. It is a disservice to do business this way—to our colleagues, to bipartisanship, and to the American people who sent us in Washington to get work done by working together. So I am disappointed in the way this was handled.

Now let me talk about the amendment itself. Today, families in Minnesota and around the country are paying painfully high prices at the pump as oil still hovers around $100 a barrel. What this amendment does is cut the legs out from under the most viable alternative to foreign oil we have. Despite decade after decade of rhetoric about weaning our country off foreign oil, we are still dependent on it. And while about a third of our oil imports comes from Canada and Mexico, close to half come from the Persian Gulf, Africa, or Venezuela.

Last year at this time we were dealing with the gulf oilspill, the worst environmental catastrophe we have ever had. That was maybe the most jarring reminder of what has been clear for decades—that we have to kick our addiction to oil. While that is not something we can do overnight, we need to do everything in our power to transition to alternatives.

There is no more viable alternative than biofuels. Today, the industry that has been most successful in displacing oil is under attack. We are talking about an industry using homegrown American resources, an industry that has created thousands of jobs and catalyzed economic development across

rural America. The first generation of biofuels has paved the way for the next generation of advanced biofuels. The first commercial-scale cellulosic ethanol plant is being built this year in Emmetsburg, IA, where it will be making ethanol from corncobs.

According to a recent study done by the researchers at Iowa State University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the growth in ethanol production reduced wholesale gas prices by an average of 89 cents per gallon in 2010. In the Midwest, that number was higher: $1.37 per gallon. Let me repeat that. At a time when so many American families are struggling to pay their bills and make ends meet, they would have paid an average of 89 cents more per gallon of gas last year had we not had ethanol.

But instead of giving this industry the tools it needs to grow and reduce our oil dependence even more, this amendment hangs the ethanol industry out to dry. It makes no sense.

I share the concern of my colleague from Oklahoma about the deficit and our national debt. To cut our deficit, everyone in America will have to make some sacrifices, and that includes the ethanol industry. The easy part here is that the ethanol industry agrees. Ethanol producers stand ready to phase out the ethanol blenders credit. But we need to be consistent. If the ethanol industry is being asked to make some sacrifices, other fuel industries need to be willing to do the same. Yet, just a month ago, many of my colleagues, including my colleague from Oklahoma, voted against repealing billions of dollars in subsidies we pay every year to the biggest five oil companies. We are talking about companies that have made almost $1 trillion in profit over the last decade. My colleagues chose to leave those tax breaks in place, amounting to 21 billion in taxpayer dollars to oil companies over the next 10 years. Expert after expert has basically concluded these subsidies are not lowering the cost of gas and would not cause it to increase if they were eliminated. But we do not need experts to tell us that. Subsidies for oil and gas are on the books right now, and some have been on the books since as far back as 1916, but they have done nothing to stem the skyrocketing gas prices that are squeezing the budgets of American families. Yet when we are talking about ethanol—a homegrown alternative to foreign oil that lowers prices at the pump—my colleagues seem to think it is absolutely imperative to repeal this tax credit now.

When it is repealing subsidies for oil and gas companies operating in oil-producing States such as Oklahoma, that somehow is a tax hike. But cutting a tax credit that supports an American renewable fuel, that is ''fiscal responsibility.'' The hypocrisy here is stunning.

Regardless, America's ethanol producers are ready and willing to phase out this credit. But there is a right way and a wrong way to do it. The Coburn amendment, which abruptly ends the credit at the end of this month, is the wrong way. The right way is to responsibly phase out the tax credit in a manner that allows the industry to build out the infrastructure it needs to bring advanced biofuels into the U.S. market.

Today my colleagues and I are introducing legislation that does it the right way, and I urge every Member of this body to support it. Right now, our biofuels industry is hitting a wall because of the national 10-percent ethanol blend limit we have had on the books. It also is hamstrung by the inability of most cars and gas pumps to use blends higher than 10 percent ethanol. That means cellulosic ethanol and other advanced biofuels have no market access or market to grow into. This isn't an industry problem, it is a public policy problem.

The EPA's E15 waiver was a step in the right direction to address this very problem. But without pumps that can deliver higher ethanol blends, American consumers have no way to access additional ethanol that would and should be on the market. What our legislation does is reform our ethanol tax policy by ending the ethanol tax credit in its current form at the end of the month. It then invests part of the savings into biofuels infrastructure, part toward extending the cellulosic ethanol credit, and puts $1 billion toward reducing our deficit.

Reducing America's dependence on oil is going to require a national strategy, and biofuels are just one part of that strategy. We also need to do things such as deploy more electric vehicles and make our entire economy more energy efficient. We have to recognize that if we don't fix our national policies to allow the biofuels industry to grow, we are actively choosing foreign oil and dirty fossil fuels over domestic, homegrown, renewable fuels.

Let me tell my colleagues something: We are never going to see a massive ethanol spill in the Gulf of Mexico that kills 11 workers, destroys thousands and thousands of livelihoods, and does irreparable harm to vital ecosystems. We are never going to see foreign countries collude to restrict the supply of ethanol and drive up gas prices for American families. As we transition to advanced biofuels and expand this industry, we are not going to see these jobs go overseas. This is an American industry, it is American jobs, and it is American energy independence. I urge my colleagues to make the responsible choice—one that will keep this industry moving forward.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. KLOBUCHAR and Mr. THUNE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1185 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). The Senator from Oklahoma.

ETHANOL

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I had a good time this afternoon listening to the debate on the amendment I have offered and visiting with Senators. I think there is an important distinction that needs to be made in the arguments that have been brought forward.

The first is we have a mandated level of ethanol that has to be produced and blended into gasoline, and it grows from now on. There will be zero job losses if this amendment is approved.

The second thing is, my colleague—and I love him to death—from South Dakota says we are going to save $1 billion. We can save $3 billion if we eliminate the VEETC blending subsidy.

Now, why should we do that? Here is a subsidy that goes to all the blenders of gasoline in the United States—all of them—and they all have called and written and said: We do not want the $3 billion for the rest of the year. We do not want it.

We actually have a letter from the National Petrochemical and Refiners Association, which they are all members of, saying: We do not want this money. So the best way to get money against the deficit is to not give money to people who do not want it on something that is already mandated anyway.

I spent a great deal of time listening to my colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, and his figures were very good. But they were only up through 2008.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 40 percent of last year's corn crop was utilized, converted to ethanol. Why would the American Bakers Association, the American Frozen Food Institute, the American Meat Institute, California Dairies, the Grocery Manufacturers Association, the International Dairy Foods Association, the Milk Producers Council, the National Chicken Council, the National Council of Chain Restaurants, the National Meat Association, the National Restaurant Association, the National Turkey Federation, the National Wildlife Federation—which is just about one-third of the people who are endorsing this—why would they be for this?

Because it is not just less than 3 percent of the cost of food, it has been, this last year, the significant driver. Corn prices are at $7.65 a bushel. They are 2½ times what they were 3½ years ago. And I am not against the farmers. I am for ethanol. I do not want to do away with ethanol blending. I do not want to do away with ethanol as a substitute. But we have a way to get the same amount of ethanol produced and put into our cars without spending $3 billion between now and the end of the year—$5.8 billion is what it has averaged over the last few years.

We spent $34 billion of money we didn't have subsidizing something that

is mandated. I mean, it even goes beyond the Reagan quote, which was that the government's view of the economy could be summed up in a few short phrases: If it moves, tax it. If it keeps moving, regulate it. If it stops moving, subsidize it.

We have the incentive to blend the ethanol, and that incentive is you by law have to blend it. They do not have a choice. So we are going to use ethanol in this country.

Another factor the American people ought to take into consideration when they go buy a gallon of fuel today—you already have $1.72 worth of subsidy in there. That does not have anything to do with oil and gas drilling; that has to do with the subsidies that go to this program for ethanol. And I am for using cellulosic. I am actually for using corn ethanol. I just do not think we ought to pay twice for it. I think we ought to pay once.

The number the Senator from Minnesota talked about in terms of subsidy, there are—I have worked on the President's commission on debt. I have worked with the Gang of 6. You cannot be for changing the Tax Code to get rid of tax expenditures and vote against this amendment. I mean, how do you explain? Here is one we do not need the incentive for and we are going to pay for, and yet you say you want to solve the problems of the country. But the first time we have a vote to really eliminate one that will make no difference in terms of the amount of ethanol that is produced in this country—it will just save us $3 billion—you can't be on both sides of that issue.

Let me address the oil and gas industries for a minute. They get accelerated depreciation and writeoff. That is true. And that amounts to taking legitimate business expenses and saying: You can write them off sooner. Why did we do that?

It started in 1903, by the way. That is when we started. We started it because it is a capital-intensive business in terms of the exploration. It is associated with a lot of dry holes.

Now, the very companies that we say we want to take some of their ''subsidies''—there is a big difference between a subsidy that is a tax credit and allowing someone to advance depreciation because they are going to get to write it off anyhow. The net effect to the Federal Government's revenue, if you take all of those away, is still zero. The Federal Government does not get any additional money because under accounting standards they get to write off those expenses anyway; they just do not get to write them off fast.

So the body has already chosen to not do that because they are legitimate business expenses. We are not saying: Take away legitimate business expenses from the ethanol distilleries or the blenders. We are just saying: Do not pay them money for something that they are going to have to do anyhow that they have already said to us they do not want.

Tomorrow during the debate, I will add to the RECORD the statement from the National Petrochemical and Refiners Association.

The other point I would make: There is no question we are not energy independent, and there is no question that biofuels and cellulosic ethanol can contribute to what our results can be in terms of maintaining that independence. But we are the only Nation in the world where we as citizens own more oil and gas than Canada, China, and Saudi Arabia combined, and our Government will not let us have it. Think about that for a minute. According to the Congressional Research Service, there is more oil, gas, and gas liquids untapped in the United States than is known in all of Canada, all of China, and all of Saudi Arabia combined. So the reason we are in trouble and importing oil is because our own government will not let us have our own resources. Why would we continue that? That is a debate for another time.

No matter what we believe in terms of green energy, what we do know is that we are 30 years away from getting away from carbon-based fuels—at the earliest. So we can either pay a price or we can buy from the Saudis or buy from other Middle Eastern countries or we can develop our own. Talk about jobs. The estimate is that if we would truly go after our own energy, we would generate over 100,000 jobs a year the next 10 years in the oil and gas industry in this country—cleanly.

The other comment I have heard is that this amendment was not brought up properly. Well, let me talk about something for a minute. When the Senator from South Dakota and I came to the Senate, the first 2 years you could offer an amendment on anything, on any bill at any time because that is the way the Senate was intended to operate. As a Senator, a Member of this body, you had the right to offer an amendment. Now, you may lose it or it may get tabled, but you had to right to do it. That is not a majority leader's prerogative; it is a prerogative of every individual Senator that you ought to cherish and protect because if the majority leader is the only one who will decide what amendments get offered and when they get offered, this is no longer the Senate. There is no longer an ability to offer what is in the best interests of our country or our constituency.

The very fact that we do not want to have controversial amendments that we have much disagreement on coming to the floor because we do not want to have to go home and defend them or we do not want to vote on them because we might lose—the Senate ought to be a free place to offer ideas and get them voted down.

In my first 2 years in the Senate, I had tons—in fact, I had every amendment voted down. There was not an amendment I won. But I had the freedom to offer the amendments. And do you know what. We passed 10 times as much legislation in that Congress than we have the last two. So limiting amendments is not the prerogative of the majority leader. Deciding what bills come to the floor is the prerogative of the majority leader.

If we want to go home and tell our constituents that we have voted against saving $3 billion, that we are going to borrow 40 percent of it from outside of this country because we do not like the way an amendment was brought up—how else do you bring up an amendment if you cannot in the Senate?

Every true and proper procedure was followed in bringing up this amendment, and had this amendment been allowed to come up, if other Members had not objected to it, we would have never used cloture to bring up an amendment. You should not have to use cloture to bring up an amendment. You should be able to bring up any amendment you want and let Senators have the courage to vote the way they want on it rather than to say: I am going to hide behind not having to vote, so I am going to object to having a vote on an amendment.

Well, if we start down that process, we are never going to have any amendments and every amendment is going to end up having 60 votes just to be brought up. If we are going to move to that procedure—and I know procedure in this body pretty well—then I will insist that we do it all the time. That will dead stop the Senate.

So the idea that you can hide behind the excuse that even though you want to save the $3 billion but you do not like the way the amendment was brought up is a pretty flimsy excuse to go home and explain to your public that you think we should not ever have cloture motions on amendments. We ought to be able to bring any amendment up at any time.

I see the majority leader coming to the floor. He is a dear friend of mine. He has the hardest job in Washington, there is no question. But the privilege to bring an amendment to the floor ought to be protected for both sides of this aisle, and you vote it down, you table it, but you do something with it.

Let me just finish by saying that I agree this is supposed to expire at the end of this year. I hope it does because we do not need it. Our corn farmers do not need it. The worldwide demand for corn is high. We are going to continue to produce ethanol. We have a federally mandated requirement that we produce ethanol. This amendment does not touch that, never intended to touch that.

But ethanol as a fuel should be processed to the next stage, which is methanol, because methanol is not water soluble and it has the same octane rating as gasoline. Ethanol is not a great fuel. It is not an economical fuel. But we can take that same carbon atom and add to it and create methanol from corn and get a much better fuel that can be transported much easier and

have much greater effect on our economy and have much better gas mileage and less effect on the engines and drivetrains and all of the other—the smog prevention we have on automobiles today.

So let me say it again. I am not against using biocrops. I am for biocrops. I am not against cellulosic-based. I am not against ethanol. I am not against algae. But ExxonMobil has spent a couple of billion of their own money on algae-based biofuels without the government's help, which is one of the points with this amendment. We no longer need to help. We no longer need to spend the money.

So I look forward to the debate tomorrow. I will be on the floor all day to answer questions and to debate the pros and cons of this amendment.

I yield the floor.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Neiman, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

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–2070. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Inclusion of Option Amounts in Limitations on Authority of the Department of Defense to Carry Out Certain Prototype Projects'' ((RIN0750–AH23)(DFARS Case 2011–D024)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2071. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Warranty Tracking of Serialized Items'' ((RIN0750–AG74)(DFARS Case 2009–D018)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2072. A communication from the Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Sustainability: Hidden Costs Risk New Waste''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2073. 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 ''United States and Area Median Gross Income Figures'' (Rev. Proc. 2011–37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2074. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of (11) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2075. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to Singapore for depot repair, overhaul and modification supporting the AH–64D Apache in the amount of $50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2076. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to Spain to support the design, manufacturing and delivery phases of the Amazonas 3 Commercial Communications Satellite Program for Spain in the amount of $100,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2077. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to support the replication of the Have Quick I/II and SATURN Electronic Counter-Counter Measure (ECCM) for integration into Radio Communications in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2078. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to Japan to support the design, manufacture, and modification of the Lead Computing Gyro Systems for F–15 Gun Targeting; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2079. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to Japan to support the design, manufacture and modification of Bell 205 (UH–1H)–205B helicopters and spare parts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2080. A communication from the Deputy Director for Policy, Legislative and Regulatory Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits'' (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2081. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress: 2006 National Estimates of the Number of Boarder Babies, Abandoned Infants, Discarded Infants and Infant Homicides''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2082. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the interim final rule entitled ''Health Insurance Issuers Implementing Medical Loss Ratio (MLR) Requirement Under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2083. A communication from the Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''General Schedule Locality Pay Areas'' (RIN3206–AM25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2084. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Comparative Analysis of Actual Cash Collections to the Revised Revenue Estimate Through the 1st Quarter of Fiscal Year 2011''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2085. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2086. A communication from the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2087. A communication from the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2088. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2089. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Commerce's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2090. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2091. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program Report for Fiscal Year 2010; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2092. A communication from the Director, Executive Office for United States Trustees, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Procedures Governing Administrative Review of a United States Trustee's Decision to Deny a Chapter 12 or Chapter 13 Standing Trustee's Claim of Actual, Necessary Expenses'' (RIN1105–AB16) received in

the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2093. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules (4); Amdt. No. 494'' ((RIN2120–AA63) (Docket No. 30787)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2094. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Anthropomorphic Test Devices; Hybrid III Test Dummy, ES–2re Side Impact Crash Test Dummy'' (RIN2127–AK64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2095. 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 ''Hazardous Materials Requirements for Storage of Explosives During Transportation'' (RIN2137–AE06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2096. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Launch Safety: Lightning Criteria for Expendable Launch Vehicles'' ((RIN2120–AJ84) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0181)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2097. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Standards; Electrical and Electronic System Lightning Protection'' ((RIN2120–AJ57) (Docket No. FAA–2010–0224)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2098. 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; Koito Industries, Ltd., Seats and Seating Systems Approved Under Technical Standard Order (TSO) TSO–C39b, TSO–C39c, or TSO–C127a'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2010–0857)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2099. 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; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model S–92A Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0548)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2100. 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; Rolls-Royce plc (RR) RB211–535 Series Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2010–0994)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2101. 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; Viking Air Limited Model DHC–3 (Otter) Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0543)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LIEBERMAN, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 191. A bill to direct the Department of Homeland Security to undertake a study on emergency communications (Rept. No. 112–22).

By Mr. LIEBERMAN, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 679. A bill to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation.

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. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. REED):

S. 1180. A bill to authorize the President to confiscate and vest certain property of the Government of Libya and to authorize the use of that property to provide humanitarian relief to and for the benefit of the people of Libya, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BENNET, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 1181. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Future Farmers of America Organization and the 85th anniversary of the founding of the National Future Farmers of America Organization; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 1182. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in Utah except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1183. A bill to establish a national mercury monitoring program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1184. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the enforcement penalties for misrepresentation of a business concern as a small business concern owned and controlled by veterans or as a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COATS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1185. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a variable VEETC rate based on the price of crude oil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

S. 1186. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code, to establish fair procedures for arbitration clauses in contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1187. A bill to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to improve a pilot program on addressing shortages of long-term parking for commercial motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CRAPO:

S. Res. 207. A resolution supporting National Men's Health Week; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 17

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 17, a bill to repeal the job-killing tax on medical devices to ensure continued access to life-saving medical devices for patients and maintain the standing of United States as the world leader in medical device innovation.

S. 119

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 418

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) 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.

S. 491

At the request of Mr. THUNE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, supra.

S. 542

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 542, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize space-available travel on military aircraft for members of the reserve components, a member or former member of a reserve component who is eligible for retired pay but for age, widows and widowers of retired members, and dependents.

S. 613

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to permit a prevailing party in an action or proceeding brought to enforce the Act to be awarded expert witness fees and certain other expenses.

S. 752

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 752, a bill to establish a comprehensive interagency response to reduce lung cancer mortality in a timely manner.

S. 815

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 815, a bill to guarantee that military funerals are conducted with dignity and respect.

S. 891

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 891, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the recognition of attending physician assistants as attending physicians to serve hospice patients.

S. 975

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 975, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1018

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1018, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 to provide for implementation of additional recommendations of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors 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.

S. 1034

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1034, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize the exclusion from gross income of parking and transportation fringe benefits and to provide for a common cost-of-living adjustment, and for other purposes.

S. 1067

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1067, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a research and development and demonstration program to reduce manufacturing and construction costs relating to nuclear reactors, and for other purposes.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, a bill to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–416).

S. 1113

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1113, a bill to facilitate the reestablishment of domestic, critical mineral designation, assessment, production, manufacturing, recycling, analysis, forecasting, workforce, education, research, and international capabilities in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1169, a bill to provide for benchmarks to evaluate progress being made toward the goal of transitioning security responsibilities in Afghanistan to the Government of Afghanistan.

S. 1176

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1176, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

S. RES. 144

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 144, a resolution supporting early detection for breast cancer.

S. RES. 185

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 185, a resolution reaffirming the commitment of the United States to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, reaffirming opposition to the inclusion of Hamas in a unity government unless it is willing to accept peace with Israel and renounce violence, and declaring that Palestinian efforts to gain recognition of a state outside direct negotiations demonstrates absence of a good faith commitment to peace negotiations, and will have implications for continued United States aid.

S. RES. 202

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 202, a resolution designating June 27, 2011, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day''.

AMENDMENT NO. 436

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 436 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. REED):

S. 1180. A bill to authorize the President to confiscate and vest certain property of the Government of Libya and to authorize the use of that property to provide humanitarian relief to and for the benefit of the people of

Libya, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I join Senator SHELBY and other senior Senators to introduce the Libyan Assets for Humanitarian Relief Act of 2011, designed to explicitly authorize the President to confiscate and distribute some of the assets of Muammar Qaddafi's government to be used to provide urgent humanitarian relief for the people of Libya. This issue lies within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs because it involves frozen assets being held by U.S. banks and other financial institutions. We are joined by Chairman KERRY of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Armed Services Committee Chairman LEVIN and Ranking Minority Member JOHN MCCAIN, and Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee Chairman LIEBERMAN as original cosponsors of this measure.

A few weeks ago the President's senior advisors from the Treasury Department, the State Department, and the White House came to Congress and provided draft legislation to explicitly authorize the President to seize and vest the Qaddafi government's assets to be used to benefit the Libyan people. This measure is an updated version of that legislation, imposing certain conditions on that authority, and providing for certain reporting, tracking and auditing requirements on the use of the funds.

Currently, there are approximately $36 billion in Libyan Government assets in banks and other financial institutions subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, both here and abroad. According to the Treasury Department, a little over $8.1 billion is physically present in the U.S.—and of that, a little over $200 million is in cash and available for immediate seizure and use to support humanitarian efforts in Libya. This measure would allow for confiscation of up to $8 billion of the Qaddafi government's assets—plus an additional $2 billion if necessary to avert an imminent humanitarian emergency.

The bill provides for the confiscation and distribution of the funds in two batches—the first $4 billion could be seized, vested and distributed upon the bill's enactment, and a second $4 billion could be confiscated and released after a 30-day notification period designed to give Congress an opportunity to deny the seizure of the funds via enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval. The additional $2 billion could be released upon certification of a humanitarian emergency.

Notwithstanding how my colleagues feel about the current military situation, or U.S. involvement in Libya—and I know there is a wide range of opinions in Congress on that issue, which we'll likely debate on the Senate floor soon—one thing is clear: in the wake of continuing violence perpetrated by the Libyan regime against its own people, there is a real, urgent and growing need for humanitarian relief and assistance.

The U.S. has already provided tens of millions of dollars of its own funds in relief aid for Libya's citizens, and last week pledged additional aid. This bill would simply authorize the confiscation of certain assets of the Government of Libya, already frozen by the U.S. government under existing legal authorities, to be used to provide additional humanitarian relief to meet urgent needs there. It would effectively give the true owners of these assets—the Libyan people—access to some of their own money to provide relief for Libya's citizens.

The bill authorizes the President to seize and distribute these assets. I understand the Administration intends the funds to be overseen by the State Department, and to go mainly through non-governmental humanitarian relief and development organizations currently active in Libya; this measure ultimately allows the President to decide who the recipients are, with some limitations. It also requires that the funds be used only for purposes related to humanitarian relief, consistent with UN Security Council resolutions on this matter, and imposes a set of accounting, recordkeeping and Congressional reporting requirements on the funds.

It requires that the funds not go to anyone or any organization whose assets are blocked under U.S. law, or those identified as terrorists or affiliated with terrorist organizations, or those complicit in human rights abuses. It also provides the President with powerful investigative and penalty authorities, to ensure appropriate distribution of the funding and to combat any potential fraud in the distribution of aid. The Administration has made clear that such assets would be disbursed only through partners that meet U.S. legal and policy standards that the United States generally applies to the provision of assistance, including those relating to human rights and transparent oversight of the disbursements. While these are not U.S. taxpayer funds, I believe we still have a fiduciary responsibility for its efficient and effective distribution, and that's why we have imposed these important accountability measures.

Such seizure of another government's assets is not unprecedented. In the past, the U.S. government has seized and frozen the assets of other governments with whom we were involved in a conflict, going all the way back to World War I. The latest example is when we seized and used a portion of Iraqi government assets in 2003 to provide urgent reconstruction assistance and other forms of support for the people of Iraq.

I hope we can move quickly on this legislation to authorize the release of these funds and show that Congress and the Executive branch are working together on this issue and that despite our differences on U.S. military action there we can act promptly and decisively to provide needed humanitarian assistance to the people of Libya. I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1180

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 ''Libyan Assets for Humanitarian Relief Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On February 26, 2011, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1970, which imposed an asset freeze on Colonel Muammar Qaddafi and members of his family.

(2) On March 17, 2011, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1973, which expanded the asset freeze to include the Central Bank of Libya, the Libyan Investment Authority, the Libyan Foreign Bank, the Libyan Africa Investment Portfolio, and the Libyan National Oil Corporation.

(3) The United Nations Security Council stated in Resolution 1973 that the assets frozen would ''at a later stage, as soon as possible, be made available to and for the benefit of the people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya''.

(4) On March 3, 2011, the President of the United States stated that ''Muammar Qaddafi has lost the legitimacy to lead, and he must leave''.

(5) On March 29, 2011, the Transitional National Council of the Libyan Republic issued ''A Vision of a Democratic Libya'', which stated that its goal is ''building a free and democratic society and ensuring the supremacy of international humanitarian law and human rights declarations'', and that ''[t]his can only be achieved through dialogue, tolerance, co-operation, national cohesiveness and the active participation of all citizens''. In that statement, the Transitional National Council pledged itself, without reservation, to the establishment of ''a constitutional civil and free state'' that upholds intellectual and political pluralism and the peaceful transfer of power and guarantees full citizenship rights to all Libyans.

(6) On April 7, 2011, Ali Aujali, the Official Representative to the United States of the Transitional National Council of the Libyan Republic, wrote to the United States Secretary of the Treasury and requested ''immediate access to some of the frozen Qaddafi regime funds to purchase needed humanitarian supplies and to support critical services such as hospitals, water distribution and sanitation''.

(7) On May 19, 2011, the President of the United States, referring to the Transitional National Council of the Libyan Republic, stated that ''the opposition has organized a legitimate and credible interim council''.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF LIBYA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 209. AUTHORIZATION OF CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF LIBYA.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

''(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term 'executive agency' has the meaning given that term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

''(3) GOVERNMENT OF LIBYA.—The term 'Government of Libya'—

''(A) means the Government of Libya on the date of the enactment of the Libyan Assets for Humanitarian Relief Act of 2011, including any agency or instrumentality of that Government, any entity controlled by that Government, and the Central Bank of Libya; and

''(B) does not include a successor government of Libya.

''(4) SUCCESSOR GOVERNMENT OF LIBYA.—The term 'successor government of Libya' means a successor government to the Government of Libya (as defined in paragraph (3)) that is recognized as the legitimate governing authority of Libya by the Government of the United States.

''(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to provide humanitarian relief to and for the benefit of the people of Libya and to support the aspirations of the people of Libya for democratic self-government.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF LIBYA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President—

''(A) may confiscate and vest, through instructions or licenses or in such other manner as the President determines appropriate, funds and other property of the Government of Libya that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States in the amounts specified in subsection (f);

''(B) may liquidate or sell any of such property; and

''(C) shall deposit any funds confiscated and vested under subparagraph (A) and any funds resulting from the liquidation or sale of property under subparagraph (B) in the account established under subsection (d).

''(2) VESTING.—All right, title, and interest in funds and other property confiscated under paragraph (1) shall vest in the Government of the United States.

''(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNT FOR CONFISCATED PROPERTY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish a non-interest-bearing account to consist of the funds deposited into the account under subsection (c)(1)(C).

''(2) USE OF FUNDS.—The funds in the account established under paragraph (1) shall be available to be used only as specified in subsection (e)(1).

''(e) USE OF CONFISCATED PROPERTY TO PROVIDE HUMANITARIAN RELIEF TO THE PEOPLE OF LIBYA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the President may transfer funds from the account established under subsection (d)—

''(A) to such executive agencies and, subject to paragraph (3), such other persons as the President determines appropriate, to be used only for costs related to providing humanitarian relief to and for the benefit of the people of Libya, consistent with the purposes of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1970 (2011) and 1973 (2011); and

''(B) on and after the date on which a successor government of Libya is recognized by the Government of the United States, to the successor government of Libya.

''(2) LIMITATIONS ON TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—

''(A) LIMITATIONS ON TRANSFER TO CERTAIN PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS.—None of the funds transferred under this subsection may knowingly be provided to—

''(i) an organization designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a));

''(ii) a person that provides support for acts of international terrorism or for an organization described in clause (i);

''(iii) a person whose property or interests in property are blocked pursuant to this Act, unless the transfer is authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury; or

''(iv) a person the President determines is responsible for violations of internationally recognized human rights.

''(B) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR MILITARY PURPOSES.—None of the funds transferred under this subsection may be used to purchase weapons or military equipment of either a lethal or nonlethal nature.

''(3) CERTIFICATIONS BY CERTAIN PERSONS.—The President may not transfer funds to any person, other than an executive agency, under paragraph (1)(A) unless that person certifies to the President that the person—

''(A) will use such funds only for the costs described in paragraph (1)(A); and

''(B) will not—

''(i) transfer any of such funds to a person or organization described in paragraph (2)(A); or

''(ii) use any of such funds to purchase weapons or military equipment of either a lethal or nonlethal nature.

''(4) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—If the President exercises the authority provided under this section, the President shall impose such additional terms and conditions as the President determines appropriate with respect to the transfer of funds under this subsection and with respect to the use of such funds.

''(5) USE BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds transferred to an executive agency under this subsection—

''(A) shall remain available until expended;

''(B) shall be used only for the costs described in paragraph (1)(A);

''(C) may be distributed in such manner as the head of the executive agency determines appropriate to accomplish the purposes of this section, including through grants and contributions; and

''(D) may be transferred among executive agencies.

''(f) INITIAL AND SUBSEQUENT AUTHORIZATIONS OF CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY.—

''(1) AUTHORITY.—The authority of the President to confiscate and vest funds and other property under subsection (c) shall be limited as follows:

''(A) INITIAL LIMITATION.—Effective on and after the date of the enactment of the Libyan Assets for Humanitarian Relief Act of 2011, the President may confiscate and vest not more than $4,000,000,000 under subsection (c).

''(B) CONFISCATION AND VESTING OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If, at any one time after the date of the enactment of the Libyan Assets for Humanitarian Relief Act of 2011, the President submits to Congress the notification described in clause (ii), effective on and after the day after the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which that notification is submitted, the President may confiscate and vest not more than an additional $4,000,000,000 under subsection (c) over the amount authorized to be confiscated and vested under subparagraph (A), unless a joint resolution of disapproval described in paragraph (2) is enacted within the 30-day period after the notification is submitted.

''(ii) NOTIFICATION DESCRIBED.—The notification described in this clause is a notification—

''(I) that the President intends to confiscate and vest the additional amount specified in clause (i) to be used for the costs described in subsection (e)(1)(A); and

''(II) submitted with a report—

''(aa) describing the necessity of confiscating and vesting that additional amount; and

''(bb) detailing the plan of the President with respect to the use of that additional amount.

''(C) EMERGENCY CERTIFICATION; CONFISCATION AND VESTING TO ADDRESS EMERGENCY HUMANITARIAN NEEDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If, at any one time after the date of the enactment of the Libyan Assets for Humanitarian Relief Act of 2011, the President submits to Congress the certification described in clause (ii), effective on and after the date on which that certification is submitted, the President may confiscate and vest not more than an additional $2,000,000,000 under subsection (c) over the amounts otherwise authorized to be confiscated and vested under this paragraph.

''(ii) CERTIFICATION DESCRIBED.—The certification described in this clause is a certification by the President that it is necessary to confiscate and vest the additional amount specified in clause (i) to address an emergency need for additional humanitarian assistance.

''(2) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

''(A) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—In this paragraph, the term 'joint resolution of disapproval' means only a joint resolution of the 2 Houses of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress disapproves of the confiscation and vesting of the amount of funds or other property specified in section 209(f)(1)(B)(i) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.'.

''(B) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERING RESOLUTIONS.—

''(i) INTRODUCTION.—A joint resolution of disapproval—

''(I) may be introduced in the House of Representatives or the Senate during the 10-day period beginning on the date on which a notification described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii) is submitted;

''(II) in the House of Representatives, may be introduced by any Member of the House of Representatives;

''(III) in the Senate, may be introduced by any Member of the Senate; and

''(IV) may not be amended.

''(ii) REFERRAL TO COMMITTEES.—A joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and a joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the House of Representatives shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

''(iii) COMMITTEE DISCHARGE AND FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—The provisions of subsections (c) through (f) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to committee discharge and floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House of Representatives and the Senate) apply to a resolution of disapproval under this paragraph to the same extent as such subsections apply to joint resolutions under such section 152, except that—

''(I) subsection (c)(1) of such section 152 shall be applied and administered by substituting '10 days' for '30 days'; and

''(II) subsection (f)(1)(A)(i) of such section 152 shall be applied and administered by substituting 'Committee on Banking, Housing,

and Urban Affairs' for 'Committee on Finance'.

''(C) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This paragraph is enacted by Congress—

''(i) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

''(ii) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''(g) RECORDKEEPING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, in exercising the authority provided under this section, require any person to keep a full record of—

''(A) any act or transaction carried out pursuant to any regulation, instruction, license, order, or direction issued under this section, either before, during, or after the completion of the act or transaction;

''(B) any property in which any foreign country or any national of a foreign country has or has had any interest; and

''(C) any other information the President determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

''(2) PRODUCTION OF INFORMATION.—The President may require any person—

''(A) to provide any information required to be kept by the person under paragraph (1) under oath and in the form of reports or any other form; and

''(B) to produce any books of account, records, contracts, letters, memoranda, or other papers in the custody or control of the person that relate to any information required to be kept under paragraph (1).

''(h) REPORTS ON USE OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the President first confiscates and vests funds or other property under subsection (c), and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing, for the 90-day period preceding the submission of the report—

''(A) the amount of funds and other property confiscated and transferred under this section;

''(B) the executive agencies and other persons to which such funds were transferred;

''(C) the manner in which such funds were used; and

''(D) the amount remaining in the account established under subsection (d) at the end of the 90-day period.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE WITH RESPECT TO REPORT RELATING TO AUTHORIZATION OF CONFISCATION OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.—If, after the date on which a report is required to be submitted by paragraph (1) and before the next such report is required to be submitted, the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the report described in subsection (f)(1)(B)(ii)(II), the President—

''(A) shall include in the report described in subsection (f)(1)(B)(ii)(II) the information required to be included in the report required by paragraph (1) for the period that—

''(i) begins on the date on which the last report required by paragraph (1) was required to be submitted; and

''(ii) ends on the date on which the President submits the report described in subsection (f)(1)(B)(ii)(II); and

''(B) may include in the next report required by paragraph (1) only the information required by paragraph (1) for the period—

''(i) beginning on the date on which the report described in subsection (f)(1)(B)(ii)(II) is submitted; and

''(ii) ending on the date on which the report required by paragraph (1) is required to be submitted.

''(i) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Libyan Assets for Humanitarian Relief Act of 2011, and every 180 days thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report assessing the confiscation and vesting of funds and other property under subsection (c) and the use of funds under subsection (e).

''(j) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of this section or any regulation, instruction, license, order, or direction issued under this section to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a).

''(k) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) SAFE HARBOR.—A person that complies fully with a regulation, instruction, license, order, or direction issued under this section may not be held liable for a violation of this section.

''(2) GOOD FAITH COMPLIANCE.—A person may not be held liable in any court for or with respect to any act or omission done in good faith in connection with the administration of, or pursuant to and in reliance on, this section, or any regulation, instruction, license, order, or direction issued under this section.

''(3) NO LEGAL PROCESS WITH RESPECT TO CONFISCATED PROPERTY.—Any funds or other property confiscated and vested under subsection (c), including any proceeds from the liquidation or sale of such property, shall be immune from any legal process or attachment.

''(4) ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THIS SECTION.—No action taken under this section, other than the imposition of penalties with respect to a person under subsection (j), shall be reviewable in any court in the United States.

''(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This section does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, that is enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, any agency of the United States, any officer or employee of the United States, or any other person.

''(l) TERMINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except to the extent necessary to carry out the plan required by paragraph (2), the provisions of this section (other than subsections (a), (g), (j), (k), and (m)) shall terminate on the date described in paragraph (3).

''(2) PLAN FOR DISTRIBUTION OF REMAINING AMOUNTS.—On the date described in paragraph (3), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the plan of the President for using any funds remaining of the amounts confiscated and vested under this section that—

''(A) describes how any of such funds that are obligated as of that date will be expended; and

''(B) provides for the distribution of any of such funds that are unobligated as of that date to a successor government of Libya.

''(3) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date described in this paragraph is the date on which the national emergency declared by the President with respect to Libya pursuant to section 202 expires and is not continued by the President.

''(m) REGULATIONS.—The President shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''Whenever'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (e), whenever''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) REPORTS RELATING TO CONFISCATION OF ASSETS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF LIBYA.—If the President exercises the authority provided under section 209, the President shall submit reports in accordance with subsection (h) of that section.''.

SUMMARY OF LIBYAN ASSETS FOR HUMANITARIAN RELIEF ACT OF 2011

Authorization of Confiscation: The measure authorizes the President to confiscate and vest certain funds and other property of the Government of Libya currently frozen by the U.S. government, allows liquidation of the assets and sale of any property, and directs the proceeds to be used solely for humanitarian purposes to benefit the Libyan people. The Government of Libya is defined to include Libya's Central Bank.

Account Established for Confiscated Funds: The bill requires the President to establish a U.S. government account to hold confiscated funds and the proceeds from any asset or property sales. The Secretary of the Treasury may hold in escrow funds that are not needed immediately to meet urgent humanitarian needs.

Use of Confiscated Funds for Humanitarian Purposes to Benefit the Libyan People: Libyan Government funds confiscated may only be used for humanitarian purposes to benefit the Libyan people, consistent with United Nations Security Council resolutions. None may be used to purchase weapons or military equipment. The President must designate recipients of funds and impose appropriate terms and conditions, which may include detailed recordkeeping requirements, on recipients. The measure prohibits the knowing transfer of funds to: 1) foreign terrorist organizations; 2) supporters of acts of terrorism or of terrorist organizations; 3) a person whose assets are blocked by the International Emergency Economics Powers Act (IEEPA); or 4) a person the President determines to be responsible for violations of internationally recognized human rights.

Framework for Confiscation of Funds: The bill authorizes an initial confiscation and distribution of $4 billion; if additional funds are needed, the President may notify Congress of his intent to confiscate an additional $4 billion, to be released within 30 days unless Congress objects via enactment of a Joint Resolution of Disapproval. The President's request for the additional funds must include information about how prior confiscated funds were disbursed, a description of the need for additional funds, a plan of how the additional funds will be used, and other information. In the event of a humanitarian emergency, the measure also authorizes the President to notify Congress of his intent to confiscate, on an expedited basis and upon certification of need, an additional $2 billion to meet emergency needs.

Investigations and Recordkeeping: The President may conduct appropriate investigations of recipients as necessary, and require recordkeeping from recipients of these funds, which could include books of account, records, contracts, letters, memoranda, or other papers related to distributions under the Act.

Audit and Reporting Requirements: The President must provide detailed reports to Congress every 90 days describing the amount of funds confiscated and transferred

to designated recipients, the recipients of these funds, and the manner in which these funds were used. If the President notifies Congress of an additional confiscation in the middle of a 90-day period, the President must only include any new information on fund distribution. GAO is required to conduct and provide to Congress periodic audits of the program.

Penalties: Substantial penalties apply to persons who violate provisions of the Act, including huge fines provided for under section 206 of IEEPA.

Legal Protections/Judicial Review: Decisions made with respect to confiscated assets are not subject to judicial review; a ''good faith'' exception is provided for those acting consistent with the requirements of the Act; and any funds or property confiscated under the Act are immune from any legal process or attachment.

Termination: The authorities provided for in the bill terminate once the existing emergency determination of the President under IEEPA with respect to Libya expires. Upon termination, the President must submit to Congress a report describing a plan for use of any remaining unspent funds, including return of such funds to a successor government of Libya.

Regulations: The bill requires the President to prescribe regulations as necessary under the Act.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1183. A bill to establish a national mercury monitoring program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today along with Senator CARPER, I am introducing the Comprehensive National Mercury Monitoring Act. This bill would ensure that the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, has accurate information about the extent of mercury pollution.

A comprehensive national mercury monitoring network is needed to protect human health, safeguard fisheries, and track the impact of emissions reductions. By accurately quantifying regional and national changes in atmospheric deposition, ecosystem contamination, and bioaccumulation of mercury in fish and wildlife in response to changes in mercury emissions, this monitoring network would help policy makers, scientists, and the public to better understand the sources, consequences, and trends in United States mercury pollution.

Mercury is a potent neurotoxin of significant ecological and public health concern, especially for children and pregnant women. It is estimated that approximately 410,000 children born in the U.S. were exposed to levels of mercury in the womb that are high enough to impair neurological development. Mercury exposure has gone down as U.S. mercury emissions have declined; however, levels remain unacceptably high.

Each new scientific study seems to find higher levels of mercury in more ecosystems and in more species than we had previously thought. For example, as of 2008, every state in the country has issued mercury advisories for human fish consumption. These advisories cover 57 percent of the Nation's total lake acreage, and 68 percent of our total river miles. This is 19 percent more lake acreage and 42 percent more river area than in 2006.

At present, scientists must rely on limited information to understand the critical linkages between mercury emissions and environmental response and human health. Successful design, implementation, and assessment of solutions to the mercury pollution problem require comprehensive long-term information—information that is currently not available. We must have more comprehensive information and we must have it soon; otherwise, we risk making misguided policy decisions.

Specifically, the Comprehensive National Mercury Monitoring Act would direct EPA, in conjunction with the Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Geological Survey, National Park Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and other appropriate Federal agencies, to establish a national mercury monitoring program to measure and monitor mercury levels in the air and watersheds, water and soil chemistry, and in aquatic and terrestrial organisms at multiple sites across the Nation.

The act would establish a scientific advisory committee to advise on the establishment, site selection, measurement, recording protocols, and operations of the monitoring program; establish a centralized database for existing and newly collected environmental mercury data that can be freely accessed on the Internet; and require a report to Congress every 2 years on the program, including trend data, and an assessment of the reduction in mercury deposition rates that are required to be achieved in order to prevent adverse human and ecological effects every 4 years.

We must establish a comprehensive, robust national mercury monitoring network to provide EPA the data it needs to make decisions that protect the people and environment of Maine and the entire Nation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COATS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1185. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a variable VEETC rate based on the price of crude oil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I first wish to thank my colleague from Minnesota who spoke before me for his strong words. Also, I am here with the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. THUNE, to speak about the legislation we are introducing today, along with several other Senators, to find a good way to handle this—not the way it thus far has been handled.

My colleague from Minnesota talked about Senator COBURN's amendment, which we will be voting on tomorrow. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. First of all, I believe we need to invest in homegrown energy. The Coburn amendment would abruptly eliminate the VEETC—the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit—without any kind of a glidepath during this year. Consequently, the 450,000 people who are directly or indirectly employed in this industry—when we think about all of the jobs we work on every single day, just because jobs are in States that maybe some people don't live in, including North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa, these are very important jobs throughout the country.

The other piece of this I think we can't neglect is the effect this would have on gas prices. That being said, both Senator THUNE and I understand this is a situation that needs to change. We are in a difficult budget situation in the Senate, and that is why we are introducing legislation today and working with stakeholders and Members from both sides of the aisle to find a reasonable solution that offers a responsible and cost-effective approach to reforming our biofuels policy.

This bill would transition to a more sustainable model of support for renewable fuel production in America instead of pulling the rug out from under an industry, with 4 days' notice, that employs hundreds of thousands of people in this country, as well as provides an alternative to oil. Senator THUNE is here, and maybe he wishes to address this a bit. We will go back and forth.

But I think one thing people need to understand is that this biofuels industry has become a major component of our fuel supply. One statistic is that the gasoline that is made from the oil we import from Canada—people know Canada is our biggest trading partner for oil. We literally produce as much biofuels as we produce gas from the oil we import from Canada, so it is a major part of our fuel supply. So we shouldn't just decide with 4 days' notice to change the rules of the game. In fact, as a recent vote showed us, oil is keeping every single cent of its subsidy.

Senator THUNE and I have a bill which basically gives away the subsidies for the rest of the year that the biofuels industry has and puts $1 billion toward deficit reduction—$1 billion toward deficit reduction—as well as making some investment with the remaining money in the infrastructure that this industry needs to be able to compete on any kind of an even playing field with oil.

So I know Senator THUNE has some thoughts on this as well, and I would like to come back and talk a little bit about what has been going on with oil versus ethanol in this country. But I think it is important to understand the

bill we are introducing today could be a major help with $1 billion in deficit reduction.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if I might just say to my colleague from Minnesota, I appreciate her good work and advocacy on this subject. This is something we have been working on for some time, along with some of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, for a lot of reasons; one of which, of course, is because, as the Senator from Minnesota mentioned, these are difficult fiscal times.

Obviously, every area in our budget needs to be reviewed and scrutinized and looked at to see where we might be able to achieve some savings. But, as my colleague noted, there is a right way and a wrong way to do this. The way that has been proposed in the amendment that was offered, and on which the cloture vote will occur tomorrow, is the wrong way. We cannot tell an industry in December we are going to give them a set of policies that are going to be in effect for the year, that they are going to be able to make investment decisions, they are going to be able to go to their lenders, they are going to be able to go secure financing based upon this set of policies—we do that around here all the time. We make policy, and we try to do it in a way, hopefully, that gives those who are investing their dollars some certainty about what those policies are going to be. Well, how can we then, in the middle of the year, come back and say we are just going to pull the rug right out from under them? We are sorry, that is just the way it is. This is gone.

Well, frankly, there is a much better way to go about doing this, and what the Senator from Minnesota and I have proposed does just that and, in my view, does this in a responsible, measured, thoughtful, reasonable way. We get to the same ultimate result, which is that for those who are really interested in doing away with the volumetric ethanol excise tax credit, it does phase it out, but it does it in a way that does not create disruption and harm and allows people to plan for the future. It also invests some of those resources in areas that are important to the future of that industry; namely, blender pumps, which is the one thing that does not exist out there today, at least not in any great numbers. If those pumps were more available, I believe we would see a lot higher usage of the fuel than we already have seen. But we already know it is 10 percent of our fuel supply.

Whether the opponents of this like it or not—and I know they do not—there are 13 billion gallons of ethanol produced in this country. At least that is what it was in 2010. We assume it will be that number, maybe a little higher, this year. That displaces 445 million barrels of imported crude oil. That is 55 million barrels more than the total crude oil imports from Saudi Arabia last year.

Now, think about that: a fuel that is produced from a kernel of corn now displaces more than the entire imports of Saudi foreign oil into this country. That is what we ought to be looking at. We ought to be looking at more ways to produce domestic energy, homegrown energy, adding that to our fuel supply rather than taking it out.

What the amendment our colleagues are trying to get a vote on tomorrow would do is basically to say to this industry: Yes, we are going to take away this particular tax incentive, and we are going to do it right in the middle of the year. We are going to do it, and we do not like this industry—which is probably what animates a lot of the opposition to this because if people look at the facts, if they look at the contribution that biofuels have made to our fuel supply in this country, it is significant.

Ten percent of our entire fuel now is biofuels. In fact, if we look at the other byproduct of biofuels—once we take the starch out of that kernel of corn and convert it into liquid form, we can get, for every bushel of corn, almost 3 gallons of ethanol. But we also get dry distillers grain, which is something that has been used extensively now for feed for livestock.

So if we take 5 billion bushels of corn, for example, that are used for ethanol production in any given year, the feed product equivalent is about 1.7 billion bushels of corn that is returned to the livestock food chain as this ethanol byproduct called dry distillers grain. So we are adding additional protein that is fed to livestock in addition to the almost 3 gallons of ethanol we get from every single bushel of corn.

So I do believe there is an approach that makes sense. What the Senator from Minnesota and I and many of our colleagues on both sides have come together around is a way in which we can move forward, and do it in a way that not only makes it reasonable for the industry to plan for the future but also in a way that returns dollars to the Treasury of this country because there is $1 billion in here for debt retirement. I think that is something the industry recognizes, we all recognize, and we need to address. It is addressed as part of this bill.

So I appreciate the good work of the Senator from Minnesota in working with me, along with other colleagues of ours, to introduce the bill we introduce today.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, if I may continue, I thank Senator THUNE for his work.

One point I think he made that is incredibly important: I think not all of our colleagues understand that the way it is under the current rules is VEETC, which has been in place to make sure we have an alternative to oil in this country, ends at the end of this year. The one piece of it that continues for another year is the cellulosic research, the cellulosic credit. But the rest of it ends at the end of this year.

So instead of looking at a glidepath, as suggested in our bill, where we could take $1 billion and put it into deficit reduction, and take another $1 billion or so—which would be going right now as a credit—and put that into the infrastructure, the alternative that is suggested by the amendment offered by our colleague from Oklahoma is just to cut it off today, basically, with a few days' notice.

What I have heard time and time again from businesses—whether it is in the energy area or in the medical device area—is they want certainty. They do not want Washington just coming in with one day's notice and changing things. That is why I ask my colleagues to look at this bill as an alternative. We are glad to discuss details with them.

One of the things we have tried to do with this bill is to acknowledge the emerging field of cellulosic with algae and other forms of research into biofuels. That would continue into next year. But, basically, the proposal Senator THUNE and I have put forward would end VEETC as we know it.

We look at the comparisons here. Over the last few decades more than $360 billion worth of subsidies have gone to the oil companies. That is nearly 10 times greater than the investments we have made in homegrown biofuels. Now they are set up in a different way, but those are the numbers. We have to remember the jobs with biofuels are jobs that are made in America. We are basically investing in the farmers and the workers of the Midwest instead of the oil cartels in the Mideast.

I have seen the boom in oil drilling in North Dakota. That has been a good thing. So I am not just a one-size fuel person. But I think to disrupt an industry like this, with no notice, is the wrong way to go. I hope our colleagues will look at our bill seriously, talk to us about this, think about the gas prices which have now topped $3.75 per gallon. While they are high now, look at the fact that the Chicago Tribune looked at the fact that if we ceased to produce the 13 billion gallons of ethanol we make every year, as Senator THUNE has pointed out, it would drive up prices at the pump by as much as $1.40 per gallon. I do not think that is something we can afford right now.

We have put together a good-faith proposal that basically even those who have a lot of questions about biofuels right now, about ethanol, will have to admit is a dramatic change. It ends VEETC as we know it. It puts a big chunk of change, $1 billion—that otherwise would be going to subsidies this year, right now—toward deficit reduction while still allowing for that infrastructure investment, and then looking into next year for just some of the key pieces but severely changing any kind of subsidy for this industry.

So with that, I thank Senator THUNE. I do not know if the Senator has something else to add.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if I might add one point.

I think the Senator from Minnesota did point out that there are a significant number of jobs that are associated with this industry—in fact, one-half million jobs. They are American jobs. They are jobs in the heartland of this country. They are jobs that help grow the economy, make it more prosperous. It strikes me, at least, that what we ought to be looking at is more jobs in this country and less investment in foreign regimes, where we get a lot of our energy today.

Mr. President, $1 billion a day is what we send outside the United States because of our addiction to foreign oil. We have a dangerous dependence upon foreign energy, and we have a fuel that, as I said, displaces 445 million barrels of oil every single year—more than we import from Saudi Arabia. That is a pretty remarkable number when you think about it.

We had a debate here a few weeks ago on the floor of the Senate about whether we ought to change tax policy with regard to oil companies. The decision was reached that we should not do that; that it would be punitive, directed at oil companies. We decided, too, that it would raise taxes on gas for people in this country.

I would make the same argument today. We are talking about a tax increase—a large tax increase—which we know is going to get passed on. So we are talking about raising taxes on consumers at a time when they can least afford it.

We have today 3½ to $4-a-gallon gasoline. The last thing consumers in this country need is something that would actually push that gas price higher. In fact, if we did away with biofuels altogether—which some people would like to do—there was a study out last year, in 2010, that said the price per gallon of gasoline would go up by 89 cents a gallon. So we have a proposal here that would have an adverse impact on energy prices, fuel prices for people in this country, which, frankly, again, because of the commitment that was made last December, strikes at the very heart of economic certainty, which so many of us come down here and talk about: the importance of having policies in place that are reliable, that people who are investing in particular areas of our economy can know they are going to be there, at least when Congress makes a commitment.

This completely undermines the commitment Congress made back in December that this particular tax credit would be in place until the end of the year. So what the Senator from Minnesota and I have done is propose a path forward that we believe makes sense and that is a thoughtful, measured, reasonable, responsible way in which to get to the goal that many of the proponents of the amendment that will be voted on tomorrow want to get to; that is, to phase down the volumetric ethanol excise tax credit. But it does it in a way that makes sense for American consumers and those who have investments in the industry today.

So I hope my colleagues will take a look at this legislation. We think we can get it moving this year. It does, as was noted by my colleague from Minnesota, put a significant amount toward reducing the debt, which I think is something all of our colleagues are very interested in doing. So we will present this legislation, obviously, to our colleagues and hope there will be many who will choose to support it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor back to the Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, again, we just hope our colleagues will look at this bill. It is a serious bill and very different than other bills that have been proposed in the past, and it actually takes existing money that was set out for the end of this year and puts a big number—$1 billion—into debt reduction.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 207—SUPPORTING NATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

Mr. CRAPO submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 207

Whereas despite advances in medical technology and research, men continue to live an average of more than 5 years less than women, and African-American men have the lowest life expectancy;

Whereas 9 of the 10 leading causes of death, as defined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, affect men at a higher percentage than women;

Whereas between ages 45 and 54, men are over 1½ times more likely than women to die of heart attacks;

Whereas men die of heart disease at 1½ times the rate of women;

Whereas men die of cancer at almost 1½ times the rate of women;

Whereas testicular cancer is 1 of the most common cancers in men aged 15 to 34, and, when detected early, has a 96 percent survival rate;

Whereas the number of cases of colon cancer among men will reach almost 49,470 in 2010, and nearly half of those men will die from the disease;

Whereas the likelihood that a man will develop prostate cancer is 1 in 6;

Whereas the number of men who developed prostate cancer in 2010 is expected to reach more than 217,730, and an estimated 32,050 of those men will die from the disease;

Whereas African-American men in the United States have the highest incidence in the world of prostate cancer;

Whereas significant numbers of health problems that affect men, such as prostate cancer, testicular cancer, colon cancer, and infertility, could be detected and treated if awareness among men of those problems was more pervasive;

Whereas more than ½ of the elderly widows now living in poverty were not poor before the death of their husbands, and by age 100, women outnumber men by a ratio of 4 to 1;

Whereas educating both the public and health care providers about the importance of early detection of male health problems will result in reducing rates of mortality for those diseases;

Whereas appropriate use of tests such as prostate specific antigen exams, blood pressure screens, and cholesterol screens, in conjunction with clinical examination and self-testing for problems such as testicular cancer, can result in the detection of many of those problems in their early stages and increase the survival rates to nearly 100 percent;

Whereas women are 2 times more likely than men to visit their doctor for annual examinations and preventive services;

Whereas men are less likely than women to visit their health center or physician for regular screening examinations of male-related problems for a variety of reasons;

Whereas Congress established National Men's Health Week in 1994 and urged men and their families to engage in appropriate health behaviors, and the resulting increased awareness has improved health-related education and helped prevent illness;

Whereas the Governors of all 50 States issue proclamations annually declaring Men's Health Week in their respective States;

Whereas since 1994, National Men's Health Week has been celebrated each June by dozens of States, cities, localities, public health departments, health care entities, churches, and community organizations throughout the United States that promote health awareness events focused on men and family;

Whereas the National Men's Health Week Internet website has been established at www.menshealthweek.org and features Governors' proclamations and National Men's Health Week events;

Whereas men who are educated about the value that preventive health can play in prolonging their lifespans and their roles as productive family members will be more likely to participate in health screenings;

Whereas men and their families are encouraged to increase their awareness of the importance of a healthy lifestyle, regular exercise, and medical checkups;

Whereas June 13 through 19, 2011, is National Men's Health Week; and

Whereas the purpose of National Men's Health Week is to heighten the awareness of preventable health problems and encourage early detection and treatment of disease among men and boys: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the annual National Men's Health Week; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States and interested groups to observe National Men's Health Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 459. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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 460. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 461. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 462. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 463. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 464. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 465. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 459. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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; as follows:

On page 19, between the matter after line 2 and line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 13. OVERSIGHT AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3141 et seq.) (as amended by section 12(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 220. OVERSIGHT AUTHORITY.

''For each fiscal year, the Government Accountability Office shall—

''(1) conduct such audits and assessments as are necessary to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that funds provided in the form of grants under this Act are so provided—

''(A) through a competitive award process; and

''(B) in accordance with all requirements and criteria established under this Act; and

''(2) submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee of Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report describing the results of the audits and assessments.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3121 et seq.) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 219 (as added by section 12(b)) the following:

''Sec. 220. Oversight authority.''.

SA 460. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD.

Section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)) is repealed.

SEC. _____. PERMANENT ESTATE TAX RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010, and the amendments made thereby, are repealed; and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied as if such title, and amendments, had never been enacted.

(b) EXCLUSION FROM EGGTRA SUNSET.—Section 901 of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 shall not apply to the provisions of, and amendments made by, subtitle A or E of title V of such Act.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal made by subsection (a) shall apply to estates of decedents dying, gifts made, and generation skipping transfers after December 31, 2009.

SA 461. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ___. LIGHTING ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title III of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140) is repealed.

(b) APPLICATION.—The Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if subtitle B of title III of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (and the amendments made by that subtitle) had not been enacted.

SA 462. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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; as follows:

On page 19, between the matter after line 19 and line 20, insert the following:

SEC. 13. PREVENTION OF FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS THROUGH EFFECTIVE OVERSIGHT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3141 et seq.) (as amended by section 12(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 220. PREVENTION OF FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS THROUGH EFFECTIVE OVERSIGHT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To limit, fraud, waste, and abuse, any grant authorized or funded under section 203, 207(a), 701(a), or 704 shall be subject to the requirements of this section.

''(b) PROHIBITION ON AWARDING OF GRANTS TO DELINQUENT FEDERAL DEBTORS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of any executive agency that offers a grant under a provision of law referred to in subsection (a), in excess of an amount equal to the simplified acquisition threshold (as defined in section 134 of title 41, United States Code), may not award such grant to any person unless such person submits with the application for such grant a form—

''(A) certifying that the person does not have a seriously delinquent tax debt; and

''(B) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to disclose to the head of the executive agency information limited to describing whether the person has a seriously delinquent tax debt.

''(2) TIME OF DISCLOSURE.—The authorization for disclosure required under paragraph (1)(B) shall authorize such disclosures to be made with respect to seriously delinquent tax debt—

''(A) at the time the form described in paragraph (1) is submitted, and

''(B) in the case of a grant that is awarded over period lasting more than 1 year, for each year during which the person receives such grant beginning with the year after the year in which the form described in paragraph (1) is submitted .

''(3) RELEASE OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to all executive agencies a standard form for the certification and authorization described in paragraph (1).

''(4) REVISION OF REGULATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall revise such regulations as necessary to incorporate the requirements of this section.

''(5) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section:

''(A) SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX DEBT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'seriously delinquent tax debt' means an outstanding debt under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for which a notice of lien has been filed in public records pursuant to section 6323 of such Code.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term does not include—

''(I) a debt that is being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement under section 6159 or section 7122 of such Code; and

''(II) a debt with respect to which a collection due process hearing under section 6330 of such Code, or relief under subsection (b), (c), or (f) of section 6015 of such Code, is requested or pending.

''(B) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term 'executive agency' has the meaning given such term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

''(C) SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.—The term 'Secretary of the Treasury' includes a delegate of the Secretary of the Treasury.

''(D) TREATMENT OF PARTNERSHIPS AND S CORPORATIONS.—

''(i) PARTNERSHIPS.—A partnership shall be treated as a person with a seriously delinquent tax debt if such partnership has a partner who—

''(I) owns 50 percent or more of either the capital interest or profits interest in such partnership; and

''(II) has a seriously delinquent tax debt.

''(ii) TREATMENT OF S CORPORATIONS.—An S corporation (as defined in section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) shall be treated as a person with a seriously delinquent tax debt if such S corporation has a member or a shareholder who—

''(I) owns 50 percent or more (by vote or value) of the stock of such corporation; and

''(II) has a seriously delinquent tax debt.

''(c) ANNUAL AUDITS.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF UNRESOLVED AUDIT FINDING.—In this subsection, the term 'unresolved audit finding' means an audit report finding or recommendation that the grantee has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved during the 1-year period beginning on the date of an initial notification of the finding or recommendation.

''(2) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—Effective for fiscal year 2012 and each fiscal year thereafter, to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of not less than 10 percent of all grantees awarded funding under a provision of law referred to in subsection (a).

''(3) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A grantee that is awarded funds under a provision of law referred to in subsection (a) that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible for an award of grant funds under this Act for the 2 fiscal years following the applicable 1-year period described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3121 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 219 (as added by section 12(b)) the following:

''Sec. 220. Prevention of fraud, waste, and abuse of taxpayer dollars through effective oversight.''.

SA 463. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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; as follows:

On page 29, after line 20, add the following:

SEC. _____. CLOSURE OF BIG OIL TAX LOOPHOLES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) gas prices have risen significantly largely in response to unrest in north Africa and the Middle East, unrest that speculators are capitalizing on to increase oil futures prices and make huge profits;

(2) high gas prices are hurting the quality of life of people of the United States, cutting into savings, and jeopardizing jobs and the economic recovery of the United States;

(3) implementation of the regulatory reforms enacted by Congress in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111–203; 124 Stat. 1376) to prevent energy market manipulation and control excessive speculation has been delayed and has been threatened with funding reductions in the House of Representatives;

(4) the United States is producing more oil than any time in the last 13 years and companies hold abundant inventories of oil, but the United States is still importing more than 11,000,000 barrels of oil per day and the Energy Information Administration projects that full production in all onshore and offshore areas would reduce gas prices by only 3 cents per gallon by 2030;

(5) domestic refining capacity now exceeds United States demand for refined petroleum products, resulting in increased idle refinery capacity;

(6) oil companies are sitting idly on approximately 60,000,000 acres of leased Federal lands and waters containing more than 11,000,000,000 barrels of oil and 59,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas;

(7) the United States possesses less than 2 percent of the proven oil reserves of the world, yet consumes an unsustainable 25 percent of the oil production of the world;

(8) the economy of the United States suffers huge net losses in jobs and productivity from the growing annual trade deficit in energy, due mainly to the outflow of $250,000,000,000 or more to pay for foreign oil;

(9) world oil prices have risen steadily since the slow beginning of the global economic recovery and, absent major efficiency or conservation improvements or deployment of alternative fuels, those oil prices are projected to remain well above $100 per barrel or higher as world demand grows as China, India and other countries industrialize;

(10) the oil production policies of cartel of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) are a large determinant of the world price of oil, so the economy of the United States will be affected by decisions of OPEC as long as the United States depends on oil for a significant portion of the energy consumption of the United States;

(11) the major oil companies have accumulated more than $1,000,000,000,000 in net profits over the last 10 years and collected more than $40,000,000,000 in tax breaks during the same period, but have invested negligible amounts of those funds into research and development of the production of clean and renewable fuels made in the United States, leaving consumers with few if any choices at the pump; and

(12) in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17001 et seq.), Congress increased fuel economy standards for the first time in 30 years and established ambitious requirements for domestic biofuels, actions that have reduced oil consumption and reduced upward pressure on gas prices.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE ON HIGH GAS PRICES.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the President and Administration should be commended for recognizing the severity of high gas prices and for taking appropriate actions to help reduce gas prices, including actions—

(A) to move forward with expeditious and responsible domestic production in the Gulf of Mexico and elsewhere;

(B) to form a Task Force led by the Department of Justice to investigate and eliminate oil and gas price gouging and market manipulation;

(C) to establish a national oil savings goal to cut imports by 33 percent by 2025;

(D) to call for 1,000,000 electric vehicles to be on the road by 2015;

(E) to harmonize corporate average fuel standards under section 32902 of title 49, United States Code, (CAFE) and carbon pollution standards to achieve 1,800,000,000 barrels in oil savings from new vehicles built before 2017, and working with stakeholders to increase those savings from future year vehicles;

(F) to establish the National Clean Fleets Partnership and Green Fleet Initiative to reduce diesel and gasoline use in fleets by incorporating electric vehicles, alternative fuels like natural gas, and efficiency measures; and

(G) to clarify and expand the use of E-15 fuel for new motor vehicles;

(2) Congress should take additional actions to complement the efforts of the President, including enacting provisions—

(A) to encourage diligent and responsible development of domestic oil and gas resources onshore and off-shore;

(B) to eliminate subsidies for major oil and gas companies and use the savings to promote research, development, and deployment of affordable alternative fuels and vehicles;

(C) to give consumers more choices at the pump and incentives for buying vehicles that displace petroleum consumption; and

(D) to direct and fund the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Federal Trade Commission to rapidly implement the energy consumer protection requirements of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111–203; 124 Stat. 1376);

(3) the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) should contribute to the stabilization of world oil markets and prices and reduce the burden of high gasoline prices borne by the consumers in the United States by using existing idle oil production capacity to compensate for any supply shortages experienced in member countries; and

(4) the economic, environmental, and national security of the United States depend on a sustained effort to drastically reduce and eventually eliminate the dependency of the United States on oil.

(c) MODIFICATIONS OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT RULES APPLICABLE TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

''(n) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, any amount paid or accrued by a dual capacity taxpayer which is a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)) to a foreign country or possession of the United States for any period shall not be considered a tax—

''(A) if, for such period, the foreign country or possession does not impose a generally applicable income tax, or

''(B) to the extent such amount exceeds the amount (determined in accordance with regulations) which—

''(i) is paid by such dual capacity taxpayer pursuant to the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession, or

''(ii) would be paid if the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession were applicable to such dual capacity taxpayer.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to imply the proper treatment of any such amount not in excess of the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

''(2) DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'dual capacity taxpayer' means, with respect to any foreign country or possession of the United States, a person who—

''(A) is subject to a levy of such country or possession, and

''(B) receives (or will receive) directly or indirectly a specific economic benefit (as determined in accordance with regulations) from such country or possession.

''(3) GENERALLY APPLICABLE INCOME TAX.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'generally applicable income tax' means an income tax (or a series of income taxes) which is generally imposed under the laws of a foreign country or possession on income derived from the conduct of a trade or business within such country or possession.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include a tax unless it has substantial application, by its terms and in practice, to—

''(i) persons who are not dual capacity taxpayers, and

''(ii) persons who are citizens or residents of the foreign country or possession.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) CONTRARY TREATY OBLIGATIONS UPHELD.—The amendments made by this subsection shall not apply to the extent contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

(d) LIMITATION ON SECTION 199 DEDUCTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO OIL, NATURAL GAS, OR PRIMARY PRODUCTS THEREOF.—

(1) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION.—Paragraph (4) of section 199(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN OIL AND GAS INCOME.—In the case of any taxpayer who is a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)) for the taxable year, the term 'domestic production gross receipts' shall not include gross receipts from the production, transportation, or distribution of oil, natural gas, or any primary product (within the meaning of subsection (d)(9)) thereof.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

(e) LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 263(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''This subsection shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)).''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

(f) LIMITATION ON PERCENTAGE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR OIL AND GAS WELLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—In the case of any taxable year in which the taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)), the allowance for percentage depletion shall be zero.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

(g) LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR TERTIARY INJECTANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 193 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—This section shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)).''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

(h) REPEAL OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF DEEP WATER AND DEEP GAS ROYALTY RELIEF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 344 and 345 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15904, 15905) are repealed.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to provide for royalty relief in the lease sale terms beginning with the first lease sale held on or after the date of enactment of this Act for which a final notice of sale has not been published.

(i) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—The net amount of any savings realized as a result of the enactment of this section and the amendments made by this section (after any expenditures authorized by this section and the amendments made by this section) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction or, if there is no Federal budget deficit, for reducing the Federal debt in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate.

(j) BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—The budgetary effects of this section, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this section, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SA 464. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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; as follows:

On page 9, strike lines 12 through 16 and insert the following:

''(A) 125-PERCENT HIGHER UNEMPLOYMENT RATE.—In the case of a grant made in an area for which the 24-month unemployment rate is at least 125 percent of the national average or the per capita income is not more than

---

SA 465. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. _____. TAXATION OF INCOME OF CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATIONS ATTRIBUTABLE TO IMPORTED PROPERTY.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subsection (a) of section 954 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting '', and'', by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4), and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) imported property income for the taxable year (determined under subsection (j) and reduced as provided in subsection (b)(5)).''.

(b) DEFINITION OF IMPORTED PROPERTY INCOME.—Section 954 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) IMPORTED PROPERTY INCOME.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a)(5), the term 'imported property income' means income (whether in the form of profits, commissions, fees, or otherwise) derived in connection with—

''(A) manufacturing, producing, growing, or extracting imported property;

''(B) the sale, exchange, or other disposition of imported property; or

''(C) the lease, rental, or licensing of imported property.

Such term shall not include any foreign oil and gas extraction income (within the meaning of section 907(c)) or any foreign oil related income (within the meaning of section 907(c)).

''(2) IMPORTED PROPERTY.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term 'imported property' means property which is imported into the United States by the controlled foreign corporation or a related person.

''(B) IMPORTED PROPERTY INCLUDES CERTAIN PROPERTY IMPORTED BY UNRELATED PERSONS.—The term 'imported property' includes any property imported into the United States by an unrelated person if, when such property was sold to the unrelated person by the controlled foreign corporation (or a related person), it was reasonable to expect that—

''(i) such property would be imported into the United States; or

''(ii) such property would be used as a component in other property which would be imported into the United States.

''(C) EXCEPTION FOR PROPERTY SUBSEQUENTLY EXPORTED.—The term 'imported property' does not include any property which is imported into the United States and which—

''(i) before substantial use in the United States, is sold, leased, or rented by the controlled foreign corporation or a related person for direct use, consumption, or disposition outside the United States; or

''(ii) is used by the controlled foreign corporation or a related person as a component in other property which is so sold, leased, or rented.

''(D) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES.—The term 'imported property' does not include any agricultural commodity which is not grown in the United States in commercially marketable quantities.

''(3) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

''(A) IMPORT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'import' means entering, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption or use. Such term includes any grant of the right to use intangible property (as defined in section 936(h)(3)(B)) in the United States.

''(B) UNITED STATES.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'United States' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands of the United States, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(C) UNRELATED PERSON.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'unrelated person' means any person who is not a related person with respect to the controlled foreign corporation.

''(D) COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN BASE COMPANY SALES INCOME.—For purposes of this section, the term 'foreign base company sales income' shall not include any imported property income.''.

(c) SEPARATE APPLICATION OF LIMITATIONS ON FOREIGN TAX CREDIT FOR IMPORTED PROPERTY INCOME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 904(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A), by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C), and by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) imported property income, and''.

(2) IMPORTED PROPERTY INCOME DEFINED.—Paragraph (2) of section 904(d) of such Code is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (I), (J), and (K) as subparagraphs (J), (K), and (L), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraph:

''(I) IMPORTED PROPERTY INCOME.—The term 'imported property income' means any income received or accrued by any person which is of a kind which would be imported property income (as defined in section 954(j)).''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Clause (ii) of section 904(d)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by inserting ''or imported property income'' after ''passive category income''.

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (iii) of section 952(c)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by redesignating subclauses (II), (III), (IV), and (V) as subclauses (III), (IV), (V), and (VI), and

(B) by inserting after subclause (I) the following new subclause:

''(II) imported property income,''.

(2) The last sentence of paragraph (4) of section 954(b) of such Code is amended by striking ''subsection (a)(5)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(4)''.

(3) Paragraph (5) of section 954(b) of such Code is amended by striking ''and the foreign base company oil related income'' and inserting ''the foreign base company oil related income, and the imported property income''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, and to taxable years of United States shareholders within which or with which such taxable years of such foreign corporations end.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Thursday, June 23, 2011, at 2:15 p.m. in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Indian Reorganization Act—75 Years Later: Renewing our Commitment to Restore Tribal Homelands and Promote Self-Determination.''

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224–2251.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 207.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 207) Supporting National Men's Health Week.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 207) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 207

Whereas despite advances in medical technology and research, men continue to live an average of more than 5 years less than women, and African-American men have the lowest life expectancy;

Whereas 9 of the 10 leading causes of death, as defined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, affect men at a higher percentage than women;

Whereas between ages 45 and 54, men are over 1½ times more likely than women to die of heart attacks;

Whereas men die of heart disease at 1½ times the rate of women;

Whereas men die of cancer at almost 1½ times the rate of women;

Whereas testicular cancer is 1 of the most common cancers in men aged 15 to 34, and, when detected early, has a 96 percent survival rate;

Whereas the number of cases of colon cancer among men will reach almost 49,470 in 2010, and nearly half of those men will die from the disease;

Whereas the likelihood that a man will develop prostate cancer is 1 in 6;

Whereas the number of men who developed prostate cancer in 2010 is expected to reach more than 217,730, and an estimated 32,050 of those men will die from the disease;

Whereas African-American men in the United States have the highest incidence in the world of prostate cancer;

Whereas significant numbers of health problems that affect men, such as prostate cancer, testicular cancer, colon cancer, and infertility, could be detected and treated if awareness among men of those problems was more pervasive;

Whereas more than ½ of the elderly widows now living in poverty were not poor before the death of their husbands, and by age 100, women outnumber men by a ratio of 4 to 1;

Whereas educating both the public and health care providers about the importance of early detection of male health problems will result in reducing rates of mortality for those diseases;

Whereas appropriate use of tests such as prostate specific antigen exams, blood pressure screens, and cholesterol screens, in conjunction with clinical examination and self-testing for problems such as testicular cancer, can result in the detection of many of those problems in their early stages and increase the survival rates to nearly 100 percent;

Whereas women are 2 times more likely than men to visit their doctor for annual examinations and preventive services;

Whereas men are less likely than women to visit their health center or physician for regular screening examinations of male-related problems for a variety of reasons;

Whereas Congress established National Men's Health Week in 1994 and urged men and their families to engage in appropriate health behaviors, and the resulting increased awareness has improved health-related education and helped prevent illness;

Whereas the Governors of all 50 States issue proclamations annually declaring Men's Health Week in their respective States;

Whereas since 1994, National Men's Health Week has been celebrated each June by dozens of States, cities, localities, public health departments, health care entities, churches, and community organizations throughout the United States that promote health awareness events focused on men and family;

Whereas the National Men's Health Week Internet website has been established at www.menshealthweek.org and features Governors' proclamations and National Men's Health Week events;

Whereas men who are educated about the value that preventive health can play in prolonging their lifespans and their roles as productive family members will be more likely to participate in health screenings;

Whereas men and their families are encouraged to increase their awareness of the importance of a healthy lifestyle, regular exercise, and medical checkups;

Whereas June 13 through 19, 2011, is National Men's Health Week; and

Whereas the purpose of National Men's Health Week is to heighten the awareness of preventable health problems and encourage early detection and treatment of disease among men and boys: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the annual National Men's Health Week; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States and interested groups to observe National Men's Health Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, June 14, following the 2:15 cloture vote on the Coburn amendment No. 436, as modified, Senator RUBIO of Florida be recognized as in morning business for debate only for up to 20 minutes for the purpose of delivering his maiden speech in the Senate.

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

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h-276k, as amended, appoints the following Senator as Vice Chairman of the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group during the 112th Congress: the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON).

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, June 14; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order; further, that the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to the Coburn amendment No. 436, as modified, be at 11:30 tomorrow morning.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, tomorrow at noon, there will be up to two rollcall votes in relation to the Cecchi and Salas nominations. Additionally, at 2:15 p.m. there will be a rollcall vote on the cloture motion Senator COBURN filed on his ethanol amendment.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order following the remarks of Senators THUNE and COBURN, who will speak as in debate only.

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

Mr. REID. Just so I have some idea, I ask Senator THUNE, how long does the Senator wish to speak?

Mr. THUNE. For 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. How much time does the Senator need?

Mr. COBURN. Ten minutes.

Mr. REID. That would be the order. Senator COBURN will be recognized for 10 minutes following the remarks of Senator THUNE, who will speak for up to 10 minutes. They are both for debate only.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ETHANOL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has a strongly held view about ethanol, particularly on this issue, on the VEETC, and I understand that. I understand there are

Members who would like to see that particular tax credit go away. I understand that.

What the Senator from Minnesota and I have come up with is a way for them to achieve that objective, but it does it in a way that is reasonable, measured, and which doesn't totally, in the middle of the year, abruptly disrupt an industry and all of the investment that has been made.

The question I ask my colleague is, does our word mean anything around here? We passed this in December. There were 81 Senators who voted for a package of tax extenders, one of which was the volumetric ethanol excise tax credit. Eighty-one Senators are on record. If you want to do away with it, there are lots of ways you can do that. But the way the Senator from Oklahoma is proposing to do that is to say, tomorrow let's pass this and end it. It is $2.5 billion we can save the taxpayers. Well, about $500 million a month is about what this is going to cost. With every month that goes by, there is a little less available to the taxpayer.

What we are saying is that we put in a billion dollars today into this proposal that would go toward debt retirement, and we phase out the tax credit to which the Senator from Oklahoma refers, and we take a very forward-looking, futuristic-type view toward ethanol production in this country, biofuel production in this country. We are going to be capped out at 15 billion gallons, which is the RFS, the renewable fuel standard to which the Senator from Oklahoma referred. We are going to hit that. Then we have to get to the next generation of biofuels.

With all due respect to my colleague from Oklahoma, methanol is not a realistic option. You would have to retool every plant in this country. We have 204 plants in America today that, directly or indirectly, employ 500,000 Americans. Those are the jobs that are impacted. We have had policy on the books now for nearly 30 years that has encouraged the investment in these plants on the belief that we need to get beyond dependence on foreign sources of energy. That ought to be our energy policy, and we ought to be looking to producing more.

I am for oil and gas. The reason I voted against the proposals leveled a couple weeks ago that would have targeted the oil and gas industry is because I think we need all forms of energy—oil and gas, clean coal, biofuels, nuclear, and we need any form of energy we can generate and produce in the United States. I am for it. That is why I think the future of this industry is still very bright, because I think there is an advanced biofuels future out there, and a cellulosic ethanol, next-generation ethanol, whatever you want to call it, where we can make it from switch grass, from blue stem grass, from corn stover, and these types of products. That is out there. But you don't get there unless you have a corn-based platform to start with.

The Senator talked about a renewable fuel standard and talked about this being redundant public policy. One of our colleagues from South Carolina introduced an amendment to this bill that would end that. I assume—I don't know this for a fact—that my colleague from Oklahoma would support that amendment, which would do away with the renewable fuel standard.

Mr. COBURN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THUNE. Certainly.

Mr. COBURN. The Senator obviously didn't hear what I said. I said I support ethanol, and I would not support that. I have been upfront with the Senator in the past, and you know my position on that.

So the question here—and I ask him a question: How do you fit what the people who would get this $3 billion, who the Senator says they don't want—why would they say that if it is going to have a negative impact on their industry?

Mr. THUNE. Well, I say to my colleague from Oklahoma that I was not aware he said he supports ethanol. I was not aware he supports the RFS. If there is an amendment offered to strike the RFS, which there will be—am I wrong in saying the Senator would oppose that amendment?

Mr. COBURN. I will oppose that amendment. My worry is because of the process of the Senate, we may not get that amendment to vote on. My colleague, as part of our leadership, would recognize that we have a problem with amendments.

Mr. THUNE. I don't disagree with that. There is an issue I have not argued. It is your prerogative to bring this up and file cloture, which you have done in this circumstance. I think the renewable fuels standard that creates the sort of policy construct we are talking about here today is one aspect of the biofuels policy going forward. The other aspect, going back for long time, historically, is the blenders credit.

I will tell you—because the statement you made is all the people who get this don't want it—well, that is not true. The large integrated oil companies, which are also refiners and, in many cases, retailers of refined gasoline, don't want it, maybe. I understand you have a letter to that effect. But there are lots of smaller refiners who do want it.

There are also an awful lot of—the blenders credit gets passed on to the retailer, which gets passed on to the consumer, hopefully. The people who will be impacted by this are not just the large integrated oil companies. If you talk about the large integrated oil companies, saying they don't want this—they said in hearings before congressional committees a few years ago they didn't want the oil subsidies they get in the Tax Code today. They are on the record saying that. Yet we voted to keep those in place just a few weeks ago.

Mr. COBURN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THUNE. Yes.

Mr. COBURN. Would the Senator define what a subsidy is to him, because part of the problem with the debate is that we keep saying ''subsidies.'' We don't have subsidies—not in the Senator's State or in Oklahoma. We have accelerated depreciation, which even if you took that away, the dollars to the Federal Government would not increase. How is there a subsidy to the oil and gas industry?

Mr. THUNE. When we characterize what you called tax expenditures, there are a bunch that fall into that category. I know the Senator is familiar with that as he served on the President's debt commission. It is about $1.1 trillion a year. In some way or another, we reduce the tax liability of various individuals and businesses around the country. I don't disagree with you. In fact, I will work with the Senator on a proposal that would address this and look at all those types of tax expenditures.

I think it is punitive to single out one and say we are going to kill this one, after we committed in December, with 81 votes, that we are for this. I don't know how we can, in good faith, go to this industry, which employs 500,000 Americans, and say we are going to pull the rug out from under you after 6 months.

That being said, I would characterize it as anything that reduces the tax liability that is public policy. I think it is characterized as tax expenditures. The oil depletion allowance and the intangible drilling costs—those are all things that are unique to the oil industry.

Mr. COBURN. Does it include charitable contributions—a subsidy, the same category?

Mr. THUNE. If it is under the definition of tax expenditure, sure. Oil depletion allowances and intangible drilling costs are characterized, for subsidy purposes, the same way as the ethanol tax credit. We have lots of what we would characterize as tax credits and earned income tax credits in the Tax Code. We have lots of what is characterized as tax expenditures. You may characterize it differently, and that is accelerated depreciation, but in fact for the purposes of description, as we describe things here, it fits into that category.

The oil industry came in front of congressional committees and said they didn't want those. So for them to say they don't want this particular blenders credit—and my view certainly isn't determinative, but I think the large integrated oil companies that get the blenders credit also view ethanol as a threat. Like it or not, today the only viable alternative to petroleum—the only one we have—is 10 percent of our fuel supply in this country.

I am not debating the Senator from Oklahoma about whether the merits of this particular policy—at least in its current form—should not be transformed and should be reformed; I am

saying that we should. I have come to the Senator with a proposal to do that. That is not something, obviously, that he agrees to. That is fine. He is entitled to not support that. But I believe we ought to reform it. I think the way we reform it is do it in a reasonable way that doesn't cut it off tomorrow but, rather, phases it out.

I think that for the Senator from Oklahoma, to me, it is something that is a win for him as well. He gets what he wants. He gets the phaseout, plus $1 billion in debt reduction, and if this thing goes to the end of the year, we get zero. We get goose-egged.

This thing expires at the end of the year. Whether it gets extended or not remains to be seen. But one thing we know with certainty is that I am putting a proposal on the table today that gets $1 billion in reduction, that provides some certainty at least in phasing out the VEETC and also makes an investment in blender pumps, which is something that is very important to the future of the industry.

So I think it is a reasonable way to deal with this issue.

The Senator from Oklahoma and I have a disagreement, and that is probably not going to change. But I am offering what I think is a reasonable proposal that gets you where you want to end up and I think also is a way in which we can keep this industry from having the rug pulled out from under them after we made a commitment to them in December of last year.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, let me make a couple of points.

When the Federal Government writes a tax credit, that means we take money from our Treasury, which is empty; therefore, we borrow it, and we write a check to people. When we have an ''accelerated appreciation,'' what we do is allow people to pay less back in, a big difference.

How many of the ethanol refineries and blenders are not represented by this group? It is about 11 percent. They all reside in the upper Midwest. That is why there is such a resistance to it.

When I met with the representatives of the ethanol industry, the reason they don't want the credit to go away is because they are afraid that they won't be able to drive as hard a bargain with the large blenders of gasoline, that they will actually be able to determine what their grind cost is—in other words, what their true cost is.

The difference between what the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from South Dakota offer is $2 billion. That is the only difference. Theirs is just denial and spend $1 billion on pumps and infrastructure—money we don't have—and mine is to say quit doing it because we are going to blend the ethanol anyway. That is the only difference in the two programs. One continues to subsidize noneconomic blenders, obviously, because they want it—a very small portion. But the vast majority of people are producing ethanol-blended gasoline. And they say: How did they ever get to the point in our country where the Federal Government is going to tell you that you have to buy a gasoline that is only 65 percent as efficient as the gasoline you were buying? And, oh, by the way, because it is only 65 percent efficient, it actually pollutes more. That is why in this list of people supporting this are all the environmental groups, because they know it is bad policy.

The reason I support a mandated level of ethanol is that until we have a cogent drilling policy in this country that says we are going to actually utilize our own resources, we need to keep ethanol. But what really ought to happen is we ought to let markets determine it. We will all be better off. We will have less government regulation, we will have less Tax Code expenditure and the markets will determine what the most efficient product is by what people will buy—what people will buy, what they want to buy. It is called freedom.

We have gotten ourselves in this mix where, actually, what people don't realize is we are down to only 47 percent of our oil coming into this country is coming from outside now. We have moved from 62 down to 47 percent, and the reason is because the oil and gas industry has actually gone out there and found an environmentally smart way to produce tons of gas liquids, which are easier to convert into fuel than anything—easier than oil, easier than any other product we have.

So the Senator didn't really answer why the people who are getting the money don't want it and yet we should continue sending it to them.

Ask yourself the question. We are broke, we are going to run a $1.4 or $1.5 or $1.6 trillion deficit this year and here is a way to save $3 billion, and the people we are going to send the money to—and borrow the money to be able to send it to them—don't want it. Yet they cannot answer why they do not want it. This represents 97 percent of all the blending in the country. They don't want the money and we are going to sit here as a body and continue to send them money they do not want? Go home and explain that to your constituents.

From which child are we going to take opportunity because we do not have the courage to do the smart thing? We have a mandate. They have to blend it. They are making a ton of money.

One final point, and I will let the Senate staff go home. Every time you go home to buy a gallon of gasoline today, the price you pay at the pump is not the price you pay. If you look at all the subsidies that are going to ethanol, when you go look at that $3.75—or that $4 around here, $3.50 in Oklahoma and Colorado—add $1.72 per gallon to it because that is what you paid in terms of the government support for the ethanol program in terms of subsidies, $1.72 a gallon. You buy it for $3.50, add $1.72, and you are paying $5.22 a gallon. You just don't know that we have picked your pocket through the government expenditures. Out of your taxes you paid, we pay them $1.72 per gallon. It makes no sense. What this does is eliminate 45 cents of that. It doesn't take it all away, the grants and the loans, the low-interest loans.

The other thing people do not recognize is most of the ethanol plants, even with this subsidy, have been bought out because they were not economical because they did not know how to run them. That is why most of them ended up with the large companies, because they did not know how to run them, they were not efficient, and now they are profitable even without the blenders credit.

It is a simple question: Do we save $3 billion or save $1 billion? I tell you, with what is in front of us as a Nation with our $14.3 trillion debt, I am going to opt for the kids who follow us and the grandkids. I am going for the $3 billion, not $1 billion.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:02 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 14, 2011, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

MARTIN J. GRUENBERG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE SHEILA C. BAIR, RESIGNED.

MARTIN J. GRUENBERG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 27, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

KENNETH J. KOPOCIS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE PETER SILVA SILVA, RESIGNED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EDWARDS, JOHNSON & HUBBOARD FAMILY REUNION

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Whereas, in the mid 1800s, the union of Henryetta Hubboard and William Johnson in Choctaw County, Mississippi has blessed us with descendants that have helped to shape our Nation; and

Whereas, the Hubboard and Johnson union produced many well respected citizens, today we honor all of the matriarchs and patriarchs, who are pillars of strength for the Edwards, Johnson and Hubboard families; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have many members of the Edwards, Johnson and Hubboard families, such as Ms. Dorothy Edwards, who are some of our most productive citizens in our District; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world, we take pride in knowing that families such as the Edwards, Johnson and Hubboard families have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other by meeting at this year's family reunion in Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Edwards, Johnson and Hubboard families;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim July 22, 2011 as Edwards, Johnson & Hubboard Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 22nd day of July, 2011.

HONORING HABITAT FOR HUMANITY OF GREATER NEW HAVEN AS THEY CELEBRATE THEIR 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the supporters and volunteers gathered this evening to congratulate Habitat for Humanity of Greater New Haven as they celebrate their silver anniversary. In its 25 year history this outstanding organization, fueled by the generosity and energy of its volunteers, has revitalized many of our neighborhoods and enhanced the quality of life in our community. Theirs is a mission that is quite literally reflected in the theme of this celebration—building hope, lives, and neighborhoods.

Over the course of its history, Habitat for Humanity of Greater New Haven has forged partnerships with individuals, religious and civic organizations, as well as local businesses and corporations that have translated into homeownership opportunities for more than eighty families. Offering a hand up rather than a hand out, families who qualify for the homebuyers program work side by side with community volunteers to build their home, investing a minimum of 400 "sweat equity" hours to the project. The families' personal investment also translates into their personal investment in the community.

Founded by a group of community leaders, Habitat for Humanity of Greater New Haven, like its sister chapters across the country, is a real grassroots organization. It encourages people to dedicate their words and actions to the elimination of poverty housing and attracts more than 2,000 volunteers every year. The need for affordable and safe housing is as much a need today as it was when this local organization was founded 25 years ago and it is heartening to know that there are so many who so willingly devote their time and energies to these efforts.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my deepest thanks and appreciation to the many volunteers and donors who have gathered tonight to celebrate this remarkable milestone. Without their generosity, compassion, and willingness to devote their time and energy, the mission of Habitat for Humanity would not be possible. Whether they have donated funds, construction material, or simply their time, it has been through their good work that Habitat for Humanity of Greater New Haven has been able to make such a difference in our community.

A home is so much more than simply a roof over ones head—it is a source of pride, comfort, independence and stability. This is the gift of Habitat for Humanity and I have been proud to support the good work that they have accomplished throughout Greater New Haven. I am honored to stand today to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Habitat for Humanity of Greater New Haven on their 25th Anniversary. I have no doubt that they will continue their extraordinary contributions for as long as there is a need.

BOB HENLEY TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bob Henley for his outstanding service as a founding member of the Chimney Rock Interpretive Association in the San Juan National Forest.

In 1996, Mr. Henley began working as a tour guide for Chimney Rock, which helped to foster his appreciation of the archeological area, and urged him to seek that tours of the ruins be independently operated in order to ensure the area receive proper attention and upkeep. In 2003, Mr. Henley's work helped to make Chimney Rock an independent organization.

Because of his efforts and the efforts of many volunteers, the Chimney Rock Interpretive Association hosts nearly 11,000 visitors in total each year, allowing it to be independently funded and operated. In addition, the Association is able to give elementary schools free tours, educating between 300 and 500 students about the history of the Chimney Rock Archeological site every year.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Bob Henley today. His service has provided many assets to the Chimney Rock Interpretive Association and the San Juan National Forest.

HONORING LILA STERN

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Hebrew School teacher and long-time community volunteer Lila Stern of Rockland County, is being honored by Congregation Shaaray Israel at their annual Journal Dinner Dance on June 12, 2011. For her numerous contributions to her community, Lila will receive the congregation's prestigious "Woman of Valor" award.

Lila has served as a leader of the Rockland Jewish community since 1953. As her husband Jules rose to the head of their congregation in the 1970s, Lila sought to encourage women's involvement in the Jewish issues as Chairwoman of Rockland County Israel Bonds Women's Division, President of Sisterhood at the Jewish Community Center, and a lifelong member of Hadassah.

In addition to her work in the Jewish community, Lila pursued a career as a "Professional Volunteer."

While raising three children, she took the time to work as a Pink Lady at Good Samaritan Hospital and as a literacy volunteer.

Lila now works as an adult teacher at Shaaray Israel where she teaches a class on Jewish appreciation. Every Wednesday she leads a discussion on Jewish issues ranging from religious issues to Israeli politics.

As a grandmother of 11, Lila has instilled in her family a respect for Jewish tradition as well as a sense of gratitude and support for the state of Israel, which she and her husband travel to frequently. Her visits to Israel began in 1950, when she first went with her parents lugging suitcases of clothing as well as money for the needy of the fledgling new country.

Through her charity and tireless dedication to her community, Lila has certainly earned her title as a "Woman of Valor," and I congratulate her on this honor.

BRIAN COOPER TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Brian Cooper for earning the Alamosa Police Department's Lifesaver Award. His quick thinking and decisive action during his regular patrol of the small Colorado town saved the life of another resident.

Detective Cooper, a patrol officer at the time, saw one of the town's elderly residents choking. After calling an ambulance, he cleared the man's airway of the food he was choking on and successfully administered CPR. Paramedics credit Officer Cooper for saving the life of a man who would have otherwise died had he not intervened.

Detective Cooper is one of only a handful of recipients of the Lifesaver Award. It is not given lightly, but there was little argument against the Detective's merit. A father of two and loving husband to his high school sweetheart, Brian Cooper is an exemplary member of Colorado's police force.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Brian Cooper today. Alamosa is deservedly proud of him and I have no doubt that he will continue to expand on his already excellent record.

HONORING OFER BAVLY

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ofer Bavly, the Consul General of Israel to Florida and Puerto Rico for his many years of service to the South Florida Jewish Community, which is being honored this evening by the Jewish Community Relations Council of the Jewish Federation of South Palm Beach County.

The son of Israeli diplomats, Mr. Bavly has dedicated his life to public service since his graduation from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem with duel degrees in International Relations and Middle Eastern Studies. Like many Israelis, Mr. Bavly courageously served his country in the Israel Defense Forces, rising to the rank of Captain.

In 1991, Mr. Bavly joined Israel's Foreign Ministry, and has since served his country in Israel's Embassies around the world, including Madrid and Rome. Mr. Bavly's success as a diplomat and foreign policy expertise led to his appointment as a Policy Advisor to the Foreign Minister of Israel in 2005. Subsequently, Mr. Bavly was appointed Counselor in the Foreign Ministry's North America Division in 2006.

Mr. Bavly's diplomatic career has culminated with his 2007 appointment to his current position of Counsul General of Israel to Florida and Puerto Rico. It has been an honor working side by side with Mr. Bavly to further America's unshakeable relationship with Israel.

I congratulate Mr. Bavly, his wife Ayala, and their three children for their great honor tonight, and I look forward to many more years of strong partnership with Mr. Bavly as we work towards our shared goals of advancing the safety and security of Israel and creating a lasting peace.

CARL TAYLOR TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Carl Taylor, a farmer, soldier, and Colorado Native who lived his life in service of his country and family.

Mr. Taylor was born in Blanca, Colorado on May 16, 1919. Shortly after his twenty-third birthday, Mr. Taylor joined the U.S. Army. He was assigned to Fort Bliss in Company B, 271st Infantry, which eventually allowed him to serve in military campaigns all over the world. He was involved in the Battle of the Bulge, as well as other campaigns in Tunisia, Naples, Rhineland, Rome and Southern France.

After the war, Mr. Taylor returned to Colorado where he farmed barley. He and his wife lived in Center, Colorado, where they eventually began to distribute their barley to the Colorado Coors factory. On January 8, 2008, Mr. Taylor and his wife, Mona, retired and moved to the Colorado State Veteran Center at Homelake, Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Carl Taylor today. Throughout his life he has served as an outstanding soldier and citizen, and his great life achievements deserve to be noted.

IN RECOGNITION AND REMEMBRANCE OF MR. LUTHER R. GATLING

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great sadness as I pay tribute to my dear friend Luther Gatling who recently passed away peacefully in his home in Teaneck, New Jersey on Tuesday, May 31st. As I speak with profound sorrow, I ascend to celebrate a life well lived and to remember with fondness the accomplishments of a remarkable man who, over his many years of service in government and credit counseling, etched his name in history as The Credit Doctor.

Luther dedicated his life to public service and championed diversity. And, as a long-time civil rights and business leader, he possessed a remarkable moral compass that inspired fiscal responsibility upon many disadvantaged people. Mr. Gatling has provided mentorship to our youth and much needed credit guidance to all. He stood for the empowerment, development, and prosperity of our Nation.

Luther R. Gatling was born in Waterbury, Connecticut on September 9, 1931. He received his Bachelors degree in business administration from Temple University. Luther then went on to serve as the president of the Waterbury City Council. He became the mayor of Waterbury before the age of 30 and later served as the assistant director at the Manpower Assistance of Boston program in Washington, D.C.

In my community of Harlem, Mr. Gatling is well known for his service as the President of the New York Chapter of the One Hundred Black Men, Inc. for 8 years. He also served on the executive committee and Board of Directors of the National One Hundred Black Men of America organization. In 1976, Luther created Budget and Credit Counseling Services, Inc. to help educate consumers with financial difficulties. BuCCS provided counseling and advocacy for more than 40,000 consumers.

Luther Gatling was an economically savvy man who never resisted sharing his wealth of knowledge with those in need. The Credit Doctor, as he was known, believed in empowering struggling and financially illiterate consumers through the power of sound credit comprehension.

Consumer credit, debt education, financial literacy are passions of Mr. Gatling. Instructing consumers on how to manage their credit wisely and pay their debts responsibly was important to my friend Luther.

Luther symbolized the American Dream. He worked vigorously with the One Hundred Black Men to expand educational and economic opportunities for African Americans and other minority communities. Mr. Gatling worked tirelessly with the BuCCS to properly educate the public on fiscal responsibility. Luther extended his guidance through practically every medium to educate the masses. He worked his first job as a taxi driver later to become the CEO of the Budget and Credit Counseling Service.

I would like for my colleagues in the Congress to join me in offering our heartfelt condolences to his wife Bonnie Gatling and their children, Dr. Sharon G Waldrum, Lydia Miller, Robbin Gatling, and Richard Patton. It is important that they know that their friends and all of those whose lives were touched by Luther over the years, are with them in spirit and the Gatling family are in our thoughts and prayers.

No amount of words can ever replace this titan. Luther bore his illness with great dignity and pride. And through his illness, he continued to persist on living and fighting for causes true to his faith and community. Now free from pain and discomfort, we can all draw some comfort in knowing that he has found peace in the eternity of God's Kingdom. He will long be remembered for his extraordinary commitment, humor, liveliness, energy, wisdom, discipline, principle and clear purpose which won the admiration of all who were privileged to come to know and work with him during his distinguished career.

Mr. Speaker, I consider myself fortunate to have had the opportunity to observe and experience Luther's example as a personal inspiration. Though Luther is no longer with us, we will continue to keep his memory alive in our hearts and minds, and continue to honor his legacy with our advocacy for the issues he cared about the most. We as a nation are all blessed to have known a Luther Gatling, ''The Credit Doctor,'' a titan who shaped financial counseling history with his everlasting spirit.

ED ELLIS TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ed Ellis for his commitment to the

railroad industry and his investment in Colorado's infrastructure.

Mr. Ellis has provided many Coloradans with railroad service to remote areas that would normally not see such attention. His company, Iowa Pacific Holdings, LLC, specializes in reviving smaller railways that serve less populated areas. One of these lines is the Rio Grande Scenic Railroad in Colorado's San Luis Valley. His dedication to running the scenic train has provided a much needed boost to the area's economy and tourism.

Mr. Ellis has provided a needed service to southern Colorado and a number of other states that benefit from his attention and investment.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to stand and pay tribute to a man so devoted to local transit and to a small company fighting in a big industry. I have no doubt that under Mr. Ellis' leadership Iowa Pacific Holdings will continue to thrive.

IN HONOR OF EDWARD M. KING, VICE PRESIDENT FOR GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Edward M. King in recognition of his 23 years of dedicated service to Boston University and his passionate advocacy on behalf of the University throughout the halls of government and the communities of Boston.

Ed began his tenure at Boston University in 1987 as Associate Vice President for Government & Community Affairs. In 1991, Ed became Vice President, overseeing all functions relating to federal, state, city, and community relations. Prior to coming to Boston University, Ed was the Director of Community Relations and Public Affairs for the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority. He was also the Executive Secretary and Deputy Director of the Youth Activities Commission for the City of Boston and is a former Manager of Little City Hall in South Boston as well as a former assistant to Mayor Kevin White.

Throughout his career at Boston University, Ed served under Presidents John Silber, Jon Westling, Aram Chobanian, and Robert Brown. During Ed's tenure, Boston University went through an unprecedented growth that benefited both the University and the economy of the city of Boston. Through Ed's effort at both the community and governmental levels, the University successfully completed such projects as: Biosquare, Sargent College, the John Hancock Student Village complex that includes 1,800 new dormitory beds and the Harry Agganis Arena, the School of Management, the Photonics Center, the Life Science & Engineering building on Cummington Street, and the new East Campus Student Services Center on Bay State Road. There was nearly $1 billion of construction that went through extensive community and government review during Ed's time at Boston University.

Additionally, Ed was the University's ambassador to the business and academic communities. He was Boston University's contact to the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, A Better City, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts, Associated Industries of Massachusetts, and the Massachusetts Association of Non-Profit Schools & Colleges. He was active in charities such as The Boys and Girls Clubs, the Greater Boston Girl Scouts Council, the West End House, the Little House, Dorchester neighborhood Little Leagues, and Catholic Charities.

A 1981 graduate of Boston State College, where he received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology, Ed currently resides with his wife, Kimberly, and their son, Charles, in Hingham.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to join with Ed's family, friends, and the Boston University community to thank him for his incredible dedication and commitment to the University and the city of Boston. I hope my colleagues will join me in celebrating Ed's distinguished career and in wishing him good health and success in all of his future endeavors.

JAMES BEDARD TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. James Bedard, of Alamosa, Colorado, for being selected to the E. (Kika) de la Garza Fellowship program. With this recognition, Dr. Bedard will be able to further represent southern Colorado and Adams State College while continuing his already impressive research.

Dr. Bedard is one of 20 other faculty members in schools across the country selected for the honor. Nominees for the fellowship are chosen based on their educational experience and the relevance of their research to the USDA, specifically to issues facing the Hispanic population. It is one of the most prestigious awards available to Hispanic-American citizens.

The new resources available to Dr. Bedard will allow him to provide a more thorough education to his students and show them opportunities that were more elusive. He will also have greater access to federal agencies that specialize in agricultural problems facing the community.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to stand and recognize Dr. James Bedard today. Southern Colorado has long benefitted from his work and will now see even greater results with help from the E. (Kika) de la Garza Fellowship. I have no doubt that Dr. Bedard will continue his important agricultural research and thrive as a teacher and community leader.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF TERRA LINDA HIGH SCHOOL

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th anniversary of Terra Linda High School in San Rafael, California. The school's Golden Anniversary was celebrated on May 28, 2011, by a gathering of three generations of proud Terra Linda alumni.

Since its founding, Terra Linda High School has provided thousands of Marin County children the firm and balanced footing they deserve, and it has played an integral role in the strength and success of San Rafael and Marin County. The school upholds high standards in education and extracurriculars, balancing a host of advanced placement offerings with the art, music, and athletic activities that truly enrich the learning experience. Terra Linda and schools like it remind us of the limitless potential of our system of public education when students are provided the resources they need to excel.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in celebrating the 50th anniversary of Terra Linda High School. Few institutions are as intimately tied to our national identity as our public schools, and none is more essential to our collective future. Terra Linda represents the best of this tradition, and I am proud to honor its legacy in our county.

JIM B. JONES TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Jim B. Jones, a man who proudly served his country during WWII.

Drafted into the U.S Army in 1945, Mr. Jones was assigned to G Company as a corporal, and was sent to Hawaii. Upon arrival in Hawaii, Mr. Jones boarded the USS *Niagara*, to Okinawa. During his time in Okinawa, the United States dropped the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. On V–J Day, only a few days after the bombing, Mr. Jones was moved to Korea. Here, he took part in accepting the surrender of the Japanese Army in ceremonies in Seoul.

During the remainder of his time in Korea, Mr. Jones served as a rifleman and a clerk typist in Chengju.

In 1946, when he was twenty years old, Mr. Jones left Korea after spending a year there. He arrived home in time for the first day of hunting season.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the service and character of Jim B. Jones.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TEMPLE BETH SHOLOM

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration and recognition of 60 years of unrivaled spiritual leadership and unequaled community service by Temple Beth Sholom in Roslyn Heights, New York.

In the summer of 1951, approximately 70 Jewish families gathered with the hopes of establishing a place of worship for the Jewish community in Roslyn and the surrounding area. They could have hardly hoped or anticipated that these humble beginnings would

grow into such a vibrant and vital temple—renowned for its excellent religious school, its benevolent activism, and its strong commitment to the Jewish faith and Jewish values.

In 1957, the still nascent congregation came together to raise funds to construct a new school wing, an atrium, offices, and a synagogue and sanctuary—facilities they still use today. Since then, the congregation has only continued to grow in both reach and mission. Temple Beth Sholom has been recognized for its extraordinary educational program—from nursery school to adult education. The Temple's Rabbi Ario S. and Tess Hyams Judaica Museum, founded in 1968, houses an impressive collection of art and artifacts important to Jews and the Jewish faith. The generous congregation has donated and raised funds to continually improve the function and facilities of the Temple. Moving forward, the congregation will continue to expand and improve its positive influence on both their membership and the community.

For decades, the Temple has maintained an unwavering fidelity to the values of the Conservative Jewish movement while encouraging both open-mindedness and innovative practices. Emblematic of this, Temple Beth Sholom elected its first woman president in 1972 and, in subsequent years, became one of the first egalitarian congregations in the Conservative movement. The Temple was also one of the first to collect congregational contributions according to a sliding scale based on income—recognizing diverse capabilities to give within their membership. Through innovation and creativity, Temple Beth Sholom has remained faithful to its Conservative tradition while embracing new and pioneering practices.

Under the current direction of Rabbi Alan B. Lucas, Temple Beth Sholom is continuing in its great tradition of faith, family, and community. His spiritual guidance is an invaluable asset to the congregation and the surrounding community, and his leadership and commitment will allow the Temple to continue its good works for years to come.

On June 12, 2011, Temple Beth Sholom will celebrate its 60th anniversary. Since 1951, it has been an essential element of the Roslyn Heights community. I am proud to recognize the synagogue's extraordinary accomplishments. I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing my gratitude and congratulations to Temple Beth Sholom for its six decades of service to the Jewish community of Roslyn.

JOAN ANZELMO TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, It is my honor to rise and pay tribute to one of America's most dedicated and passionate Civil Servants. On July 1st, 2011 Joan Anzelmo will be hanging up her "flat hat" after a meritorious 35 year career with the National Park Service.

Joan is a native of Washington, D.C., and graduated from the University of Maryland in 1975 with a Bachelor's Degree in French. She began her Park Service career the next year as the Visitor Services Chief at the National Visitor Center in Washington, D.C. Along the way, Joan has served in Virginia at Great Falls Park, Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park, and has been tasked by the Park Service to coordinate large scale events including the Bicentennial Celebrations at Yorktown, the 75th Anniversary Celebrations of the National Park Service in Yellowstone, and the 50th Anniversary Celebrations for Grand Teton National Park. Among her accomplishments is her service as National Park Service spokesperson during the 1988 wildfires that swept through Yellowstone, equipping her with nationally recognized crisis communications prowess, and seeing her assigned to the Unified Area Command for the National Park Service in response to the BP Oil Spill in 2010. She has received numerous awards for her service, including the Superior Service and Meritorious Service awards, two of the Department of Interior's most prestigious honors.

Joan wraps up her career overseeing the management of the awe-inspiring red rock canyons and formations of the Colorado National Monument in my district at the far western edge of Colorado, where she serves as Superintendent. With rising visitation, active outreach to the local school population, and a very successful centennial celebration just this year, this is a fitting capstone to an accomplished career, and worthy of our recognition. I wish her well as she returns to Jackson, Wyoming, where she will be in close proximity to her daughter, Jenny, who is herself employed at Grand Teton National Park's public affairs office.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ADELE WILSON

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker,

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one woman . . . who has given of herself in order for others to stand; and

Whereas, Mrs. Adele Wilson's work is present not only in the city of New Orleans, but around the nation for all to see, being an usher, missionary and friend; and

Whereas, this giant of a woman gave so much to her family, her community and her church; and

Whereas, this remarkable woman gave of herself, her time, her talent and her life; she never asked for fame or fortune to uplift those in need, she just wanted to do what was right and she not only talked the talk, she walked the walk for others to get involved in matters of the community; and

Whereas, Mrs. Adele Wilson led by doing, she was a warrior for education, a beacon of light for all people, a wife, a mother, a daughter, a friend; she was a Proverbs 31 woman, our matriarch, a woman of great integrity who remained true to the uplifting of our community until her end; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow an honorable mention and recognition on Mrs. Adele Wilson for her leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens of the United States of America; a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR. do hereby attest to the 112th Congress that Mrs. Adele Wilson of New Orleans, Louisiana is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honorable Mention."

Mrs. Adele Wilson,
U.S. Citizen of Distinction
in the 4th Congressional District.
Proclaimed, this 11th day of June, 2011.

INTRODUCTION OF THE VITA ACT

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today upon the introduction of the VITA Act of 2011. This legislation would permanently authorize the Community Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) Matching Grant Program that has been funded through the annual appropriations process since Fiscal Year 2008.

The availability of free tax education and assistance programs in local communities helps many low-income individuals avoid having to depend upon paid tax return preparers and refund anticipation loans in order to successfully file their annual federal income tax returns. Currently, the Community VITA Program is a federally-supported taxpayer education and assistance program funded through the Internal Revenue Service, aimed at supporting low-income individuals and targeted subpopulations during the tax preparation process.

VITA programs offer free tax assistance to low-to-moderate income individuals who cannot afford professional assistance. More than 75,000 VITA volunteers prepare basic tax returns for low income taxpayers with a focus on at least one specific underserved group with special needs, including persons with disabilities, non-English speaking persons, Native Americans, rural taxpayers, and the elderly. The continued federal support has enabled community VITA programs to reach more underserved low-income taxpayers, and resulted in more families accessing vital tax credits, such as the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and the Child Tax Credit (CTC). During the 2009 filing season, VITA centers prepared over 1.2 million tax returns and brought back over $1.6 billion in tax returns to working families.

The VITA Act of 2011 would authorize $30 million in matching grants to eligible Community VITA Programs to be used for program operation, taxpayer outreach, and related financial services. The legislation would also establish a National Center to Promote Quality, Excellence, and Evaluation in VITA with a $5 million authorization to disseminate best practices, facilitate technical assistance, coordinate program outcomes, and ensure continuation of service to underserved taxpayers for the 4,500 VITA sites operating nationwide.

The benefits of this community-based approach are abundant. First, VITA centers offer taxpayers a free, community-based alternative to commercial tax preparation chains, some of which steer low-income taxpayers into Refund Anticipation Loans, essentially borrowing their own money at high interest rates. Second, considerable evidence demonstrates that VITA centers significantly increase taxpayer compliance. Finally, VITA centers ensure that taxpayers not only claim the benefits of which they are entitled, but that they are also exposed to a variety of financial literacy tools

and savings strategies aimed at helping them build assets for the future.

For these reasons, I have joined Senator SHERROD BROWN in introducing the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Act of 2011, which is focused on expanding the original successes of the VITA program and ensuring the program is brought to a national scale. I urge all my colleagues to join me in this bill, which saves the Federal Government money, pumps money into our communities and gives a fair deal to our working families.

JOHN F. MARTINEZ TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to rise in commendation of John F. Martinez, who has served his country with great honor and dignity during WWII.

Mr. Martinez was born in San Luis, Colorado, in 1917. He worked as a farmer and answered his country's call, enlisting in the US Army at Fort Logan in 1942. There he was assigned to the 358th Infantry Division as squad leader.

The admirable career of Mr. Martinez included campaigns in Normandy, Europe, Africa and the Middle East. Because of his courageous service, Mr. Martinez has received ribbons for each campaign, was awarded a Bronze Star, and received a Purple Heart after being wounded in combat.

Mr. Speaker, John F. Martinez embodies the values of hard work, courage and sacrifice that make this country great. His actions and service are worthy of admiration and praise.

HONORING THE TRINITY CHOIR OF MEN AND BOYS AS THEY CELEBRATE THEIR 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to join the New Haven community in commemorating the 125th Anniversary of the Choir of Men and Boys of Trinity Church. This extraordinary group of gifted adults and children has been in continuous service since its founding and has been nationally and internationally recognized for its talent and service.

With members as young as age eight and ranging to men well into adulthood, the Trinity Choir of Men and Boys is the oldest such choir in Connecticut, one of the oldest in the United States, and one of very few that have been in continuous service since inception. In addition to providing choral music at Trinity worship services, the choir also performs at the Christmas and spring concerts as well as throughout events in the wider community. The dedication and talent of its membership have earned the choir a distinguished reputation and they have regularly appeared with other musical organizations such as the Orchestra of Old Fairfield Academy and the members of the Choir of Christ Church in Greenwich, Connecticut, the Julliard Orchestra, the Boston Philharmonic and the American Classical Orchestra. They have appeared in venues ranging from the Green in New Haven to Carnegie Hall, Lincoln Center, and the White House. The boys of the choir have also performed in the United Kingdom and Italy. They have received well-deserved accolades throughout their history and they continue to make their hometown of New Haven, Connecticut proud.

The youngest of the group have a separate identity as the Trinity Boys Choir and their service to the community is certainly something to be recognized. Their frequent outreach activities have included benefit performances for the Children's Center, Ronald McDonald House, Sage Services, Newington Children's Hospital, the Fair Haven Parents' Ministry, the Smilow Cancer Center, and, most recently, for WFSB Channel 3's annual Joy for Kids Holiday Show at the Hartford Stage. They have sung in the Cathedrals of the British Isles and have been invited to appear at five Christmas time celebrations at the White House. Their talent is remarkable, but it is the commitment they have made to bring the joy of music to some of our most vulnerable citizens that is what makes the choir so special.

Today, with members past and present gathered as their year-long celebration comes to an end, the choir can reflect on their exceptional history and look forward to many more years of acclaimed performances. I consider it a privilege to have this opportunity to join the New Haven community in extending my heartfelt congratulations to the Trinity Men and Boys Choir as they celebrate their 125th anniversary. Under the leadership Music Director Walden Moore, Associate Music Director Andrew Kotylo, and Organ Scholar Benjamin Straley, I have no doubt that the Trinity Choir of Men and Boys will continue to bring distinctive and unique performances to our community and others across the world.

HONOR FLIGHT CHICAGO PROGRAM

HON. RANDY HULTGREN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor all the World War II veterans, but especially our distinguished guests from the Honor Flight Chicago Program. This noble program enables hundreds of Veterans from the Chicago area to come visit the memorial built to honor their great service and courage, and I have the great privilege of welcoming them to Washington DC.

We all have a special appreciation for our veterans because we know the sacrifices they made to protect us and bring peace to a world ravaged by war. These servicemen answered our nation's call during one of its greatest times of need. These brave Americans risked life and limb, gave service and sacrificed much, all while embodying what it is to be a hero. We owe them our deepest gratitude and thanks for protecting and ensuring our future.

I welcome these brave veterans to Washington and to their memorial. I am proud to submit the names of these men for all to see, hear, recognize, and I call on my colleagues to rise and join me in expressing thanks.

Joseph Bialek, Stephen Bobic, George Bosy, Norman Breyer, Ralph Brockman, Peter Broustis, Simon Bult, Joseph Burke, Joseph Buzinski, Ingemar Carlson, John Carlson, James Carson, John Casper, George Charnas, Lehman Cheshier, William Corrigan, Raymond Craig, John DeHesus, Arthur DeLorenzo, Cyril Diskin, James Doheny, Raymond Donovan, William Doyle, John Dryja, Eileen DuPont, Willard Duvall, Irving Ellis, Robert Elmer, Robert Engdahl, Charles Ettner, Guy Franzese, Julian Friedman, William Froelke, Alfred Galuszka, Olaf Gjovik, Norman Goone, Lester Guenther, Gilbert Hancock, Robert Heinzen, Vernon Hill, Donald Hintz, Andrew Hitzelberger, Rick Jimenez, James Kinnard, Fred Klooster, Alfred Koszyk, Guenther Krieger, Walter Krulac, Andrew Kwinn, Lloyd Lage, Seymour Laurie, John Lavelle, Thomas Leo, Irving Lerner, James Letarte, Marcel Levesque, C. Russel Lockwood, Joseph Mann, John Marias, Richard Martial, Marvin McGreal, Marion Mitchell, Edward Moran, William Nicholson, John Oberholz, Louis Olmetti, David Perlman, Richard Pevitts, John Plisky, Joseph Pratl, Emil Pribula, George Renner, Arthur Reynders, William Rjeker, Robert Riplow, Frank Rock, James Rossi, Edward Ryan, Charles Sauer, Donald Schoo, Robert Shields, Edward Siessmann, Paul Sternfeld, Howard Surrett, Leonard Sytsma, Anthony Thomas, Robert Tinucci, John Torhan, Eugene Tronvig, Howard Vander Meer, Robert Vehlow, Dorothy Vesely, Lawrence Wallach, Frank Washburn, Albert Wiener, Elmer Wilhelm, Robert Winscott, Theodore Woytowicz, Joseph Zajac, Richard Zidek, and Henry Westrop.

HONORING CHIEF ROBERT FINN

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor the service of an outstanding public servant in the 24th Congressional District of Texas. Police Chief Robert Finn is a hard working, family-oriented individual who has served the Southlake area selflessly throughout his personal and professional life. Chief Finn is retiring after 24 years of public service with the City of Southlake.

Chief Finn graduated from Grand Canyon University in Phoenix, Arizona, with a bachelor's degree of Public Safety Administration and an Executive Masters of Business Administration. In 2001, Chief Finn also graduated from the FBI National Academy. He has been married to his wife, Monica, for eight years and has two children.

In 1987, Chief Finn began his career in public safety as a Firefighter EMT-Paramedic for the city of Southlake. In 2002, he was appointed as the Southlake Fire Chief, and in 2008 he became Chief of the Southlake Police Department.

During his tenure as a public servant, Chief Finn assisted in the completion of the beautiful Southlake Department of Public Safety headquarters. Chief Finn developed strong relationships with neighboring cities, Keller and

Colleyville, for joint cooperation in jail and dispatch services. He created and implemented a career guide to improve the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the command staff and supervisors in a successful effort to secure a safer community.

Chief Finn has received numerous awards and recognitions throughout his career. In 1993, Chief Finn was recognized as Southlake Firefighter of the Year, and in 1995 he received the Southlake DPS Director's Award for Excellence. As a member of the community, Chief Finn's leadership has been recognized by the Southlake Rotary Club as 2007 Rotarian of Year and Southlake Chamber of Commerce as 2008 Southlake Citizen of the Year.

Chief Finn has also served as a leader in many of the Southlake community organizations. He was the President of the Texas Association of Law Enforcement Planners from 2000–2001, Peer Assessor for the Commission of Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies from 2000–2005, FBI National Academy Alumni Association member since 2001, Peer Assessor and Team Leader of the Center for Public Safety Excellence since 2006, Rotarian since 2004 and President from 2006–2007, Advisory Board Member for Southlake Art in the Square since 2008, Board of Trustee Member of Metroport Meals on Wheels since 2010, and Advisory Board Member of Kids Matter International since 2011.

On behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Chief Finn for his 24 years of public service to the City of Southlake.

HONORING STACIE AND KEN PODOS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Congregation Shaaray Israel of Monroe, NY, will honor Stacie and Ken Podos at their Journal Dinner Dance on June 12, 2011 for their long-time dedication to the congregation. Stacie and Ken are deeply involved in the synagogue and have held various leadership positions within the congregation.

Ken, a sales representative for J.K.J. Sales, Inc., currently serves as Chairman of Shaaray Israel's Board, and until recently was President of the congregation. Before his term as President, Ken began as financial secretary at Shaaray Israel, eventually moving on to serve as third, second and first Vice President. In addition to his work at the congregation, Ken is active on the Jewish Federation of Rockland's Board of Trustees.

Stacie, like her husband, is a leader in the congregation. She currently serves as chairperson of Shaaray Israel's Dedication Committee and is the incoming Vice-President of the Sisterhood. In addition to her work within the congregation, Stacie was heavily involved in the construction and design of the synagogue's new building. Trained at the Fashion Institute of Technology, Stacie is an interior designer by trade and helped decide on the materials and look of the synagogue.

Ken's and Stacie's commitment to the Jewish community extends beyond their congregation. They are actively involved in the Jewish Community Center of Long Beach Island, and serve on various national Jewish organizations. Ken and Stacie have been honored with the Tree of Life Award from Israel Bonds and serve as Solidarity Founders and Keepers of the Gate for Hadassah. Stacie, who has been a member of Hadassah for 24 years, also holds a position on the organization's national board.

Ken and Stacie are proud parents of Jordan, Kimberly, and Jared and are expecting their first grandchild this September. They have made outstanding contributions to their community through their involvement and dedication to Jewish issues, and I congratulate them on this honor they so richly deserve.

WILLIAM R. THURSTON TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to businessman, community philanthropist, and courageous WWII and Korean War hero, William R. Thurston.

While studying for a geology degree at Harvard University, Mr. Thurston trained to fly torpedo bombers for the Navy after Pearl Harbor. He was awarded the Air Medal 11 times and the Distinguished Flying Cross three times for his bravery while flying missions in the Pacific and over Japan.

Mr. Thurston put his geology degree to use, working for Sun Oil Co. between WWII and the Korean War, and for an independent oilman in Denver after the Korean War.

Mr. Thurston moved to Durango in 1977 with his wife Beatrice, where he became involved in the local arts scene and was an avid supporter of community theater. Lovers of live-music, the Thurstons founded Four corners Opera in 1980, and also became sponsors of Music in the Mountains, organizers for the Raise the Roof concert series, and participants in many other community endeavors.

Mr. Thurston's community involvement also included efforts to preserve and protect the rich history of the Four Corners area, and educate others about the region and its people. He supported the founding of the Crow Canyon Archaeological Center in 1983, with the hope of sharing his great enthusiasm for the area's remarkable past, precious artifacts, and cultural significance with others.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise and pay tribute to the inspiring life of of William R. Thurston. Colorado was fortunate to benefit from his tremendous spirit and lifetime of community service.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF ALPHONSE ''AL'' G. CONDON, JR.

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to rise today to recognize the life of Alphonse ''Al'' G. Condon, Jr.

The people of Northwest Florida have come to associate the name Al Condon with the terms honest, hardworking and benevolent. For 45 years, Mr. Condon practiced law with the Emmanuel, Sheppard and Condon law firm where he demonstrated these traits while serving his community. Mr. Condon, born in Pensacola, graduated from St. Michael's Catholic School and Pensacola Catholic High School. After receiving a bachelor's degree, Cum Laude, from Vanderbilt University, he joined the United States Marine Corps to serve his country. He then pursued a law degree from the University of Florida College of Law and established himself as a premier trial lawyer.

Civil litigation was not just a practice for Mr. Condon. His passion for justice transpired from the courtroom into his daily activities as well and is evident in his service as a past President of the Escambia-Santa Rosa Bar Association, member of the Board of Governors of The Florida Bar and an emeritus member of the Florida Board of Bar Examiners. Mr. Condon also served as special counsel to former Governor Bob Graham.

The impact Al Condon had on the Northwest Florida community extended far beyond his legal practice. A pivotal leader in the local community, Mr. Condon was actively involved with Big Brothers/Big Sisters, the Development Council of Pensacola Catholic High School, the YMCA, Pensacola Sports Association, and the City of Pensacola Recreation Board. The Catholic Church recognized Mr. Condon's lifetime service to the Diocese of Pensacola-Tallahassee by awarding him the Medal of Honor.

Throughout his life, Al Condon exemplified the Catholic High School motto Pro Deo et Patria and United States Marine Corps motto Semper Fidelis in all he did. His legacy as a man of honor and sacrifice for his community will stand the test of time. Survived by his wife Judy of 48 years, five children, and nine grandchildren, he will forever be remembered by his family as a loving husband, father, and grandfather.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize the life of Al Condon, Jr. of Pensacola, Florida. My wife Vicki and I offer our prayers for his entire family. He will be truly missed by all of us.

HONORING PAUL HIRSCHON

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Paul Hirschon, the Deputy Consul General of Israel to Florida and Puerto Rico for his many years of service to the South Florida Jewish Community, which is being honored this evening by the Jewish Community Relations Council of the Jewish Federation of South Palm Beach County.

Born in London, Mr. Hirschon spent his early life in South Africa and pursued degrees in accounting, law, and business before immigrating to Israel. Upon his move to Israel, Mr. Hischon served in the Israel Defense Forces and worked in the Civil Service.

After a brief time back in England, Mr. Hirschon returned to Israel and spent ten years as a respected businessman in the hi-tech sector, where he focused on developing lasting relationships with businesses throughout the Middle East. However, in 2004, Mr.

Hirschon returned to public service and joined the Foreign Service.

Mr. Hirschon was quickly promoted up the ranks of Israel's Foreign Ministry, working for the Consul General's Office in the Persian Gulf countries before being named the Deputy Consul General of Israel to Florida and Puerto Rico in 2008. It has been an honor working side by side with Mr. Hirschon as Israel and the United States continue advancing our shared core values of freedom, equality, and democracy.

I congratulate Mr. Hirschon for this great honor tonight, and I look forward to many more years of strong partnership with Mr. Hirschon.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. XXXX, ''TO DESIGNATE THE FACILITY OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE LOCATED AT 14901 ADELFA DRIVE IN LA MIRADA, CALIFORNIA, AS THE 'WAYNE GRISHAM POST OFFFICE'.''

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. XXXX, the ''To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14901 Adelfa Drive in La Mirada, California, as the 'Wayne Grisham Post Office'.''

Mr. Wayne Grisham spent a significant portion of his life working for our country. He valiantly served our country as a fighter pilot during World War II and was held as a prisoner of war when his plane was shot down over Germany. Mr. Grisham was awarded the Purple Heart for his courageous service. After the war, an entrepreneurial spirit drove Mr. Grisham to open his own realty business in La Mirada, which he maintained for much of his life.

His dedication to the local community was truly remarkable. Mr. Grisham proudly served the City of La Mirada for over two decades, beginning in 1970 when he was elected to the city council. He continued his service to the community with his election to Congress in 1978 and the California State Assembly in 1984. He also lent his talents to the Peace Corps, serving as Director in Kenya in 1983.

A resident of Long Beach and later La Mirada, and graduate of Whittier College, Wayne Grisham was a longtime leader in the local community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me to honor the service and memory and of this true civic leader.

A TRIBUTE TO NORTH CAROLINA VETERANS PARK

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only to celebrate our nation's 235th birthday, but also to take note of another very special event taking place in the great state of North Carolina. Today in Fayetteville, NC there will be a very special celebration for the dedication of the North Carolina Veterans Park.

Fayetteville, North Carolina has a rich history of supporting our troops and honoring those who choose to serve their country in such an admirable way. Across the state, our military institutions have led the way in protecting our country whether it be from Cherry Point Air Station to Charlotte Air National Guard from Camp Lejeune to U.S. Coast Guard Air Station Elizabeth City, from Fort Bragg and Pope Army Air Field to New River Air Station and Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, from the Military Ocean Terminal at Sunny Point to the Oak Island and Wrightsville Beach Coast Guard Stations. North Carolina has opened its hearts and hands to support those who have made so many sacrifices for all of us.

Today's dedication of the Veterans Park is yet another way that North Carolina can show its appreciation to our men and women in uniform. Just as each generation has continued to protect our freedoms, this park exemplifies why North Carolina continues to hold the designation as the ''Most Military Friendly State.''

The NC Veterans Park will be a place of remembrance, and it further solidifies the commitment that North Carolina and its citizens have to the military and to all veterans. Today, our state affirms its gratitude for the men and women who have sacrificed in protecting the freedoms of this great nation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to offer some words from General Douglas MacArthur, who understood the commitment of those who choose to serve and the honor that they bestow upon this great nation by doing so.

> The soldier above all others prays for peace, for it is the soldier who must suffer and bear the deepest wounds and scars of war. Therefore, let no man [be] entitled to the blessings of freedom unless he be vigilant in its preservation.

Veterans; the people of North Carolina dedicate this park in honor of your service. God Bless you all and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING PASTOR ROBERT E. SMITH, SR. AND MOTHER GILDA J. SMITH

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pastor Robert E. Smith, Sr. and his wife, Mother Gilda J. Smith, as they retire from the White Cloud Empowerment Center Church of God in Christ after 45 years ministering to the people in White Cloud and Flint, Michigan.

Pastor Smith and his wife Gilda were married in 1960 after he completed a tour of duty in the United States Air Force. Gilda graduated from the Hurley Hospital School of Nursing the following year and Robert went to work at Delphi. During this time they sustained a lifetime of ministry, calling individuals to live in Christ Jesus. Their ministry has taken them throughout the country but the focus has been in the State of Michigan. Pastor Smith and Mother Gilda have walked the streets of several communities giving prayer and encouragement to the people they meet. They have reached out to youth, the homeless, and the disaffected. As the pastor of the White Cloud Empowerment Center Church of God in Christ they have traveled every week from Flint to White Cloud to hold services and minister to the people of that community. In addition, Pastor Smith has served his jurisdiction as Assistant State Sunday School Superintendent, District Superintendent (on 3 occasions), State Sunday School Superintendent, Chairman of Auxiliaries-in-Ministry, and presently serves as Administrative Assistant to Bishop P.A. Brooks, Jurisdictional Prelate, who is also 1st Assistant presiding Bishop of the Church of God in Christ.

Their three sons are all ministers and they have five grandchildren. Retired from their jobs at Delphi and Hurley Medical Center, Pastor Smith and Mother Gilda continue to encourage and bring spiritual healing to their many ''adopted children'' throughout our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Pastor Robert E. Smith, Sr. and Mother Gilda Smith as they retire from ministry at the White Cloud Empowerment Center, Church of God in Christ and I pray they will find much joy as they enter this next phase of their lives.

HONORING SERGEANT CORNELIUS H. CHARLTON, ''THE HERO OF HILL 543''

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before you in continued celebration of the 60th Anniversary of the Korean war in honor of SGT Cornelius H. Charlton, the Hero of Hill 543. On Saturday, June 11, the Cornelius H. Charlton Memorial Society and the 369th Historical Society celebrate the bravery of Sergeant Charlton by unveiling an exhibition in his honor highlighting his historic exploits on Hill 543, a major battle during the Korean war.

SGT Cornelius H. Charlton is one of 87 African-American Medal of Honor recipients. He was born on July 24, 1929, in East Gulf, West Virginia to Van and Clara Charlton. In 1944, the family moved to the Bronx, New York. Cornelius attended James Monroe High School. After graduation he enlisted in the U.S. Army in 1946. Initially assigned to an engineering group, Sergeant Charlton requested a transfer to an infantry unit and was placed in Company C of the 24th Infantry Regiment, 25th Infantry Division. The 24th Infantry, nicknamed the ''Buffalo Soldiers,'' was the United States Army's last, all-Black, segregated regiment to engage in combat. Sergeant Major Charlton volunteered for frontline duty for this rear-echelon outfit.

On June 2, 1951, near the village of Chipori, northeast of Seoul, Korea, Sergeant Charlton's platoon encountered heavy resistance while attempting to take Hill 543. Taking command after his platoon leader was wounded, he regrouped his men and led an assault against the hill. Wounded by a grenade, Sergeant Charlton refused medical attention and continued to lead the charge. He single

handedly attacked and disabled the last remaining enemy gun emplacement, suffering another grenade wound in the process. Sergeant Charlton succumbed to his wounds and died after he knocked out two Chinese machine guns guarding Hill 543. The North Korean and Communist Red troops had stalled United Nations troop advance for three days.

Prior to that tragic battle, and ultimate sacrifice, Sergeant Charlton was recommended for a battlefield commission by his Commander. On February 12, 1952, for his actions during the battle, he was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor and the Purple Heart.

After his death, Sergeant Charlton's body was returned to the United States and buried in his mother's family burial place in Virginia. According to family members and other veterans, Sergeant Charlton was not buried at Arlington National Cemetery because of his race. The Army later stated he was not buried at Arlington because of an administrative oversight. In 1989, the Medal of Honor Society discovered Sergeant Charlton's burial site in poor condition; and in 1990 re-interred his remains at the American Legion Cemetery in Beckley, West Virginia. Finally, on November 12, 2008, Sergeant Charlton was finally re-interred at Arlington National Cemetery.

The Cornelius H. Charlton Memorial Society, Inc., CHCMS, a non-profit organization, was founded in 2010 by the family and friends of SGT Cornelius H. Charlton. Sergeant Charlton, a member of Company C, 24th Infantry Regiment, 25th Infantry Division, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor during the Korean war, 1950–1953. The mission of CHCMS is to preserve the heroic legacy of Sergeant Charlton, while also promoting his character and leadership qualities to young people through its college scholarship fund.

The 369th Historical Society Museum is housed in the 369th Regimental Armory, home of the famous Harlem Hellfighters. The 369th Historical Society is an all volunteer non-profit 501 (c) 3 organization, chartered by the New York State Board of Regents. Established in 1960 to collect, preserve and maintain artifacts, books, papers, photographs, film and articles on the history of the 369th Regiment, its allies and affiliates, and of African American soldiers who served in the Military Service of the United States. The Museum's holdings consist of an extensive collection of photographs and artifacts of the 369th soldiers from WWI to the present.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join two very grateful nations in honor and in memory of our American hero, Medal of Honor and Purple Heart recipient, SGT Cornelius H. Charlton, as we continue to celebrate and remember the 60th Anniversary of the Korean war.

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA ARGONAUTS BASEBALL TEAM AS THE 2011 NCAA DIVISION II NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of West Florida's baseball team on becoming the 2011 NCAA Division II National Champions.

Saturday, June 4, 2011 was a proud day to be wearing green and blue. Over 700 miles from home, the USA Baseball National Training Complex was filled with Argonaut spirit. After a remarkable season of 52–9, the University of West Florida baseball team scored a National Championship, bringing home the first national NCAA title for UWF.

Under the direction of Head Coach and former Argo player Mike Jeffcoat, the impressive victory of 12–2 against Winona State showcased not only his leadership, but also the determination of these young athletes. Through their unwavering dedication and teamwork, these young men earned the title of national champions and have made Northwest Florida proud. Their inspiration and victory was a grand slam not only for the team, but for the University and the entire Gulf Coast.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I congratulate the University of West Florida Argonauts for their outstanding accomplishments. My wife Vicki joins me in offering our best wishes to the team, coaches, faculty, and students at the University of West Florida for their continued success.

HONORING 50 YEARS OF EXEMPLARY SERVICE BY THE FILIPINO LADIES ASSOCIATION OF GUAM

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Filipino Ladies Association of Guam (FLAG) for their years of exemplary service to our community. Founded in 1962, FLAG has worked to foster unity and friendship amongst Filipinas throughout Guam by promoting the traditions and values of the Filipino culture. The organization has also worked to address the needs of our island community through volunteer services.

For 50 years, FLAG has been instrumental in contributing to our local community through volunteer efforts, educational assistance, and fundraising projects for local charities. FLAG has contributed to national charities such as the American Red Cross, American Cancer Society, Salvation Army, and local non-profit organizations such as Erica's House Family Visitation Center, Alee Shelter, Sanctuary Incorporated, Carmelite Sisters, the University of Guam, and our local hospital. FLAG's efforts have been an asset our community, especially for our island's women and children.

I congratulation the Filipino Ladies Association of Guam on their 50th Anniversary, and I commend them for their years of humanitarian service and efforts in helping Guam's community. I also commend the efforts of the Board of Trustees, executive officers, members, and volunteers who have dedicated and contributed their time in promoting Filipino culture and values over the last five decades. I look forward to many more years of service as we commemorate the hard work and contributions of the Filipino Ladies Association of Guam.

HONORING HARRIET BEECHER STOWE ON HER BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of one of our nation's most influential and eminent women authors, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and it is with great pride that I rise today to join Connecticut's Harriet Beecher Stowe Center in recognizing this remarkable milestone as well as celebrate this Connecticut daughter's life and distinguished career.

Harriet Beecher Stowe was the most famous American woman of the 19th century and what earned her that status was her best-selling, anti-slavery novel Uncle Tom's Cabin. What you may not know is that she made her home in Hartford, Connecticut, and with neighbors including Mark Twain, Isabella Beecher, Joseph Hawley, Charles Dudley Warner, and William Gillette, Stowe lived and worked in what was one of the nation's preeminent literary communities.

Uncle Tom's Cabin was and still is an extraordinary story. Through its pages, Stowe brought humanity to slavery in the United States and catapulted the issue to the forefront of the time's political debate. Her informal, conversational style spoke to people, touching them in a way that political speeches and newspaper accounts could not. While there were many contributing factors to the outbreak of the Civil War, it is often said that Uncle Tom's Cabin and the debates that its publication sparked helped 19th century Americans determine what kind of country they wanted. In fact, it is said that upon meeting Stowe in the White House in 1862, President Abraham Lincoln said to her, "So you are the little woman who wrote the book that started the Great War."

Stowe was a prolific writer and Uncle Tom's Cabin may have been her most famous work but it was certainly not her only book. In fact, over her lifetime, she wrote more than 30 books and novels. Her broad range of interests resulted in such varied publications as children's text books, advice books on homemaking and child rearing as well as biographies and religious studies. In each of her works, Stowe's unique style encouraged discussion among everyday people and those ranged from slavery to religious reform to gender roles. Though overshadowed by her most famous of works, Stowe's ability to influence public debate on a variety of controversial topics and the influence she had on shaping public opinion is undeniable.

Today, the Harriet Beecher Stowe Center, located in Hartford, Connecticut, uses Stowe's life story and work to inspire social justice and positive change with programs and initiatives that reach thousands across the world. In Connecticut, we are proud to call Harriet Beecher Stowe our First Lady of Literature and we could not be more proud to celebrate her life, her work, and her invaluable contributions to our society. Two hundred years after her birth, Harriet Beecher Stowe's life continues to inspire the belief that each of us can make a difference in the world—that one person, using their talent and determination, can create change.

TRIBUTE TO DONNIE A. BRYANT

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. JOHNSON, of Georgia. Mr. Speaker,

Whereas, Twenty two years ago a tenacious man of God accepted his calling to serve in the corporate world of South Central Bell, BellSouth and AT&T; and

Whereas, Mr. Donnie A. Bryant began his career in 1981 serving in various positions with the company and serving in various cities in the United States, cities such as Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana, New Orleans, Louisiana, Birmingham, Alabama, Conyers, Georgia and Atlanta, Georgia; and

Whereas, Mr. Bryant has shared his time and talents, giving the citizens of our District a friend to help those in need, a community leader and a servant to all who wants to insure that the system works for everyone; and

Whereas, Mr. Donnie A. Bryant is a cornerstone in our community that has enhanced the lives of thousands for the betterment of our District and Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mr. Donnie A. Bryant on his retirement from AT&T and to wish him well in his new endeavors;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR. do hereby proclaim June 5, 2011 as

Mr. Donnie A. Bryant Day

in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 5th day of June, 2011.

RECOGNIZING DR. MARION J. BROOKS AND THE NAMING OF THE DR. MARION J. BROOKS BUILDING

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of Dr. Marion Jackson Brooks, an individual fondly known as "Dr. Jack," a name not only synonymous with medical care among Fort Worth's African-American community, but also the community at large. As a lifelong resident of the City of Fort Worth, he was a devoted family man, a generous and caring physician, a tireless advocate for social justice and a steadfast friend. His legacy of community service has been immortalized in Fort Worth through the naming of the Tarrant County Health Building in his honor.

Jack Brooks was the third of four boys born to Roy and Eula Brooks, graduating from I.M. Terrell High School in 1936. A born leader, he became commander of the ROTC while attending Prairie View A & M College, a service that presaged his role in World War II as an army First Lieutenant.

On Christmas Day, 1945, Jack married the former Marie Louise Norris and shortly thereafter moved to Washington D.C. where he received an honorable discharge and enrolled in Medical School at Howard University. He graduated 5th in the medical school class in 1951 and returned to Fort Worth with his wife and four children to begin practicing medicine in Fort Worth's black business district.

From this vantage point, he recognized the broad needs of his community beyond the delivery and access to quality health care and encouraged and helped politically organize the African-American community through dissemination of information, programs, voter registration and organization.

Dr. Brooks worked toward expanding access and equality for his community. Initiatives he worked and advocated for included integration of Fort Worth's hospitals and public school district, serving as co-founder and the first president of the Sickle Cell Anemia Association of Texas, and service on boards and commissions devoted to his alma mater, Prairie View. Additionally he worked to expand economic opportunities as head of the local Urban League chapter and toward expanding political empowerment as a founding organizer of the Tarrant County Precinct Workers Council.

He expanded his medical practice with his brother Donald through the establishment of the Brooks Clinic in Fort Worth's Morningside Community, a full-service medical facility in the heart of the African-American community. In this neighborhood he and his wife established a home for what had now expanded to a family of five children and organized the Morningside United Methodist Church in their living room in 1962. From this foundation he served over 30 years as Sunday school teacher.

Dr. Brooks also contributed to the McDonald Branch Y.M.C.A., Free and Accepted Masons-Prince Hall, Ft. Worth Chamber of Commerce, the Ft. Worth Symphony Orchestra and served as the first African-American member of the Parks and Recreation Board of the City of Ft. Worth. He was also a professional affiliate of the Tarrant county Medical Society, American Association of Family Practice Physicians, and the National Medical Association. He was also a member of the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, NAACP and SNCC.

Through his medical practice and his life, Dr. Brooks remained committed to the underrepresented and underprivileged. He accepted his role of service as a physician within the African-American community and broadened the responsibility to speak out for the rights of its citizens as an elder statesman, impacting the lives before closing his story of service to God, family and community on March 3, 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Dr. Brooks contributions to the City of Fort Worth and to celebrate the naming of the Dr. Marion J. Brooks Building. He has enriched the city, county and state which I am honored to represent.

HONORING SUKANYA ROY

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, Miss Sukanya Roy, to celebrate her victory in the Scripps National Spelling Bee. Sue, as she is more commonly known, is currently an eighth grader at Abington Heights Middle School. She lives in South Abington Township with her father Abhi Roy, a professor at Scranton University, and her mother Mousumi Roy, a professor at the Pennsylvania State University.

Sue is an avid member of her school's Ecology Club and plays the violin in the school orchestra. Outside of academia, Sue enjoys indoor rock climbing, ice skating, and playing the piano. She is also fluent in Bengali and keeps in touch with her heritage by traveling to India every summer.

This was the third consecutive year that Sue participated in the National Spelling Bee, having finished in the top twenty in previous years. This year Sue said she knew every word and did not guess once. Sue was crowned this year's champion after correctly spelling "CYMOTRICHOUS," a word of Greek origin relating to having wavy hair.

Although she is just about to enter high school, Sue wants to pursue a career in International Relations and hopes to bring an end to world poverty and hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sukanya Roy and ask my colleagues to join me in praising her achievement as the 84th Scripps National Spelling Bee Champion.

IN HONOR OF JENNEFER LLOYD SANTEE WINEMAN

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Jennefer Lloyd Santee Wineman. Jennefer was a gracious, loving and strikingly beautiful woman who generously gave her time and talents in an effort to better the lives of those around her whom she loved. She passed away on November 26, 2010.

Jennefer was born on May 15, 1931 in Montreal Canada, but soon moved to Carmel, California where she later became a proud U.S. citizen. In the beautiful backdrop of cypress trees and glowing sunsets, Jennefer flourished and graduated from Carmel High School in 1949 earning the "Gold C" award, which was given to an outstanding scholastic female student. It was during my years at Carmel High School that I really became close with Jennefer, through her younger sister Cindy. Following Carmel High, Jennefer attended Stanford University where she met Nathaniel Baylis and they soon were married. Jennefer and "Nat" were blessed with two wonderful sons, Owen and Lloyd. Those closest to her have said that her most natural and intuitive gift was that of being a wonderful, caring mother.

In addition to being a loving wife and mother, Jennefer helped pioneer a revolutionary form of education. She became a teacher at the Charles Armstrong School for the dyslexic, a school which specifically caters to the needs of children who require a different method of teaching. Education became Jennefer's passion and led her to play a pivotal role in the establishment of Chartwell School in Carmel. Through her dedication to improving the lives of her students and their families, Jennefer molded Chartwell school into one of the premier special education institutions. After completing her long held dream of providing Chartwell with its own independent campus, families from across America began to relocate to the Central Coast just to have their

children attend. Chartwell graduates have gone on to very successful careers in many fields, adding to the strength of our country. As Margaret Mead said, "never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever does". Jennefer and the Chartwell School did change the worlds of many young people for the better.

Not only a brilliant educator, Jennefer was the guiding light for the Lloyd family, a family which will be celebrating the anniversary of its 100th year in Carmel this coming July. She loved her family and cherished her family's history. She set to work tracing her lineage and eventually joined the Daughters of the Revolution, in which her membership remained an integral part of her life. She challenged her family just as she did her students, to overstep the insurmountable and to take what you want from life with tenacity; she was the catalyst that lit the fire.

Jennefer's bright smile and positive outlook helped her see the good in everyone around her and she had the ability to always bring the best qualities of a person to light. Her friends and family have many stories of how Jennefer encouraged them to try again, to gain new skills and reinvent themselves. As a friend of Jennefer's, I truly believe the she took to heart the song, "Over the Rainbow." She believed "the dreams that you dare to dream really do come true."

Christmas was Jennefer's favorite holiday because it was a time for the entire family to be together and a special time to give thanks for the wonderful things in life. If you were to ask her what she wanted for Christmas, the answer was always the same, "peace on earth".

Mr. Speaker, Jennefer Lloyd Santee Wineman always put others before herself and dedicated her life to serving her community and family. She was so beautiful, caring and remarkable and I know that one day, on the other side of the rainbow, where skies are blue, and where troubles melt like lemon drops, that is where I'll find her.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman CULBERSON and Ranking Member BISHOP for bringing the FY 2012 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill to the floor today. This bill provides funding that is critical to the strength and the well-being of our military, and supports the education and training of our veterans, construction of Department of Defense hospitals, schools and family housing.

The bill provides a total of $143.9 billion in FY 2012, of which $69.5 billion is mandatory funding for pensions and other benefits administered by the Veterans Benefit Administration. This funding will support service-connected compensation programs that help an estimated 4 million veterans, survivors and dependents and makes pension payments to 507,000 veterans and survivors.

The bill also provides $60.2 billion in discretionary funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs and $14 billion for military construction and family housing. This includes funds for inpatient care and treatment of beneficiaries in 152 hospitals, 101 domiciliary residential rehabilitation treatment programs, 133 nursing homes, 300 Vet Centers, 50 mobile Vet Centers and 807 outpatient clinics, which include independent, satellite, community-based and rural outreach clinics.

Our nation's servicemembers and veterans and their families deserve the best quality care and support available. This measure helps to fund the programs and benefits they have earned for their service and sacrifice.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of the bill.

THE BETHLEHEM GRANGE NUMBER 121

HON. CHRISTOPHER S. MURPHY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Bethlehem Grange on their 120th anniversary. The Bethlehem Grange Number 121 is one of nearly sixty National Grange chapters in the state of Connecticut. On January 6, 1891, the Bethlehem Grange was organized by 24 charter members. Through the years, the Bethlehem Grange has grown substantially, having at one point over 150 members. The Bethlehem Grange has maintained a strong commitment to the rural communities of northwestern Connecticut.

The Bethlehem Grange has a rich history of promoting family farming and community service in rural Connecticut. In 1891 the Bethlehem Grange sponsored their first Grange Fair in the Town Hall. The fair has grown and expanded since then, eventually becoming the popular Bethlehem Fair, which I've had the pleasure of attending numerous times over the years.

The Bethlehem Grange is committed to fostering a deeply-rooted sense of community. In addition to their monthly activities, the Grange supports their local food bank, donates dictionaries to the local elementary school, and provides scholarships to local high school students. Their dedication to civic responsibility doesn't end there: the Bethlehem Grange holds an annual community flea market and participates in the Adopt-A-Road program.

Over its 120 years of existence, the Bethlehem Grange has done its part to preserve the cherished historical character of northwestern Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can all learn from the Bethlehem Grange's dedication to fellowship and service, and so I ask my colleagues to join with me, and the people of Bethlehem, in recognizing the Bethlehem Grange Number 121 on their 120th anniversary.

RECOGNIZING SAM GILLIAM

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Sam Gilliam, a world-renowned artist, an innovative leader in artistic expression, and a resident of the District of Columbia. Sam Gilliam's work has been acclaimed throughout our nation. We now ask the Congress of the United States to officially recognize Sam Gilliam as well.

Born in Tupelo, Mississippi, Sam has spent most of his distinguished career as a resident of the nation's capitol. Through the guidance and encouragement of his elementary school teachers, Sam discovered his interest in painting and artistic expression while growing up in Louisville, Kentucky. After graduating from Central High School in Louisville, Sam earned a bachelor of arts degree in fine arts and a master's degree in painting at the University of Louisville. He taught in Louisville public schools and served in the United States Army.

Sam Gilliam's work is distinctive in its creative artistry, using bright, piercing colors (which solidified his place at the Washington Color School), distorting geometric shapes, and displaying unframed painted canvases, enabling the work of art and background to blend as one.

As a member of the Smithsonian Art Collectors Program, Sam has produced several pieces to benefit arts education programs at the Smithsonian Institution, including In Celebration, 1987 and Museum Moment, 2009. In 2005, the District's prestigious Corcoran Gallery of Art honored Sam with a retrospective exhibition that highlighted his artistic achievements. Sam's first solo exhibition was featured in the District's Jefferson Place Gallery, and the current exhibition of his work at two premiere galleries in the city, the Philips Collection and the Katzen Center at American University, indicate continuing appreciation of his unique pieces. Sam has been awarded numerous honorary degrees, and his work has been featured throughout the world, including the National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC; Tate Gallery, London; Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, Washington, DC; Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, OH; and the Musée d'Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris, Paris, France. Sam's new piece for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's (Metro) Art-in-Transit Program, From a Model to a Rainbow, is being displayed at the Metro underpass at 4th and Cedar Street, NW near Takoma Station. I will be among the guests to recognize Sam on Saturday, June 11, 2011, at Takoma Station.

The District of Columbia and its residents are particularly grateful for Sam Gilliam's work in developing the next generation of artists by mentoring and teaching art classes to DC Public Schools students. His studio is located in the historic Shaw neighborhood, an area of the city known for its diverse forms of music, dance, and culture.

For a lifetime of achievements and for continuing contributions to the arts, as recognized throughout the nation and the world, I ask the House to join me in celebrating the uniquely distinctive place of Sam Gilliam in the arts.

IN HONOR OF LANCE CORPORAL NICHOLAS O'BRIEN

HON. SUE WILKENS MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life of Lance Corporal Nicholas O'Brien—a Marine from Stanley, NC, who was killed in action while serving our country in Afghanistan. He had just turned 21 two weeks earlier.

Nic—as he was known to family and friends—entered the United States Marine Corps knowing the risks, but also knowing that he had a calling to serve our country.

From a young age, he knew he wanted to be a Marine, and even turned down scholarships to continue playing baseball—he was a star player at East Gaston High School, from which he graduated in 2008.

Lance Corporal Nic O'Brien is what his father calls ''a true American hero in every sense of the word.'' He's right.

There is no way that we can adequately thank our men and women in uniform all for their service and sacrifice to protect our freedoms. The thoughts and prayers of our entire Nation are with them—those who have bravely served, and the families of those whose ultimate sacrifice will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our deepest thanks and condolences to the O'Brien family and to everyone who knew Nic—a true American hero.

REGARDING THE LEGENDARY JIMMY HEATH, RECIPIENT OF THE 2011 DC JAZZ FESTIVAL LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues know of my passion for jazz music. This original American art form has played an influential role in my life and is as integral to my District as Motown and automobiles. As such, it has been my pleasure to support and promote the music over my many years in Washington.

I am proud to be an original supporter of the 7-year old DC Jazz Festival, now the largest music festival in the Nation's Capital. It has truly been a pleasure to be a part of this event and all it offers the District and the Nation—from great year-round jazz programming to real educational partnerships with the DC public schools. Truly, the DC Jazz Festival demonstrates that equality, inclusion and democratic values stand at the heart of jazz music.

Since its inception in 2005, the DC Jazz Festival honors living legends each year with a Lifetime Achievement Award. Past recipients include Dave Brubeck, Dr. Billy Taylor, Clark Terry, Hank Jones, Buck Hill, George Wein, Ellis Marsalis and James Moody. Today I rise to add my words of congratulations to the most recent jazz legend to receive this honor—Mr. Jimmy Heath.

The second oldest brother of the legendary Heath Brothers, Jimmy Heath has long been recognized as a virtuoso instrumentalist, and magnificent composer and arranger. He has performed on more than 100 recordings with his own groups, as well as with jazz icons such as Dizzy Gillespie, James Moody, and Miles Davis, to name just a few. Nicknamed ''Little Bird'' due to his similarities in saxophone style to Charlie ''Bird Parker,'' Mr. Heath has written more than 125 compositions, many of which have become jazz standards. Mr. Heath has also long understood the importance of educating the next generation jazz musician. A preeminent educator, he directed the jazz program at Queens College in New York for over twenty years. Jimmy Heath was also a panelist at my 1987 Congressional Black Caucus Foundation Jazz Forum entitled: ''Jazz a Family Tradition.'' He talked about his experience growing up in a household with two brothers who also became world renowned jazz musicians: Percy Heath, and Albert ''Tootie'' Heath.

Jimmy Heath has served on the Board of the Louis Armstrong Archives housed at Queens College, and taught at renowned institutions, including New York's famed Jazzmobile, Housatonic College, the City College of New York, and The New School for Social Research. Recipient of the 2003 NEA Jazz Masters Award, we celebrate Jimmy Heath's enduring achievements and contributions to our nation's singular original art form.

Today, I am proud to honor this American living legend and pass on my congratulations for a job well done and an award well deserved.

HONORING KARL BAUER

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of Karl Bauer who passed away on February 16, 2011. For many years, he served as an active member of the Greater Independence Park Neighborhood Association and a source of joy for all those who knew him.

As a young man, Mr. Bauer escaped from East Germany and arrived in Chicago in 1957. He brought with him tremendous skill as a machinist and worked in several small shops throughout the city over the course of his life.

After marrying Edith Bauer, the love of his life, the two bought a house at the corner of Byron and Hamlin in the center of the 5th Congressional District. This house served as a source of pride and happiness for Mr. Bauer and came to be a model of excellence for the rest of the neighborhood. He soon became active in his new community, joined GIPNA and, in the words of his neighbors, served as ''a familiar and loveable presence.'' Always willing to help, he acted as a dependable block representative and made sure to greet neighbors at the pancake breakfast every year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering Karl Bauer and his commitment to improving and supporting his neighborhood. His work has touched the lives of many in his community, and his contributions will be greatly missed.

IN HONOR OF THE REVEREND JOHN KEVIN RING

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Father John Kevin Ring, who on June 12, 2011 will celebrate his Golden Jubilee of priestly service in San Francisco, California.

I join my fellow parishioners in profound gratitude for Father Ring's service as Pastor of St. Vincent de Paul Church and St. Vincent de Paul School, both which have flourished with his guidance over the past 24 years.

Father John Ring was born in San Francisco and grew up in St. Anne's Parish in the Sunset district. He entered the seminary at St. Joseph's College in Mountain View and continued his studies for the Priesthood at St. Patrick's Seminary in Menlo Park. Father Ring was ordained a priest on June 10, 1961 at St. Mary's Cathedral and began his first assignment at the Most Holy Redeemer Parish in San Francisco. He served at St. Patrick's in Larkspur, St. Matthew's in San Mateo, St. Brigid's in San Francisco and Mater Dolorosa Church in South San Francisco before being appointed by Archbishop Quinn in 1986 to serve as fifth Pastor of St Vincent de Paul Church in San Francisco.

St. Vincent de Paul Catholic Church was founded in 1901, also called the ''Church of Cow Hollow'' for its oldest neighborhood, ''Church of the Exposition'' for the Panama Pacific International Exposition that took place largely in the Marina District and the ''Church of the Earthquakes'' since it withstood both of San Francisco's big earthquakes.

The 1989 earthquake was a momentous event in the history of the St. Vincent de Paul parish because much of the damage was sustained in the Marina District, including considerable structural damage to the church itself. On the Friday following the earthquake Archbishop John Quinn offered mass at the church. Father Ring presided over the church's renovation which was celebrated at the Feast of St. Vincent de Paul on September 27, 1991. Both the new altar and the new pipe organ were dedicated by Archbishop Quinn in 1993.

As Pastor of St. Vincent de Paul Church, Father Ring stressed the need to involve the laity in decision and policy making. During his Pastorate there were many beginnings, including a mass for young adults, a group of Home Visitors to care for the sick and homebound in the parish, and beyond, and girls were allowed to be altar servers.

Father Ring formed a Parish Finance Committee and worked to stabilize St. Vincent de Paul School that has become a highly regarded parochial school in San Francisco.

The individuals and families in Father Ring's parish have been blessed with a Pastor who has strengthened their church and school, built community, and inspired their love for service and their love for God.

On a personal note, my husband Paul's parents John and Corinne Pelosi became parishioners of St. Vincent de Paul in the 1930s and our family has had a relationship with this parish for over 70 years. Although Father Ring will be retiring he will long be an inspiration to our family.

IN RECOGNITION OF HONDA NORTH AMERICA'S OPERATIONS BACK UP BY AUGUST 2011

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the people of Honda by including an editorial below from The Daily Home on May 28th about their resilience after the tragedies in Japan.

It is very good news that Honda expects all its North American operations to be back to full speed by August and that includes its Lincoln plant where three of its most popular vehicles are assembled.

The March earthquake and tsunami in Japan severely hampered Honda's supply chain and ended up costing the giant automaker months of production as it faced difficult and at times insurmountable obstacles to getting supplies from Japan to North America.

Without those supplies, cars could not be built.

As time passed, the supply chain opened up a bit, and then a little more.

But not too long ago Honda officials (along with other Japanese automakers) were expecting a late fall date for full production to resume.

Last week, however, the company announced it wouldn't take that long.

''Honda will increase production volume at its North America automobile plants to a rate of 100 percent original production plan in August,'' a company press release announced.

Honda's employees in Lincoln met the news with enthusiasm.

''Today we announced to our associates in plant-wide meetings that we are planning to accelerate recovery of our production. . . .'' said Mark Morrison, a company spokesman. ''When we announced that the Odyssey and Pilot would reach 100 percent of their original production plan in August, our associates greeted the news with great applause,'' he said.

That kind of reaction is what you would expect from Honda employees. The 4,000 people who work in the local plant are intensely loyal and, based on the plant's expansion since opening, also are very productive.

That loyalty and productivity have been rewarded with a unique approach to the forced slowdown in production. Rather than lay off workers, Honda allowed them to work on maintenance chores, or to take earned vacation time to keep their paychecks coming. And after the April 27 tornadoes ripped through our area, Honda allowed its employees to take two days per week to volunteer at cleanup activities while getting paid as though they were at work.

Those policies say a lot about Honda and the kind of company it is. And they say a lot about Honda's employees and the kind of people they are.

Honda made it through this parts crisis without laying off a single employee in their North American plants, the company said. Now that they are ready to ramp up production again, those employees are available and their morale should be high, since no one had to do with a reduced paycheck during the difficult times.

The Japanese automaker obviously enjoys great economic strength to be able to weather such a crisis without cutting employee paychecks. We commend Honda for its approach, we continue to wish the company a long and prosperous future in Lincoln and the rest of its North America plants.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLES F. BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 2011, I was on a leave of absence from the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of former Congressman Peter Frelinghuysen. As a result, I did not have the opportunity to vote on rollcall votes 410, 411, and 412. On rollcall vote 410, providing consideration of H. Res. 292 and H. Con. Res. 51, I would have voted in the affirmative. On rollcall vote 411, declaring that the President shall not deploy, establish, or maintain the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya, I would have voted in the affirmative. On rollcall vote 412, directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Libya, I would have voted in the affirmative.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 2011, I was unable to be on the House floor to vote for the three amendments to H.R. 1229. Had I been there, I would have voted as follows: rollcall 299: Polis amendment: ''nay''; rollcall 300: Garamendi amendment: ''nay''; rollcall 301: Markey amendment: ''nay.''

Also, I regretfully inform you I was detained during a vote on May 11, 2011. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall 312: Connolly amendment: ''nay.''

Finally, in addition, I was detained during a vote on May 25, 2011. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall 338: Foxx amendment: ''yea.''

HONORING HARRIET BEECHER STOWE

HON. CHRISTOPHER S. MURPHY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the bicentennial of the birth of Harriet Beecher Stowe. Stowe was born on June 14, 1811, and was an integral figure in the abolition movement. She is best known for her anti-slavery novel Uncle Tom's Cabin—a book that painted a human picture of slavery in the United States.

Her writing stirred an international groundswell of support for abolition. Uncle Tom's Cabin, first serialized in the weekly National Era, became the best-selling book of the 19th century, with 10,000 copies sold in the first week of publication. In Great Britain, 1.5 million copies were sold in its first year. Uncle Tom's Cabin has since been translated into 60 languages and continues to be read around the world.

Stowe leveraged the media of her day, demanding that America fulfill its promise of freedom and recognize the human face of bondage. Virulent criticism from slavery proponents prompted Stowe to publish A Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin, detailing her sources. Over the next decade, public attitudes toward slavery changed.

Stowe's informal, conversational writing style inspired people in a way that political speeches and newspaper accounts could not. Many believe that Uncle Tom's Cabin helped 19th century Americans determine what kind of country they wanted.

Harriet Beecher Stowe's legacy is proof that we all have the ability to make profound position changes to our world, no matter the obstacles. Her creativity and courage positively influenced the lives of many. I ask my colleagues to join with me in officially recognizing the bicentennial of the birth of an incredible American, Harriet Beecher Stowe.

PLEDGE FOR RESPECT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the National Council of La Raza (NCLR) has called on Congress to oppose irresponsible and inflammatory rhetoric toward Latinos, and instead to focus on fording solutions to the nation's most pressing concerns that work for all Americans. Today, I join with them in opposing irresponsible rhetoric and supporting the importance of civil discourse in the political process, especially on issues related to race and ethnicity.

The current national immigration narrative misrepresents the Latino community. Some use the community as a scapegoat, and some blatantly encourage xenophobia for political gain. Like all Americans, Latinos care about and are deeply affected by the complex issues facing our nation: serious economic challenges, a flawed immigration system in need of reform, an unnecessarily complex tax code that often hurts the middle class, and an aging infrastructure that endangers the literal ties between us. Those who slander, dehumanize or disrespect any community in particular are refusing to solve problems in a thoughtful, constructive way.

If we as a country join hands, move forward and choose to be respectful of Latino—and all racial and ethnic communities—we can solve our problems together. Every day, Latinos make substantial contributions to the economic, civic, and cultural life of Oregon and this country. I encourage my colleagues to seek out and consider the Latino perspective on today's issues, and to find areas of common ground based on our shared values and interests. I encourage them to meet with NCLR and other Latino businesses, non-profits and community groups in their area. Hearing the Latino perspective benefits all Americans. I consider it an honor to represent the Latino families, students, workers and constituents of the 3rd congressional district in Oregon.

HONORING LEONARD REZMIERSKI

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Mr. Leonard Rezmierski upon his retirement after 46 years of service with Northville Public Schools and having served the last 20 years as Superintendent.

After receiving a Bachelor of Science from Western Michigan University in 1965, Leonard Rezmierski went on, in 1969, to earn a Master of Arts majoring in Special Education with a minor in Administration at the University of Michigan. He earned a Doctor of Philosophy, majoring in Education and Anthropology, at the University of Michigan in 1982.

Founder of the Galileo Leadership Training Program, Dr. Rezmierski served as the Tri-County Alliance President and as the Michigan Association of School Administrators Region 9 President during the 2003/2004 school year. He held the position of MASA Region 9 Vice President in the prior year and during the 2006/2007 school year he was chosen as President Elect while also being an active member and Past President of the Wayne County School Superintendents' Association. Dedicating considerable time and effort to the Council for Exceptional Children at the state, national and international levels, Leonard has also devoted himself to the Wayne County and the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education.

Dr. Leonard Rezmierski has been the recipient of numerous awards including the Northville Parent-Teacher Organization Service Achievement Award, the Marvin E. Beekman Administrator of the Year Award, the Susan Phillips Gorin Award for Outstanding Service to University Students and the TASH (The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps) Award for Leadership in Non-Adversive Programming for Handicapped Students.

Active in his community as a member and Past President of the Northville Rotary and as a member of First Presbyterian Church of Ann Arbor, Leonard has volunteered as a Boy Scout Leader, a youth hockey and Little League Baseball coach, and with Meals for the Homeless Program. Perhaps, the most poignant recognition of his devotion to educational distinction, innovation and leadership in academics, athletics, the arts and community service is the establishment of the Dr. Leonard Rezmierski Fund for Excellence. This enduring legacy will stand as confirmation of Leonard Rezmierski's idea of valuing the unique contributions of every child and adult to their school community. His perception of educational experience transcending classroom walls and reaching beyond traditional academics innovatively prepares students to work, live and succeed in our ever more global society.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Leonard Rezmierski has faithfully served the students and citizens of Northville, Michigan. As he enters the next phase of his life with his beloved wife Virginia, his daughter Sara and his son Ryan, he leaves behind a legacy of dedication, integrity, and excellence. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Leonard Rezmierski upon his retirement and recognizing his years of loyal service to our community and country.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MR. FRITZ CARL STEIN, JR.

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mr. Fritz Carl Stein, Jr., a founding member of the Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative of Florida. Mr. Stein was the vice president and secretary-treasurer of the Belle Glade cooperative and a third-generation farmer in the Everglades Agricultural Area. He also owned and operated Stein Sugar Farms and a cattle ranch in Highlands County.

A talented farmer and businessman, Mr. Stein had a heart as big as the Everglades. He was a leader in many organizations, donating his time to the Boy Scouts and the Belle Glade Little League, among others. Mr. Stein served on the boards of the South Florida Conservancy District, the South Florida Water Management District, and the Palm Beach County Soil and Water Conservation District.

Demonstrating his concern for the less fortunate, Mr. Stein was chairman of the Belle Glade Housing Authority. As an example of the trust and respect he enjoyed among his fellow Belle Glade residents, he was a founding trustee of Glades Day School. He was also a longtime member of the Belle Glade Rotary Club and the Belle Glade Missionary Alliance Church.

Mr Speaker, Mr. Stein was a graduate of Belle Glade High School and the University of Florida and he served honorably in the United States Army. He made great contributions to the sugar cane growers cooperative and contributed immensely to the economic health of the Glades area. His passing will be mourned by his wife, Lois, six children, nine grandchildren, two great-grandchildren and people throughout the community surrounding Lake Okeechobee.

HONORING REVEREND MARVIN DOZIER

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement from the Southampton School Board, I rise to commend the Reverend Marvin Dozier for a life spent in service to others.

As a board member and past president of the board, Reverend Dozier devoted eleven-and-a-half years to the children and families of our community. Never concerned with recognition or accolades, he made the students his first priority. He was the first African-American to serve as president of the school board, and he worked tirelessly, with dignity and wisdom, to encourage collaboration and forge a common understanding among those with different backgrounds.

Reverend Dozier's community activism began when he was a student at Southampton High School during the 1960s. He worked with several teachers to organize diversity training workshops for students, advocated for the hiring of black teachers and served as a voice for the minority in student government. Although he considered himself an activist, his goal was never to be divisive, but to work to bring people together.

In 1980, Reverend Dozier was ordained a minister by the First Baptist Church of Southampton and is now pastor of the Unity Baptist Church of Mattituck. He also served as chair of the Southold Town Anti-Bias Task Force. Among many other contributions, Reverend Dozer is Director of the Southampton Youth Association, an organization that coordinates sports programs and summer camps for the school district and seeks to build character through sports. He has insisted that SYA remain true to its mission to give every child an opportunity whether or not the family has money or resources to pay for it.

Furthermore, Reverend Dozier serves as the voice for those who cannot stand up for themselves, making sure they have a chance to participate and become involved. A man who always seems to have a smile and a warm welcome for everyone he encounters, Reverend Dozier makes sure his work is guided by his desire to put the children of the community first—not himself, not his own children, but all the children.

Additionally, Reverend Dozier has held positions of leadership with great responsibility and dedication, always striving to raise social consciousness and create awareness. His purpose has never been to blame, but to hold people accountable for their actions.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure on behalf of New York's first congressional district to thank Reverend Martin Dozier for making our community a better place and to wish him well as he continues a life of service and contribution.

CONGRATULATING THE 2011 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONS, THE DALLAS MAVERICKS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Dallas Mavericks, on winning the 2011 National Basketball Association Championship. This is the organization's first NBA World Championship title.

I congratulate team owner Mark Cuban, Coach Rick Carlisle, his staff, and the entire Maverick organization for their accomplishment in winning basketball's coveted Larry O'Brien championship trophy.

I also congratulate the team's captain, Dirk Nowitzki, on being named the recipient of the Bill Russell NBA Finals Most Valuable Player Award.

The Maverick's success is a result of contributions by the entire team, including players Jose Barea, Rodrigue Beaubois, Corey Brewer, Caron Butler, Brian Cardinal, Tyson Chandler, Brendan Haywood, Dominique Jones, Jason Kidd, Ian Mahinmi, Shawn Marion, DeShawn Stevenson, Peja Stojakovic, and

Jason Terry; head coach Rick Carlisle, and assistant coaches Terry Stotts, Dwane Casey, Darrell Armstrong, Monte Mathis and Robert Hackett, head athletic trainer Casey Smith, and assistant trainer Dionne Calhoun, led the Mavericks to their first NBA championship by stressing teamwork and determination.

The Mavericks have such a loyal following not only because they are champions on the court, but because they are champions in the community as well. The Dallas Mavericks possess a strong sense of social responsibility, acknowledging that a community is only as strong as its weakest link. The team displays a strong commitment to the community through its foundation. The Dallas Mavericks Foundation is dedicated to inspiring and motivating youth to take their education seriously, strive for healthy bodies and minds, become involved in community service activities, set personal goals, visualize their dreams and take responsibility for their own lives and neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating each member of the 2011 NBA Champion Dallas Mavericks for their many victories on the court and in the community. They are champions to their sports fans, to beneficiaries of their Foundation, and to the entire Dallas community. We thank them for bringing the NBA championship trophy where it belongs—the American Airlines Center located in the heart of the 30th Congressional District of Texas.

HONORING SRI SRI RAVI SHANKAR

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, Sri Sri Ravi Shankar is a renowned spiritual leader and multi-faceted humanitarian whose mission of uplifting human values and creating a stress-free, violence-free world has inspired millions of people around the world over the past 30 years; and

In 1981, Sri Sri established the Art of Living Foundation, an international nonprofit educational and humanitarian organization, with a presence in 151 countries, which offers educational and self-development programs designed to eliminate stress and foster well-being, including programs which are helping inner city youth turn away from gang violence and programs which are helping transform the lives of veterans, prison inmates, terrorists and victims of trauma around the world; and

Through Sri Sri's message of religious harmony, non-violence, equality, tolerance and peace transcends class; race, religion and nationality and promotes ecumenical and universal human values; and

In 1997, Sri Sri founded the International Association for Human Values, a humanitarian nonprofit organization that advances and strengthens society by strengthening the individual.

The Art of Living Foundation and the International Association for Human Values collaborate on humanitarian initiatives that include some of the following: trauma relief at the site of the world's most horrific natural disasters and conflicts, including helping such traumatized populations as survivors, refugees, veterans, Katrina and 9/11 survivors, earthquake and tsunami survivors in Japan, and others; and prison settings, where more than 350,000 staff and inmates in 32 countries have participated in stress relief and life-skills programs, including both adult and juvenile offenders; and corporate, military, and government settings, bringing stress relief, team building, and a competitive edge to the World Bank, IBM, Shell Oil, Intel, the Third Circuit Court, the Army National Guard, and many other organizations in the U.S. and around the world; and addressing corruption and ethics, including hosting the World Forum for Ethics and Business each year at the European Parliament and speaking out against corruption in India; and the Youth Leadership Training Program, which has trained 100,000 at-risk youth and others to become leaders, who in turn have brought transformation to more than 36,000 rural villages; and the environment, with numerous environmental initiatives, including clean-up and awareness programs, sustainable agriculture and the planting of 10 million trees around the world; and U.S. school initiatives, with more than 12,000 U.S. students participating in school stress relief and life-skills programs in the last year alone; and

The Foundation's self-development programs have benefitted over 30 million people around the world over the past 30 years.

GINA CALABRESE

HON. CHRISTOPHER S. MURPHY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great woman and constituent, Gina Calabrese. Ms. Calabrese is the principal of the Rotella Interdistrict Magnet School in Waterbury, Connecticut, and was recently honored as the National Principal of the Year by the Magnet Schools of America. This award is presented annually to an exemplary school leader who has created and fostered innovative academic and extracurricular programs in magnet schools.

The students of the Rotella Magnet School and the community of Waterbury as a whole are fortunate to have a leader like Gina Calabrese, and I am proud that the Rotella School is in my district. Her dedication to education and her students is remarkable. In fact, largely because of Ms. Calabrese's leadership, the Rotella Interdistrict Magnet School was also honored in 2008 with the Magnet Schools of America's Dr. Ronald P. Simpson Distinguished Magnet Schools of Excellence.

Ms. Calabrese has demonstrated an outstanding commitment to innovation and education, and her efforts have raised the bar for magnet schools and educational institutions in Connecticut and across the country. Gina's achievements represent the highest dedication to success, and I am proud to recognize her contributions here today.

Although the Rotella School only opened in 2000, it has quickly distinguished itself as one of the best Magnet Schools in the country. It embodies a dedication to a holistic education that incorporates a strong academic program and an emphasis on the performing and visual arts. This approach combines the most valuable aspects of the arts—self-expression, creativity and practice—with academics, leading to a unique and valuable student experience.

On behalf of the people of Waterbury, I want to congratulate Ms. Calabrese for this award and thank her for her tireless efforts to educate the future leaders of Connecticut.

STANLEY K. SHEINBAUM

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 91st birthday of Stanley Sheinbaum, one of our country's most unique civic leaders. In his early years, Stanley served as a cartographer in World War II and was a student at Stanford, where he received top honors. He went on to become a Fulbright scholar and a professor of economics—first at Stanford, then at Michigan State. In 1964 he married Betty Warner and together they moved to Santa Barbara, where Stanley became one of the most vocal opponents of the war in Viet Nam. He twice ran for Congress on an aggressive anti-war platform and helped raise money for the legal defense fund of Daniel Ellsberg, the Defense Department analyst who leaked the ''Pentagon Papers'' to the New York Times.

After the war, Stanley remained deeply involved in the causes that were dear to him. His many interests, accomplishments, and important relationships are too numerous to recount. A few of the highlights include the nine years he served as chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Southern California, where his leadership led to a tenfold increase in contributions. In 1988, he was the leader of a Jewish-American delegation that convinced Yasser Arafat to recognize Israel and disavow terrorism. From 1991–93 he served as president of the Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners in the wake of the Rodney King beating, during which time he led the fight for justice and accountability, during that explosive period in the city's history.

His many achievements are in a delightful documentary, Citizen Stanley, which pays tribute to his many years of service and activism. Today, here in Congress, we have the opportunity to wish ''Citizen Stanley'' a happy birthday as we celebrate his extraordinary life and many contributions, especially to American justice and foreign affairs. At 91 years of age, Stanley Sheinbaum continues to inspire the best of the American progressive tradition.

REPUBLICAN POLICY PROPOSALS HARM SENIORS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss how the proposed Republican policies will harm our seniors. Republicans are attacking our seniors' most vital support systems.

The Republican budget would replace Medicare with an underfunded voucher system that

eliminates guaranteed Medicare benefits. Private insurance companies, which would be much more expensive than traditional Medicare, would be in charge of seniors' health care for those currently under the age of 55. It is estimated that seniors' health care costs would increase by more than $6,000 a year and costs would continue to skyrocket over time.

Republicans have claimed that their budget does not affect current Medicare beneficiaries; however, this claim is false. In fact, the Republican proposal would immediately cut benefits and would require seniors to pay more out-of-pocket for prescription drugs.

With respect to Medicaid, the Republican budget would cut almost $800 billion dollars over the next decade. Currently, Medicaid is the primary payer for nursing home care; massive cuts in this area would result in staffing shortages and reduced care quality.

At a time where our seniors are struggling to stay afloat in an unstable and unpredictable economy, we should be creating policies that will protect them instead of proposing policies that will place them in harm's way. Balancing the budget on the backs of seniors is reprehensible to say the least. We must fight for our nation's seniors and defend them against these reckless attacks on their health, economic security, and peace of mind.

TRIBUTE TO JESSICA BOLAND

HON. BENJAMIN QUAYLE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize Jessica Boland, a third-grade teacher at Rose Lane Elementary School in Phoenix, Arizona, who on April 28th, 2011, received the 2010 Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science. This honor is recognition of teachers with an exemplary record in both mathematics and science. Ms. Boland is one of only 85 recipients of this celebrated honor.

Ms. Boland always knew she wanted to be a teacher. The goal of all teachers should be to do everything possible to encourage, support, and promote excellence in the classroom, and she eagerly takes on this challenge every day. Ms. Boland has proven that she is up to this task, and while she is humbled and honored by this award, the satisfaction she gets every day when a classroom of eager students "get it," is by far her greatest reward.

Jessica's day does not begin with the first bell, nor does it end when her class is dismissed. She provides before and after school assistance to students who are struggling with their school work, offering a greater opportunity to succeed. She facilitates math academies for parents so that their children have more than just one teacher to help them understand. Her belief is that if a parent can help at home, then the child never runs out of opportunities to learn. She also works with student teachers who will soon be entering the field of education. This allows for each new generation of teachers to have a greater feeling of comfort when entering the classroom for the first time. Students then receive a quality education, regardless of the experience of their teacher.

Few awards offer such esteem and honor as the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science. This award is testimony to the gratitude that our nation shares for teachers like Jessica Boland. I am proud today to enter this recognition of Jessica's achievements into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and hope that all teachers across our great nation share in the responsibility that she has undertaken. It is with great joy and honor that I recognize Jessica Boland, and thank her with never-ending gratitude for giving her students the greatest opportunity to succeed.

HONORING MARINE SERGEANT SEAN T. CALLAHAN

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, Marine Sergeant Sean T. Callahan of Warrenton, Virginia, made the supreme sacrifice for his country on April 23, 2011, while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Sergeant Callahan was assigned antitank missile duties and was with the 3rd Battalion of the 9th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force, based at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

Sean joined the Marine Corps in March 2008 and received a combat meritorious promotion to the grade of sergeant on February 2, 2011. He deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom from August until October 2009. He deployed again in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in December, 2010. His awards include a Purple Heart, the Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Combat Action Ribbon, and Navy-Marine Corps Commendation Medal with Valor Device. Sean was escorted home from Dover, Delaware, by his brother, Corporal Daniel J. Callahan, who is assigned to the 1st Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion at Camp Pendleton, California.

Sean was born on Flag Day, June 14, 1987, in Manassas, Virginia, the youngest of four children. He grew up in Prince William County and graduated from Brentsville High School in 2005. He was an accomplished guitar player who loved music and went out of his way to encourage younger musicians to pursue their shared love of music.

Sergeant Callahan's leadership qualities, his loyalty and dedication all found a purpose when he joined the United States Marine Corps. He believed deeply in his calling to defend the freedoms granted in America and in the defense of dignity and freedom in other countries.

Sean was a true son of Virginia and will be deeply missed by those who knew and loved him.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, June 14, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 15

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine the "Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act" and implementation of Title VII one year later.

SR–328A

Armed Services

Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee

Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012.

SR–232A

10 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the "Clean Air Act" and public health.

SD–406

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine enhancing safety and soundness, focusing on lessons learned and opportunities for continued improvement.

SD–538

11 a.m.

Appropriations

Department of Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Defense.

SD–192

2:30 p.m.

Armed Services

Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012.

SR–232A

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jennifer A. Di Toro, Donna Mary Murphy, and Yvonne M. Williams, all to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

SD–342

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control

To hold hearings to examine the continued construction of illegal tunnels on the southwest border of the United States and the role these tunnels may play in the transport of drugs, weapons and human beings.

SD–562

JUNE 16

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue markup of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012.
SR–232A

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting to consider S. 1180, to authorize the President to confiscate and vest certain property of the Government of Libya and to authorize the use of that property to provide humanitarian relief to and for the benefit of the people of Libya; to be immediately followed a hearing to examine credit unions, focusing on member business lending.
SD–538

Environment and Public Works
Clean Air and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee
To hold a joint oversight hearing to examine the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's preliminary results of the nuclear safety review in the United States following the emergency at Fukushima Daiichi power plant in Japan.
SD–406

Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider S. Res. 194, expressing the sense of the Senate on United States military operations in Libya, and the nominations of William J. Burns, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary, Gary Locke, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of China, and Ryan C. Crocker, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, all of the Department of State.
S–116, Capitol

Judiciary
Business meeting to consider S. 1103, to extend the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, S. 978, to amend the criminal penalty provision for criminal infringement of a copyright, S. 1145, to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and the nominations of Steve Six, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Marina Garcia Marmolejo, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Michael Charles Green, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, Wilma Antoinette Lewis, of the District of Columbia, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and Major General Marilyn A. Quagliotti, USAF (Ret.), of Virginia, to be Deputy Director for Supply Reduction, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President.
SD–226

Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine Small Business Administration programs, focusing on eliminating inefficiencies, duplications, fraud and abuse.
SR–428A

10:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 343, to amend Title I of PL 99–658 regarding the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Government 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 PL 99–658 for fiscal years ending on or before September 30, 2024, to carry out the agreements resulting from that review.
SD–366

2:15 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine achieving the policy goals of the ''Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act'' (NAGPRA).
SD–628

2:30 p.m.
Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

JUNE 17

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue markup of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012.
SR–232A

JUNE 20

2 p.m.
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold hearings to examine 2050, focusing on implications of demographic trends in the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) region.
2247, Rayburn Building

JUNE 21

2:30 p.m.
Judiciary
Crime and Terrorism Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine cybersecurity, focusing on evaluating the Administration's proposals.
SD–226

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine evaluating goals and progress in Afghanistan and Pakistan.
SD–106

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine inspiring students to Federal service.
SD–342

JUNE 22

10 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold an oversight hearing to examine intellectual property law enforcement efforts.
SD–226

JUNE 23

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine farm bill accountability, focusing on the importance of measuring performance, while eliminating duplication and waste.
SD–G50

2:15 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the ''Indian Reorganization Act'' 75 years later, focusing on restoring tribal homelands and promote self-determination.
SD–628

Foreign Relations
Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps and Global Narcotics Affairs Subcommittee
International Development and Foreign Assistance, Economic Affairs and International Environmental Protection Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings to examine Haiti, focusing on reinvigorating aid under Martelly.
SD–419

JUNE 29

2:30 p.m.
Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SR–418

CORRECTION

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3709–S3740

Measures Introduced: Eight bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1180–1187, and S. Res. 207. **Page S3727**

Measures Reported:

S. 191, to direct the Department of Homeland Security to undertake a study on emergency communications, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 112–22).

S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S3727**

Measures Passed:

National Men's Health Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 207, supporting National Men's Health Week. **Page S3738**

Appointments:

Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h–276k, as amended, appointed the following Senator as Vice Chairman of the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group during the 112th Congress:

Senator Hutchison. **Page S3738**

Economic Development Revitalization Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that on Tuesday, June 14, 2011, following the 2:15 p.m. cloture vote on Coburn Modified Amendment No. 436, Senator Rubio be recognized as if in morning business for debate only for up to 20 minutes for the purpose of giving his maiden speech to the Senate; providing further, that the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to Coburn Modified Amendment No. 436, be at 11:30 a.m., on Tuesday, June 14, 2011. **Page S3738**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Martin J. Gruenberg, of Maryland, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years.

Martin J. Gruenberg, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term expiring December 27, 2018.

Kenneth J. Kopocis, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. **Page S3740**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3726–27**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3727–28**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3728–34**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S3734–37**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S3737**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 7:02 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, June 14, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3738.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

LIBYA AND OPERATION UNIFIED PROTECTOR

Committee on Armed Services: On Friday, June 10, 2011, Committee received a closed briefing on the situation in Libya and Operation Unified Protector from Michele A. Flournoy, Under Secretary for Policy, and Lieutenant General Charles H. Jacoby, Director, Strategic Plans and Policy, J5, Joint Staff, both of the Department of Defense; and Major General John R. Landry, USA (Ret.), National Intelligence Officer for Military Issues, and Alan R. Pino, National Intelligence Officer for the Near East, both of the National Intelligence Council.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: On Thursday, May 26, 2011, Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments for the 112th Congress:

Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security: Senators Cantwell (Chair), Inouye, Boxer, Nelson (FL), Lautenberg, Klobuchar, Udall (NM), Warner, Begich, Thune, DeMint, Wicker, Isakson, Blunt, Boozman, Toomey, and Heller.

Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet: Senators Kerry (Chair), Inouye, Boxer, Nelson (FL), Cantwell, Lautenberg, Pryor, McCaskill, Klobuchar, Udall (NM), Warner, Begich, DeMint, Snowe, Thune, Wicker, Isakson, Blunt, Boozman, Toomey, Rubio, Ayotte, and Heller.

Subcommittee on Competitiveness, Innovation, and Export Promotion: Senators Klobuchar (Chair), Kerry, Cantwell, Pryor, Udall (NM), Warner, Begich, Blunt, DeMint, Thune, Boozman, Ayotte, and Heller.

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance: Senators Pryor (Chair), Kerry, Boxer, McCaskill, Klobuchar, Udall (NM), Toomey, Thune, Boozman, Wicker, and Heller.

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard: Senators Begich (Chair), Inouye, Kerry, Nelson (FL), Cantwell, Lautenberg, Klobuchar, Warner, Snowe, Wicker, Isakson, Boozman, Rubio, Ayotte, and Heller.

Subcommittee on Science and Space: Senators Nelson (FL) (Chair), Inouye, Kerry, Cantwell, Pryor, Warner, Boozman, Wicker, Rubio, Ayotte, and Heller.

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security: Senators Lautenberg (Chair), Inouye, Kerry, Boxer, Cantwell, Pryor, McCaskill, Klobuchar, Udall (NM), Warner, Begich, Wicker, DeMint, Thune, Isakson, Blunt, Boozman, Toomey, Rubio, Ayotte, and Heller.

Senators Rockefeller and Hutchison are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: On Thursday, May 26, 2011, Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments for the 112th Congress:

Subcommittee on Energy: Senators Cantwell (Chair), Wyden, Johnson (SD), Landrieu, Sanders, Udall (CO), Shaheen, Franken, Manchin, Coons, Risch, Barrasso, Lee, Paul, Coats, Portman, Hoeven, and Corker.

Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests: Senators Wyden (Chair), Johnson (SD), Landrieu, Cantwell, Udall (CO), Shaheen, Franken, Coons, Barrasso, Risch, Lee, Paul, Portman, Hoeven, and Heller.

Subcommittee on National Parks: Senator Udall (CO) (Chair), Landrieu, Sanders, Stabenow, Franken, Manchin, Coons, Barrasso, Paul, Coats, Portman, Heller, and Corker.

Subcommittee on Water and Power: Senators Shaheen (Chair), Wyden, Johnson (SD), Cantwell, Sanders, Stabenow, Manchin, Lee, Risch, Coats, Hoeven, Heller, and Corker.

Senators Bingaman and Murkowski are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 2146–2158; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 301–302 were introduced. **Pages H4074–75**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4075–76**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 300, providing for consideration of 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 (H. Rept. 112–103). **Page H4074**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative McClintock to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4045**

Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012: The House resumed consideration of H.R. 2055, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012. Consideration of the measure began on Thursday, June 2nd. **Pages H4046–66**

Agreed to retain Title II of the bill, relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs, by a recorded vote of 409 ayes with 1 voting ''no'', Roll No. 416. **Page H4066**

Agreed to:

Mica amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Military Construction, Army National Guard by $25 million; **Pages H4046–47**

Meeks amendment (No. 1 printed in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2011) that prohibits funds

from being used to declare as excess to the needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs or otherwise take any action to exchange, trade, auction, transfer, or otherwise dispose of, or reduce the acreage of, Federal land and improvements at the St. Albans campus; **Pages H4055–56**

Flores amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007; **Pages H4059–61**

Fitzpatrick amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enter into a contract using procedures that do not give to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans any preference available with respect to such contract; **Pages H4061–63**

LaTourette amendment that strikes section 415 of the bill (by a recorded vote of 204 ayes to 203 noes, Roll No. 413); and **Pages H4047–55, H4063–64**

Sherman amendment (No. 2 printed in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (by a recorded vote of 248 ayes to 163 noes, Roll No. 415). **Pages H4058–59, H4065–66**

Rejected:

Amash amendment (No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011) that sought to prohibit funds from being used to administer or enforce the wage-rate requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, popularly known as the "Davis-Bacon Act" (by a recorded vote of 178 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 414). **Pages H4056–58, H4064–65**

Withdrawn:

Coffman amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used to provide disability compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to any veteran for post-traumatic stress disorder if the required in-service stressor claimed by the veteran is related to the veteran's fear of hostile military or terrorist activity and the places, types, and circumstances of the veteran's service did not include a combat zone. **Page H4061**

Point of Order sustained against:

Amash amendment (No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011) that sought to prohibit funds from being used for any project or program named for an individual serving as a Senator in the United States Senate or as the President of the United States. **Page H4059**

H. Res. 288, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on June 2nd.

Recess: The House recessed at 4:13 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H4063**

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H4076–77.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4063–64, H4064, H4065, H4066. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Committee Meetings

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing on H.R. 2054, the Energy and Revenue Enrichment Act of 2011. Testimony was heard from Sen. Mitch McConnell, Kentucky; Gene Aloise, Director of Natural Resources & Environment, GAO; and public witnesses.

VIEWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES ON REGULATORY REFORM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "The Views of the Department of Health and Human Services on Regulatory Reform: An Update." Testimony was heard from Sherry Glied, Assistant Secretary for Policy and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights held a hearing on Best Practices and Next Steps: A New Decade in the Fight Against Human Trafficking. Testimony was heard from Luis CdeBaca, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, Department of State; and public witnesses.

NYSE-DEUTSCHE BOERSE MERGER

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition and the Internet held a hearing on Competition and Consolidation in Financial Markets: The NYSE-Deutsche Boerse Merger. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on H.R. 1837, to address certain water-related concerns on the San Joaquin River, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from Will Stelle, Regional Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service; and public witnesses.

DOES THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT HAVE TO RESPOND TO A LAWFULLY ISSUED AND VALID CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENA?

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Obstruction of Justice: Does the Justice Department Have to Respond to a Lawfully Issued and Valid Congressional Subpoena?'' Testimony was heard from Charles Tiefer, Commissioner, Commission on Wartime Contracting; Morton Rosenberg, former Specialist in American Public Law, American Law Division, Congressional Research Service; Todd Tatelman, Legislative Attorney, American Law Division, Congressional Research Service; and public witnesses.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 2112, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food & Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. The Committee granted, by non-record vote, an open rule providing one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI except for sections 740, 741, 743, and 744. Under the Rules of the House the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the Congressional Record. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Rep. Kingston; and Rep. Farr.

BUS SAFETY ON OUR NATION'S HIGHWAYS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee hearing entitled ''How Best to Improve Bus Safety on Our Nation's Highways.'' Testimony was heard from Anne S. Ferro, Administrator, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, DOT; and public witnesses.

PREVENTING SEXUAL ASSAULTS AND SAFETY INCIDENTS AT VA FACILITIES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on Preventing Sexual Assaults and Safety Incidents at VA Facilities. Testimony was heard from Randall B. Williamson, Director, Health Care, GAO; Joseph G. Sullivan, Jr., Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, Office of Investigations, Office of Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs; William Schoenhard, FACHE, Deputy Under Secretary for Health Operations and Management, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Kevin Hanretta, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Emergency Management, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D603)*

H.R. 754, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. Signed on June 8, 2011. (Public Law 112–18)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Airland, closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012, 9 a.m., SR–232A.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012, 10:30 a.m., SR–232A.

Subcommittee on SeaPower, closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012, 2 p.m., SR–232A.

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012, 3:30 p.m., SD–G50.

Subcommittee on Personnel, closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012, 5 p.m., SR–232A.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Luis A. Aguilar, of Georgia, and Daniel M. Gallagher, Jr., of Maryland, both to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and Anthony Frank D'Agostino, of

Maryland, and Gregory Karawan, of Virginia, both to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to hold hearings to examine emerging threats to rail security, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to hold hearings to examine wildfire management programs of the Federal land management agencies, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Select Committee on Intelligence, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, hearing on the Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2012; and the Defense Appropriations Bill, FY 2012. 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, hearing entitled ''Retirement Security: Challenges Confronting Pension Plan Sponsors, Workers, and Retirees.'' 11 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, hearing entitled ''The NRC Inspector General Report on the 'NRC Chairman's Unilateral Decision to Terminate NRC's Review of the DOE Yucca Mountain Repository License Application.' '' 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled ''Does the Dodd Frank Act End 'Too Big to Fail'?'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled ''The Role of the U.S. in the World Bank and Multilateral Development Banks: Bank Oversight and Requested Capital Increases.'' 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing on Holding Honduras Hostage: Revoked Visas and U.S. Policy, 3 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, hearing entitled ''Securing the Nation's Ports and Maritime Border—A Review of the Coast Guard Post 9/11 Homeland Security Missions.'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing on the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans, and Insular Affairs, hearing on H.R. 946, the ''Endangered Salmon Predation Prevention Act.'' 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1904, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011; H.R. 869, to clarify the definition of flood control operations for the purposes of the operation and maintenance of Project No. 2179 on the Lower Merced River; H.R. 1258, the Box Elder Utah Land Conveyance Act; H.R. 1545, the Waco Mammoth National Monument Establishment Act of 2011; H.R. 473, the HALE Scouts Act; and H.R. 1740, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Achieving Transparency and Accountability in Federal Spending.'' 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1249, the America Invents Act, 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation, hearing on Transportation Research Priorities: Maximizing Return on Investment of Taxpayer Dollars, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, hearing on The Federal Perspective on a National Critical Materials Strategy, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight and Regulations, hearing entitled ''Do Not Enter: How Proposed Hours of Service Trucking Rules are a Dead End for Small Businesses.'' 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing entitled ''Creating Jobs and Increasing U.S. Exports by Enhancing the Marine Transportation System.'' 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, hearing on Mental Health: Bridging the Gap between Care and Compensation for Veterans, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Oversight and Subcommittee on Social Security, joint hearing on the accuracy of payments made by the Social Security Administration (SSA), 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, to receive a briefing on prospects for unfreezing Moldova's frozen conflict in Transnistria, focusing on examining how the existing security and governance conditions in the region affect the human rights and humanitarian situations on the ground, 10 a.m., 2203 Rayburn Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Tuesday, June 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 11 a.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of Claire C. Cecchi, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, and Esther Salas, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, with votes on confirmation of the nominations, at approximately 12 noon. Following which, at 2:15 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of S. 782, Economic Development Revitalization Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Coburn Modified Amendment No. 436, to repeal the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit.

(Senate will recess following the votes on confirmation of the nominations until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Tuesday, June 14

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Complete consideration of H.R. 2055—Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012. Begin consideration of H.R. 2112— Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E1067
Bass, Charles F., N.H., E1076
Bishop, Timothy H., N.Y., E1077
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1076, E1078
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1072
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1073
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1075
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E1065, E1069, E1072
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E1066, E1070
Ellmers, Renee L., N.C., E1071
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1065, E1070
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1073
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1077
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E1068
Hultgren, Randy, Ill., E1069
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1077, E1078
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E1065, E1068, E1073
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E1071
Lynch, Stephen F., Mass., E1067
McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E1077
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1069
Marino, Tom, Pa., E1073
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1070, E1072
Murphy, Christopher S., Conn., E1074, E1076, E1078
Myrick, Sue Wilkins, N.C., E1075
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1074
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E1075
Quayle, Benjamin, Ariz., E1079
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E1075, E1078
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1066, E1071
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E1076
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1076
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E1071
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E1065, E1066, E1066, E1066, E1067, E1067, E1068, E1069, E1070
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1074
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1079
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E1067

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.