United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2011 No. 136

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 14, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DENHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

WE NEED A REAL JOBS AGENDA, NOT ANOTHER ROUND OF NAFTA-STYLE DEALS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, you want to know why we have a budget deficit?

We have a budget deficit because we have a jobs deficit, and we have a jobs deficit because our Nation has been outsourcing millions of jobs for over a quarter century. White House after White House and Congress after Congress have allowed our manufacturing and jobs base to be whittled away through a trade regimen that outsources U.S. production and American jobs, financed by the same big Wall Street banks that caused the financial meltdown.

Year after year the United States continues to rack up enormous trade deficits with nation after nation. The numbers don't lie. They tell us that over 2.7 million manufacturing jobs alone were lost just during the Bush administration. Washington must finally confront our so-called free trade failed policies if we are going to be serious about creating jobs in order to balance the budget.

Last year, the trade deficit was another astonishing half a trillion dollars. Imagine a half a trillion, plus a half a trillion, plus a half a trillion, plus a half a trillion year after year after year. That equaled, just for last year, 7 million American jobs that were not created here because of our job-killing trade policies.

Rather than stopping this enormous outsourcing of America, we're being offered up more of the same, more failed free trade agreements, this time with Korea, Panama, Colombia.

Has Washington learned nothing, or are the economic powers that outsource these jobs bearing down on Washington so greatly that the American people can't be heard? The public's interest is being suppressed.

These agreements are another expansion of the same policies and processes that were enacted with NAFTA. We were all told in 1993 that NAFTA would create millions of jobs. Instead, we have seen exactly the opposite, millions of jobs decimated.

Our trade deficit with Mexico last year was over $66 billion in the red. In 1993, proponents of NAFTA, like Gary Huffbauer and economist Jeffrey Schott, promised we would have, and I quote them, ''an annual current account surplus with Mexico of about $10 billion through the 1990s.'' That was an absolute falsehood. Obviously, they were all wrong, dead wrong. Instead, we saw over a third of all manufacturing jobs in the United States disappear since we signed that agreement and $1 trillion accumulated trade deficit with Mexico. Not a single year since NAFTA's is passage was the U.S. in the black.

We heard the exact same fairy tale regarding China's Permanent Most Favored Nation Status. We were told that that agreement in 1998 would create millions of jobs in America. Instead, the result has been a cumulative $2 trillion trade deficit with China alone.

When you think about the budget deficit, you'd better think about the trade deficit because they are absolutely interlinked. You're not going to balance the budget until the American people go back to work, and they can't go back to work when their jobs are being sent elsewhere.

If you always do what you have always done, you will always get what you always got.

The Economic Policy Institute's analysis predicts that the agreement that's proposed with South Korea will cost us an additional 159,000 jobs in our country. Since this January, we have already rung up, look at the numbers, over $7 billion trade deficit with South Korea. With passage of the proposed agreement, do you think it's going to make the job situation better?

If you want to see just how poorly negotiated the Korea deal is, take a quick look at the auto provisions. There's no reciprocity. Last year, Korea sold nearly half a million cars in our country; 500,000 cars. The United States, you know how much we sell to them? Six thousand. What kind of deal is that?

And we'll be lucky if, under this agreement, where there's a hope that we might sell perhaps, 75,000 cars to Korea, so, they get a half a million, we get a handful? How's that a credible plan to create jobs in our country?

Printed on recycled paper.

And then there are the other two proposed agreements with Panama and Colombia, the latest NAFTA expansion. What are the major commercial interests there?

The Government Accountability Office has identified Panama as a major haven for, guess what, tax avoidance. Panama is a popular destination for the very same multinational corporations that want to avoid paying their fair share of U.S. taxes by creating offshore subsidiaries.

And how about Colombia, which is the most dangerous country in the world if you care about labor rights, and no free country in the world does not have labor rights. Over 2,000 trade unionists, 2,000 have been assassinated there since 1990. What a pleasant place to do business. And there has been no justice for their victims and their families in the majority of those murder cases.

And what is the largest economic interest we have with Colombia? It has three letters. It isn't a place to export U.S.-made goods. Rather, it's more oil imports.

How can those that support these failed trade agreements want more?

We need to create jobs in this country again because, in order to balance the budget, you have to put the American people back to work, and you can't do that when you're outsourcing more of their jobs and importing more into our nation than we export.

PASS E-VERIFY TO CREATE AMERICAN JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) for 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for 2 years, 14 million Americans have been out of work. Yet illegal workers hold 7 million jobs. It is inexcusable that American workers have to compete with illegal immigrants for scarce jobs.

Congress has the opportunity to open up millions of jobs for unemployed Americans by requiring all U.S. employers to use E-Verify. This program checks the Social Security numbers of new hires. E-Verify is free, quick and easy to use. Individuals eligible to work in the U.S. are confirmed 99.5 percent of the time.

The public also supports E-Verify. According to a recent Rasmussen poll, 82 percent of likely voters think businesses should be required to use E-Verify to determine if a new employee is in the country legally. This is one of the most important job creation bills Congress should pass and the President should sign.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction began work on a roadmap to bring down our Nation's deficit and restore our fiscal health. They heard from Doug Elmendorf, Director of the Congressional Budget Office, who reiterated once again what we already know, our Nation's current fiscal position is not sustainable.

We also know that the problem we're facing stems, in part, from buying things without paying for them, including two wars, tax cuts for the wealthiest in America, and a prescription drug program. But what matters now is taking action.

□ 1010

Over the month of August, we heard very clearly from the American public that they want us to work together on the issues they are most concerned about: jobs and the deficit. Action on one issue will directly impact on the other.

Creating jobs and growing the economy is one of the most important things we can do to bring down the deficit. And getting a handle on our fiscal situation will give confidence to encourage economic growth and job creation. Both the Bowles-Simpson and Domenici-Rivlin fiscal commissions supported this tenet by calling for immediate action to boost the economy while laying out a plan to reduce the deficit over the long term. This is why the joint select committee must succeed.

We have a responsibility to show Americans and the international community that we can meet the challenges we face, that we can join together and make the tough decisions necessary to spur growth and to bring our debt under control.

I believe the committee must go beyond the $1.5 trillion target in the deficit reduction bill if we hope to strengthen our economy and seriously change our Nation's fiscal outlook.

Over 60 economists and former Members of Congress signed a letter encouraging the joint select committee to reach the biggest agreement possible, and I want to join with them in that request. In their letter, signed by co-chairs of both the Bowles-Simpson and Domenici-Rivlin fiscal commissions, among others, they state, ''We believe that a 'go big' approach that goes well beyond the $1.5 trillion deficit reduction goal that the committee has been charged with and includes major reforms of entitlement programs and the Tax Code is necessary to bring the debt down to a manageable and sustainable level, improve the long-term fiscal imbalance, reassure markets, and restore Americans' faith in the political system.''

I am in absolute agreement with that proposition. As the letter I just quoted indicates, the committee must also put all options on the table. That's a challenge on the Republican side; that's a challenge on the Democratic side. But it must be done because we cannot get to where we need to get without doing so.

The math is irrefutable. We cannot get to where we need to go if we ignore revenues or if we fail to ensure our safety net is sustainable for generations to come. A balanced approach that looks at defense spending, revenues, and entitlements is the only real way we're going to put America's fiscal house back in order.

A balanced approach is also key to making sure everyone pays their fair share. We cannot ask the middle class families and seniors to bear the entire burden of balancing the budget. The most well-off among us, which is most of us, by the way, in this body must also contribute to that objective.

But as we focus on ways to restore our budget balance, we cannot and must not forget the immediate jobs crisis that too many families face.

Any plan to bring down the deficit must start, as Bowles-Simpson and Domenici-Rivlin both observed, with getting people back to work. That is why I hope Republicans and Democrats will work together to bring the President's proposed American Jobs Act to the floor for a vote without delay. As the President said, we have 14 months to wait until the next election. People without jobs, people's whose homes are underwater, people who have lost their homes, they don't have 14 months to wait.

The jobs program suggested by the President mirrors many components included in the House Democrats' Make It In America agenda and will help create jobs in the short term.

All of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, must be invested in the committee's success. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be committed to the success of reaching agreement in this committee of 12. This is a time to put partisan politics aside and do the hard things, very hard things, the courageous things that we have to do for our country.

I believe we're equal to the task. And I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, if we are not equal to the task, then all of our citizens will rightfully be extraordinarily disappointed, as they are today, in their elected representatives on both sides of the aisle.

Success of this committee, success of this House and the Senate in reaching and meeting the challenge that confronts us is essential if the confidence level of our own citizens and the international community is to be raised and given the level necessary for future success.

AMERICAN LAND ACT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many, many years ago the second American Revolution took place when Washington, D.C., was invaded by the British in the War of 1812. Many forget that the Capitol, the White House, and Washington, D.C., were burned to the

ground by the British. And after the War of 1812 was over with, America found itself in a situation that's not unfamiliar with us today. America was out of money.

So what did people decide to do here in this body of Congress about how to get more money into the Federal Treasury? They thought of a unique approach that maybe we ought to think of and do today.

Right now we talk about raising taxes, cutting spending, and we need more revenue. Maybe we ought to think outside of the box when it comes to revenue instead of more government taking from the people and giving it to its special groups. Let's do what they did at the end of the War of 1812.

The Federal Government decided that it would sell some of the land to Americans—what a novel thought—and let Americans own America. They could produce that land, and then they could pay more taxes. And that's what they did at the end of the War of 1812.

We talk about the land in America. Who is the biggest landowner in this country? Uncle Sam. Uncle Sam owns 27 percent of the land mass in the United States. This poster here shows the land area in red, including Alaska, that is owned by the Federal Government, Uncle Sam. Twenty-seven percent of the land! Half of the land west of the Mississippi, or in the West, belongs to the Federal Government. Those folks in the West, half of it belongs to Uncle Sam. He's their neighbor in every western State. It's different in the East because much of that land was sold at the end of the War of 1812.

Now, 27 percent, what does that mean? That's really hard to understand how much that is. If you were to superimpose the 27 percent of the land mass in the United States into Europe, you would find that Uncle Sam would own almost all of Europe. Western Europe is about 27 percent of the land mass of the United States. And of course that includes the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Italy, Poland, and even Spain.

Now, we're talking about a lot of land. Does Uncle Sam really need all of that land? Much of it's unproductive, not paying any taxes, not paying any revenue to local and State governments.

So maybe we should do something that our forefathers, our ancestors did—sell some of that land to Americans and allow that revenue to come into the Federal Treasury so we can pay off all of our debts that we have accumulated over the years. Twenty-seven percent of the land mass is 623 million acres in this country.

Ronald Reagan tried to do that when he was President, but it did not go very far at all. You know, even President Obama mentioned about a month ago that there's 300 acres in Los Angeles County that's owned by the Federal Government. We could sell that for $2 billion.

So maybe we need to think outside of the box. I've introduced the American Land Act. We talk about the American Jobs Act. The American Land Act would require that the Federal Government sell a portion of that land over a period of years.

Now, I want to be careful to state we're not talking about the national parks. We're not talking about Yosemite. We're not talking about the marshes and environmentally sensitive areas in this country. We're talking about unused land by the Federal Government. And then we could raise some revenue.

I believe that this could be up to about $200 billion of revenue that would be brought into the United States. Sell it to Americans and that will bring revenue into our treasury. When Americans own America, they can also develop that land. Then they can be productive and then they can pay even more taxes.

□ 1020

When people own land, they pay property tax. That tax primarily goes to local and State governments, which pays for our school systems. So that undeveloped land, that unused land, some of that should be sold to Americans. Let Americans buy American. Real property in the hands of real Americans. What a novel thought that is.

Uncle Sam, the Federal Government, is all about power and control over everything. Loosen up a little, and let Americans buy part of America. Uncle Sam shouldn't prevent Americans from having a real stake or share in our country, the United States of America. It doesn't belong to Uncle Sam—at least it shouldn't. It should belong to Americans. The United States owns most of the grand estate in this country, and it's time to let more Americans own it because America should belong to Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

A REFLECTION ON THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING SYSTEM AND LABOR UNIONS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is unfortunate there is an attempt to scapegoat America's unions for the economic problems that beset us.

After all, it was not America's grocery clerks, nurses, teachers, postal workers, and electricians who nearly caused the meltdown of the economy. It wasn't America's labor unions that were pushing for tax loopholes that made our revenue system a hopeless, inefficient mess. It wasn't unions that pushed for shortcuts for worker safety that produced the tragedy that we've seen in our mines. America's working men and women didn't engineer poor loans, systematically cheat consumers, and transform financial institutions into giant casinos.

No doubt there were some consumers who took unfair advantage as well as others who were not as vigilant as they should have been in the financial meltdown; but the truth is they were part of an unprecedented economic scheme that played on those weaknesses, the gullibility and some individual greed to make it into a vast industry.

Are there some areas where unions are too effective in securing benefits for their members? That probably depends on who you ask about the give and take of the collective bargaining process. The leadership of unions are, in fact, much more democratic than their corporate counterparts. Union officials are routinely challenged for reelection. There are insurgents even in the most powerful and entrenched unions, something one seldom sees on the boards of public corporations. How many business directors are defeated? It's not easy to even have opposing nominees through today's shareholder democracy. It's pretty sketchy compared with what happens with unions.

There is a very direct remedy for union power in the negotiation process. For 18 years, I was a local elected official, part of that time responsible for a collective bargaining program. I like to think that I bargained tough but that I bargained fair—but I bargained. I've supported collective bargaining rights for public employees since I was first in the Oregon legislature and still believe that honest, tough, principled negotiations will lead to the best results.

Having someone attempt to dictate working conditions unilaterally is not calculated to produce enhanced productivity. It matters how people are treated and how they feel. Employee-owned corporations illustrate this principle in spades, some of which are not only employee-owned but have unions in addition. One of the best performing of the world's economy is Germany, where they still manufacture and have a huge export market for high-value products. The Germans work hard to integrate labor and business with government in the decision-making process, something that is, sadly, too rare in the United States.

Unions are not the answer for every employee and every company, but every employee and every company ought to have that option. Even companies that are nonunion benefit. I've had executives from successful companies candidly tell me that they treat their employees right because they don't want them to unionize. Even these nonunion company employees benefit from higher wages, better benefits, and a system that respects worker rights because of the competition with the unions.

Instead of treating employees fairly by allowing them to organize, far too many corporations have chosen instead to attack the fundamentals of collective bargaining. It is today an art form in some companies to stall, delay, intimidate, even to flagrantly violate the

laws of collective bargaining in this country, weak as they are and as ineffectively as they are enforced.

Collective bargaining has been systematically under attack by my Republican friends in Congress as Republican administrations have fought to make a National Labor Relations Board that is toothless, passive and unable or unwilling to protect the rights of employees to organize. This is not calculated to produce a spirit of cooperation. It is not clear that people need to cheat in order to avoid any excesses of collective bargaining.

I would argue the opposite.

It's not just workers in companies, union and nonunion, who benefit from unions. American society benefits. It was organized labor that spearheaded the effort for a 40-hour workweek. It is not just rhetoric that unions brought you the weekend. Unions have played a key role in extending security to millions of Americans in the workplace, in consumer safety and in environmental protections.

Again I don't pretend unions are perfect and I've had some differences with them over the years. But make no mistake: Unions are amongst the few who stand up to some of the more egregious economic follies, for justice in the workplace, for protecting the unorganized, fighting for a minimum wage, even a living wage.

It's important to reflect about our collective bargaining system. I'm all for fine tuning, but I am adamantly opposed to gutting rights and protection of workers.

I think we all should start by acknowledging the debt we owe to unions and work to stop this wholesale assault on America's workers.

THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION, ''THE SINGLE BIGGEST IMPEDIMENT TO JOB GROWTH''

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. A legendary Georgia businessman recently called the Obama administration ''the single biggest impediment to job growth.''

That same man, Mr. Bernie Marcus, also says the business that he founded would have never succeeded if he were trying to start it today. Home Depot, his Georgia-based company, currently has more than 2,200 stores all across the United States. They support more than 300,000 American jobs, and they generated $68 billion in revenue just last year.

Now, imagine the impact on our country if companies that start out like Home Depot—which started as an individual store—or other small businesses weren't able to flourish. That is what the Obama administration is trying to do to the American Dream today. By creating a huge bill with ObamaCare and a failed stimulus bill and by piling thousands of new government regulations onto the backs of small businesses, it is no wonder that job creators are afraid to expand and hire new people.

And so, after 2½ years of growing the Federal Government and $4.5 trillion in spending later, the Obama administration has given us another proposal of the same old failed policies. Unfortunately, their latest solution to our 9 percent unemployment rate comes with a price tag of almost a half trillion dollars, money that we just simply do not have. So to pay for the American Jobs Act, as I like to call it ''stimulus part II,'' our Democrat leaders want to hike taxes on families and job creators.

We've been down this road before. The stimulus did not work 2 years ago, and it will not work today. Hiking taxes in the middle of a recession will make our economy worse, not better. When will this administration learn that more of the same just simply isn't good enough anymore? Jobs will come when government gets out of the way—by getting rid of ObamaCare, by stopping the reckless spending here in Washington and the threat of higher taxes, and by ending the uncertainty in the marketplace.

□ 1030

Congress needs to pass my jobs bill, which would immediately and permanently lower the corporate tax rate to zero, and it will permanently lower the capital gains tax to zero. This will stimulate our small businesses so that they can do what they do best, grow, expand and to thrive.

In the words of Mr. Marcus, the founder of Home Depot, ''It's time to stand up and fight.''

The free enterprise system has made this country what it is today, and we must have policy that makes it prosper.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS FOR PUERTO RICAN CIVILIANS

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask us to take action on a scathing Department of Justice investigation of a police department that ''regularly violates the constitutional rights of civilians through illegal searches, detentions, and arrests,'' that ''continues to demonstrate a deliberate indifference to the public's safety and the civil rights of individuals engaging in protected speech activities during protests,'' a police force where ''officers engage in a pattern and practice of unreasonable force and other misconduct to suppress the exercise of protected First Amendment rights.''

The report details the abuse against the people of Puerto Rico that they are facing by the Puerto Rico Police Department. Underscore, I said, ''I rise to bring the urgent attention of the U.S. House of Representatives to a human rights and civil rights crisis.'' I further stated, ''where the right of students to protest and speak their minds is being denied with clubs and mace and pepper spray.''

I spoke those words 7 months ago on this floor. The DOJ report states that the Governor of Puerto Rico has ''supreme authority'' over the police. Did he use that supreme authority to respond to Puerto Ricans who asked for help? Yes, he did.

The Governor's ruling party took immediate action after I detailed the abuse. The ruling party was outraged. It was outraged at me. Facing a civil rights crisis, the ruling party of Puerto Rico acted without hesitation, convening the legislature to urgently pass legislation to censure me for speaking out.

In part, the censure reads: ''Congressman LUIS GUTIERREZ made false allegations about a supposed human rights crisis in Puerto Rico; he expressed himself in a denigrating and malicious manner about the honorable body of the Puerto Rico police; all of which tends to hurt the good image and good name of Puerto Rico.''

Here's the problem: The ruling party of Puerto Rico has made clear time and time again they are not concerned about the abuse of their people, only that the world might notice that abuse. They don't seem to understand that if you love people, you stand up and you speak out, not pretend that everything is all right.

For standing up, the Government of Puerto Rico gave me a 600-word censure. But the government didn't give one word, not one word of censure, to what happened to Rachel Hiskes.

Here's what the DOJ describes happened to her:

''A student journalist, Rachel Hiskes, entered the Capitol with other individuals and attempted to access the senate chambers.

''Puerto Rico Police Department officers, who had been dispatched to the capitol earlier in the day, stopped Hiskes and hit her.

''She was not resisting or combative. Hiskes then sat in the hallway with other visitors in protest. A capitol employee then sprayed Hiskes and others with chemical irritants.

''As Hiskes tried to get up, an officer hit her across the back with a baton, causing her to fall. An officer continued to push and strike her with his baton, driving her toward the doorway.

''When she reached the door and had her back to the officer, the officer shoved her out onto the concrete stairs using his baton and hitting her in the neck.

''Hiskes was never arrested or charged with any crime.''

Instead of protecting people like Rachel, the government derided the people.

This Governor's chief of staff, a man he has absurdly tasked with responding to the Department of Justice report, said protesting workers would be treated as ''terrorists'' and boasted he would

personally kick protesting students off campus.

This government cannot fix a problem they helped to create and expand.

The students, bloodied with batons, deserve more. The workers beaten and the journalists pepper-sprayed deserve more.

And, to be clear, the many honorable and brave Puerto Rican police officers, men and women who are incorruptible, who do their jobs right and risk their lives every day, they deserve more too.

When crimes like these are brought to light, we expect criminal indictments.

I want to see a special prosecutor appointed, the grand jury seated, the trials begun and see those responsible, not just the police officers following orders but those who directed the police to systematically suppress free speech, sent to jail.

The goal must be to reestablish the rule of law and to reestablish a police department in Puerto Rico that protects and serves the people. The goal must be a police department fighting crime, not committing crime. The goal must be that no government can act with impunity against its own people.

And I have one last recommendation. The Governor of Puerto Rico should apologize to his people. Puerto Ricans have called out for help. In response, the Governor and the ruling party have led an effort to demonize them for standing up for their civil rights.

Governor, the Department of Justice of the United States of America has just made clear that your people were right and you were wrong, and it is time for you to say you're sorry.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL THEODORE MALLORY III

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, there are men who watch life go by as a spectator, and then there are the Ted Mallorys of the world. In one of life's greatest mysteries, Ted Mallory's time on Earth came to an end June 26 after a late diagnosis of stomach cancer.

Major General Theodore ''Ted'' Mallory III had embraced his many gifts and lived one of the fullest lives I have ever been privileged enough to encounter. The Bible says: As iron sharpens iron, so one man sharpens another. Ted made it his personal mission to sharpen the lives of those men and women around him, and he pushed people to their highest potential.

After attending Auburn University, Ted entered into the U.S. Air Force Officer Training School in 1965 and graduated with the U.S. Air Force Outstanding Graduate Officer Award, among many other awards that he obtained while in training. These were the first of many commendations Ted would receive throughout his 36-year military career. A recipient of the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal, National Defense Service Medal with one bronze service star, Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with Palm, and Global War on Terrorism Service Medal. Ted truly embodied the ideal airman. He was also awarded the Daughters of the American Revolution Medal of Honor. I would need an hour on this floor, Mr. Speaker, of time just to list all the rest of Ted's accomplishments.

His education did not stop at Auburn University. In addition to the military professional education programs offered through the Air Force, Ted is also an alumnus of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

After he left active duty service, Ted entered into the Air National Guard, where he served for 30 years and held the roles of group commander, wing commander, and chief of staff. He was promoted to major general in 1997 and retired in 2001 as commander of the Air National Guard/Air Education and Training Command.

While serving in the Air National Guard, he remained active in his community, serving on the Fayette County school board for 10 years as chairman, and on the Georgia School Board Association as president in 1986. Ted served on several additional boards, including my academy nomination board, and was president of the Joseph Sams School board of directors, a school serving the needs of children with mental and physical disabilities, and Ted took me on a tour of that facility about 2 months before he passed away.

His accomplishments reach far beyond military service, though. Ted was also a very successful businessman in the aviation industry. His focus was always on safety and flying, where he was training new pilots, or as a senior vice president of Flight Operations and chief safety and security officer for ASTAR Air Cargo.

□ 1040

General Mallory is now flying sorties far above us all, watching down on his loved ones left behind. My wife, Joan, and I will continue to pray for Alice, his wife of 44 years, his soul mate; his children, Teddi and T.J. and their families; his grandchildren, Mallory and Thomas; and his sister and brother-in-law, Molly and Tom. May all those who have been touched by Ted's life find comfort knowing that his legacy will live on in both our lives and our memories.

So Ted, until we meet again one day, I want to thank you for everything you did to better our lives and our country. I miss you, Teddy. We all miss you.

A COST-EFFECTIVE CIVILIAN SURGE FOR AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the U.S. embassy and NATO headquarters in Kabul were attacked. The Taliban, which we know has exerted its influence in many of the remote regions of the country, is now flexing its muscle in the supposedly secure capital. It's just the latest piece of evidence that the military occupation of Afghanistan is having exactly the opposite of its intended effect. Nearly a decade after we allegedly defeated the Taliban and drove them from power, they remain as fearless and undaunted as ever.

The longer we have boots on the ground, the more we prop up the very enemy we are supposed to be fighting. And for this, the American people have the privilege of shelling out $10 billion a month.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, the ones who are lecturing us every day about cutting spending, isn't there something better we can do with the taxpayers' money?

Well, it turns out there is, and it would do more to promote security and counterterrorism than waging a bloody and violent war.

For years now, I've been promoting a platform I call ''SMART Security.'' SMART Security represents a wholesale change in the way we protect our country and promote our values abroad. It puts us in a position of partner, not invader. It's smart because it treats warfare as a very last resort. It's smart because it uses different tools to engage other nations and resolve global conflicts. It's smart because it emphasizes diplomacy, pursues multilateralism, promotes democracy, and respects human rights. And it's smart because it would dramatically increase our investment in international development projects that will lift people up instead of tearing their country down.

What we need in Afghanistan and poor countries around the world is a civilian surge, one that will rebuild infrastructure, power lines, schools, hospitals, economic opportunity, and much more, whatever that nation would find useful that we could help with.

You think it sounds expensive? It's a drop in the bucket. I'm talking about pennies on the dollar compared to a 10-year military occupation. In fact, The Washington Post noted last week that civilian efforts in Afghanistan have cost the United States about $1.7 billion over the last 2 years. Let's compare $1.7 billion over 2 years to $10 billion a month in Afghanistan. And even that level of funding is now facing tough scrutiny here on the Hill. Are you kidding me? Let's put this into perspective—$1.7 billion, we spend that much on the war in Afghanistan in less than a week, and that's what we invest in 2 years of civilian efforts.

If we ended this war, we could reinvest the money in the bigger, bolder surge that we really need and still have plenty left over to create jobs right

here at home and meet other important obligations. But right now, Mr. Speaker, our priorities are completely distorted. We are sacrificing the lives of our troops in a morally reprehensible war that is fiscally reckless and strategically an epic, historic failure. After 10 years, it's time to bring our troops home, make the change we so desperately need.

Embrace and adopt the principles of SMART Security.

TEXAS LEGISLATURE CALLS ON CONGRESS TO PASS BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks as I traveled across my district, the 24th District of Texas, it became very obvious to me that the number one issue on the minds of my constituents is out-of-control Federal spending.

In the last legislative session in Texas, my former colleagues in the Texas legislature passed a resolution addressing this out-of-control Federal spending. The resolution requested that the Congress pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and send it to the States for ratification.

This is the resolution I have in my hand that was sent to me by the State representatives and the senators in my district that I represent. By overwhelming votes in both houses, the house and the senate, the Texas legislature passed this resolution that I'm holding right here in my hand. The Texas House of Representatives approved this bill by a vote of 115–17 on April 13, and the Senate adopted the bill on May 19 by a vote of 28–3.

This resolution calls on Congress to enact the best measure to stop runaway Federal spending. We can best ensure our future prosperity by passing a balanced budget amendment. I would like to personally thank the members of the Texas legislature that represent parts of my district, the 24th District of Texas. I applaud them for sending this resolution urging us to take action. My sincere thanks go to State Senator Jane Nelson, State Senator Chris Harris and State Senator John Carona, and to State representatives Vicki Truitt, Burt Solomons, Linda Harper-Brown, and Todd Smith. These brave men and women have taken a courageous stand on this issue, and I feel it's my obligation to follow through with their request.

The Federal Government must end sustained deficit spending. In fiscal year 2010, the Federal Government accumulated a deficit in excess of $1.3 trillion, an annual deficit that exceeds the entire gross State product of Texas. In order to finance our current deficit, we borrow 40 cents of every dollar we spend—40 cents on the dollar—money that could easily go to pay our national debt down.

The longer we wait only results in more debt, debt that we will pass along to our children and to our grandchildren. Our national debt currently stands at $14.7 trillion, which equals a debt per taxpayer of $131,288. This is a problem we can no longer ignore.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Texas legislature's request for prompt passage of a balanced budget amendment.

THE STATE OF TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 18

Whereas, the gravity of federal debt and federal obligations was established early in American history, with deficit occurring only in relation to extraordinary circumstances, such as war; yet for much of the 20th century and into the 21st, the United States has operated on a budget deficit, including the 2010 budget year, which surpassed an astounding $1.3 trillion, an annual deficit that exceeded the entire gross state product of Texas; and

Whereas, the federal debt is greater than $14 trillion, a sum that if shared equally by each person in America would be a burden of over $45,000 per person, and yet the federal government continues to accrue debt; and

Whereas, the higher the deficit, the more the government must spend on paying interest on the debt; compounding the problem is the use of deficit spending, which becomes a responsibility for future generations of Americans to assume without their consent; and

Whereas, Congress has attempted to set budgetary restraints for itself in the form of a balanced budget amendment; the proposal won wide support in 1995, failing by only one vote in the senate; and

Whereas, many states have previously requested that Congress propose a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget, but Congress has proven to be unresponsive; and

Whereas, this growing burden of public debt is a threat to the nation's economic health, and action must be taken to restore fiscal responsibility; a balanced budget amendment would require the government not to spend more than it receives in revenues and compel lawmakers to carefully consider choices about spending and taxes; by encouraging spending control and discouraging deficit spending, a balanced budget amendment will help put the nation on the path to lasting prosperity; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 82nd Legislature of the State of Texas hereby respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to propose and submit to the states for ratification an amendment to the United States Constitution providing that except during a war declared by the Congress of the United States pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 11, United States Constitution, or other national emergency, the total of all federal appropriations for a fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated federal revenue for that fiscal year and providing for a spending limitation; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Texas Secretary of State forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the speaker of the house of representatives and the president of the senate of the United States Congress, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to the congress with the request that this resolution be officially entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

UNDERAGE DRINKING AND FTC WE DON'T SERVE TEENS INITIATIVE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the topic of underage drinking. It is an issue that challenges every generation of public officials, parents, educators, law enforcement, industry members, and concerned citizens. But through bipartisan leadership and almost three decades of public and private effort, our Nation has made some substantial progress. I mention ''bipartisan'' because it was President Reagan who teamed up with Democrats in Congress to enact the National Minimum Drinking Age Act of 1984.

□ 1050

At the signing ceremony, the President's remarks are a great lesson in federalism and national leadership that remains very important today. He said that underage drinking is a problem that is ''bigger than the individual States.'' He called underage drinking a ''grave national problem'' that ''touches all our lives.'' President Reagan concluded, ''With the problem so clearcut and the proven solution at hand, we have no misgiving about this judicious use of Federal power.''

I said that this was a bipartisan effort. Our colleague from the other body, Senator LAUTENBERG from New Jersey, was instrumental in guiding the measure through Congress, and he continues to be a forceful advocate for young people today.

According to the National Highway Safety Administration, the number of fatalities in teen drunk driving crashes has declined 74 percent since the early 1980s. Studies from the Department of Transportation and Government Accountability Office indicate that the 21-year-old drinking age has saved tens of thousands of lives. Most government measures of underage drinking have also declined.

Parents, educators, and other adults who have influence on young people need to recognize that older teens are still capable of making youthful mistakes, and some of these mistakes can be fatal. We should not do anything that allows our young people to obtain alcohol before they reach the legal drinking age. We need to remain involved in their lives and do everything we can to encourage and insist that they make responsible decisions.

Back in 2006, our colleague LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD led the effort to enact the Sober Truth on Preventing Underage Drinking Act, better known as the STOP Act. The law established a framework for cooperation among Federal agencies with responsibility to address underage drinking. In mid-July, we received a report from the Federal Interagency Coordinating Committee that was formally established by the STOP Act. It documents Federal Government prevention initiatives across

17 agencies, including the Federal Trade Commission, which created the We Don't Serve Teens program as a public education and outreach initiative.

The 2011 launch of We Don't Serve Teens occurred last week in Chicago and throughout the Nation. One purpose of the We Don't Serve Teens initiative is to inform parents and all adults that teen drinking is not inevitable. Crown Imports and MillerCoors, the number two and number three American beer suppliers, are both headquartered in the district I represent in Chicago. Both companies have supported the We Don't Serve Teens program since it began in 2006.

I am pleased that these two companies have joined the FTC, Members of Congress, Chicago officials, and thousands of concerned citizens to support We Don't Serve Teens. We need everyone at the table. Industry members have a unique ability to reach out directly to local stores, bars, restaurants, and other places where alcohol is served.

The We Don't Serve Teens message is reinforced. I commend these efforts. I especially commend the distributors of these alcoholic beverages in their effort to make sure that teens handle alcohol responsibly. The best way is to not drink at all.

POVERTY

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the founding member and a cochair of the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus. The 42 members of the caucus work every day to ensure that we meet our economic and, yes, our moral obligation to the most vulnerable across this Nation—those people facing or living in poverty.

Yesterday, the United States Census Bureau released data showing that 2.6 million more Americans fell into poverty, making it 46.2 million people living in poverty in America. This is the highest number since the Census Bureau started keeping these records in 1959. Fifteen percent of Americans lived in poverty last year. The poverty rate among African Americans in 2010 was 27.4 percent; for nonwhite Hispanics it was 26.6 percent; for Asian Pacific Islanders it was 12.1 percent; and for non-Hispanic whites it was 9.9 percent.

Digging deeper into the disparities, the data reveals that the real median income declined for white and black households between 2009 and 2010. Real median income for each race and Hispanic-origin groups have not recovered to the pre-2001 recession all-time highs.

According to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, the Census data reveals that both the number and percentages of people living in deep poverty hit record highs, meaning that some 20.5 million Americans had cash incomes below $11,000 for a family of four. In addition, the Census reports that the median household income fell 2.3 percent, or $1,100, in 2010.

Those at the bottom of the income scale have lost far more ground than those at the top. Income inequality continues to grow at alarming rates. We know that this crisis is even worse in communities of color.

The national average of children living in poverty in America is 20 percent. That's outrageous. For African American children, it's 36 percent; for Latino children, it's 31 percent. That's hard to believe. The median net worth of white families in 2009 was 20 times greater than that of the average black family, and 18 times greater than the average Hispanic family.

These are not just statistics. These are real human beings who deserve an opportunity to live the American Dream, which to our dismay, unfortunately, has turned into a nightmare for millions. So the Out of Poverty Caucus cochairs, Congressmen BACA, BUTTERFIELD, CONYERS, HONDA, and myself, sent a letter to the President asking him to address our Nation's job crisis, which is a national emergency, through a bold package of direct investment which is aimed at our Nation's most vulnerable—those facing or living in poverty. We asked that he consider including programs like the TANF Emergency Contingency Fund, which gets money out of the door across the country efficiently and effectively, and it puts people to work. We asked for job training at communities affected by the Great Recession, which of course is the depression for these communities, and we asked for programs that will help train and put our Nation's young people to work.

We are pleased and thankful that in the President's jobs bill he did embrace some of our suggestions, including building on programs like the TANF Emergency Contingency Fund and on the job training, youth employment, extension initiatives, and extending unemployment compensation, but we also still believe that unemployment compensation must be extended to those who have exhausted their benefits after 99 weeks until we create these jobs, because there are four individuals looking for one job. After 99 weeks, these individuals are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation. So we're asking that H.R. 589 be considered, which is a bill by Congressman BOBBY SCOTT and myself, to extend this unemployment compensation by 14 weeks. That's the least we can do.

Make no mistake about it, people are suffering. Children don't have enough to eat. People want and need jobs, as we saw during the Congressional Black Caucus' very important and successful jobs tour and the Congressional Progressive Caucus' Speak Out for Jobs Now tour. People want our economy to grow, but they know that they need a job to do this.

Our country needs full employment for people to turn the economy around. More and more people are falling into poverty than ever before—from all walks of life and educational backgrounds.

The Out of Poverty Caucus will continue to sound the alarm about the growing crisis of people living in or facing poverty. I want to remind everyone that many middle-income people are on the verge of falling into poverty. As we say, many are one paycheck away from poverty. It is critical that America returns to the land of opportunity for all.

□ 1100

STOP MILITARY RAPE

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as I have done virtually every week, to tell a story of a man or a woman in the military who has been raped. Nineteen thousand are raped every year in the military. Only 13 percent report the rapes because there has been such an ineffective addressing of this issue. So today, I rise again to tell another story.

I hear from victims who have been sharing their stories with me by emailing me at stopmilitaryrape@mail.house.gov. It is time for us to act. We have known of this problem for over 16 years. We have had 18 hearings and reports on this issue, and yet nothing changes.

So today I'm going to tell you about Darchelle Mitchell, an airman. And she writes: ''I never thought that I would be a victim of such a horrible and traumatic event, nor did I believe that it would occur under the blanket of freedom I swore to fight for. I decided to serve my country as an example for my two boys and to do my share to better my Nation.

''In my first year, I began to accept the unwanted comments of my shape, size and looks as though it was part of something to deal with when working and living with men on a ship. It escalated to the uncomfortable motions by a superior trying to pull me into a two-manned rack that was in the office. I reported the incident to my immediate supervisors requesting that they speak with him, and the responses were always that the superior meant no harm and that he was just being playful. This led to my superior grabbing me by the top of my head and pushing it into his genital area, stating, ''I bet I can make you say 'oh, God.' ''

''After the reporting of this incident, I suffered the backlash of being blackballed. My job assignments became very difficult, and I bounced around from command to command until someone was willing to take the chance to allow me to perform as an airman trying to advance.

''I worked very hard to remove the negative light that was cast upon me. I went on to advance to a dual-qualified

second class petty officer in less than 3 years. Despite my efforts of advancing and volunteer services, the stigma remained with me.

''I decided to take orders to Italy and move my family to another country in an attempt to step away from the negative light. Within the first 3 months of my tour in Italy, I was raped by another servicemember. I did everything in accordance to the training provided by the military. I reported the incident to NCIS and suffered through a rape kit. My children were present and had to experience something that no parent could ever dream of allowing their children to go through.

''With his DNA found in my rape kit, his fingerprints found throughout my room, and ripped clothing, the servicemember was found not guilty. The explanation given to me was, 'It is no question that his genitals touched your genitals, but it is reasonable to believe that he thought he had your consent.' From that, I was expected to return to work as if tomorrow was just another day. My superiors continued to treat me as if I brought shame to their command. The trauma was so overwhelming that I attempted to take my life on two occasions.

''Despite the constant reminder that the military is a man military, I graduated with my master's in business administration, volunteered at numerous organizations, and regained some confidence in my safety around people. This was not supposed to be the intended meaning of the sacrifices that veterans go through to serve their country.

''I pray that my experiences are not completely in vain and that one day no one will ever have to suffer what my family and I are still suffering.''

For Darchelle and every other servicemember, we must take steps to prevent this crime from happening and punish the perpetrators when it does. We should not be a country in which it is more likely to be taken into someone's room to be violated, to have violence committed against you by another member of the service, more likely than by the enemy.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

Bless the Members of this assembly as they set upon the work of these hours, of these days. Help them to make wise decisions in a good manner and to carry their responsibilities steadily with high hopes for a better future for our great Nation.

Deepen their faith, widen their sympathies, heighten their aspirations, and give them the strength to do what ought to be done for this country. Give them the wisdom and perseverance to work together constructively to address the pressing issues facing our Nation.

May Your blessing, O God, be with them and with us all this day and every day to come, and may all we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. TSONGAS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches from each side of the aisle.

FREE STUFF

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Ron and Cynthia Barrs from Texas sent me this email:

''The folks who are getting the free stuff don't like the folks who are paying for the free stuff because the folks who are paying for the free stuff can no longer afford to pay both for the free stuff and their own stuff. And the folks who are getting the free stuff want even more free stuff on top of the free stuff that they're already getting. So now the ones who are forcing the people to pay for the free stuff have told the people who are receiving that free stuff that the people who are paying for the free stuff are mean and greedy. So the people who are getting the free stuff have been convinced they need to despise the people who are paying for the free stuff. And they are promised more free stuff if they vote for the ones who force others to pay for the free stuff.''

Mr. Speaker, there's just not enough stuff for free.

And that's just the way it is.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, last week President Obama laid out a plan of action to create new jobs and strengthen our economy. Now the American Jobs Act has been sent to Congress, and it is up to us to catch the ball and run it into the end zone.

The American people are suffering. They are in pain. They are hurting. They need and deserve our help now, not tomorrow. They don't need more excuses.

The American Jobs Act contains tax incentives, Federal incentives that will give our economy an immediate boost. Ninety-eight percent of businesses will have payroll tax cut in half. The new tax credit will encourage businesses to hire returning veterans, and 280,000 teachers will be saved from being laid off. New investments will help build our roads, our bridges, our airports and rail systems, and not the bridges to nowhere.

Let's invest in the American people and work together to build our economy. This is not about allowing President Obama a win. This is about the American people, people who need jobs now, and building our economy.

Let's work together. Let's help the American people who are suffering.

A JOBS PLAN THAT WORKS

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

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, instead of President Obama's no-jobs plan, which is just more of the same, I'd like to give my 2 cents worth on what it takes to create jobs right here in America. Why? Because I know what it's like to take a risk and open a business, to hire someone and make a payroll.

Putting a moratorium on all new regulations would be a good start. Repealing the job-killing ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank financial reform laws—which are actually no reform at all and are already decimating our economy—and putting forth a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. If President Obama adopted these approaches, immediately capital would start flowing, which would then create jobs.

What we can no longer afford are the current, Big Government, socialist policies that will only put us further into debt and hurt job creation.

I have created hundreds of jobs in my district in Louisiana. How many jobs has the President created in his 2½

years? I would say net negative on that.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, on January 21, 1990, over 300,000 Ukrainians joined hands to create a 300-mile human chain from Kiev to Lviv in a show of unity and support for Ukrainian independence. One year later, on August 24, 1991, Ukraine rose from under its Soviet yoke and declared its independence.

I stand here today to commemorate the 20th anniversary of Ukraine's independence and to commend them on their many democratic achievements over the last two decades. Yet as we celebrate Ukraine's severing of its Soviet chains, we must be aware of new restraints, for new shackles in the form of press crackdowns and opposition intimidation threaten to re-enchain Ukrainians and reverse their many hard-fought freedoms.

I have faith in the spirit of the Ukrainian people and hope they will join hands again, as they did 20 years ago, and continue to stand strong for freedom and democracy, knowing America will always be standing beside them.

As they say in Ukraine: Together we are many. We cannot be defeated.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER DAVID R. CARTER

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor a soldier who made the ultimate sacrifice and laid down his life for our freedom: U.S. Army Warrant Officer 4 David R. Carter.

Chief Warrant Officer Carter dedicated himself to over 24 years of military service. As a member of the Colorado Army National Guard, he deployed to Afghanistan this summer. On August 6, 2011, he was piloting a CH–47 helicopter on a mission to reinforce a unit under attack in Wardak province. On that tragic day, he was one of 30 Americans who lost their lives when their helicopter was brought down by enemy fire.

David Carter was regarded as one of the most highly trained aviators in Colorado, with multiple combat deployments and over 4,000 flight hours. He is also remembered for the tremendous impact he had on his family, friends, and community. Friends recall that he was never too busy to help out with a problem.

Chief Warrant Officer David Carter personified the honor and selflessness of service as a citizen soldier. His bravery and dedication to duty will not be forgotten.

As a Marine Corps combat veteran, my deepest sympathies go out to his family, fellow soldiers, and all who knew him.

□ 1210

WORK TOGETHER TO PASS AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, the American people have waited too long for this Congress to put the focus where it belongs—on creating jobs and getting the Nation back to work. Now we must boldly make up for lost time. We need a plan as serious as the challenges we face. The American Jobs Act is that plan.

We will harness the industry and energy of the American people. We will give small businesses, the backbone of our economy, the incentives and assistance that they need to hire and to grow. We will put people to work building a transportation infrastructure worthy of the 21st century. We will stop teachers from being laid off and help end the outrage of our crumbling schools.

The American Jobs Act is good news for veterans, construction workers, teachers, firefighters, the long-term unemployed, and good news for all Americans who can look forward to a stronger economy and a more competitive Nation. Let's work together to pass this bill and get the American people the help they need and the support they deserve.

TIME TO GET AMERICA WORKING AGAIN

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, there are 14 million Americans out of work. We have a record 30 straight months of unemployment at 8 percent or above—the longest stretch since the Great Depression. That's simply unacceptable. The President and the Congress must work together to grow the economy and create jobs. As a businessman for over 30 years, I have seen firsthand that the government does not create jobs. The private sector does. Small business does.

My jobs plan would expand overseas markets for U.S. goods and services, lower taxes on business, eliminate frivolous lawsuits, and abolish unnecessary regulation. We need to get our financial house back in order and move towards a constitutional balanced budget amendment. It's time we work together to get America back to work.

INVESTING IN CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, we need to put people back to work, and it is past time that this issue is finally getting the national attention necessary to get something done. As we work to finally enact a jobs plan, we should be investing not only in our workforce, but also in our future competitiveness, which is why we should invest in the next revolution—clean energy technologies. We export billions of dollars each year to import the energy that powers our country. If we can harness the power of clean, renewable energy, we will not only create high-paying jobs but we can begin to address the real threat of climate change as well.

By investing in clean energy technologies, such as wind and solar, we can begin to replace many of the manufacturing, construction, and high-tech jobs lost during the recession. We should take advantage of this unique opportunity to immediately create good jobs here in America while safeguarding the future of our children and grandchildren at the same time.

PRESIDENT'S SCORECARD ON 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. Madam Speaker, the Nation's unemployment rate is a gruesome 9.1 percent. This marks the largest period of high unemployment since the Great Depression. More than 14 million Americans are unemployed. More than 25 million Americans who want a full-time job don't have one. In today's Politico, Josh Boak reported that ''Long-Term Jobless at 50-year Record.'' The State's front page revealed the Nation's poor have swelled to a sad record of 46.2 million people. The Democrat chairwoman says the President ''owns'' the economy.

The President's policies are sadly failing. He's on the wrong track, as evidenced in New York. He needs to change course with a bipartisan tax cut in the tradition of Presidents Kennedy and Reagan. The President's proposal for a second half-trillion dollar stimulus is a repeat of failure. Out-of-control borrowing and spending and the failed stimulus have aggravated unemployment. Tax increases destroy jobs. House Republicans will continue to lead bipartisan efforts of creating an environment for job creation that promotes small businesses.

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

PASS THE AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, despite the fact that we face persistent unemployment and slow economic growth, Republicans would rather waste time with debt ceiling disapproval resolutions and risk default again than come up with real answers to our most pressing problems. Democrats want to pass the American Jobs Act right now to get people back to work. We want to offer payroll tax breaks to small businesses that create jobs, not continue corporate welfare to major oil companies. We want to create infrastructure banks to repair and rebuild our communities, not delay these highway projects to score political points.

Monday, in Politico, a senior Republican aide was quoted as saying he ''didn't want to hand Obama a win'' on jobs legislation. It's clear that Republicans care more about beating the President than beating unemployment. The jobless of this country cannot wait another 14 months. Pass the American Jobs Act today.

COMMONSENSE SOLUTIONS FOR JOBS

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

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, our country is facing record deficits, high unemployment, and stagnant economic growth. Yet President Obama is doubling down on the triple threat of taxation, regulation, and spending that is crushing job growth. This week, the President has been touting his so-called ''jobs plan.'' But his detrimental policies have forced a power generation company in Texas to close five facilities and sacrifice 500 middle class jobs. The impact of this EPA shutdown will reduce generating capacity in Texas by 1,300 megawatts, a move which the Electric Reliability Council of Texas says could spur future power outages.

These regulations hurt middle class jobs and harm electric reliability in Texas with no scientific evidence that power generation in Texas is causing nonattainment of clear air standards in other States. Not only are this administration's disastrous policies preventing future job creation; they're destroying existing jobs. Instead of proposing the same failed idea that Washington can create jobs, we need to get Washington out of the way and rely on commonsense Main Street solutions that put Americans back to work.

NASA ANNOUNCEMENT ON SLS

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, this morning, NASA announced the design of a new space launch system which will be the basis for future exploration beyond low Earth orbit. It is a critical step, but one among many we need to take. Although I am pleased this decision was made, it is long overdue since it was mandated by the NASA authorization bill passed in the last Congress. This announcement combines existing technologies while enabling new ones, all the while attempting to maintain the most skilled and dedicated workforce in existence in human space flight. NASA's plan still lacks the destination focus I would like to see, and we must be diligent in keeping costs manageable, especially in these difficult economic times. But the investment in our Nation's space program enables men and women like those at the Stennis Space Center to do what they do best—test rocket engines for space flight.

America is the leader in human space flight. Today's decision helps continue that leadership role.

□ 1220

DISASTER RELIEF SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Hurricane Irene ravaged the east coast, including the State of New Jersey. Earlier this year, tornados leveled parts of the Midwest, and now Texas is experiencing one of the worst wildfires in its history. Furthermore, on the heels of Hurricane Irene, Tropical Storm Lee hit New Jersey, causing more damage and forcing more people from their homes. Homes have been destroyed, businesses are suffering, and many areas are still covered in water.

While many major disaster declarations have been made, the availability of Federal assistance remains uncertain. Today, I rise to ask my colleagues to work in a bipartisan manner to immediately pass emergency disaster relief legislation to support recovery efforts. Communities across the country have witnessed unthinkable destruction and endured great loss, and it is the Federal Government's responsibility to replenish the Disaster Relief Fund to ensure that these communities receive help in their time of need.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting supplemental disaster relief. We must come together now to provide disaster assistance to these devastated areas.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S JOBS BILL

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Madam Speaker, I rise today with great disappointment in the President's most recent proposed bill to create jobs. I was hopeful that the President would offer a commonsense, pro-growth agenda. Unfortunately, the House continues to stand ready without a proposal that is acceptable.

But this administration continues to offer the same tired, Big Government proposals. One example is the section that creates, in 17 pages, a wholly government-owned corporation—that's right, government-owned corporation—complete with a chief financial officer, chief risk officer, chief compliance officer, chief operations officer, chief lending officer, general counsel, board of directors, and billions of dollars in new taxpayer money.

It appears once again that this administration is more focused on growing government than it is on growing jobs.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker and Members, jobs are the issue, and the American Jobs Act is the solution that this House should consider on the floor immediately. This bill will help reverse the flow of jobs overseas and will help rebuild the manufacturing base in America, providing good jobs for hardworking Americans.

Make It In America creates jobs in America. This bill builds America. The long-term FAA reauthorization will create 150,000 jobs, and reauthorizing the surface transportation bill will support 134,000 projects around the country, 5,000 mass transit projects, and nearly 1 million jobs over the next year. The national infrastructure bank proposal would combine public and private resources to build, rebuild, and repair the country's key infrastructure.

This bill also helps create jobs through the Tax Code. The proposal cuts the payroll tax in half for 98 percent of businesses on their first $5 million in payroll; it offers a $4,000 tax credit to employers for hiring long-term unemployed workers—get them on the tax rolls and not on the unemployment rolls—and it starts a ''Returning Heroes'' hiring tax credit, between $5,600 and $9,600 for firms that hire unemployed veterans.

We have the responsibility to help our country climb out of this tough economy, and this bill is a proposal that deserves bipartisan support to help accomplish that.

REGULATIONS DON'T CREATE JOBS

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

Mr. YODER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join the chorus of Americans asking Washington to stop damaging the economy with job-killing regulations. Small businesses don't thrive when they're hit with additional burdens from the Federal Government.

As unbelievable as it sounds, some in this body actually believe that new regulations create jobs because they force businesses to hire people to comply with the new mandates. Madam

Speaker, this defies common sense. And that's why I am introducing two bills: one which would pause all new regulations for a year so that businesses would know the rules they are to live under, and another that would require Federal regulators to analyze the impact of their new rules on jobs and to find the least costly alternative for each new business mandate.

Madam Speaker, let's come together and agree that regulations don't create jobs. And let's pass commonsense legislation to get America working again.

THE URGENT NEED FOR JOB CREATION IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the urgent need to create jobs in America.

Millions of Americans have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, and finding a job now is as hard as it has been in generations. Our country needs decisive action, and we need it now.

Earlier this week, the President submitted the American Jobs Act to Congress, and I ask my colleagues in both parties to put partisanship aside and work together to create jobs our country desperately needs. Many of the proposals included in the American Jobs Act enjoy bipartisan support, and I call on Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR to work together in good faith to bring forward good jobs proposals from both parties to Congress.

We won't have an economic recovery without putting people back to work.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, too many people in America are out of work, and as the President said in his speech last week, too many people are living day to day, paycheck to paycheck, struggling to find work. That is why we need to pass the American Jobs Act now.

A consequence of such high unemployment is poverty. Yesterday, the Census Bureau reported that our country's poverty rate last year was an astonishing 15.1 percent, the highest it has been in almost two decades. With 22 percent of our children living in poverty, this report makes clear who has borne the brunt of our country's economic woes.

I believe that all of my colleagues share a strong love of this Nation and its children, but in order for them to succeed, we must ensure that they have access to health care, housing, modern classrooms, and qualified teachers. We must also put their parents on a path back to work.

Madam Speaker, it is a travesty to have even one child living in poverty in this country, let alone one in five of our children. It is also unconscionable to allow our actions, or inactions, to affect their future prosperity. Let's work together in a bipartisan way now to pass the American Jobs Act today.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 352

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, 53 years ago, China declared ownership of the islands in the Eastern Sea, which include the Spratly and the Paracel Islands.

On September 14, 1958, then-Prime Minister Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam issued a diplomatic note affirming the declaration from China regarding the Chinese ownership of those islands. When this decision became known, Vietnamese students and bloggers organized unprecedented protests in Hanoi and in Saigon against China's violations of Vietnam's sovereignty in the Eastern Sea. The Vietnamese security police were ordered to end the public demonstrations regarding the issue of the Spratly and Paracel Islands and detained over 40 activists who were involved in this protest.

Since early August of this year, at least 13 young patriots have been arrested by police and the Ministry of Public Security in Vietnam, and several of these activists are prominent bloggers, such as the Vinh Diocese of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, for this same issue.

As a cosponsor of House Resolution 352, I call for a framework in accordance with the United States Convention on the Law of the Sea for a peaceful resolution to this conflict.

Furthermore, I urge the Vietnamese Government to unconditionally release all advocates who were exercising their rights as citizens to call for social justice and protesting the sovereignty of Vietnamese territories from China.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, as I traveled throughout my district these last few weeks, one issue dominated all conversations—jobs.

As my colleagues on the other side created the default crisis this summer, the American people threw up their hands in disgust and dismay, and I don't blame them. Our constituents know the number one issue facing this country is jobs, and they know this Congress must take concrete actions to grow our economy, and it must take them now.

The good news is we have a plan. The American Jobs Act is a commonsense, bipartisan plan to put Americans back to work and strengthen our economy. It keeps teachers in the classrooms and cops and firefighters on our streets. It rebuilds our crumbling roads and bridges, modernizes our schools, and rehabilitates our neighborhoods. It cuts taxes for small businesses, workers and their families.

The time for political games—which are costing jobs and creating economic uncertainty—has passed. I urge the House leadership, help us pass the American Jobs Act, and let's pass it now.

□ 1230

AMERICANS LIVING IN POVERTY

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, today we learned that 46 million Americans are living in poverty. More people are suffering economically than at any time since the Great Depression. But we learned from an excellent article by Scott Lilly of the Center for American Progress that history may be repeating itself.

In 1937, conservative Republicans succeeded in virtually eliminating the Federal jobs programs of the New Deal, so as to eliminate the Federal deficit. But the results were catastrophic to America's economy and society. Half of the 8 million jobs that had been created by the New Deal were lost, and unemployment went over 19 percent.

Economists generally classified the economic reversal in 1937 and 1938 as a second depression. Not until military spending began to revive activity in 1940 did unemployment again drop to less than 15 percent.

That was a long and painful experience. It would be tragic if we permitted the new conservative crowd in Washington to repeat it by killing President Obama's jobs act and sending us back into a double-dip recession.

Those who don't learn from the past are doomed to repeat it.

JOBS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the all-important issue of jobs in America.

As I travel around my district, I frequently hear discussions about jobs. But more importantly, I hear discussions about jobs that have gone unfilled. In my district alone, that is 2,600 jobs. In America it is 3.2 million jobs that are ready to be filled today.

We must come together, as Members of Congress, to provide assistance that helps us train people, relocate them, or do whatever is necessary to bring people to jobs; 3.2 million people back to work, that's significant. I hope that my colleagues in Congress will work with me to put 3.2 million Americans back to work.

This is not a situation where there are not jobs. This is a situation where there are unfilled jobs.

INVEST IN DETROIT

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I offer this Congress and this country a simple, yet powerful, way to create new, good-paying manufacturing jobs in the United States, and that's by investing in Detroit, by allowing the tax dollars that Detroiters pay to be invested back in Detroit; invested to help make the streets of Detroit safer, to help improve Detroit schools, to help train Detroiters for jobs, to help rebuild our city.

You see, this type of investment will definitely create jobs in Detroit. But more importantly, Detroit's manufacturing know-how, our trained workforce, investing in Detroit will help put Americans back to work. So by helping put Detroiters back to work, you're going to help put this country back to work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM REFORM AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2867) to reauthorize the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2867

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 ''United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT AND COMPOSITION.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—Section 201(b)(1)(B) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(b)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''Nine'' and inserting ''five'';

(2) in clause (i), by striking ''Three members'' and inserting ''One member'';

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) by striking ''Three members'' and inserting ''Two members'';

(B) by striking ''two of the members'' and inserting ''one member''; and

(C) by striking ''one of the members'' and inserting ''the other member''; and

(4) in clause (iii)—

(A) by striking ''Three members'' and inserting ''Two members'';

(B) by striking ''two of the members'' and inserting ''one member''; and

(C) by striking ''one of the members'' and inserting ''the other member''.

(b) TERMS.—Section 201(c) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: ''An individual is not eligible to serve more than two consecutive terms as a member of the Commission. Each member serving on the Commission on the date of enactment of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2011 may be reappointed to not more than one additional consecutive term.'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''May 15, 2003, through May 14, 2005'' and inserting ''May 15, 2012, through May 14, 2014'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS.—The member of the Commission appointed by the President under subsection (b)(1)(B)(i) shall be appointed to a 1-year term.'';

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking ''three members'' and inserting ''two members'';

(ii) by striking ''the other two appointments'' and inserting ''the other appointment''; and

(iii) by striking ''2-year terms'' and inserting ''to a 2-year term'';

(D) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking ''three members'' and inserting ''two members'';

(ii) by striking ''the other two appointments'' and inserting ''the other appointment''; and

(iii) by striking ''2-year terms'' and inserting ''to a 2-year term''; and

(E) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''May 15, 2003, and shall end on May 14, 2004'' and inserting ''May 15, 2012, and shall end on May 14, 2013''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) INELIGIBILITY FOR REAPPOINTMENT.—If a member of the Commission attends, by being physically present or by conference call, less than 75 percent of the meetings of the Commission during one of that member's terms on the Commission, the member shall not be eligible for reappointment to the Commission.''.

(c) ELECTION OF CHAIR.—Section 201(d) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(d)) is amended by inserting at the end the following: ''No member of the Commission is eligible to be elected as Chair of the Commission for a second, consecutive term.''.

(d) QUORUM.—Section 201(e) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(e)) is amended by striking ''Six'' and inserting ''Four''.

(e) APPLICABILITY.—A member of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom who is serving on the Commission on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve on the Commission until the expiration of the current term of the member under the terms and conditions for membership on the Commission as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAWS.

Section 204 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6432b) is amended by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

''(g) APPLICATION OF ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAWS.—For purposes of providing remedies and procedures to address alleged violations of rights and protections that pertain to employment discrimination, family and medical leave, fair labor standards, employee polygraph protection, worker adjustment and retraining, veterans' employment and reemployment, intimidation or reprisal, protections under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, occupational safety and health, labor-management relations, and rights and protections that apply to employees whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, all employees of the Commission shall be treated as employees whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives and the Commission shall be treated as an employing office of the Senate or the House of Representatives.''.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 207(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6435(a)) is amended by striking ''for the fiscal year 2003'' and inserting ''for each of the fiscal years 2012 and 2013''.

SEC. 5. STANDARDS OF CONDUCT AND DISCLOSURE.

Section 208 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6435a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''$100,000'' and inserting ''$250,000''; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking ''International Relations'' and inserting ''Foreign Affairs''.

SEC. 6. TERMINATION.

Section 209 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6436) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2011'' and inserting ''September 30, 2013''.

SEC. 7. REPORT ON EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAMS TO PROMOTE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Comptroller General shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees and nongovernmental organizations for purposes of preparing the report.

(c) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report shall include the following:

(1) A review of the effectiveness of all United States Government programs to promote international religious freedom, including their goals and objectives.

(2) An assessment of the roles and functions of the Office on International Religious Freedom established in section 101(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6411(a)) and the relationship of the Office to other offices in the Department of State.

(3) A review of the role of the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom appointed under section 101(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6411(b)) and the placement of such position within the Department of State.

(4) A review and assessment of the goals and objectives of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom established under section 201(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(a)).

(5) A comparative analysis of the structure of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom as an independent non-partisan entity in relation to other United States advisory commissions, whether or not such commissions are under the direct authority of Congress.

(6) A review of the relationship between the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom and the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and possible reforms that would improve the ability of both to reach their goals and objectives.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6402).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, the chairwoman of our committee, and HOWARD BERMAN for their fine work in helping to bring this very important legislation to the floor today.

I want to thank especially Congressman FRANK WOLF, the author of this legislation, who is also the author of the original International Religious Freedom Act that was passed back in 1998, against considerable odds, opposition from the Clinton administration, for example, opposition from a number of people on both sides of the aisle. But at the end of the day, that legislation, historic, was signed into law and was signed by President Clinton. So he came around and actually put his signature on that historic legislation.

So I again want to thank Mr. WOLF for his famous leadership. He has been a leader on human rights and on religious freedom in particular for more than 30 years. And that culminated, at least on the religious freedom side, with the enactment of the International Religious Freedom Act.

Madam Speaker, religious freedom, the right to worship and practice one's faith according to the dictates of one's own conscience, is a foundational human right. Not only is it an essential element in our Constitution; it is intrinsic to the human dignity of every man and woman on this Earth and was enshrined in the universal declaration of human rights.

But it is a right denied or curtailed for millions, really billions, according to some estimates, even a majority of the people living in the world. For Copts in Egypt, for Christians, Buddhists, and Uighurs in China, Montagnards, Evangelical Christians in Central Vietnam, Jews in Baha'i in Iran, many Buddhist monks in Burma and, of course, this rising pernicious tide of anti-Semitism, not just in the Middle East but in many parts of Europe, and even in the United States, the ability to live their faith without threat of persecution is a distant and unrealized promise.

I was pleased to work with Mr. WOLF years ago, as I mentioned, on this legislation. And I actually chaired the hearings on the legislation. And again, there was considerable opposition that was turned around, and at the end of the day this legislation did become law.

The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom was an important part of this effort. It was created as an independent body of experts to review the facts and make policy recommendations from a vantage point outside of our diplomatic corps, where bilateral and other concerns had sometimes resulted in the soft-pedaling of severe ongoing violations of religious freedom around the world.

Even today, when the quality of State Department reporting on religious issues, while it's improved, the commission continues to serve as a critical role and a sounding board and a catalyst. One indicator is the fact that the commission's list of recommended, what is called ''countries of particular concern'' for severe violations of religious freedom, remains larger than the number actually designated by the State Department. They ought to be the same, but they are not.

Just yesterday, Secretary Clinton rightfully designated the People's Republic of China, Burma, Eritrea, Iran, North Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sudan and Uzbekistan as countries of particular concern. But the State Department's list does not add any new countries from last year, and one of the most glaring omissions of all is Vietnam, whose policies have more than earned that badge of shame.

Secretary Clinton did not designate Egypt either, or Iraq, Nigeria, Turkmenistan and Pakistan, as recommended by the commission. So, unfortunately, their recommendations went unheeded. But it does provide an important backdrop and framework to review and to look at what it is that the State Department is doing.

We need, Madam Speaker, this commission more than ever. Already in the Congress, we have had three comprehensive hearings on religious freedom: one in the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission in January regarding the religious freedom of minorities in the Middle East; one in the committee that I chair, the Africa Global Health global Human Rights Committee, regarding the prioritization of religious freedom in U.S. foreign policy; and one just last month in the Helsinki Commission on the particular plight of Coptic Christians in Egypt. That hearing brought to light an egregious policy that is acted out in Egypt each and every day, where young Coptic Christians girls, some as young as 14 and 15, are kidnapped. They are forced into Islam, and then they are, at age 18 or thereafter, given in marriage forcibly to an Islamic man.

□ 1240

That is an outrage against women's rights, human rights, and religious freedom as well.

The Commission has been an invaluable resource to Congress as we monitor the protection and promotion of religious freedom around the world and the response of the administration on this very important issue. They have also a resource to governments seeking to remedy religious freedom abuses within their own borders. For instance, in Indonesia, the Commission worked with members of the Indonesian House of Representatives and civil society groups and introduced measures to strengthen provisions in the criminal code regarding attacks on religious gatherings and amend the law governing the building of religious venues.

The Commission also continues to help network human rights and legal advocates in Indonesia and elsewhere around the world working to defend individuals accused of blasphemy and religious minorities facing intimidation and violence from extremist groups. The Commission's work in Indonesia will have practical impact on the exercise of human rights and the preservation of peace in that country.

Other governments have looked to the Commission as a model for their own religious freedom commissions.

The bill before us today includes a number of bipartisan reforms to the Commission authorities and operations to make their work even more effective.

Again, I want to thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, the chairwoman, and thank HOWARD BERMAN for their leadership in ensuring the bill came to the floor today and for their support for the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2867, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2011.

I would like to thank the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who has been a leader on this issue for, as my colleague Mr. SMITH pointed out, well over a decade on the question of international religious freedom.

We're fortunate to live in a country that was founded by religious refugees on principles of tolerance. We strive to adhere to article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that ''everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion. This right includes freedom to

manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.''

But elsewhere around the globe, religious freedom and human rights are routinely violated. Countless men, women, and children face violence, persecution, and discrimination because of their faith. Violent extremist attacks have taken place in the Middle East and South Asia. The regimes in North Korea and Iran actively repress religious freedom. Apostasy and blasphemy laws have fueled discrimination against religious minorities in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia.

Other religious minorities like Tibetan Buddhists, Uighur Muslims, Ahmadis, Baha'is, Assyrian Christians in Iraq, Copts in Egypt face violence and government restrictions. And anti-Semitism is still prevalent around the world.

Just yesterday, Secretary Clinton designated Burma, China, Eritrea, Iran, North Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, and Uzbekistan as countries of particular concern that have ''engaged in or tolerated particularly severe violations of religious freedom.''

While these may be the worst offenders, we have serious concerns about religious freedom in many other countries around the world. More than ever, we need the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom to continue its important work.

The bipartisan bill before us today reauthorizes the Commission, also known as USCIRF, which is set to expire at the end of the month. The bill also contains some sensible reforms that will strengthen USCIRF's efforts to monitor and report on the status of freedom of religion abroad. These reforms include the process of selecting the chair, terms of service for members of the Commission, and a GAO study on improving the effectiveness and coordination of all U.S. Government bodies that focus on international religious freedom.

In particular, I would like to thank Mr. WOLF for agreeing to include a provision that clarifies that USCIRF is subject to the same workplace restrictions and civil rights laws as the rest of the Federal Government.

Congress has long provided that the Federal Government, including the executive and legislative branches, is subject to laws intended to keep the American workplace safe and free from discrimination, including the Family and Medical Leave Act, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, OSHA, and workplace protections for veterans.

However, under current law, it is unclear whether USCIRF's employees could resolve disputes over workplace protections through the procedures designed for executive branch workers or under the procedures that apply to legislative branch employees through the Congressional Accountability Act. This legislation will ensure that all claims will now be resolved under the procedures created by the Congressional Accountability Act. USCIRF supports this clarifying position.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, it is a distinct privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, the author of the original International Religious Freedom Act, an historic piece of legislation and today's reauthorization, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I want to thank Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN; ranking member, Mr. BERMAN; the Human Rights Committee chairman, Mr. SMITH, who's been a champion on all of these issues from the very first day he got in here; and their staffs. The staffs have made all the difference in the world.

I want to particularly thank the chairman's staff, Yleem Poblete and Doug Anderson, for their help, and also the leadership on both sides and my side, and the leadership staff who have really tried to work this and get this thing through. I'm going to say some things that hopefully are not too controversial, but I do want to thank them for getting this thing out and getting it moving because, if it didn't move today, it may very well come to an end.

I rise in support of this critical legislation to reauthorize and reform the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. The sad truth, though, Madam Speaker, this bill has been held hostage by the other body—and keep the word ''hostage'' out there as we think in terms of what this bill would do and what's taking place around the world. And if we do not pass this bill in this form today, the likelihood of this Commission shutting down is very, very high.

I wish I could name—I know the House rule—and I would name the members over there if anyone asks me, but it's being held hostage. Some in the other body are now saying that even these are not the changes that they would like to see to the Commission. And, quite frankly, I believe that some over there and this very administration would not mind seeing this Commission shut its doors.

This was a bipartisan issue for years. Scoop Jackson, the leader, Jackson-Vanik, President Reagan. To my side, Reagan said the words in the Constitution were a covenant to the entire world, not just to the people in Philadelphia in 1787 but to the entire world. And yet religious freedom, often referred to as the first freedom, is central to our American values and should be featured prominently in foreign policy.

But, sadly, the constituency for human rights and religious freedom issues is growing smaller and smaller in Washington and in this Congress. These issues have become second-class citizens in this Congress and in this town. There are no big law firms downtown. They're representing the Saudis. They're representing the Chinese. They're representing filth and garbage in certain cases, but no one represents human rights and religious freedom.

So there are all the Members who have agonized and pushed and pulled and want to kill this. I'm concerned because as we stand here today and debate, and you've got to know this, Iraqi Christians are being killed. People who speak the same language as Jesus, the Aramaic language, and more biblical activity took place in Iraq than almost any other country other than Israel, they're being killed; and Iraqi women are being forced to do terrible things in order to keep their families.

And there are some who don't want this bill to pass. They never talk about the Iraqi Christians. Yet many of them supported the Iraqi war and yet they say nothing.

The Baha'is in Iran and Egypt are being marginalized, and I never hear a word said.

Chinese Bishops. I can remember Congressman SMITH took Holy Communion from Bishop Su. Bishop Su was arrested and has never been seen since, maybe once being forced into a public security police car and taken away.

□ 1250

Protestant pastors are being arrested today as we speak in China, and yet this doesn't really seem to bother this place. It's almost like, Well, you know, what are we going do? You know, man does not live by bread alone. These are important issues. Go back to Scoop Jackson. Go back to Ronald Reagan. Go back to the Constitution. Go back to the Declaration of Independence.

Shabaz Bhatti, the Christian minister in the government, was gunned down because of his faith, because he was a Christian. The Ahmadiyya Muslims in Pakistan are being persecuted. They're going through a very, very difficult time. There are the Coptic Christians. I was in Egypt in July, and the Coptic Christians—8.5 million—are going through a very difficult time.

As Mr. SMITH just said, anti-Semitism is running rampant. Anti-Semitism is running rampant in this world, and yet there are some who are trying to kill this Commission, for some reason, over in the other body. We're having such a hard time.

The Buddhists in Tibet, they can't even have a picture of the Dalai Lama. Hu Jintao, who is the current President of China, was the one who cracked down on Tibet and raided all those monasteries, and yet, with this bill, some are just saying, Well, you know, I don't know, and I don't know, and I don't know.

Though this bill is not what we originally planned, the Commission has said they can live with these provisions so that the Commission may remain a reliable voice for the world's persecuted

people. As Mr. SMITH said, there probably is not a time that you do need this Commission more than now. Since the passage of this legislation, religious freedom has been elevated at times in U.S. foreign policy, but it still does not enjoy the preeminence it deserves.

Sadly, a strong U.S. voice on these critical issues has arguably never been more needed. The Commission faces extinction at the end of the month. Members of Congress know, if you knock this bill down, if you want to kill this Commission and if they vote ''no,'' it will go out of business by the end of this month if the Congress fails to pass it.

Just yesterday, as Mr. SMITH said, the State Department released its annual International Religious Freedom Report. In the report, several challenges to religious freedom were pinpointed. People around the world continue to face violent extremist attacks, apostasy and blasphemy laws, repression, and anti-Semitism. According to a Pew Research Study released in 2009, one-third of all nations, containing 70 percent of the world's population, severely restrict religious freedom.

I want to thank again Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. BERMAN and my good friend Mr. SMITH and their staffs.

I don't know what we would say to the Christian community around the world and to the Baha'is and to those concerned about anti-Semitism and the Buddhist community in Tibet and the Uyghurs in China if this thing fails to pass. They would say, What's taking place in Washington? Why is this no longer an issue that this Congress and this administration care about? So I would hope we should pass it. I think we should have a roll call vote. Every Member should stand up and explain what they're going to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN, Ranking Member BERMAN, Human Rights Subcommittee Chairman SMITH, and their staffs for working tirelessly in a bipartisan manner to continue to fight for those who are persecuted for their religious beliefs. I would like to particularly thank the chairman's staffers, Yleem Poblete and Doug Anderson, for their help. Thank you also to our leadership for bringing this bill to the floor.

I rise in support of this critical legislation to reauthorize and reform the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF). The sad truth is that this bill has been held hostage in the other body, and if we do not pass this bill in the form it is in today, the commission will shut down.

Some in the other body are now saying that even these are not the changes they would like to see to the commission, and quite frankly, I believe that some over there and this very administration would not mind if the commission were to shut its doors.

Religious freedom, often referred to as the first freedom, is central to our American values and should be featured prominently in U.S. foreign policy. Sadly, the constituency for human rights and religious freedom issues is growing smaller and smaller in Washington and in Congress. These issues have become second class citizens in this Congress.

I am deeply concerned because, as we stand here and debate this bill, Iraqi Christians are being killed, Baha'is are being marginalized in Iran, Chinese bishops and Protestants pastors sit in jail, Christian and Ahmadis continue to be repressed in Pakistan, Coptic Christians are having a difficult time in Egypt, and anti-Semitism is growing around the world.

Though this bill is not what we originally planned, the commission has said they can live with these provisions so that the commission may remain a reliable voice for the world's persecuted people.

Recognizing that this critical issue and other human rights related issues are often relegated to the sidelines within the State Department, I authored legislation more than 10 years ago, in 1998, to establish the International Religious Freedom Office at the State Department, headed by an ambassador at-large, and to create the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF)—an independent, bipartisan Federal Government commission, charged with monitoring the status of freedom of religion or belief abroad and providing policy recommendations to the President, Secretary of State, and Congress.

Since the passage of this legislation religious freedom has been elevated within U.S. foreign policy. But it still does not enjoy the preeminence it deserves. And sadly, a strong U.S. voice on this critical issue has arguably never been more needed. USCIRF faces extinction at the end of this month if Congress fails to pass the bill before us today and it is not signed into law.

Just yesterday, the State Department released its annual International Religious Freedom Report. In the report, several challenges to religious freedom were pinpointed. People around the world continue to face violent extremist attacks, apostasy and blasphemy laws, repression, and anti-Semitism. According to a Pew Research Study released in December 2009, one-third of all nations, containing 70 percent of the world's population, severely restrict religious freedom.

This legislation will reauthorize the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom until September 30, 2013. USCIRF, unlike the State Department, is unencumbered by the impulse to maintain good bilateral relations above all else . . . an impulse which sadly can result in critical issues of religious freedom being sidelined in the pursuit of broader foreign policy goals.

USCIRF regularly holds briefings and hearings on and off the Hill and is frequently called upon to provide expert witness testimony to Congress.

Just in the last year the commission has taken a leadership role on a series of key issues. It was quick to recognize the strategic importance and courageous voice of the late Shabaz Bhatti, Pakistan's federal minister of Minorities Affairs, an outspoken critic of his nation's draconian blasphemy laws.

During a critical time for the people of Sudan, the USCIRF issued special recommendations on the implementation of the historic Comprehensive Peace Agreement.

It made a series of policy recommendations aimed at preserving and protecting Iraq's besieged religious minorities.

It has actively worked with dozens of Hill offices on combating the ''defamation of religions'' resolution before the United Nations.

In short, ensuring that the commission is reauthorized is of paramount importance. In a Constitution Day speech, President Ronald Reagan famously described the United States constitution as ''a covenant we have made not only with ourselves, but with all of mankind.''

Passage of this legislation will go a long way in helping us keep that covenant. I urge my colleagues' support. We must let the world know that the U.S. Congress continues to believe in the importance of protecting the first freedom for every person in this world.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to again thank Congressman FRANK WOLF, Chairman WOLF, for his eloquence and for his passion for those men and women and children of faith who suffer terrible, terrible injustices around the world, including persecution.

There were two books that got me involved, in all candor, in religious freedom issues—there were two incidents in my first year in Congress in 1981—''Tortured for Christ,'' by Richard Wurmbrand, who was a great evangelical pastor who spent years being tortured by the Securitate in Romania because of his faith. He made an appeal, and he said, Do not sit idly by while men and women of any faith are being tortured and persecuted because of that faith, because it's not just the individual who suffers; the entire family suffers; and very often they're incarcerated and tortured as well.

The other was the trip to the Soviet Union with the National Conference on Soviet Jewry in 1982, January. It was 10 days in Moscow and Leningrad, meeting Soviet Jewish refusniks who were persecuted, who were put into psychiatric prisons simply because of their faith.

A couple of years later, Mr. WOLF and I went to Perm Camp 35 in the Ural Mountains. It took years to negotiate our way in. This was in 1987. We met with persecuted Jewish refusniks and Christians and political prisoners who were there simply because of their faith. It was where Natan Sharansky had spent a number of his years incarcerated by the cruel dictatorship of the Soviet Union.

In China today, the believer Christians, Uyghurs, Tibetans, and Buddhists are tortured beyond anyone's imagination. It's real. It's happening today. In Vietnam, there has been a backlash against people of faith ever since they got trading benefits and the bilateral trade agreement and MFN were extended to them, or PNTR. They have done a backlash to men and women of faith that is unprecedented, and ought to be on the CPC list of the International Religious Freedom Commission. I hope people will go to the Web site. Check out this wonderful Commission, which if it is not renewed by the end of this month, goes out of business.

I would call out our Members on the other side of this Capitol, the other

body, to pass this legislation immediately. We ought to be strengthening and significantly expanding it, not doing less than status quo, which is what we're doing today because of some budget concerns that people have. This is the quintessential watchdog agency in this town. It doesn't get the big press, as Mr. WOLF said. It doesn't have the big bucks—no K Street lobbyists—but it is a wonderful and a very important and effective Commission that keeps track of religious persecution globally, that keeps us in line in the House and the Senate and also the State Department. I read their reports. I read them from cover to cover. Please, I would ask the Members of this body to support this legislation and call on our friends in the Senate to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2867, "United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2011." This legislation mandates the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom (Commission) compliance with federal anti-discrimination laws, restricts the Commissioner to two consecutive terms, and requires the Commissioner to attend 75 percent of Commission meetings. H.R. 2867, extends the Commission's sunset date by two years, and appropriates $4.29 million for FY12 and FY13. In addition, H.R. 2867 requires study to determine the Commission's effectiveness to ensure that the act is being implemented properly.

As a senior Member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I understand the importance of protecting the religious rights of men, women, and children throughout the world. By advocating for religious stability, we in turn decrease the likelihood of religious extremism and advance the growth of healthy nations. The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom serves as an essential fact finder and impartial advisor on these matters.

The 18th District of Texas is home to many different faiths and religious backgrounds and welcomes a variety of views on religion. This reflects the principles of freedom of religion upon which our nation was founded. The founding fathers understood the importance of freedom of religion and the perils of religious persecution. Respect for the religious practices of others is woven into the very fabric of the United States.

The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom is an independent, bipartisan commission. The Commissioners are appointed by the President and Congress. The Commission's core mission is to review international violations of religion freedom and make policy recommendations to the President, the Secretary of State and Congress. These recommendations impact the lives of millions of people of faith around the world. I believe in the importance of protecting those who are being persecuted based upon their religious beliefs.

According to a Pew Research Study released in December 2009, 198 countries, containing 70 percent of the world's population, severely restrict religious freedom. The study found that 101 governments used force against religious groups or individuals. Christians and Muslims, who make up more than half of the world's population, were harassed in more countries than other religions, although the study does not reflect the intensity of the persecution. This study was conducted prior to the Arab Spring. Many of the nations with increasing religious restrictions are the very nations that have seen popular uprisings and subsequent crackdowns—among them Egypt, Yemen, Syria and Libya, a clear indication that we need this Commission more than ever.

I firmly believe that the Commission has a positive impact on the lives of millions of people of faith throughout the world, especially at a time when many governments continue to repress religious freedom and persecute persons on the basis of their religion. Such repression only stands to marginalize vulnerable populations, emboldens extremists, fuels sectarian tensions, and robs societies of the moral and charitable contributions of faith communities.

Repression of religious freedom runs contrary to shared universal values and undermines genuine stability. In the words of Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton "Religious freedom provides a cornerstone for every healthy society. It empowers faith-based service. It fosters tolerance and respect among different communities. And it allows nations that uphold it to become more stable, secure, and prosperous.

The Commission monitors religious freedom through the lens of international human rights standards, such as those found in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Forty-five years ago the nations of the world signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which codified in international law the right to religious freedom. The ICCPR affirmed under Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that "everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching."

The Commission is not a tool to advance religious beliefs or any specific values. It is focused on addressing the religious climate in each country based upon the ICCPR. By relying on international human rights standards as specified in ICCPR, The Commission guards against any attempts to impose American values on other nations, but rather examines the actions of foreign governments against these universal standards and by their freely undertaken international commitments. This Commission is a vital resource in learning to address conflicts between religious groups, especially in the wake of the Arab Spring.

As the Commission serves to address the violations of religious freedom abroad, Congress is charged with ensuring the Commission itself is in compliance with laws that protect the rights of workers and those they serve. H.R. 2867 reflects the principle that discrimination has no place within our government and will ensure that the commission itself complies with all federal anti-discrimination laws. This is an essential distinction from the current law, which lacks these robust discrimination protections. This legislation further underscores the importance of this Commission by expending the sunset date of the Commission by 2 years to September 30, 2013. Lastly, the amount of appropriations allotted for the Commission would be amended by striking $3,000,000 for the fiscal year 2003, to $4,291,000 for fiscal years 2012 and 2013.

I firmly believe that H.R. 2867 will allow the Commission to continue to address international religious persecution, provide much needed discrimination protections, and will garner the appropriate amount of oversight to ensure that the Commission operates as effectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2867, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION RELATING TO DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 392 and as the designee of the majority leader, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Reed moves that the House proceed to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 77) relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as submitted under section 3101A of title 31, United States Code, on August 2, 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3101A(c)(3) of title 31, United States Code, the motion is not debatable.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 77

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 3101A(a) of title 31, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3101A(c)(4) of title 31, United States Code, the joint resolution is considered as read, and the previous question is considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage

without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) as the proponent and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) as the opponent.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1300

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. I am pleased to offer this resolution of disapproval of the request from the President of the United States to borrow an additional one-half trillion dollars. Dealing with this national debt is one of the primary reasons why I ran for Congress. It is to stop the endless borrowing of Washington, D.C. on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. I am also pleased to offer it in the House as the demonstration of a commitment to ending the decades-old borrow-and-spend practices and mentality that runs rampant here in Washington.

Our national debt has reached its breaking point. The need to make serious decisions to get our spending under control has never been more urgent. We have all heard the words of Admiral Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. When asked what is the most direct threat to our Nation, his immediate and clear response was that our national debt is the greatest threat to our national security. The recent downgrade of our national credit rating by S&P further demonstrates the necessity of making significant structural changes to the way we spend money in Washington, D.C.

My focus here today, because we know the Senate has acted and this resolution did not pass the Senate—and is likely not to result in the borrowing of the President getting the additional half a trillion dollars of borrowing—but it's to send a message to the Nation that we need to act proactively in this Chamber and in both Chambers of this House. We need to recognize the national debt. And rather than deal with it in a crisis situation, we should be mindful of it in a proactive, strategic, open and honest manner so that we have good, sound policy responses to the issue that we face and finally tame this beast known as the national debt.

We have spent over $15 trillion of money we did not have. That national debt is growing at the rate of $58,000 per second. That's $55,000 owed by every man, child and woman in America. That level of borrowing, that level of spending is just not acceptable because it jeopardizes our Nation and, more importantly, jeopardizes our Nation for the generations yet to come.

The American people have made it clear. They spoke loudly in November 2010, and we are listening. More borrowing won't solve the problem. In fact, it will dig the hole even deeper. Borrowing even more before we can enact significant spending cuts to begin dealing with the root problem is a foolish errand. We have a responsibility to future generations to take immediate action.

I will continue along the path of working on both sides of this Chamber to try to identify common ground to solve this crisis on the national debt. The continuing resolution last spring and the Budget Control Act, which requires this vote, are only the beginning.

This war on our national debt is going to go on for many years to come; but we need to take those first steps because with every journey it takes the first step to get us on the path too success. I know the battles ahead will not be popular, and there will be tremendous political pressure on all of us to continue to borrow and spend as usual, but we must stand up to that political pressure. We must honor our oath to do our duty and do our job in this Chamber, and that means standing up and changing the path of Washington, D.C. Making difficult decisions now is the only way we can win this war on what is a common enemy we all face, our national debt.

It is my hope this resolution continues to show the President how serious we are about this issue and at the same time that we are dealing with this issue we will focus on jobs, we will focus on the economy. We, in the United States Congress, have to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. We are competent men and women in this Chamber who love our great Nation.

We must come together on all fronts at all times, not only on the national debt but on our economy, on getting Americans back to work. And I think, with that bipartisan attitude, it will be amazing what we can accomplish in order to achieve all those goals, the national debt being one of the critical ones that we must face head on today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we should not even be considering this resolution. I repeat, we should not even be considering this resolution. We should be moving forward, not backwards. This resolution is a dangerous distraction from the unprecedented challenge before us.

Fourteen million Americans are looking for work. The Census Bureau reported just yesterday that the poverty rate is higher than it's been in 17 years, and median income in this country is at 1996 levels.

The President has proposed a jobs bill that one knowledgeable observer, Mark Zandi, estimates would create 1.9 million new jobs and add 2 percentage points to GDP growth next year. We need action to spur economic growth and job creation. That's what we should be considering today.

Instead, through this resolution, Republicans want to prolong the agony of the debt limit debate and take us back to the brink of default, which would be where we would be if you succeeded.

This bill can pass the House only if Members who voted ''yes'' in August on this issue decide in essence to vote ''no'' in September. ''Yes'' in August, ''no'' in September.

This Nation wants us to be guided by the needs of the Nation, not the internal politics of a caucus or a conference. We have seen the consequences of that kind of Republican brinkmanship. Standard & Poor's said, in downgrading our credit rating: ''It involved a level of brinkmanship greater than what we had expected earlier in the year.''

In August, consumer confidence dropped by the largest amount since the peak of the financial crisis in 2008, and the conference board noted a direct link between the fall and the debate over default. I think we need only to check 401(k) statements from August to remember the precipitous drop in the stock market.

Were this resolution to become law, all those who speak or vote for it have to understand that the U.S. would default on its obligations for the first time in our history. This would throw our economy back into deep recession, trigger $400 billion in immediate job-destroying cuts, and call into question our ability to pay earned Social Security and Medicare benefits.

Madam Speaker, we should not be considering this resolution today. We should be moving forward on the President's plan to jump-start our economy and create jobs for American workers.

□ 1310

The American Jobs Act will put more money in workers' pockets through a temporary tax cut, saving the average family $1,500. It would also keep over 6 million workers from losing their unemployment benefits while they continue searching for work and provide new employer incentives to help get them hired.

If we don't act on these issues, over a million people will lose their unemployment benefits in January and over 2 million in February. So we need to act. We need to look ahead, not just try to go backwards.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this resolution so we don't waste one more minute on a renewal of Republican brinksmanship. Fourteen million Americans who are looking for a job and 43 million Americans who are living in poverty cannot afford to wait 1 minute longer.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MACK).

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution of disapproval because Washington will continue to have a deficit spending problem until we say enough is enough and we put a stop to it. The gentleman across the aisle would like to say this is going backwards. Every time I hear someone on the left speak, it ends up costing us more money. We need to stop the insanity here in Washington. We need to stop this overspending. It seems like the only proposals that are coming our way are more spending and more taxes, so I strongly support this resolution.

I opposed the debt deal because we can no longer wait to make deep spending cuts and balance our Federal budget. We need to act now. Today we have an opportunity to prevent some of the debt deal from going into effect and disallow the government from borrowing another $500 billion—borrowing another half trillion dollars.

Recently, we heard the President keep saying on his new proposal: Pass this bill now. Pass this bill now. Pass this bill today. I'm saying and the American people are saying: Stop the spending now. Stop the spending today. Stop putting this burden on our children and grandchildren. Yet the President wants to continue to go out there and sell a jobs plan that is more of the same, and he wants to pay for it mysteriously, shockingly, by raising taxes that will do nothing but kill jobs. So his own proposal that he wants the Congress to take up, in effect, will destroy jobs.

Somehow we have to convince the people here in Washington and the President that it's not the government that creates jobs. It's the individual. It's the entrepreneurs, the people willing to take risks. But they are not willing to take risks in an economy where the President continues to try to push more regulation and more laws and more taxes. It just doesn't make sense, and the American people are fed up. They've had it. Enough is enough. We've spent way too much money.

During the August district work period, over 500 people showed up to my town hall meeting in Fort Myers, Florida. And do you know what I heard over and over again? ''Hold the line on government spending.'' ''Stay strong.'' ''Reduce government.''

And this one I love: ''It's not your money; it's my money.'' See, only in Washington do the people in this room look at it as their money. They look at your money as their money. It's not. It's the people's who have earned it.

Now a comment was made by a constituent of mine, Edward Benet, which I think speaks directly to this issue. He said: ''We have to reduce the size and scope of government. I'm unemployed, but just because I don't have a job doesn't mean my neighbor should have to pay for me.'' And then he continued on: ''The best way for government to help is to step aside, get out of the way, and let individuals and businesses do what they do best.''

He and his family are willing to sacrifice to preserve the economic freedom for Americans. We must cut spending now. That's why I introduced the 1 Percent Spending Reduction Act, commonly known as the Mack Penny Plan. With this plan, we can balance the budget in 8 years by capping spending at 18 percent of GDP in the 7th year and cutting 1 penny out of every Federal dollar for 6 years. One penny. Everybody at home, every business, every individual has had to take more than 1 penny out of their home budget or 1 penny out of their business budget over the last 4 to 6 years. And for the Federal Government to instead be talking about spending more money every year, we need to cut spending. We need to balance our budget. My plan will balance the budget in 8 years.

And for those people who might want to say we're not for just across-the-board cuts, great. What we've said is Congress decides where the 1 percent comes from. But if the Congress fails, then we're going to require an across-the-board cut. So we can either work together, or one way or another we'll get the 1 percent across the board.

The deficit spending has to stop. Like I said before, enough is enough. I support this resolution, and I would encourage all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to the gentleman, working together won't work if you undo the work that we did together.

I now yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I'm a great fan of the tradition of comedy in America, and I want to salute my Republican colleagues for this tribute to one of our great comedians who died tragically early, Gilda Radner, who in the early days of ''Saturday Night Live'' invented the character of Roseanne Roseannadanna, who would get on the news segment and say something outlandish. And then when she was corrected, her response was, ''Never mind.''

This is the ''never mind'' resolution that the Republicans have brought forward. People should understand what this says. It says that the bill that we passed that kept the government from shutting down—and I didn't like the bill, but I liked the part of it that kept the government from shutting down. I was ready to vote just for an increase in the debt limit. Singling out the increase in the debt limit and canceling it, that's what this does. What this says is—and here's the problem. We have a majority that has a problem with reality. They have a problem with reality in the field of science. They have a problem with reality in the field of the economy.

One of the manifestations of that is their objection to raising the debt limit that was in large part necessary because of debt they incurred. You know, when the debt limit came up, it struck me: It wasn't my debt limit; I didn't vote for the war in Iraq at a cost of a trillion dollars; I didn't vote to give millionaires a tax cut that they didn't need and that had no beneficial effect on the economy. But I did, out of a sense of responsibility, vote to raise the debt limit. Now, I voted against one of them, but I voted for several others.

What this bill says is this: Yes, we had to, because we were getting a lot of pressure, vote to raise the debt limit, but now that that is safely behind us, we're going to pretend that we were really against it. So this is the ''never mind'' resolution. People should understand this. What this resolution would do would be to undo what just happened.

So we have Members on the majority side who have trouble explaining to their primary voters why they had a temporary embrace of reality. Now they're not comfortable with that. Their primary voters aren't comfortable with that. So having done what they had to do, they now want to pretend that they're going to undo it.

The Senate has already killed this. They don't want it to pass because, understand what it would do, it would put us right back in the debt limit situation crisis.

And, by the way, these are people who are putting this resolution forward who purport to believe that a major concern with the economy today is the uncertainty that faces investors. So what do they do? They bring up a resolution today that would re-create—if anyone took it seriously, and I will give them the credit of saying that they don't. But if anyone took it seriously, it would re-create the greatest source of uncertainty we've seen in a long time, whether or not the Federal Government was going to shut down. So that's the phoniness of this.

□ 1320

Now let's talk about the substance. My colleagues claim to be against spending. Apparently, in their world, the nearly $700 billion that is spent annually by the Pentagon isn't spending. I don't know what it is. We have a situation in which this year in the budget the Republicans brought forward a bill to increase military spending by $17 billion while funds for local police and funds for local street repair were cut. So that's the problem.

Yes, I am for reducing spending. I am for reducing a swollen Pentagon budget. We had the President reduce by 10,000 the troops in Afghanistan. Many on the Republican side, including their leadership, criticized him for that. Do they think 10,000 troops in Afghanistan are paid for with ''funny'' money?

The fact is that while on the one hand we hear these complaints about spending, we have people who are pushing for more and more spending. And I

have to say here that I would include my administration in this. And I think if the President expects us to go along with certain restraints elsewhere, adding billions of dollars to what we have already wasted in Iraq by keeping thousands of troops in Iraq beyond this—and, by the way, why are we keeping troops in Iraq? One of the leading advocates for keeping troops in Iraq, a leading Republican Senator, Senator GRAHAM, said we must keep our troops in Iraq because we have to police the border between the Arabs and the Kurds, that at a time when we are denying funds to our cities to police their own areas.

So, let's be clear. First of all, this sham says, You know what? We had to vote to raise the debt limit. We're now going to engage in this mock exercise of taking back what we did. If anybody takes it seriously, it will send waves of uncertainty back into the economy. But, secondly, going forward, yes, join us. And that includes some on the Republican side—unfortunately, a small minority. Don't give more and more and more for the military not to defend America, not to fight terrorism. Those things are not in controversy, but to subsidize the wealthy European nations.

Madam Speaker, the NATO nations outside the United States spend an average of 1.7 percent of their gross domestic product on the military. We spend 5.4 percent—more than three times as much. And my Republican colleagues have resisted reducing that. What they want to do is subsidize the social safety nets and the spending of Western Europe at the expense of spending here. And how do we do that? By allowing them to hold down the military.

So people who want to keep troops in Iraq; people who objected when the President began a withdrawal that was too timid, in my judgment, from Afghanistan; people who want to continue to spend unnecessarily and unwisely not to defend America but to keep America the worldwide policemen have no credibility in complaining about spending.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS).

Mr. DESJARLAIS. I thank the gentleman.

For too long, the Federal Government has been allowed to engage in an irresponsible spending spree that has resulted in the accumulation of over $14 trillion of debt, and $3 trillion of that debt occurred in just the last 3 years under President Obama.

Does anyone really believe that the American people have received a good return on their investment? I know that many of my constituents in Tennessee's Fourth District don't. Unemployment is still above 9 percent, and our economy is still not creating jobs. And now this President claims to need a $2.4 trillion blank check to continue with his failed policies. That means our national debt would be close to $17 trillion by the end of next year. Enough is enough.

The latest assessment of our debt indicates it will reach 109 percent of GDP in the next decade. That will only further degrade employers' confidence in our economy and hinder their ability to create jobs. We cannot allow that to happen. I was elected by the people of Tennessee's Fourth Congressional District to come to Washington to finally make the Federal Government learn to live within its means. No more borrowing 40 cents out of every dollar, no more trillion-dollar deficits, no more stimulus spending, and, most importantly, no more expecting our children and grandchildren to pay for all of this.

The debt limit debate provided us with a real opportunity to put our Nation back on a fiscally sustainable path by finally forcing the Federal Government to make difficult, but badly needed, spending decisions—decisions that I am more than willing to make. I believe that we missed an opportunity to open up the books and do something that should have been done years ago—prioritize our spending.

It is hard to believe that with all the waste, fraud, and abuse that occurs within the Federal Government that we would have any problem cutting enough spending so that raising the debt limit would be unnecessary. When families in my district have spent more than their budget allows, they look to how they can cut back, not how they can borrow more money. Maybe they don't take a vacation that summer. Maybe they go out to eat less often or hold off on purchasing a new car. The point is they know that the answer to getting back on the right fiscal track is spending less, not borrowing more. The same should hold true for the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this joint resolution of disapproval.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to another member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Seattle, Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution because it is in favor of the United States defaulting on its debts. The Republican Party is calling for the United States to default, to tell the whole world: we don't pay our debts. That's what this is about, and it doesn't do one single thing to help American workers or businesses with jobs.

Now, make no mistake: The House of Representatives is being used by the Tea Party as an attack machine on the President. They will delay action on anything that helps the economy. The President came up here on Thursday with a plan. Where's the schedule for bringing it out on the floor to create jobs? No, we have to come up here with this resolution. For the majority, delaying economic recovery is a small price to pay if they can win an election. They don't care about ordinary folks, working people. They only care about people on the top. Instead of doing something to help create jobs, they have brought up this bill to gin up their extreme base that thinks the only thing Americans should build together are roads and a Defense Department. That is what the U.S. Government is all about. Nothing else makes any difference. We don't need to invest in health or science. What do we need science for? It will work out. Don't worry.

In this resolution the Republicans are voting for the United States not to pay its bills. That's what we're spending time on. Today is just another day in the Alice in Wonderland of the Republican House. Pure politics and nothing to help the American people get jobs. This whole Republican Congress is about the Presidential election. It has been from the beginning back in January. Not helping the middle class. What have they done for foreclosures in this country? What have they done for youngsters trying to go to school? What have they done for anything except try and get the President? They are trying it by stopping the economy from moving forward.

I urge my colleagues not to just vote ''no'' on this but for the majority to withdraw it and bring up the American Jobs Act. The President brought it up here. It deserves to be brought up to the floor and debated and amended and passed.

I sometimes wonder when I listen to the discussion about this doing stuff to pay someplace down the road, some long-term investment, if a Republican has ever bought a house. I remember when I bought my first house in Seattle. I was 25 years old. I was a medical resident. I paid $16,400 for it. And I wondered if I would ever be able to pay for it, because I wasn't making that much money in those days.

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

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Lo and behold, I bought the house. And you know what? Thirty years later I paid off that house. That's what investment is about. What the President is saying is that we have to invest in this country if we're going to bring it out of the problems it's in. And that means infrastructure on the ground and it means in human beings in education.

□ 1330

If we don't invest, as the Greatest Generation did after the Second World War—here came Eisenhower and said, hey, we've got to build roads. Nobody said, well, you know, we can't go in debt for all that. Nobody said we can't invest in human beings.

We did the GI Bill of Rights, and that's what made us the strongest country in the world. We took every veteran who came back from the war and said here's a college education; get

it and take it out and make this country work. That was investment. But not today's Republican Party. Oh, no, we can't, we mustn't.

Don't you understand investment?

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, it's been said that leadership is willing to make hard choices, fact-based choices to come up with solutions to solve problems and deliver results.

Now, we gathered here last Thursday in this Chamber to hear the President, with a much-touted plan beforehand that he was going to bring forth to the American people that was going to help solve the high unemployment in this country and get our economy back on a competitive basis. I can tell you, Madam Speaker, I sat there and I listened very intently, and I left this Chamber with great disappointment because it's not enough.

Furthermore, he is proposing taxes, new taxes, taxes on energy production, American energy production. Now, let's look at the facts of what happened.

Yes, we had an oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, and it was dealt with. It was a tragic situation, but it has been dealt with. The fact of the matter is we need American energy production to move this country forward. And now what we're seeing with the lifting of the moratorium is this continued de facto moratorium because of slow-walking of exploration plans and permits.

Now, what does this mean? If we brought back the permitting process to the same timeframe we had before—without sacrificing safety—bring it back into a reasonable amount of time, let's say 30 days to take care of these permits, in 1 year, the year 2012, 230,000 jobs would be created, new jobs, good, high-paying jobs. And not only that, a third of those jobs would be beyond the Gulf Coast States around this country, in California and Florida and in the central part of the country. This would add $34 billion to our GDP. And that's just getting things back to where they were. That's not even talking about expanding exploration in these shale formations or looking at the east and west coast where we can do more or Alaska. These energy jobs are good-paying jobs. And not only that, it would bring in, in 1 year, $12 billion more into the Treasury and reduce our bill on foreign oil by $15 billion. And that's just getting us back to where we were.

Now, I stood here and listened to the President. Instead, he offers taxes, $45 billion more in new taxes on independent oil and gas companies. That's going to hurt American energy production, it's going to kill American jobs, and it's going to do nothing to help solve our economy.

Furthermore, he chided us about the trade agreements. We have three trade agreements sitting there. They've been there for 3 years. They've been negotiated. They're ready to go. And he said Congress needs to pass them. Well, Mr. President, the answer is: Send them to Congress and we'll pass them. That's the process.

And beyond that, what is our trade policy? This country is losing credibility globally and it's losing its leverage because we have no trade strategy, a strategy that's going to promote American-manufactured goods, American farmers and their commodities so that we can sell these around the world to open markets. That will get our economy going.

If we want to solve our debt problem, yes, we've got to balance our budgets, yes, we've got to deal with the debt problem—we've taken some steps—but I saw nothing that the President offered. That's why I'm here supporting this resolution, to push this President to consider the steps that need to be taken to promote American competitiveness, private sector job growth. That's what we need in this economy.

Now, the President had the answer. He was standing here at this podium and he had the answer right up there on the wall of the House behind him. There is a plaque up there, and it's a quote from Daniel Webster. And that first sentence of the quote says, ''Let us develop the resources of our land.'' What's wrong with that, Mr. President?

For God's sake, we need American energy production, and it's simple. With the stroke of a pen, he could solve this permitting problem and at least get us back to where we were, create 230,000 jobs next year and add to our GDP growth. And this would be a start, a down payment to a comprehensive energy strategy for this country. This is a no-brainer.

We need natural gas as part of our transition strategy. His policy is going to lock out natural gas production in this country. Ninety-seven percent of it is done by small domestic companies here in the U.S., and these taxes will put many of these companies out of business.

Mr. President, read the plaque. Let's develop our natural resources. Let's do what we have to do. Let's promote a very aggressive, export-oriented trade policy.

And we need a willing partner to move forward with tax reform. We're getting half-hearted signals. This country needs fundamental tax reform. We want to do it on the House Ways and Means Committee. We're ready. We stand ready as willing partners, but yet we're getting signals—mixed signals. This administration has not shown a serious intent to move forward with fundamental tax reform that will unleash American ingenuity and entrepreneurship in this country.

And that's what I heard all through August when I was back home in my district when I talked to folks. They want to see an energy strategy. They want to see comprehensive tax reform that simplifies our Code and lowers rates and clears up some of the loopholes. They want to make sense out of this Tax Code. And they want to see us selling goods overseas, letting our ports expand.

He didn't even mention maritime infrastructure. We've got bills right now that would improve our maritime infrastructure without costing one penny more in deficit spending. Why aren't we acting on these things?

We're tired of rhetoric. We're tired of political talking points. And what we need is action. The American people have had enough. And I say let's get to work. Let's get this House moving on fundamental changes that will improve this economy and create private sector jobs.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to say to the gentleman from Louisiana, I listened intently, and I don't understand how he could have voted ''yes'' to raise the debt ceiling in August and now, in essence, he's going to vote ''no'' and bring this country back to the brink of chaos.

I now yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, a very active member of our committee, Mr. NEAL.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I'm fascinated by this argument, for the people that are viewing it, largely because this is not an argument about new spending; this is an argument about paying for past spending. So when Bill Clinton said ado, said goodbye to the American people on January 19, 2001—this is fact, not opinion—America was staring at a $5.6 trillion surplus. On January 20, George Bush took the oath of office, and when he left 8 years later, we were looking at a $10.6 trillion deficit.

Let's recount those years: Two wars, $2.3 trillion worth of tax cuts, and a prescription D benefit that was unfunded. And all of the money they applied to those arguments—and I am very pleased by the fact I voted against those tax cuts, spoke against them, and voted against the war in Iraq. But all of the money that I've just referenced was borrowed money by the Republican Party. They borrowed all of the money for it—fact, not opinion. And now the bill has come due, and they're on the floor talking about fiscal rectitude.

Now, here's what I think is important: The gentleman from Florida opened this debate, my friend, Mr. MACK, by talking about our money and how that money is utilized. Well, guess what? The veterans hospitals, 35,000 men and women wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, is he saying that that's not our money that ought to pay for those hospitals?

□ 1340

Joe Stiglitz has estimated that the cost of disability for the war in Iraq will be between $500 billion and $900 billion.

I hope people pay attention to what I'm about to say. Almost one out of two people who have served us honorably in Iraq and Afghanistan, they're coming back with a long-term disability. Those VA hospitals are going to be stretched for years to come.

Now, whether you were for Iraq or against it, our responsibility is to pay for those men and women who served us honorably: 20 years old, life expectancy of 80, they're in our care for the next 60 years.

I would note with some humor that the Republican leadership did not send out, today, people that were here for the tax cut vote or for the vote on the war in Iraq. Remember weapons of mass destruction and how that vote was to take place?

Friends, this is about paying our bills. This is not about new spending. And I hope there's no confusion in the hinterlands. Today, because of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, every American citizen has a bill of $17,000.

They helped bring us to this path of fiscal irresponsibility during their years of borrowing and borrowing and borrowing, and they ask the American people to embrace amnesia. They set the fire, and now they're calling the fire department.

This is a very simple vote. It's about paying our bills.

Mr. REED. I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding on such an important subject that we're talking about today.

I would like to make a couple of points in reference to what the gentleman from Massachusetts just made regarding the Republican Party. And I would say that the Republican Party did make mistakes at the beginning of this decade. I would say the Democrat Party has made some mistakes in the last several years. I think there's plenty of blame to go around for both parties in Washington.

But there's a new crew in town. There's 87 new Republicans that were elected last November from all across this country who have joined those in our party who are saying stop the spending. Stop the madness. We're working against ourselves, folks.

Madam Speaker, I would say that we wouldn't have to continue having this discussion if we would stop spending, stop borrowing, and then we would focus on the economy. It's going to take both sides to come together to fix the problem within our economy.

We're going to have to control our spending. We're going to have to help those Americans who are out there and those who are actually establishing jobs, those who are creating jobs. It's not the U.S. Government that is going to create the jobs for those who are unemployed.

I believe that we have a great opportunity right now to again say, let's stop this sort of spending binge in Washington, D.C. We're passing on debt to our kids and our grandkids. This is an opportunity for us to come together, both parties, and say, let's forget about the sins of the past. Let's pay those bills. But let's not continue to spend the way that we're spending today.

From a debt of $79 million when the Revolutionary War ended, the United States has racked up a debt of nearly $14.6 trillion. It would take nearly everything that Americans produced in all of last year to pay off the existing national debt.

Right now I see two competing visions in Washington and across this country, Madam Speaker. The first vision is the ''business as usual'' vision. And we see a lot of that right here in Washington. It says we need to blindly increase our debt; and if people complain, call it investment instead of debt.

In May, President Obama called for a no-cuts-attached increase to the debt ceiling. He didn't give up his call for a blank check until his request had failed here in this House by an overwhelming and bipartisan vote of 97–318.

The second vision that I hear a lot about back in Indiana is the same vision and the same work that families do every year. You figure out how to live within your means. You have real cuts, not budgetary gimmicks. You don't fool yourself when you're sitting around the kitchen table trying to figure out the mess that you find yourself in. It's based on the truth.

Families sit down at the kitchen table and have the heart-to-heart talks about the situation that they're in. Two conclusions that they usually come to are, we have to cut spending, and we're going to have to figure out how to bring more dollars in. It accepts the challenge, Americans accept the challenge, knowing that these things are not easy.

We know that the ''business as usual'' vision, it's broken, and it will inevitably lead us to ruin and more ruin. This vote is a vote against that vision.

I come to the floor to support the second vision, the vision that Americans across this country support, a vision that is shared by the men and women of northeast Indiana. It is a vision of prudence, honest conversations, and optimism.

When we get pulled into these discussions because of the continual discussion about more spending, we cannot focus on the important part of getting people back to work and growing our economy. Government doesn't create jobs. Governors don't create jobs. Americans create jobs. I believe in the American people, and that hope is still a part of our vocabulary.

I believe that we're also changing the discussion here in Washington. Career politicians have had their day in Washington, and it's time to talk about cuts. And since we've talked about cuts, the sky has not fallen. Optimism is a part of what the American fabric is built upon. I believe that this Joint Deficit Committee needs to find common ground for actual cuts and that the Senate will pick up the job growth bill that we passed right here on the floor of the House of Representatives this Congress.

We all knew that this debt ceiling debate was never going to be our final battle in a struggle for balanced budgets and fiscal responsibility. It gives us the chance to continue to talk about it. And if we want to continue to raise the debt, if we want to continue to increase spending, we'll continue to talk about why we need to restrain Washington politicians.

I'm going to continue the dialogue. I believe it's crucial. It's an important part of saving this country's economic future for my kids, for our children and for our grandchildren across this country.

Government has, for too long, continued this business as usual and the status quo vision that I talked about earlier. Americans are going to have to pay back all of this debt. This may not be a tax increase, but inevitably and indirectly it is.

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

Mr. REED. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. STUTZMAN. So, Madam Speaker, I come to the floor in support of this resolution because I believe that we need to all agree, Republicans and Democrats, that we're going to limit spending, we're going to stop borrowing.

We can pay our bills back. But at the same time we're going to focus on job creation, getting people back to work, as the gentleman from Louisiana mentioned, the energy jobs that were talked about. That was one of the things the President didn't discuss in his address the other night is he didn't talk about energy.

We are the leaders in the world on production. I come from a district of a lot of manufacturing; and I believe that if we would focus on energy, cut spending, we need to reform government. That's what's going to get people back to work. The economy's going to grow. We will still be number one in the world.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 30 seconds.

This resolution isn't about a new vision. It's really about blind rage. There may be a new crew in town; but if this were to pass, it would be a wrecking crew because, essentially, we would be back on the edge, once again, of default.

I now yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, America was united in its disgust at the spectacle in Washington during the debt ceiling fiasco. The Republican threat of default ranks among the most reckless and destructive political stunts in modern American history. It undermined the fragile, but recovering, economy and reduced faith in

the United States of America. It has also undermined the American people's trust in its government.

There's no reason to have a debt ceiling at all. It doesn't restrain spending since the spending has already been committed. It just threatens our credit, and it weakens our country.

That's why I, Representative NADLER, and Representative MORAN introduced this morning the Full Faith and Credit Act, a bill to do away with the debt ceiling once and for all.

□ 1350

But if we are going to have a debt ceiling, the threat by Members of Congress to refuse to raise it is an outrage. We've already made these commitments; yet some would have us default. Some would undermine the full faith and credit of the United States. Some would do irreparable damage to our economy and our standing in the world. It's a disgrace. It's a total disgrace.

And the American people see it for what it is: part of a concerted effort to undermine this economy in order to undermine the President and fulfill the congressional Republicans' Inauguration Day vow to do everything within their power to ensure that President Obama would be a one-term President.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I appreciate the gentleman from New York yielding to me.

I do support this resolution.

Here in this Chamber—actually, here in America—we often talk about achievements in terms of metrics: the larger, the better. For a private company, it's impressive when it has a large budget, a large workforce, and a large profit and a large presence.

The Federal Government, as an institution, should not talk this way, even though similar assertions would all be true. Washington spends too much, employs too many people, and is too intrusive in the lives of all Americans.

The major difference is that private business makes investments that deliver returns, and failure to do so is the demise of the business. The Federal Government's spending, though, often fails to deliver real results. But the Federal Government does not meet its demise; rather, the all-too-often negative consequences fall on taxpayers and usually result in a new government program or one or dozens more.

But if we were thinking like a businessperson, we would consider the results that have come from past investments before making another.

Two-and-a-half years ago, the previous Congress and this current President implemented a stimulus that ultimately will cost Americans more than $1 trillion. This mega-investment was supposed to create 3.5 million jobs. This investment was supposed to bring an unemployment rate of 6.4 percent last month. But what has actually happened? The President is more than 6 million jobs short and unemployment stood at 9.1 percent last month. That's not even counting the millions of Americans who are underemployed.

The Budget Control Act, which the President signed, was supposed to be about putting an end to Washington's business as usual: spend and borrow, spend and borrow some more. Yet when the President came before us here in this very room a week ago tomorrow, all we heard was a recycled idea: another stimulus, another $450 billion exercise in excessive spending that will underperform and underdeliver.

Spend, spend, spend, raise taxes and borrow more to pay for that spending. Raise those taxes from the very individuals and businesses that can actually create jobs that will get the economy out of this rut and put millions of Americans to work. And along the way, let's demonize job creators. That's what happened in this Chamber.

I believe the Federal Government should function as efficiently and as effectively as a private business; but it, by no means, should be able to brag about a large budget that fails to deliver and which only adds to the red ink each year.

Before adding to the $15 trillion in debt this country already has or sustaining more years of trillion dollar annual deficits, we have no choice, and the American people expect no less, cut current spending and cap future spending obligations and pass a balanced budget amendment.

I support this resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 3 minutes to another active member of our committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

I think it's clear that this resolution is just not my cup of tea, but I can tell you if we followed the path that was just recommended, Republicans could drive us deeper into recession or even depression.

It's as if the Republicans who are here today wanted to start Halloween early because they keep trying to bring back to life, as if it were some zombie, the specter of debt default that has already caused us so many problems.

Building on their earlier success in sowing panic and reaping fear in our global financial markets that contributed to the first-ever downgrade of our Nation's credit rating, these professional obstructionists are determined to keep trying to wreak havoc.

As families are demanding action on the economy, a response to jobs, the Republicans instead are focusing on pandering to a small group of people for whom reality doesn't seem to make much difference. The problem is reality has a Democratic bias when it comes to this question of the economy and job creation.

I think if the Republicans really want to help us close the debt gap, the best way to do that is to get this economy moving. An increase in economic growth will do more than any of the things that he just mentioned—some amendment that might be approved years from now—will do more to help us get the debt under control than most anything else.

Of course, how did we end up with the debt that we have today? Much of it is directly related to the policies of the Bush-Cheney years when Republicans were totally ignoring the issue of debt: unpaid wars, tax cuts based on the mythology that they would pay for themselves when they just dug us deeper into debt. And now we face the need to try to get our economy moving again. Their solution? Do less. Jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States.

I think one of the problems that we have here, and it afflicts the Democratic Party to some extent as well as the Republicans, but especially with our Republican colleagues, is that we've just got too many certified smart people here in Washington. They're so smart they know what they know; they just don't know what the American people are experiencing. You don't have very many people advising about this economic recovery.

Whoever had to drive a truck for a living? You don't have people who even had to worry about whether they could make their next truck payment. And you sure don't have people advising who've had their house foreclosed and had to move their family into a truck. But that's the plight that too many Americans face today, and we need to be responding to their legitimate concern that what we need to do is focus on the demand side of the equation and help improve demand and get this economy going again.

I like the idea of focusing on our roadways, our trucks, our crumbling bridges and the like, building the infrastructure that will help American business as well as the people who would do that construction work.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. I believe that focusing on our infrastructure, our roads, bridges, our schools, focusing on what is happening inside our schools with so many teachers threatened with dismissal around the country with the cutback in State and local budgets, that's the kind of focus that can help get America moving and address the debt issues at the same time.

I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's empty political resolution so we can focus on what really makes a difference to working families across this country.

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

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York, CHARLES RANGEL.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise against this resolution.

I had thought that the Congress had already passed this very, very embarrassing experience.

When you read the papers today and see the pain that exists throughout these United States, it is not Republican or Democratic pain. It's pain that they're feeling as a result of the lack of economic growth in our great country.

And when you see the number of years and decades that this Congress has approved the President's authority to increase the debt ceiling for the purpose of maintaining the fiscal integrity of our country and, therefore, the democracy-loving countries that depend on the credibility of our fiscal condition, I would have hoped that we would think of this issue not in terms of the political implications, but how does the world perceive us to be.

Quite frankly, without being political, in watching the debate the other night, it wasn't that it annoyed me, but I was just so embarrassed that the world might think that that represented the principles of my country, people laughing about execution and laughing about people dying.

I'm certain nobody in this body takes pride in that type of thing. But to go against the President's ability to maintain the integrity of the United States of America, I think it is just so wrong.

There are good reasons that we can't challenge as to why our polling as a body is so low.

□ 1400

I don't think anyone can walk away feeling proud—liberal, conservative—about what's going on. The reason is because people don't go to sleep at night worried about what we're doing and debating on the question of revoking, of giving the power to the President to protect the integrity of our great Nation. No. They're going to bed at night having hope that maybe tomorrow they'll get a job, that maybe they'll be able to guarantee their health insurance, that maybe their kids will have a better life, that maybe we'll stop fooling around, playing politics with the future of this great country, that just maybe, one day, we'll be more concerned about the lack of default and the credit of our country than our own reelections.

I know it seems absurd that we can wish that; but if you think about it, they're not talking about Democrats' polls being low, and they're not just talking about Republicans' polls being low. They're talking about all of us.

The greatest thing about America, far beyond our military and economic wealth, is the trust that people used to have in government. Once they lose that, whether they're poor or whether they belong to that small number of people who hold the Nation's wealth, then the country is in desperate trouble.

So I hope that people who witness this debate recognize that the opposition is not speaking for the country or the Congress, but probably for the Republican National Committee.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another member of our committee, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. This pointless exercise that the House has embarked upon here today illustrates the challenge that we have to try and deal meaningfully with the very real problems that America expects us to make progress on. This resolution has already been laid to rest in the Senate. It has been defeated. Ain't going to happen. So, no matter what the result of the hours of debate that we have here today, it will make absolutely no difference.

It is an extension of what happened with the totally manufactured crisis surrounding the debt ceiling earlier this year. The debt ceiling increase was to deal with bills that we had already incurred, for which Congress over the years had already approved the spending, and we'd borrowed the money for it. It made no difference about future debt. It made no difference about the spending commitments that had already been made. Yet we watched tremors go through international markets, not because America couldn't pay its bills, but because some politicians, for their own purposes, were willing to risk that America didn't pay its bills.

Unprecedented.

We've raised the debt ceiling over 100 times. There was no doubt that we would, in fact, honor our commitments; but there were people talking crazy enough that cast doubt. That, I think, at least in part, is why we have seen the markets in the United States be on a roller coaster and people watch their 401(k)s maybe become 301(k)s one afternoon before they go up a little again and then go back down.

It doesn't have to be this hard if, instead of a pointless exercise, we would spend some time on areas where actually Congress could come together and cooperate on dealing with the infrastructure crisis in this country, where there is broad support from the business community, organized labor, contractors, local government, environmentalists to move forward to rebuild and renew this country, putting not tens of thousands but millions of Americans to work in strengthening our country and our economy. We could be dealing with something like this, but we're not.

We could deal with reforms in agriculture that would put more money in the hands of America's farmers and ranchers, less in mega-agribusiness. We'd save money, and we'd improve the state of agriculture. While we're at it, we could probably improve the health of our children in school with their nutrition, but we're not dealing with that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Most tellingly, we should be accelerating the reforms that the last Congress enacted. When they started, most of them were bipartisan ideas that have been implemented, in some cases, by Republican Governors. The difference between what America spends on health care this year and what the second most expensive country, Switzerland, spends is $3,000 a person, $3 trillion over 10 years. If we could just spend as much as the second most expensive country in the world.

We ought to be working on things like this that will make a difference for America, put them back to work, have fiscal stability—and maybe regain a little confidence in the political process instead of pointless exercises like this. I hope—I hope—that we will get this out of our system, get down and get to work. America deserves our best, not our worst, which is on exhibit here today.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my good friend from Michigan for yielding.

Let me take this opportunity to thank the 174 Republican Members of this House who voted with us in a bipartisan fashion just last month to avert the first Federal default in the Nation's history. It may not have been an easy vote for some, but it was the right thing to do to prevent a catastrophe that would have certainly shaken further our fragile economic recovery. Today's vote is no different.

I urge my colleagues to not give in to the political gamesmanship that Standard & Poor's cited as the very reason for its bleak downgrading of the United States' credit rating. We must reaffirm our commitment that America will meet its obligations, and we don't want to find ourselves politically explaining how we voted for it before we voted against it.

Make no mistake that voting in favor of this resolution will, in fact, lead to the very default we voted to avoid with the Budget Control Act. You cannot now be for default after having just voted against it. We must reject this resolution and move on to the real challenge of working with a bipartisan supercommittee to restore fiscal responsibility, revive our economy and, most importantly, re-instill confidence in the American citizen and the American business community.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Does the gentleman from New York have any more speakers?

Mr. REED. I have one additional speaker, and then I am prepared to close after that, I believe.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I know of the intentions of my colleagues across the aisle. You want to try to make America a better place.

We had the prior speaker indicate that tremors were sent through the financial markets because some politicians, for their own purposes, put the financial integrity at risk. The Democratic speaker before that indicated that we should not go against the President's ability to protect the integrity of the United States. The Democratic speaker before that said that no one was apparently advising Republicans who had missed a truck payment. Things like that.

Guess what. I know that was not intended to be misleading. I know the intent was not that, but the fact is some of us go home as we did in August.

□ 1410

Some of us get out into the far reaches, the most rural areas of America, our districts. We talk to those people. They're struggling with gas prices. They are having all kinds of trouble making ends meet, and they cannot understand how the people that are sent to Washington as representatives don't get it, how we could come up here and we can't control our spending.

So I wanted to help illuminate those friends who are mystified as to what our own purposes were in opposing a debt ceiling bill that jacked up the debt ceiling and then says, you know, we are going to cut 1, maybe 2, 2.5 trillion over 10 years when everyone in this body either knows or needs a good education to know that there is not a court, there is no way in the world you can bind a future Congress into making cuts that they have not agreed to. You can't do that. It's not enforceable. So the trick here in Washington is to back load all of the massive cuts, have a little trickle of cuts now.

So our own purposes boil down to this: I didn't deserve to be born in America. None of us that were born here did. We weren't born here because in the womb we did something deserving of being born in America. We are the most blessed nation in the history of the world, and it's not because of what anybody living today has done. We were blessed. We were born here. So many have been able to immigrate here and be blessed because of what prior generations have done: the responsibility, putting their lives on the line in war, struggling through depression to be accountable, struggling through the earliest days when they pledged their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor. Those people are the reason we have been blessed.

So to make clear about what our own purposes were in opposing that debt ceiling, that didn't really do any kind of significant cuts in the next year, 2 years, back loaded them for 10 years, because that's irresponsible. And if future generations have any hope at all of being blessed as we have been, it's up to us. We can't repay the people that paid the ultimate price and that scraped and saved and were responsible in Congresses for 200—well, not 200, but 150 years or so that lived within their means. We can't repay them, but we can repay them by being responsible for the future.

So to come in and to have a debt ceiling increase time after time after time is not a real debt ceiling. And it is not an adequate defense to say, well, Bush did it; well, Clinton did it; well, Bush did it before him or Reagan did it, and just go on down, Carter did it. At some point we have to be responsible for our own actions and quit playing the pointing game and say, look, our time is now. We are elected to be responsible now. Our own purposes are to be responsible for the debt that we are incurring now. The $4.5 trillion more than has been brought in is pretty irresponsible. That's no way to go.

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

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

Mr. GOHMERT. But if you want the numbers, if we are only able to save a trillion dollars over 10 years, which is quite possible under the debt ceiling deal that passed, then it will take 150 years before the budget balances if we continue to cut 1 trillion every year, and it will only add about $120 trillion to the 14 trillion we have now. If we could save 2 trillion every 10 years, then we are looking at 80 years before we balance the budget and only adding 72 trillion to the debt that we have.

That's irresponsible. This country won't be around in this form, this Congress, and therefore that is our special purpose for doing this. That is why we say it's time to stop the debt ceiling bill from where it was, get responsible, and propose real cuts so this Congress does what the people who are missing payments are trying to do—live within their means.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to say to the gentleman from Texas I disagree with his position, but I respect it. I can understand that those who voted ''no'' will now vote ''yes.'' What is not understandable is that those on the Republican side who voted ''yes'' are now voting ''no.''

I yield 4 minutes to our distinguished whip, the gentleman from the proud State of Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The previous speaker voted to go deeply into debt. Frankly, I voted for some of those programs myself, two of which were to support the efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq. We didn't pay for them.

As has been said, I didn't vote for it initially, but I think it's a good program. We have made it better for the prescription drug program, and the gentleman wasn't here when we passed that, but we didn't pay for it. He is correct: It doesn't matter which side didn't pay for it; we haven't paid for it.

This bill is about whether or not we are going to stand up and say, yes, we voted to pay for it but, guess what, we had our fingers crossed; we are not going to do it. We said we were going to do this. We took some tough action. Both sides joined together, both leaderships joined together and said we are going to do this.

Now, this bill is a phony. This is posturing. This is politics. This is pure politics because the United States Senate has already rejected this bill and only one House needed to reject it. We are going to have an extension of the debt.

The extension of the debt will simply mean that those items that we all voted on will be paid for, that we won't welsh on our debts, that America will pay its debts.

Now, this bill is about, oh, no, let's not pay our debts. Let's pretend that they don't occur, that we really don't have to pay them. America's welshing on its debts really won't have much consequence; although the overwhelming majority of people believe that if we welsh on our debts it will have extraordinary consequences. In fact, it's having extraordinary consequences on our economy right now, as we speak. It's undermined the confidence in America that we had this confrontation about whether America was going to pay its bills.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to urge my colleagues to vote down this resolution of disapproval which is transparently political and which will do nothing to secure our Nation's fiscal future. In fact, this resolution is premised on the assumption that the American people are ignorant—I don't believe that—ignorant about the nature of our debt ceiling and the sources of America's fiscal challenges.

As often as some in this House attempt to falsely persuade the American people that raising the debt ceiling means taking on more debt, we will be here to repeat the truth. This is about nothing more than paying the bills we have already incurred. The American people understand that fact, as evidenced by their disgust with the partisan brinksmanship that almost brought America to the brink of default.

What Americans want to see is us coming together to take real action on two issues they are deeply concerned about: jobs and our mounting deficit.

One of the most important things we can do to reduce the deficit is to create jobs, grow our economy, get people back to work.

The President has put forward the American Jobs Act, which incorporates many elements of House Democrats' Make It in America agenda to create jobs. I hope my Republican colleagues bring it to the House floor for a vote as soon as possible.

Over the long term, though, we must lay out a path to restore fiscal sustainability. And the only path that is feasible fiscally, politically, and morally is one that is balanced and asks everyone to pay their fair share, not let some of the special interests and favored few be left out of the obligations to bring fiscal responsibility to this Nation. All of us need to be included. A balanced solution is favored by an overwhelming majority of Americans and even three-quarters of Republicans.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. The Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction must put aside partisan politics and put some hard choices on the table, choices that encompass both spending and revenue, and we must support their efforts to reach agreement.

□ 1420

That's what the American people deserve. That's the difference between posturing on our fiscal future, as this vote today does, and leading on our fiscal future. I urge my colleagues, let's vote down this empty resolution which is a pretense, a pretend, a statement that we don't like debt. Nobody likes the debt we've incurred, and everybody ought to join together in paying it down.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an issue of responsibility. It's not easy. It's not always politically popular. We've incurred a debt. It is our responsibility collectively, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans to come together and pay down this debt and not pretend that simply by defeating a resolution, or passing a resolution of so-called disapproval—which is already a dead letter, and everybody on your side of the aisle knows it's a dead letter because the Senate has already voted.

This is just a statement that I don't like debt. None of us like debt. Let's join together and reduce it as we did in the nineties.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I just wanted to make sure the record was clear.

My dear friend from Maryland said there were those on this side who wanted to welsh on our debt, and that's not the case. The thing that we want to do is stop incurring debt. We are all about being good for the debt we incur. We don't want to welsh on any agreements. I didn't ask my friend for time, so my time is very limited. I just wanted to correct the record. We're not out to welsh on anything. We're here to say, let's quit incurring debt. That's the whole point.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think we have already set the parameters for this discussion. We can see by the throngs that are on the floor of the House how keenly important this is to the American people. The reason why I say that is because important discussions draw Members even away from their duties elsewhere. But we know that the reason why we are speaking to empty seats is, one, because the other body has resoundingly denounced and voted this particular provision down because we have reached a compromise, a respectable compromise that we realize we have to pay our bills.

But of course those who believe that they are not in the people's House, they can put this resolution on the floor because if they look to what the people want, 46 percent of the American people believe that jobs are more important than reducing the deficit. More than 65 percent believe we should be doing a jobs bill. We have the greatest poverty among children of all sectors in all areas of the country right now as I speak. And the new population of the impoverished are those recent college graduates. All of the stars in the eyes and excited parents who've paid large amounts of dollars to ensure that their young ones have an opportunity for a college education, there are no jobs.

Now, I don't concede to the fact that the only initiative that should come about should be from the government, but we are the umbrella on a rainy day. This is a small measure that the President has offered, a small, constructive measure, his jobs bill. It is balanced across the board. It provides relief for small businesses. It provides the jobs that they will create. It gives incentives to hire someone. It works with our larger companies as well. And, of course, it puts back to work what has been a devastating phenomenon in our communities, taking away firefighters, police and teachers. You're going to feel the pinch when your young children are in classes that are 50 and 60 persons. So this is realistic.

It also addresses the question of the 46.2 million Americans who are living in poverty. As I indicated, a disproportionate share of those are children.

So what we are doing today goes smack against what the people want, and this is the people's House. I am concerned that we are not only being redundant, but we're saying to the world: smack us as irresponsible. We have the money to pay our bills, but we want the word to go out: we are irresponsible. We're not paying any bills. We're not Greece, we're not Spain, we're not Italy. We are Americans, and we have the know-it-all and the commitment to be the greatest country.

I've never taken seriously the pundits about America's decline; but it is a decline if we get on the floor of the House and ignore the needs of our brothers and sisters, ignore the needs in the Northeast where there's been a devastating hurricane, ignore those in the Southwest where 1,400 homes have been burned to the ground in Texas. Who is going to help those folks besides their private insurance? They need the Federal Government, the rainy day umbrella on a rainy day or when a fire is there, the hose for the fire.

So I ask my colleagues to consider being realistic and rational. Vote this down. Put a jobs bill on the floor and do what the people want, create jobs now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 77, a Resolution of Disapproval intended to prevent President Obama from raising the debt ceiling by $500 billion as he is authorized to do by the debt ceiling agreement reached last month. This resolution will obstruct the federal government from meeting their financial obligations; measures like this one have already failed in the Senate. This is a colossal waste of valuable legislative time. The message has been heard loud and clear, we must address the debt limit; however another message is being muffled—the need to focus on jobs. Here we are once again with another proposal before the House that appears to throw caution to the wind. This joint resolution is gambling on our financial future, if this amendment passes then we will fail to raise our nation's debt limit and will allow our nation to default.

We should have learned a valuable lesson from what happened the last time my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tried to suggest that we should allow our nation to default. The stock market reacted immediately and a well known credit company lowered our nation's credit rating. We need to maintain our creditworthiness to meet the needs of the very people we have been sent here to serve. I am disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are more interested in playing political games than creating jobs or improving the economy.

Attempting to prevent the President from raising the debt ceiling to pay for the needs of the country and functions of the government will only lead us to the brink of another crisis. This is a continued effort by my Republican friends to ransom the American economy in order to extort the American public.

Instead of working toward a bipartisan job creation bill, congressional Republicans are attempting to constrain the ability of Congress to deal effectively with America's economic, fiscal, and job creation troubles.

There has been a consistent theme this Congress of failing to bring forward measures that will create jobs. My Republicans colleagues have set the agenda. They seem focused on cutting programs that benefit the public and those in need, while making no concrete attempt to focus on job creation and economic recovery. This bill is wasting a tremendous amount of time when we should be focused on paying our nation's bills and resolving our differences.

In my district, the Texas 186, more than 190,000 people live below the poverty line. We must not, we cannot, at a time when the Census Bureau places the number of American living in poverty at the highest rate in over 50 years, cut vital social services. Not in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis and persistent unemployment, when so many rely on federal benefits to survive, like the Supplemental Nutrition Access Program, SNAP, that fed 3.9 million residents of Texas in April

2011, or the Women, Infant, and Children, WIC, Program that provides nutritious food to more than 990,000 mothers and children in my home state.

In 2010, there were 46.2 million Americans living in poverty nationwide. According to the 2010 Federal poverty threshold, determined by the US Census, a family of four is considered impoverished if they are living on less than $22,314 per year.

Children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States poor population. In 2008, there were 15.45 million impoverished children in the nation, 20.7% of America's youth. The Kaiser Family Foundation estimates that there are currently 5.6 million Texans living in poverty, 2.2 million of them children, and that 17.4% of households in the state struggle with food insecurity.

Attempts to prevent President Obama from raising the debt ceiling threaten our ability to keep paying for programs that benefit the least among us, and I for one, will not turn my back on the Americans who are the most in need of compassionate leadership and responsible governing.

Threatening an increase in the debt ceiling threatens our ability to pay for Medicare, which guarantees a healthy and secure retirement for Americans who have paid into it for their entire working lives. Protecting Medicare represents the basic values of fairness and respect for our seniors, including the 2.9 million Texans who received Medicare in 2010.

Yes, we must take steps to balance the budget and reduce the national debt, but not at the expense of vital social programs. It is unconscionable that in our nation of vast resources, my Republican colleagues would pass a budget that cuts funding for essential social programs. Poverty impacts far too many Americans and social safety nets provide these individuals with vital assistance.

Perhaps my friends on the other side of the aisle are content to conclude that life simply is not fair, equality is not accessible to everyone, and the less advantaged among us are condemned to remain as they are, but I do not accept that. That kind of complacency is not fitting for America.

Prior to the existence of the debt ceiling, Congress had to approve borrowing each time the federal government wished to borrow money in order to carry out its functions. With the onset of World War I, more flexibility was needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements of funding a major war in the modern era.

To address this need, the first debt ceiling was established in 1917, allowing the federal government to borrow money to meet its obligations without prior congressional approval, so long as in the aggregate, the amount borrowed did not eclipse a specified limit.

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade, and last month, we were able to negotiate another compromise, and keep the country from default. I urge my colleagues not to undermine the agreement that was reached by attempting to block the President's ability to raise the debt ceiling.

Once again, the American economy hangs in the balance as the act of the President raising the debt ceiling becomes an irrelevant spending debate that is as unnecessary as it is perilous, as increasing the debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the federal government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply allows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present.

This resolution is a petulant attempt to undermine President Obama. The bill itself says it is a joint resolution ''relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit''. Exercise of authority. It does not say unlawful exercise of authority, or unconstitutional exercise of authority. The language of the bill itself makes it clear the President has the authority to raise the debt ceiling as indicated in the agreement reached on August 2.

Passing this resolution will not decrease spending; it will merely compromise our ability to pay for spending already authorized. This bill does nothing to reduce the deficit, or address the budget, it only risks our economic standing and ability to pay our nation's bills, while simultaneously hurtling the nation toward another debt ceiling crisis.

Instead of spending time on resolutions designed to cast the President in a negative light, it is time for this Congress to come together, and pass meaningful legislation that will benefit the American people. In his address to a joint session of Congress last Thursday, President Obama gave this body a great opportunity to achieve bipartisan, job creating legislation that will invest in small business, help families that have been struggling with chronic unemployment, assist veterans in finding jobs, and invest in our infrastructure.

It is time for a new sense of bipartisanship. It is time for Congress to work together to aggressively take on job creation. It is time to end these divisive tactics and compromise to encourage the rapid job growth the American people deserve. I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to stand up and vote no on this partisan resolution; we can, and we must take this opportunity to declare our intent to do what is right, face what is hard, and achieve what is great.

Instead of attempting to embarrass the President, I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to come together, and focus on passing legislation that will help the American people by improving the economy and creating jobs. Now is not the time for partisan malice, now is not the time for H.J. Res 77; now is the time for this Congress to do all it can to usher in a new age of American ingenuity and prosperity. H.J. Res. 77 is simply a way to engage in past battles, and I am voting against it in order to focus on the future.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the great State of New York, Representative REED, for recognizing me, but most of all for bringing this resolution. I support it, and I urge everyone here to support it.

As you may remember, it was a two-step process when the debt ceiling was increased: an initial $400 billion immediately to avert the possibility of a default. That has been done. But an additional $500 billion will not go out if this resolution passes. I think we need to slow down and take a look at our spending before we commit another trillion dollars of debt.

We did reduce next year's budget by, I believe, $31 billion over last year. That's a good step. That's a step in the right direction, but it's only a small step when you realize that this year's deficit is $1.3 trillion. So $31 billion is only a small step in the right direction. So this would give us more time and seriousness of purpose to look at additional savings.

So with that prospect in mind, I would urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Let's slow down the adoption of an additional half trillion of debt. I urge support.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Very briefly, in one sense this is a meaningless resolution. My guess is that opinion makers in this country and I think abroad will consider it not meaningful, that it's going through the motions.

But there is a real danger here, and that is what it says about the dynamics on the majority side. That's the worrisome thing. It isn't that we would slow things down. If this were to pass and become law, indeed, the ceiling would fall. We would go into default very soon.

And I guess what this resolution being allowed to be brought up says is that there's a feeling within majority ranks that we have to let some bring this up, and perhaps a lot who voted ''yes'' now in essence vote ''no'' in order to bring some kind of peaceful equilibrium within the ranks of the majority.

The problem is that we need to be able to reach across the aisle. Having set up a select committee, it says we need to worry less about the dynamics within our caucus or conference and more about reaching common ground.

□ 1430

That's why this exercise isn't meaningless. The danger is that it will become very meaningful and that we will become—this Congress—essentially handicapped, if not imprisoned, by the inability of the majority on this side to step up to the plate and realize that in order to solve our problems there needs to be a balanced instead of imbalanced approach; that we have to look at revenues as well as spending cuts. That's the significance of this being brought up here.

I think all of us need to take another look before we essentially change our votes. And, essentially, it would mean ''signaling.'' It will be still more difficult than the present perilous path to make meaningful our effort to move ahead in this country to address the job needs in this country, and yes, to address the deficit, but mainly or essentially to get our economy growing again. If we don't send that right signal here today, and send the wrong signal, I'm afraid this vote will become too meaningful.

I strongly urge that people vote ''no.'' I strongly urge on the Republican side that those who stepped up to the plate last time, step up to the plate this time and not duck for what is essentially an internal political dynamic. The dynamics of this country in terms of jobs and job growth, those dynamics are too essential for partisan internal politics to reign supreme on this floor at this time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I truly appreciate the sentiments of my colleague from Michigan, and I truly appreciate the debate that we've had today on this resolution.

It is time that we come together. As a member of the freshman class that's come to Washington, DC, I can tell you it is not a group of radical extremists, but men and women who have left their families, who have left their businesses, and have come down here to Washington, DC to accomplish what needs to be accomplished, that is, to get the fiscal house of Washington in order; it is to have the ability and skill to deal with the economy and put people back to work.

We have the energy, we have the desire to reignite this country so that generations of our children and grandchildren will be able to enjoy the benefits that we have all benefited from. We come here sincerely to reach across the aisle to have an open and honest dialogue with each and every one of the Members of this House, and that is why this debate is such a positive thing, in my mind. Because we are now starting down the path of recognizing that the debt has to be dealt with once and for all, but at the same time we must work together to heal our country, to reignite our country's economy so that people can afford the American Dream that they so deserve and as each and every one of us has always benefited from.

So I come here this afternoon and offer this resolution to send a message to the President, to the world, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we cannot take our eye off the ball. We have to do all things. Because we are in a historic time when the issues we face can no longer be pushed down the road. It is now time to lead. It is now time to come together and act for this great Nation, the United States of America.

In this vote, I urge all my colleagues to support the passage of this resolution to send that message that we will deal with the debt, we will deal with the economy, we will deal with the jobs, and we will create an environment upon which the private sector will blossom again and people will benefit for generations to come.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 77, a resolution disapproving of President Obama's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit. The recent decision by the President to raise the debt ceiling was not one made in haste or taken lightly, but rather it is one that absolutely must be made. The consequences of not acting are so grave that we could not let it be an option as it would do great irreparable damage to our economy. We played with fire last month, and although we ultimately approved an increase, we spooked world markets and caused an unprecedented downgrading of our country's heretofore sterling credit rating. In brief, we must raise the debt ceiling to prevent a default on our Nation's obligations, avert an international economic crisis, and prevent further harm from being visited upon middle class families.

My colleagues have failed to recognize the damage their political posturing is doing to our economy. We have wasted plenty of floor time on theater, and in the meantime have let our Nation dangle on the precipice of default. Instead of rehashing old arguments and playing the same political blame games, we should come together and focus on the main problem facing Americans today: jobs. When I was back home in Michigan during the August recess, I heard firsthand from my constituents about the urgent need to create jobs, regenerate our economy, and get America going again. People across our Nation are hurting and are sick of the inaction in Washington.

President Obama should be commended for taking the initiative on this important issue by unveiling the American Jobs Act. While we may disagree on the specifics of his proposal, it should be considered on merit alone and Congress should come together to reach consensus on what can be done to improve the economy. Resolutions such as this one are nothing but a distraction from this important mission, which is why I am voting against it today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the statute, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 186, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 706]

AYES—232

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

NOES—186

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)

Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Ribble
Walsh (IL)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann
Barletta
Capuano
Deutch
Giffords
Grimm
Lewis (GA)
Marino
Nadler
Towns
Yarmuth

□ 1502

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

Messrs. ROGERS of Alabama, GOODLATTE, WHITFIELD, ALEXANDER, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 706, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2881

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for Representative HASTINGS of Washington to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2881 and be replaced with Representative HASTINGS of Florida.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING CUMBERLAND AMERICAN LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Cumberland American Little League team from my home State of Rhode Island. Cumberland American reached its first Little League World Series after winning the New England Regional Championship. It was one of 16 teams out of 6,800 Little League All-Star teams that made it to the World Series in Williamsport, Pennsylvania.

Congratulations to Cumberland American for working so hard and for showing such great sportsmanship in the World Series. In my record book, Cumberland American is a champion, not because it drove in the most runs or caught the most fly balls, but because of the dedication and respect and sportsmanship they showed while playing this great game.

Little League baseball is more than a game. It's an enrichment activity that fosters community spirit and helps young people develop critical skills. The coaches, sponsors, Little League officials, and parents who cheered from the stands all played valuable roles in making Cumberland American a success and providing a safe and nurturing environment for these young people to grow.

Thank you to all who made this possible. Again, my congratulations to each of our Cumberland American Little League Baseball players.

CUMBERLAND, RHODE ISLAND AMERICAN LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM ROSTER

Players: Jacob Glod; Austin Cabral; Stephen Dugas; Max Hanuschak; Cam Rosa; Connor Lavallee; Chris Wright; Connor Mastin; James Belisle; Thomas Faltus; Matt Murphy; Colin Cannata; Ryan McCormick.

Coaches: Dave Belisle; Chris Gold; Matt Wright.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that all of us, all 435 of us, went back to our districts during the August recess. Now, I would suspect that most every Member of this House heard what I heard. I suspect that all of us who were listening heard the same message: When can I go back to work? When will there be a job for me? I'm going to lose my house because I lost my job. I can't afford to put my kids through school. You guys have got to get the job engine working once again. You've got to get Americans back to work.

Well, we are back here at work, and we're probably at the 257th day of this Congress, and yet the Republican majority has yet to put one jobs-creating bill on the floor. Now, they put a lot of bills on the floor, all of which would actually reduce employment. You cut the budgets, you're cutting somebody's job.

Fortunately, last week, the President of the United States came before this Congress, stood there where the Speaker is now standing, and presented to the American people an answer to the question that all of us heard during the recess. And he said: We can and we will put Americans back to work when Congress acts on this jobs act.

The American Jobs Act is now before the United States Congress and the United States Senate, and it's time for us to act so that Americans can go back to work.

Some say we could delay until after the next election. It will be 17 months—just short of a year and a half—before the next Congress will be in session and we will be able to pass legislation. There is not an unemployed American in this Nation that can or wants to wait 17 months to get a job. We have the opportunity today to put Americans back to work with the American Jobs Act.

The American Jobs Act works. It works. Americans can immediately go back to work as soon as that legislation is passed by this House and the Senate and put on the President's desk.

This afternoon, we're going to take maybe an hour with my colleagues to talk about various parts of the American Jobs Act, and we're going to start right now with the Representative from Illinois.

JAN, if you would join us, you talked earlier about this very eloquently on the steps of the Capitol. Please share with us.

□ 1510

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Let me add a personal twist to all of this about jobs.

When I grew up in Chicago—I was the daughter of a furniture salesman and a Chicago public schoolteacher—the American Dream was alive and well. On my dad's modest income, we could afford a little house in a quiet, middle class neighborhood.

Back then, a man could work in the steel mills on Chicago's South Side—one good union job with family health care benefits and a decent pension—and really live a middle class life. The family could own a home and buy a car and even send the kids to college. That was the 1950s, and anything seemed possible if you were willing to work hard. Incomes were going up for everyone. Income inequality was shrinking, and Americans were experiencing the greatest growth in living standards in history. For most working families, that American Dream was in reach, and that was the normal.

But today, after decades of attacks on organized labor, the passage of tax policies that favor wealthy individuals and corporations, the growing disparity of income, the squandering of a

budget surplus, and the turning of a blind eye to Wall Street greed and recklessness, that dream is drowning in a sea of joblessness. I feel like the Republicans are pushing this as the new normal: that the rich get richer and the rest of the country gets poorer. Fortunately, our President, President Barack Obama, has made it perfectly clear that we are not helpless in the face of our daunting but man-made economic challenges, and he has proposed a jobs bill that will immediately improve people's lives and jump-start the economy.

The answer to this jobs crisis is surprisingly simple. If you want to create jobs, then create jobs, good jobs—jobs that can provide people with a middle class life, that can rebuild our middle class, jobs like the 35,000 schools that under the President's bill will be repaired.

There are children all over this country right now who are sitting in classrooms where the ceilings are crumbling, that have dangerous asbestos in them, that are leaking energy, that don't have the wiring for the new technologies that our children need to succeed in this world and to get those 21st century jobs. We don't have the kind of schools and classrooms in which our children are going to be able to compete in this 21st century world. At the same time, we have hundreds and thousands of construction workers and electricians and boilermakers and maintenance workers who are jobless right now, who are sitting home, unemployed, who are more than willing to roll up their sleeves and give our schoolchildren the kind of classrooms that they deserve.

So here we have a tremendous need, and we have the people who can answer that need. Not only will they be back to work, but it will jump-start our economy and be good for everyone. It is not rocket science. We can do this, and we need to do it now. As the President said, the election isn't until 14 months from now. The Republicans seem to want to adjudicate this issue at that time, but this isn't about politics. This is about all those families who simply want a job. They don't want to be receiving unemployment benefits. As a matter of fact, they want to pay taxes.

If we want to reduce the deficit, jobs are the answer once again. Jobs equal deficit reduction. That's why we can't wait to pass this American Jobs Act. We need to enlist the help of all Americans to call their Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats—I'm talking about the people out there regardless of party—to say, ''We need to pass this right now.'' This is the way that we can get back to what the normal was when I was growing up, when there was opportunity. People lived a middle class life. Instead, we're watching that middle class disappear and that American Dream slip through our fingers. The economy needs to be revived. The President has the answer. We need to do it now.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentlelady from Illinois who speaks so eloquently on this.

As you were talking about the schools, 44 percent of the principals across this Nation say clearly that their schools are not up to the standard that they want to have their own children in. In the classrooms, paint on the walls is falling off and bathrooms are inadequate, playgrounds and the like. There are 35,000 schools across this country that can be repaired, that can be rebuilt—new classrooms, science classrooms, upgrading the Internet systems in these schools, and the playgrounds. All of that is possible.

How correct you are when you say there are men and women out there who are ready to do that work. These are a lot of jobs. This isn't heavy equipment work. This is heavy ''person power'' work. Let's put these people to work.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. May I say one more thing about it?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Please.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. These are jobs that can be created right away. I'm from the Midwest, so we actually have a construction season; but for fixing schools, you can do that around the year, around the calendar. We can put these people to work within a few months. They can be on the job, earning money. This is such a sensible program.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Actually, in discussing this with the administration, the day the bill is signed, the schools can begin the work because the administrative process is very straightforward. This is a very, very important one. We're talking 35,000 schools, perhaps several hundred thousand or a couple hundred thousand men and women going to work immediately to repair our schools. Wouldn't that give us community pride? My school is getting repaired. It's getting a paint job. The toilets are getting fixed and the classroom, the science classroom.

This is community pride. This is American pride in our most basic of investments—the investment in our children.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The sign you have there says that poor conditions of their schools interfere with students' learning. So we are also depriving our children of that sense of pride that will motivate them to be good students, to learn, to be ready to take over in this 21st century job market.

Mr. GARAMENDI. One of my favorite subjects is Making It In America. The way the legislation is written, when that gallon of paint, when that heating/air-conditioning system or the playground equipment is brought to the school, it's going to be made in America. It's going to be made in America because the legislation that the President brought to us says that the money will be used to buy equipment made in America.

I notice that our colleague from Maryland, DONNA EDWARDS, has joined us.

I know we were talking earlier about some of your favorite subjects. I believe it was infrastructure. So please, if you will, DONNA, join us in this conversation.

Ms. EDWARDS. I want to thank the gentleman because I think that we've received some rather sobering news about the state of America and the state of American workers—the state of Americans.

It is that here we are at a time when we've reached the highest poverty rates in 52 years in this country, where median incomes are down lower than they've been in a generation—7 percent less, in fact, than what median incomes were even in 1999—where nearly a third of African American families in this country live in poverty, where millions upon millions of children in this country go to bed hungry because they live in poverty, because their families—their parents—don't have a chance for a job and an opportunity.

I think that that should be sobering news for us, not as Democrats and Republicans; it should be sobering news for us as Americans. That's why, when I heard President Obama in this House speaking to the American people about the need to create jobs right now, I know what I heard was a message that said: I suppose with the politics we could politic this out for 14 months, that we could fight amongst ourselves as Democrats and Republicans for 14 months, that we could in the political arena just raise millions and millions of dollars to run campaign ads and make annoying phone calls to people across this country for 14 months—or we could take a different path.

□ 1520

We could take a path that's really about creating jobs and opportunities for people who are living in poverty, for Americans who want to work right now.

I had a really interesting experience for me over the break that the Congress had. I visited the new Martin Luther King, Jr., memorial with my mother—my mother, who was born at the beginning of the Depression, my mother, who lived in a community in North Carolina where she would visit the local town and had segregated water fountains, where people really struggled. They were farmers who struggled greatly to put food on the table.

On the way to the Martin Luther King, Jr., memorial, we passed the memorial to FDR. I saw there the statues representing people who were standing in employment lines and in food lines, and I saw the words of that wonderful President who recognized that he had to get beyond the politics to a point where we were creating jobs, not just meaningless jobs, but jobs that were about rebuilding the Nation's infrastructure, that were about putting people to work so that they could put food on their tables so that they could make a contribution to this country.

So as I walked, as we walked from the FDR memorial over to the Martin Luther King, Jr., memorial, I said to myself that the United States right now, in this time of great need, with 14 million people unemployed, that we need an FDR moment, that the American people need an FDR moment and that that moment has to be about creating jobs for people right here in America, for rebuilding our manufacturing sector, for investing in research and development and innovation and creativity, for taking those 150,000 bridges across this country that are falling apart.

And I know when I drive over a bridge, I don't say, Is this a Republican bridge or is this a Democratic bridge? What I say is, Is this a bridge that I can get my car over that waterway safely? And when I look at that bridge and I see the steel beams, I know that those are steel beams manufactured by people right here in the United States.

When I look at the asphalt and the cement that covers that bridge, I see work that took place right here in the United States. When I look at those bridges and these 150,000 bridges all across the country that need to be rebuilt by hardworking Americans, what I see are the light posts up by the bridge with the electricity running through them or the solar panels on them that are put there and built there by American workers.

So when the President says to pass the American Jobs Act right away, the reason he is saying that is because those are jobs right now for hardworking Americans who actually want to work hard, building things in this country, rebuilding all of our infrastructure, our bridges, our roadways, our water and sewer systems that are falling apart. They want to do this.

I think it's really incumbent on us to do it, and I think that the American people ought to hold each and every one of us to account for failing to do it.

I note, as Mr. GARAMENDI is showing here and that we will see, that nearly 2 million construction workers across this country are unemployed. When our colleague, JAN SCHAKOWSKY from Illinois, talks about the 35,000 schools that need to be reconstructed for the 21st century so that our young people can learn in a 21st-century learning environment, it is not just because it feels good but because it will make a difference to our own competitiveness for the 21st century. What I know is that those are those 2 million construction workers who are unemployed across this country who can do that work in our schools, in their communities.

So I think that this is a real imperative, and I would just urge our colleagues to look beyond the D and an R and look to a job for the American people who are asking us to do this for them, but also to do this for us. I don't know how it is that we survive in a global economy when we are not producing anything, when we are not putting our people back to work, when we are not engaged in rebuilding all of our infrastructure that was decades in the making from FDR and beyond and is now falling apart.

I owe that to my mother and my grandmother and my grandfather for the generation that did all of that for us. We owe it to them not to allow it to fall apart.

So I say, yes, let's pass the American Jobs Act now.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative EDWARDS, thank you so very much for your compassion and passion for these issues. Bringing FDR, the monument, and Martin Luther King together around this set of issues is really important.

This is the worst economy since the Great Depression, and I remember on one of those plaques at the FDR memorial—and I may get this wrong a little bit—but he said, we measure our progress not by those who have much could have more, but by those who have little have enough. He had the compassion.

Last week, the President brought to us an answer to the compelling question that we hear—what are you going to do about jobs?—the American Jobs Act.

You spoke so eloquently about the infrastructure—the streets, the bridges, the schools—and that 2 million construction workers are out of jobs. The President has proposed a $50 billion immediate infusion of money into America's infrastructure—into our roads, our bridges, our water systems, our airports. There is $50 billion available this year to put Americans back to work.

It's not just the construction workers that will have those jobs, because these people will be able to keep their homes. They will be able to buy their food; they will be able to bring that money back into their economy with what is called the multiplier effect. And so that $50 billion may run through the economy three times, two and a half times, so that instead of 2 million, maybe it will be 3 million that will get their jobs.

I know that you want to add to this, Ms. EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS. Thank you for that.

I just want to remind our colleagues that for every $1 billion, $1 billion that we invest in repairing the Nation's infrastructure, we create 35,000 jobs: $1 billion, 35,000 jobs.

So the multiplier effect is really tremendous. It is the construction worker on the site, but it's also the canteen truck that drives up—that's the small business person at that site. It's the engineers and all of the technicians who develop that amazing engineering for these construction sites. It's the architects who are designing a revamped school in a neighborhood to educate our children to compete in the 21st century. So $1 billion equals 35,000 jobs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. There you have it. That's when we have the opportunity if we act now. If this Chamber, empty but for three of us and our staffs here and the desk crew, were to act tomorrow on the legislation that the President has brought before us—it's in proper form; it's before us—we could take it up, and these people, all that you talked about, could be at work in the next couple of weeks. That's the possibility.

Ms. EDWARDS, thank you so much for joining us and for your eloquence and for your determination to make this happen.

Our friend from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) has joined us. Please share with us your thoughts from middle America.

□ 1530

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, and I appreciate your leading this hour.

Just last week, the President stood just behind where you're standing and addressed this Congress—bipartisan, bicameral, Senators and House Members—and laid out a plan to fix this economy. Pass this bill, he said. And we need to pass the bill. The President and his team have put a lot of work into it. People want jobs. They want to work.

In my district, there are more unemployed. Every weekend when I go out in my district, people come up to me and tell me they are either looking for a job, have lost their job and are looking for a job. We need to find ways to put those people to work. We are working on ways to make schools better. Building infrastructure which is so important to Memphis, Tennessee, where we have rails, roads, rivers, and runways, the distribution center of America, is so important. And if you put the money in infrastructure, which this plan plans on, Make It In America, if you do infrastructure, it's got to be made in America. You can't export those jobs overseas, and you put people to work immediately. What they are building are avenues that make commerce move and work.

Federal Express moves more packages around the world than any other American company, and Memphis International Airport is the largest American cargo airport in the world. We create jobs by putting money into infrastructure. Teachers, policemen, and firefighters, 3 million kept their jobs because of the recovery bill that we passed that did successfully help this country stay out of a great depression.

Sometimes, Mr. GARAMENDI, I'm amazed at the rhetoric that you hear from some people, particularly from the other side, who blithely tell people that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was $770 billion that didn't make a difference. The fact is that 40 percent of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, so as to pass the Senate where we needed Senator COLLINS' and Senator SNOWE's votes, were the Republican endorsed and loved tax cuts. How can they talk out of both sides of their mouth and say that a bill, 40 percent of which—which means over $300 billion of tax

cuts—didn't do any good, because now all they talk about is tax cuts.

But when the President of the United States proposes and the Congress with him in a bipartisan effort passes tax cuts—and I'm not sure that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was bipartisan. That was strictly Democrats. But when we passed tax cuts with a few Republicans in the Senate, in their minds, it didn't create any jobs. But when they propose tax cuts, this is Christopher Columbus' new way to find the New World. Well, it's hypocritical.

We need to support our President because he is the President. There isn't a red America and a blue America. There is, as he said in his speech at the 2004 Democratic Convention, the United States of America. People need to understand that. We need to be here for that red, white, and blue flag, for this country, to put this country back to work, to keep it as the most competitive country in the world so we don't fall behind China and India in engineering and science, and coming up with programs that give our children an opportunity to be able to fill the jobs of the 21st century—the green jobs that the President has proposed that are the jobs of the 21st century, and the technology jobs that we haven't done a good enough job in filling, giving money to colleges to do the research for industry to create jobs.

In our caucus yesterday, we had Joseph Stiglitz, a Nobel Prize winning economist. I read Krugman a lot, a Nobel Prize winning economist. Both say basically the same thing: The austerity programs proposed by the other side don't work. They've used them in Japan; didn't work. Greece, England, didn't work—unless you're in the upper 1 percent. If you wear a crown and you're the queen or the prince or the leaders of whatever, it works. But in this country, we don't have that kind of royalty, but we're starting to have a separate society with the upper 1 percent who the Republican Party won't raise their taxes no matter what, and the rest.

The President is right. We need to think about the whole country. We need to come together as a United States of America, not a red, a blue, a Democrat or Republican, and create jobs. The President's plan, over half of it, is tax cuts.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say we can go for what we like there even though they said it didn't work when the President and the Democrats passed it in the Recovery Act, but they can't go for the infrastructure jobs that, of course, help businesses—trucking businesses, the airline industry, and the transportation industry. Automobiles and trucks have to have highways. So we need to pass this.

I support the President. I took an oath to do what I could to make this country better. We need to come together now because this is a crisis time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. COHEN, thank you so very much. Your experience from the great Midwest, along America's great river, is really important for us to understand.

We really have an opportunity here right now. This legislation is before Congress and the Senate, and we have an opportunity for a better deal for America. It's an investment in America. We talked about the infrastructure. That's an investment that will last for 50 to 100 years because it's in the ground. It's the roads, the sanitation system. It's also a critical investment in tomorrow's workers, in our children.

The American Jobs Act has money for 280,000 teachers; 280,000 teachers will be able to stay on the job. Right now in California, teachers are getting laid off as they are in most other States of this Nation. That means that classroom sizes are going up, and the educational opportunity for our children is diminishing. We have no more important investment. Roads are important and bridges are important, but the most important investment in any society, in any economy is the investment in education, in the children, in tomorrow's workforce. 280,000 teachers will be able to stay in the classroom. This money flows directly to the school districts, not a big administrative task at all but one that goes there directly.

Small businesses. Our Republican colleagues love to talk about small businesses, and they say, correctly, most jobs are created by small businesses. That's true. That's accurate. Sixty-four percent of the new jobs over the past 15 years were created by small businesses. But what are they doing for small businesses? Cutting the contracts that the small businesses depend upon as they push an austerity budget.

The American Jobs Act takes a different path. It tells small businesses: You get an immediate tax break; 3.1 percent of your payroll tax will be eliminated in the next year. That's a lot of money, and I'll explain how much it is. In addition to that, if you hire a long-term unemployed worker, your entire payroll tax will disappear.

Let me tell you what that means. Let's take a warehouse.

You've got warehouses in your district?

Mr. COHEN. We've got lots of warehouses. They're full of goods ready to go on Federal Express planes and service the rest of this Nation. It all starts in Memphis, Tennessee, and goes out from there.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thought they might have some of that Tennessee whiskey in them. Some of that, too?

Mr. COHEN. Some of that, too.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So a warehouse with a payroll last year of $7 million that this year hires 40 new workers, it would add $2 million to its payroll. It would get a full refund of the 6.2 percent payroll taxes paid on the $2 million of payroll. How much is that? That's $124,000 that goes immediately to the bottom line of that warehouse. In addition to that, they have already seen a 3.1 percent reduction—actually, it's a 50 percent reduction in their payroll tax for workers who were already there, and that's another $155,000. So we are looking here at $279,000 of reduced expenses, taxes, to that company. That means that they can improve the warehouse. That means they can expand or hire more workers. This is in the President's American jobs program specifically for small businesses.

Listen up, America. Listen up businesses out there. There is an opportunity here for you to immediately expand your business, reduce your payroll taxes, hire new workers, bringing a new worker on that has been on long-term unemployment and paying no payroll taxes for the next year. This is very, very important and very big, and it is immediately available as soon as the leadership, the Republican leadership in this House, brings the American jobs bill to the floor.

Mr. COHEN, if you would like to carry on here, I know you have some more thoughts.

□ 1540

Mr. COHEN. Well, just the whole prospect. Jobs are so important. I was thinking back about Stiglitz. I think you were there at the caucus. He and Krugman say the same thing, that there's several ways you can get yourself out of this deficit. He went back into a little bit of history about how during the Clinton years we had a big deficit from the Reagan-Bush years and that President Clinton, with a bill that was passed in this Congress with all Democrat votes in about 1994, I think, put us on a road to balance the budget, and got us a surplus. It got us a surplus by the time President Clinton left office.

Stiglitz said, which is so true—it's a factoid—the surplus was lost because of two wars, one of which was a volunteer war, not related to 9/11—Iraq—and Afghanistan, that were both passed through these Congresses, which were Republican-controlled, Republican Congresses, without being funded. Then the Bush tax cuts giving the wealthiest people the largest tax cuts and contributing to the largest disparity in wealth that we've ever had in this Nation.

Now, the wealthy can only spend so much. There are only so many Chanel purses a woman can buy. There are only so many Rolex watches a guy can have, but we are losing a middle class. Then we put all this wealth through these tax cuts on the richest, making their tax rates the lowest since the 1950s, and then extended it for 2 years, the inheritance tax, to where the wealthy get to keep more and more in perpetuity.

The middle class is disappearing in this country. Jobs are being shipped overseas. Taxes stay high on them. They're living paycheck to paycheck. They've got their children in school. Pell Grants are in danger. They almost

were reduced in the last month or two, but we salvaged them in the final bill. People are having trouble making ends meet, and the middle class has got to be there to be a consumer group. If you don't have consumers, you can't have an economy to service people who are making goods and services. You've got to have a customer. We're losing the customer base.

We can ship all the jobs we want off to Southeast Asia and China, where they don't pay any salaries and don't give any benefits; but those people aren't our market, and if our people can't buy goods, then we're not going to have any manufacturing base and the opportunity to make it in America.

So we've got to build up the middle class. We've got to produce jobs, and we've got to see to it that the middle class is given priority and not the richest 1 percent.

The President's plan, which is so great, is it's all paid for. It's paid for. But paid for by a tax that's appropriate for the people who can afford it.

Tell us how we can deal with that and keep this as a paid-for program.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I've been kind of shuffling the boards down here because you went through several subjects along the way, and each one is so terribly important and pertinent to the issue. But I think I can wrap it all up in this, and that is, America lost about 50 percent of its manufacturing jobs in the last 20, 25 years. We went from 20 million, 21 million manufacturing jobs to just over 10 million today, but we can once again rebuild the American manufacturing sector. That's where the middle class jobs are.

You had talked about tax policy, that the tax policy has shifted from one that was broad based and which the wealthy and everybody participated in in a progressive mechanism in which now the wealthy—and Warren Buffett has said it so very well—he actually pays a lower tax rate than does his secretary. He said, This is wrong. This is upside down and wrong. And he's quite correct. But if we take a look at the manufacturing sector of America and we apply a couple of principles, that is, that we're going to buy American—and this has to do with our policies here.

Trade policies. We've been giving it away in these international trade deals. On the taxes, we just talked about that. The tax burden has shifted from the wealthy down to the middle class, further eroding the purchasing power and the status of the middle class, so much so that just yesterday the Bureau of Labor Statistics came out with a report that the poverty level in America has reached the highest level in 52 years. That's the pushing down of the American middle class so that those at the bottom have been pushed out of the middle class into poverty.

Mr. COHEN. Out of six adults—think about that—one out of six adults. Now this body of which I am extremely proud to be a Member is not representative of America. Because if it were, one out of six, or 74 people, would be earning $22,000 a year or less for a family of four. So that doesn't happen. One out of five children in this country is now living in poverty—they're in my district—and people can't get along without having a job.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly right. Twenty-two million children living in poverty, not knowing where their next meal is going to come from. At the same time, they're cutting the food programs.

This is our program. This is the President's program. Every one of the things that is in the American Jobs Act is here. Taxes. There are tax breaks for businesses. And this entire program is paid for by ending the giveaway of our tax money to the oil companies. That's $4 billion a year—$40 billion over the next decade—of our tax money going to support the oil industry, the wealthiest industry in this world.

Mr. COHEN. How about the hedge fund guys? There's another Steve Cohen. There's the one in New York that's got all the money, the hedge fund guy, billions and billions of dollars.

What does he pay on his income?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, he pays 15 percent. Somehow or another they got into the law. The hedge fund folks that are making hundreds of millions of dollars a year—in some cases, billions—are paying 15 percent on their income. Now they've got it classified as capital gains when, in fact, it's their labor. That is, it's their work. As you and I are working here and as people are working in the manufacturing plants, it's their work, but it's taxed at 15 percent, not at 35 or 38 percent. What's that all about? Where are we going to end that tax break? That's about $17 billion over 10 years.

Mr. COHEN. And that shouldn't exist. That's absurd. There's another Steve Cohen, the magician, and apparently he had something to do with the Tax Code when they took care of the other Steve Cohen.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So taxes are part of it. The energy policy, we haven't talk about that. We talked about labor—putting men and women back to work. And the education system, 280,000 new teachers or teachers in the classroom. Research and infrastructure, this is part of the Make it in America agenda which can be carried out with the American Jobs Act.

So, if we pass the American Jobs Act, we've got a really good opportunity to once again make things in America, because the legislation calls for about $50 billion in infrastructure and the establishment of an infrastructure bank for sanitation, water systems, Internet, high-speed cable, and all of those kinds of things in the infrastructure bank. So we may be looking at $60 billion, $70 billion a year of investment in these infrastructure projects. Coupled with that is Buy America, Make it in America. Buy American-made buses, American-made locomotives. The concrete and steel in the bridges, that's going to be American made.

I can tell you one of the greatest horror stories about infrastructure. It's right in San Francisco, just outside my district. The San Francisco Bay Bridge, a multibillion-dollar rebuilding of the Bay Bridge because it falls down in an earthquake. It did once. We don't want it to happen again. Multibillion dollars. To save 10 percent, the contract went to Chinese steel companies. All of the steel manufacturing in that bridge comes from China. Thousands of jobs in China. And to make things worse, the inspectors were over there, and they didn't do a good job. Beyond that, when the bridge parts came over here, Chinese workers came with the bridge. No more of that. We're going to make it in America.

I've got a bill in—others are working on this—and that is, if it's American taxpayer money, by God, it's going to be used to buy American taxpayer goods and services. We can do this, and the first step is the American Jobs Act.

Mr. COHEN. You mention on there—I looked at your chart—education. Part of the American Jobs Act is to rebuild our schools and to go to work and make them structurally sound and also energy efficient. When you look at labor, it's work. The labor movement has been attacked all over this country, and it's labor who's created the middle class and seen to it they got good jobs and opportunities and wages and benefits.

In my community, we just had a grocery store taken over by a large national grocery store. A grocery store from another city had come in and taken over some local owners. One man worked there for 44 years. He'd been making $9.85 an hour and working 40 hours a week. They came in and said, You can work 16 hours. You'll get $7.50 an hour. You won't get your benefits that you had accumulated, and you'll go to another store. He quit. They did a lot of employees that way.

What happened yesterday? Help inform me. Because I heard this, and it's difficult to believe: Bank of America, did they make something like $7 billion last year? And how many people did they lay off yesterday?

□ 1550

Mr. GARAMENDI. They're talking about laying off 40,000 people across America in the next year.

Mr. COHEN. So how does that jibe with what we hear from the other side about just trust business to hire people, that the jobs come from business and the private sector?

They're making $7.8 billion. They benefited from the TARP—a President Bush/Secretary Paulson plan that I supported in a bipartisan manner that kept Bank of America alive. I think they're on the hook, maybe, since some Federal recent action considering their loans and all. But $7 billion, and

they're laying off 30,000 to 40,000 people? Those people are going to need unemployment benefits, and it's not because they don't want a job. They've been put out.

A lot of qualified people who can do jobs and are intelligent don't have jobs because they are not there. But the people at the top are making more money than ever. They're eating at Masa in New York. They're eating the $500 dinner at the Japanese restaurant and not thinking twice about it, and they're firing people right and left. The limousines are still moving. The wealthy are still doing whatever they've been doing. They've got their jets—not the football team—their private jets. They're living great, but the American Dream is disappearing. The American Dream disappeared for my grocery workers. It's disappearing for Bank of America employees. It's disappearing for a lot of people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The American public, through the TARP program, bailed out Wall Street, bailed out the banks, and the banks have done nothing. The big Wall Street banks have done nothing except enrich themselves at the expense of the American taxpayer. Those days should be over. We need to move in a different direction.

One of the groups we really need to help are those men and women that have been fighting the wars. Now, my personal view is that the war in Afghanistan ought to stop tomorrow. We ought to bring that $120 billion a year that we're spending in Afghanistan, bring it back here, invest it in America in education and bridges, infrastructure and debt relief; 120 billion a year in Afghanistan, and we're still spending a vast amount of money in Iraq. End those wars, bring that money home. Bring the soldiers home. And when we do, we're bringing home a lot of wounded Americans, wounded Americans who need our respect and who need jobs.

In the American Jobs Act there is a special place for veterans, special advantage. They deserve it. They're the ones that have sacrificed. They're the ones that took time out of their lives to fight those wars. Whatever we may think about those wars, we can only think good thoughts and honor the veterans, and here's a way to do it.

There are 877,000 unemployed veterans in America today—nearly 1 million; 877,000 looking for work. In the American Jobs Act, there is a very special tax credit available to any employer who hires a veteran. You can reduce your taxes by $5,600 right off the bottom, $5,600 tax credit—not a deduction, but a credit. And if you happen to hire one of those wounded vets—and we know them, we've seen their pictures, we know what post-traumatic stress syndrome is all about—hire a wounded vet, and it's a $9,600 tax credit to every employer, whomever it happens to be, across this Nation. Now that's what we need to do.

All the talk about balancing the budget, all the talk about a deficit hasn't put one person to work in America; in fact, it has laid off hundreds of thousands of people. We need to put America back to work. The American Jobs Act does that, and it does it in a very special way. For those Americans that have been out there sacrificing in Iraq, in Afghanistan it gives them an opportunity. It gives every employer an incentive to hire those workers. We owe it to these men and women. And when these men and women go back to work, they become taxpayers. And when men and women in America go back to work and become taxpayers, then the deficit will be resolved, then we will solve the deficit.

We need to make cuts, we need to do those things, but those are in the out years. Right now, it is about jobs. The President has given us the legislation. The question for our Republican leadership here is—they control this House; they're the ones that set the agenda; they're the only ones that can bring a bill to the floor—When will you bring the American Jobs Act to this floor so that we can put Americans back to work?

Mr. COHEN, I know how deeply you feel about this. I know that in your district your people that you represent are hurting. They want jobs.

We're going to wrap this up in just a few moments. So for our closing remarks, go for it.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI.

Every weekend I'm home—and the weeks that I'm home, because we're home many weeks now, this Congress doesn't work them very much. We spend a lot of time at home. And that's a beautiful thing for us, but not a great thing for America because we need to be here, working on trying to get a jobs bill passed, which hasn't been introduced by the majority yet.

But Professor Stiglitz talked about the causes of the loss of the surplus that President Clinton and the Democratic Congress got in the late part of the 20th century. It was the two wars—voted for by this Congress, supported by President Bush, the Bush tax cuts—passed by this Congress, proposed by President Bush; and Medicare part D, President Bush's Medicare plan to take care of the insurance companies. That's what did it. Those were the causes.

Professor Stiglitz, and he has a lady that works with him—I think her name is Linda Bilmes—they've studied what it's going to cost in America in the years to come with the veterans. Now, the ones we can employ, we need to employ. But 1 to 2 percent are going to come back disabled, and they're going to need veteran services and they're going to need money for the rest of their lives. So these wars, particularly the Iraq war—President Bush and the Republican Congress' war—is going to cost this country for another 70 years, at minimum; and we need to be prepared for that.

We need to come together. And there's no question that when Professor Stiglitz said, when you can borrow money at like 1 or 2 percent and make a greater percentage on it, this is the time that you borrow because rates are so low. And the top people in economics say this whole idea of the austerity and the cut is wrong. What does it do? It helps the wealthy because they're immune to it. The benefit for the low-cost labor they get overseas and the salaries they get here, they get great tax rates, helps them.

But what else does it help? It helps what Senator MCCONNELL said was the number one job of this Congress the first day after President Obama was elected, to defeat President Obama. That's what Senator MITCH MCCONNELL said was the number one priority that he had. He's a focused man. I admire him for the fact that he gets an issue and he stays on it and he's focused. And he thought that and thinks that when he works on the debt ceiling, when he works on the deficit, when he works on the American Jobs Act. It's all about one thing—not employing Americans, but taking two Americans, Barack Obama and JOE BIDEN, and making them unemployed. That's not appropriate.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We have a different view here. I'm confident that the President will be reelected because he understands very clearly that we need to put Americans back to work, And he has given us the American Jobs Act—complete legislation. All the sections are there. All the writing is done. All the legal work is done. It is now before the United States Congress and the Senate, and it's up to us, 435 of us in this House. Are we ready to act? Are we ready to do what Americans want us to do? And that is to put them back to work.

Mr. COHEN. Pass the bill.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Pass the bill. Pass the bill. Put Americans back to work.

I'm going to quickly go through some of the parts of this bill and the way in which they affect Americans.

It's about investment, investing in our infrastructure: $50 billion directly available for the transportation sector—rail, high-speed rail, intercity rail, bridges, roads, $50 billion available this year to put men and women back to work repairing our transportation infrastructure. Another $10 billion for an infrastructure bank in which the pension funds of America, the public pension funds, could invest. And perhaps another $20 billion or $30 billion in that infrastructure bank to once again augment the development of the infrastructure that we need—water systems, sanitation systems, all of those communications systems that we desperately need.

□ 1600

That's on the infrastructure side.

On the education side, repairing our schools:

Thirty-five thousand schools to be repaired, repainted, classrooms, science laboratories, as well as the playgrounds; 35,000 schools out there. Your

neighborhood school, the opportunity for it to have a new paint job, a new bathroom, whatever is needed;

280,000 teachers. You could fill the entire stadium in Ann Arbor, Michigan, football, 100,000, and still have a third game with only 80,000 people. 280,000, think of it. The Ann Arbor, Michigan, stadium filled 2.8 times over. Teachers in the classroom. This is exciting.

Veterans, a very powerful incentive where a business can reduce its tax burden. That is the bottom-line tax reduced by $9,600 when you hire a disabled veteran. That man, that woman is going back to work, becoming a taxpayer. Once again, pride in our Nation. This is powerful.

For the unemployed, an extension of unemployment benefits, and we didn't even get to that today—and all of this in the context of rebuilding the American manufacturing sector.

More than 10 million American manufacturing jobs have been lost in the last two decades. We can put them back to work if we use our public policy, use our tax money that's going to build those bridges or those roads, buses and locomotives, use our tax money to buy American-made, American-made equipment. All it takes is a law, and it works.

Sacramento, California, near where I live, has built—or Siemens, a German company, has built a major manufacturing plant in Sacramento, California, to manufacture light railcars and Amtrak locomotives.

Why did they do that? They did that because the American Recovery Act, the stimulus bill that our Republican colleagues like to trash, said that the money for transportation systems—buses, light rail, and trains—must be spent on American-made equipment. So Siemens said, well, if that's the law, we want the business. They built the plant, and they're manufacturing light rail cars and locomotives today in America, using American equipment, using American workers. That's what we can do if we are willing to pass the laws to make it in America.

Photovoltaic systems, wind turbines, all of these things supported with our tax dollars. Why not use those tax dollars to buy American-made solar cells and wind turbines?

The President has given us the opportunity to do what we should do, as representatives of the American people. Put Americans back to work. Pass the American Jobs Act. Pass the American Jobs Act.

Mr. COHEN, wrap this up for us.

Mr. COHEN. I just thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI, for the leadership and for putting this hour together and allowing me to join you. And let's say it together. Pass the bill.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Pass the bill.

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

OUR COUNTRY IS IN TROUBLE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to be an honor for me to be able to speak on this floor. The freedoms we have, the blessings, we've received because of those who've gone before us.

The country is in trouble. People around the world cannot believe that the greatest nation in the history of mankind just cannot make itself live within its means. So businesses, manufacturing have flocked away from America.

I know there are some who believe that the greatest thing that can happen for America is for those manufacturing jobs to leave America because they believe, gee, they hurt the environment because they pollute, so just as well they go to some other Third World country or China or other place, when the truth is, apparently, when those same manufacturing companies leave the United States, they go to nations that, on average, pollute, depending on the nations, 4 to 10 times more than we do here in the United States. For those that understand the way the world turns, as pollution goes up in Asia, we usually breathe it here in the United States. So that hasn't worked out so well for the environment of the planet. We're hurting the planet as we drive manufacturing jobs out of America.

This administration has used the EPA as a sword, as a tool to drive more and more manufacturing and production out of the United States, hurting the country more and more, not because, necessarily, they want to intentionally hurt the country. I'm not saying that. They just think we're better off.

If they're not willing to have a draconian EPA being, as the President said in his speech, working side by side with them in private business, good riddance. Go somewhere else. Because, in the President's own words, that's what he said, and it was the scariest thing I heard that the President said last week, standing right here at the second level in this Hall, the line, and I'll read from his speech directly. He said, ''We need to look for ways to work side by side with America's businesses.''

America's businesses do not need a government that wants to be their partner. The government in this country, according to the Constitution, metaphorically speaking, is supposed to be a referee—keep the playing field fair, keep it level, make sure everybody has a chance to compete and compete fairly, and stay out of the way. Do not interfere. Don't try to be a partner with business. Stay out of the way and be a referee.

It's when this United States Government has tried to be a partner that so often it gets in trouble, and it kills businesses and it kills jobs, and people flee and go to some other country where they're allowed to produce things without the government trying to be their partner.

Anybody that wants the government to be their partner should go to Venezuela or Third World nations. They're more than happy to partner with those businesses.

But some years back there was a group of us that went to China, and we met with a number of CEOs of international corporations that have taken their American jobs by the thousands, taken their businesses, their manufacturing production and gone to China. I had the feeling that when we talked to them and asked them the question, ''Why did you move all these jobs to China?'' that they would say, well, they just couldn't work with the labor unions. The price of labor was too high. Regulations were too much. But the number one answer was because of the corporate tax. The corporate tax in America, in the United States, is the highest corporate tax in the world.

□ 1610

Now corporations, those that understand business law, corporations, directors, and officers, have a fiduciary duty to their stockholders to try to make as much money as they can. Unless some, Mr. Speaker, do not know who the stockholders are, more and more they're union workers; they're American workers across their countries; they're small business owners and operators, franchise operators; they're the rank and file across the country—State employees, local employees, Federal employees. But more than that, businesses across America, they have retirement accounts that invest in these companies.

Those companies' officers and directors have a fiduciary duty that they have to—or they could be sued—have the best interests of the company and the stockholders at stake in the decisions they make. If you go to law school—I hopefully have saved somebody a lot of money—that's it in a nutshell.

So, when a group of corporate leaders is trying to decide how can we avoid being sued by the stockholders by doing the best thing to help them create the most revenue for their stock—what can we do? What will enhance their dividends?—they have to look. When they see the United States of America is taxing corporations at 35 percent and they see that China taxes at 17 percent, you would think it was pretty much a no-brainer. That's basically what they said.

I was gratified to hear that, whether it's union labor or nonunion labor, across the board, the experience that the corporate leaders that I talked to in China say really their best workers are right here in the United States—union workers, nonunion workers—and that, generally speaking, they have better quality control over products produced here in the United States of America. So, when they move plants from here in the United States to other

places like China, they have wonderful workers, but the quality control is not as good as what they have here.

But if you think about it and you realize, gee, they would pay half the corporate tax in China that they pay here by the billions, then they could afford to build state-of-the-art facilities, where facilities here in the United States, their manufacturing plants, may be falling apart and getting older. Well, you could go build a state-of-the-art facility in a place like China, and because of the tremendously reduced corporate tax, by the time you really get around to paying much tax, you've paid for the plant.

I was advised privately that it was possible the Chinese Government would make deals with some companies if they were big enough, and it might be, for example, they would say, Look, you move your manufacturing plant, hire these thousands of employees here in China instead of in the United States, and we'll make a deal with you. No corporate tax for 5 years.

Then, depending on the company and the negotiations, they might say, And then for the next 5 years, maybe 5, 7 percent, maybe 10 percent. Maybe then it goes to 17, or maybe by 15 years you get to the 17 percent rate.

But in those kind of scenarios, they say, We paid for a state-of-the-art facility by the time we ever get around to paying corporate tax. Whereas, if we kept those jobs in America, facilities getting older, we just can't produce dividends and returns on money for stockholders. We're just treading water. Here, because the corporate rates are half as expensive, then we can produce, we can compete anywhere in the world. Our goods are that much cheaper.

Now, it is true our labor is more expensive, but, in general, we have good laborers in this country, and there are Americans that are willing to work, willing to do the jobs. From talking to employers, though, we could use a lot more people willing to be employees who can pass a drug test. That's kind of important.

Now, I have had so many constituents say, Look, you have to pass a drug test in order to get employment for most important jobs nowadays, whether it's with a grocery company back home or a small operator. I was talking to an independent oilman this afternoon that drills wells from Longview, Texas, and he was saying, We have to give people drug tests.

He was telling me, because of the drilling that's currently going on in east Texas, he's having trouble finding enough workers right now, today. While people are unemployed around the country, he's having trouble right now, today, finding enough people who can pass a drug test and are willing to work hard on an oil well, and he would put them to work.

In fact, he was telling me this afternoon, they'd start out at $50,000 a year. They'd have health care. It's hard, dirty, long hours, tough work, but it's a good living. But so many of the people that apply can't pass a drug test. And because it's such difficult work physically and it requires that you be alert because all of the other people on the rig have to count on each other, kind of like in a military operation, the equipment is so dangerous, if somebody has taken drugs and is not at peak performance, they can get somebody killed. It's happened far too many times. They have to have people pass a drug test.

That's just this afternoon. Well, think about it. If we had manufacturers coming back into America because the corporate tax rate was less than 17 percent, then the manufacturing jobs show up like crazy.

Now, I realize from hearing all of the news, apparently the big emphasis of the national union leaders, who sure don't seem to be speaking to all of the union folks I know, but their emphasis seems to be basically we're not doing very well getting union members from private corporations. So they've gone all after government employees: Let's try to unionize government employees because maybe we can pick them up.

And what I think eventually rank-and-file union workers for private companies will begin to understand is it seems that they're being thrown under the bus. The concentration seems to be for more government workers, less private workers, which means they're driving for more jobs in the government sector, which kills off the private sector, which will kill off those jobs for the union members who have jobs in the private sector.

So, as I sat back here listening to the President's speech last Thursday night and as I struggled with what the President was saying—because some of it didn't seem to me that it was going to create the jobs he was promising, but I was willing to wait for the bill and not judge from a speech, because it's been said around here before that CBO cannot score a speech. Well, that was before, a couple years ago, when the administration got on to them, and basically they did score a speech, but that's because the White House is able to exert pressure on CBO that the Republicans have not been able to see fit to do.

I know Mr. Elmendorf was not happy with my reference, but the fact is, after Mr. Elmendorf met with the President in the woodshed, or the Oval Office, he came back and was able to bring down the scoring of ObamaCare by about a quarter of a trillion dollars or so. Then after ObamaCare passed, they said, Whoops, looks like maybe we underestimated by about a quarter of a trillion dollars.

That makes for a pretty big plus-or-minus margin of error when CBO can't do better than that, but CBO and the rules were created by the most liberal Congress in history until about 5 years ago. They created CBO. They created the rules for scoring. They yanked us out of Vietnam without a chance to make sure our allies there would not be killed, so most of them were. They also created an automatic baseline for government budgets that increases every year. They created a formula. It increases every year.

□ 1620

Now, I was here in '05 and '06, and I am embarrassed that, as Republicans, our party did not have the nerve to eliminate the CBO, to eliminate the ridiculous rules by which bills are scored. The actual reality and history and recurrent numbers of what happens—when you do this, you get this effect—you can't consider that. They have to use rules that don't apply in the real world and without taking into consideration the effects that have been had when an action is taken every time.

So we get terribly inaccurate scoring from a government entity, and we also have this automatic baseline that increases every year. There is not a business or home in America that can plan a budget by saying, We're automatically going to increase our budget every year from now on. No matter how much income or revenue we have each year, we're going to keep increasing our budget. That is what has been happening for 37 years, since 1974.

The Budget chairman back in '05 and '06 was not willing to do it, but I am extremely gratified that our bright chairman of the Budget, this Budget chairman, is going to do it, in that this year he's going to take up a zero baseline budget. I filed one in my first Congress back in '05 and '06, in my second Congress in '07 and '08, in my third Congress in '09 and 2010, and in this Congress. I am delighted. I don't care whose name is on the bill; but when we finally eliminate the automatic increases in the Federal budgets every year, that's going to be huge, and it's going to be better than anything that the President has proposed by way of producing revenue and balancing the budget.

I do appreciate the White House emailing their version of the American Jobs Act.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOHMERT. If I might inquire of the Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry: If there are charts around on the floor, can anybody use those?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is free to use charts in debate.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, because I saw my friends across the aisle using a chart that said the ''American Jobs Act.'' It makes a wonderful chart if it's still on the floor, because that's what we're talking about, an American Jobs Act.

The President kept saying, Pass it right away. Act now. Pass this jobs bill. Pass it right away. Pass it again right away. Pass the bill right away. They'll get back on their feet right away if we pass the bill. Anyway, just on and on—pass the bill, pass the bill,

pass the bill. So I heard the speech. I got a copy of the speech, and I like to highlight stuff where I can find it easier. So we've got all this ''pass it now,'' ''pass it right away'' stuff highlighted.

Where is it? We were told to pass it now, to pass it right away. We heard the speech Thursday night. We didn't get a bill Friday. We didn't get a bill Saturday. Obviously, it can't be filed Saturday or Sunday if we're not in session. We didn't get it, though, through email. They send the stuff when it's needed, but nothing Saturday, nothing Sunday.

On Monday, we were inquiring of the White House by email, by phone, Look, when are you going to let us see what this bill we've got to pass last week is?

We finally got a copy, and I was up until 5 a.m. on Tuesday morning going through it—tagging it, highlighting it, being staggered by the stuff in here that will kill jobs instead of create them—oh, other than the jobs that are created for the government that will help kill the economy. I couldn't believe this was being called an American Jobs Act, but it was not a surprise to me even at noon today when we inquired and found that no one had been willing to file an American Jobs Act in the House of Representatives. It had been available. The President had been talking about it since last Thursday, but nobody had been willing to actually file that bill in the House.

I have been through the President's American Jobs bill, and I am absolutely convinced—absolutely no question—that this will hurt our economy. It creates massive, bigger government intrusion. If you like Freddie and Fannie Mae, you will love the new American Infrastructure Financing Authority. What a wonderful government creation that is. We're going to provide billions and billions of dollars to create this new government entity. But not to worry—these are people who will be running it who really know what they're doing—right?—because the Secretary of Transportation is going to be in charge. I do know the Secretary of Transportation right now, and I like him very much. He's a good guy. Nonetheless, we're creating another government nightmare called the American Infrastructure Financing Authority.

Unbelievable.

You would have thought we would have learned a lesson—but not to worry. These are people who will be appointed by the President. Some other people here in Congress can throw in some recommendations, but they're appointed. The seven voting members are appointed by the President. So that will be wonderful. They'll run all our infrastructure requirements for us, and of course the President will appoint the chief executive officer.

Having been a history major in college, I do believe that the best indication of future performance is past history, past performance. With the auto czars and the private committee composed of a bunch of auto czars, I read somewhere that not any of them had ever worked in the auto industry at all, and most of them didn't even own a car. Nonetheless, they had put them in charge of our auto industry.

That kind of scares you when you think about it and when you think this is the same guy who's going to appoint all these people to run the brand-new American Infrastructure Financing Authority. That's AIFA, and it is just another nightmare. It's going to help bankrupt America quicker than this administration has already been doing.

I know people like to throw blame around. There is plenty of blame to go around because I know, in 2006, I was on this side of the aisle, hearing people stand up at the Democratic microphones, saying what I knew to be true. They were right. We had no business spending $160 billion more than we took in. That was un-American. It was outrageous. This body had no business authorizing expenditures of $160 billion more than we took in. They were right. The Democrats were right when they said we should not spend in a year $160 billion more than we took in.

Nowadays, people like to say, Well, it's Afghanistan and Iraq that have broken this country and have made us bankrupt. That's not the case. We were in Afghanistan; we were in the worst part of the expenditures in Iraq during those days, and we overspent what we had coming in by about $160 billion. If anybody back then had told me that within 4 years those same people who condemned this side of the aisle for overspending by $160 billion would be just fine with overspending by $1.6 trillion, I would never have believed it.

□ 1630

There is no way, with the speeches that were given here in '05, '06, '07 about the Republicans' irresponsibility in '05 and '06, my freshman year, over $160 billion more being spent than we brought in, that they would have any nerve or ability to stand up and say I'm voting to spend $1.6 trillion more than we're going to take in. I just didn't think, I wouldn't have believed that anybody would be willing to do that. Well, they have, and we as a country have.

But I went through the President's bill. Yesterday I went through much of it, but there is a little more that needs to be said, for example, to illuminate the President's comments about he wants to go after the profits of Big Oil; and he does that in his bill, we were told. He was going to fix it for Big Oil.

Well, I was a little cynical, I was a little leery, because I have heard the President call the Wall Street executives fat cats. He has called them names, said we wouldn't be letting them do that, that we ought to go after them, that kind of stuff.

Yet I knew that, while he was calling them names, at the same time his governing made sure that an entity like Goldman Sachs made more money than they've ever made in their history. They should have had to file for bankruptcy. Instead, now they're making more money than they've ever made in history, and this President is presiding in such a way it's bad for America, but Wall Street is doing great, and some would say that doesn't make sense because we know that Wall Street is mainly Republicans.

But if you look into it, as the Heritage Foundation has—my friend Mike Franc there has done the research—you found out that, in essence, corporate executives on Wall Street, when you include their immediate family that donates with them, donate about 4–1 or donate about 4–1 for Obama over MCCAIN. And Mike had said, when he first saw that, he thought, wow, that's intriguing. That may be different from prior years, But as he checked on it, it wasn't that different from prior years, donations from Wall Street.

Then you get to realizing, wait a minute, Democratic Presidents, Members here in this body are constantly deriding these greedy, evil people on Wall Street; and yet they're generally giving 4–1 to Democrats over Republicans. There are 4–1 Democrats on Wall Street in executive positions than there are Republicans. Well, no wonder. It starts making more sense that they would do much better under Democratic administrations since it helps to know people in those kinds of positions.

But we were told by the President he's going after Big Oil. The provisions in this President's bill—it's at page 151—repeal the deduction for intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells. Now, the bill has a dishonest word here. It says repealing oil ''subsidies.''

A subsidy, you can look it up, Webster, wherever you want to, but the definition will basically be the same wherever you look it up. A ''subsidy'' is a grant or a gift of money. There are no grants or gifts of money, and there wasn't anybody that wanted to go after British Petroleum more than I did around here when we found out 800 violations or so and when all the other majors were having maybe one or two in the gulf.

Yet they were involved in crony capitalism. So the administration looked the other way over and over and over again until the Deepwater Horizon blew out. People were killed, you know, not only lives lost but fortunes lost. The Gulf of Mexico was devastated all because this administration and those inspectors that were sent looked the other way to all of this pitiful way that drilling was done because they were buddies, crony capitalism.

So when you look here at what the President actually has in his bill, who it's going to help and who it's going to hurt, what you see are these deductions here that he's repealing—the repeal of deduction for tertiary injectants, the repeal of the percentage depletion allowance for oil and gas wells. Section 199, the deduction attributable to oil, natural gas or primary

products thereof, the repeal of oil and gas working interest exception to passive activity rules.

I read through these, checked with experts and find out, CPAs, people that do the tax returns for independent oil companies, and I was reminded, this stuff basically applies only as a deduction for an oil company that produces less than a thousand barrels of oil. All of the majors that this President says he wants to go after and go after their profits, they're majors.

All of the deductions that he is trying to repeal, they're not going to affect, they're not really going to hurt the major oil companies. They're going to devastate the independent oil companies. That will be the result here.

So he says he wants to go after the majors, but that's just not what he is doing in his bill, and I know that, being a community organizer, he's not that well up on what he's going to hurt and what he's going to help. But the fact is there are figures that indicate American production activities are dominated by independent producers, who drill 95 percent of the Nation's natural gas and oil wells, accounting for 67 percent of total U.S. natural gas and oil production. That's the independent oil companies of America. Ninety-five percent of the drilling, 67 percent of the production is not ExxonMobil. It's not Shell. It's not British Petroleum. It's the independent oil companies in America.

And who are they? They're people that cannot go to the banks, for the most part, to get a loan. Any bank that would loan an oil company money to drill a particular well is probably going to get shut down because the chances are, in most cases—certainly in the investments I have had—you are more likely to have a dry hole than you are to hit anything that's really going to be of a sufficient, productive nature.

So, of course, once you have established a field, the odds go up dramatically, but most of these wells, when it's not an established field and it's just helping produce more from a known field, you can't get loans. The only way independent oil companies have to be assured of being able to drill oil wells is not to go get a loan, and they also know that if they invest and pay all of the 100 percent of their own drilling and they hit a few dry holes in a row, they're going to be bankrupt, if there were so many of them.

What most independent oil companies do, they do studies geologically. They have to hire geologists most of the time. I am told they were independent geologists. I know a great number of those. They do great work. They will study an area, and they will hire a landman to come in and study who owns what interests in the minerals, who owns what rights that they're going to have to acquire in order to do drilling, and then they hire people that are involved in drilling.

They're not like the majors where they've got all they need to go do all the drilling. They hire independent mud companies, independent wire line companies. They will often have to have people come out and feed them, and if they don't, they're going to have people who need to go eat somewhere.

It is hard, nasty, 24-hour-a-day work. You don't stop 8–5. You have to do shifts because you can't afford to get somebody too tired for staying on a rig too long. But they employ millions of people. They cause the employment of millions around America even though there aren't that many that actually work on the wells, themselves.

□ 1640

They create jobs. They don't just save them like this President says he's been doing. And so what's the President doing? He, in his bill, is not touching, he's not going to hurt the Big Oil companies. They're going to apparently do as well as his good friends at General Electric.

So what we have seen is, if you're really friends with this administration, or to be fair, the parties in power, then odds are you're going to get your tax bills through and you are going to be like General Electric, you're going to be like Warren Buffett, and you're going to be able to skate through without paying virtually any tax.

I loved the way Art Laffer explained to it me in his living room after a Sunday lunch one day last year. We talked about these taxing concepts. I just love the guy. He is so brilliant. He's charming and funny. He sure got us out of a mess back in 1980–1981 because he was the adviser to Ronald Reagan. Art Laffer was his economic adviser.

Many people have heard about the Laffer curve because for people in government who want to maximize the amount of revenue to the Federal Government so they can spend more, how do you do it? Well, if you don't have any kind of tax at all, the government has no tax at all, then the revenue of the Federal Government would be zero on this end. If the government taxed a 100 percent tax, very, very quickly nobody would work. Nobody's going to work to produce 100 percent revenue for the Federal Government unless the whole Nation is enslaved, and God forbid that that will happen.

So on the two ends of the graph, you have zero revenue to the Federal Government, if it is zero percent tax altogether, and on the other end you have zero revenue to the Federal Government if there's 100 percent tax. So somewhere in between, you reach the maximum efficiency for bringing in revenue to the Federal Government. If you tax too high, then you start hurting the amount of revenue percentagewise coming in, and so you actually get less revenue when you pass that maximum point. Before that point, you can continue to raise taxes and actually increase revenue. Beyond that, the revenue starts coming down. So as Art has described it, you need to cut taxes 30 percent, and you will get us out of this horrific doldrums of an economy.

I was back at Fort Benning, Georgia, at the time, and things were not good. The military was not respected at all. I liked Ronald Reagan a lot. Of course, when you're in the military, you can't say anything negative about the Commander in Chief or you've committed an offense under the UCMJ. You can't criticize someone in your chain of command, including the Commander in Chief. So we just had to bite our tongues, but we could see Jimmy Carter was doing such damage to this country economically and in the foreign arena. It was just tragic.

I liked Ronald Reagan. He said he was going to be able to help bring down double-digit inflation, double-digit unemployment and double-digit interest rates. As much as I liked him, I recall telling my wife, Kathy, back at Fort Benning, I like him, but I don't care who the President is, there's no way a President can actually help do all that, really have that kind of effect.

He proved me wrong. With Laffer's guidance, taxes were cut 30 percent, and the economy took off. Because the economy took off and there were more jobs, unemployment dropped dramatically. Interest rates were able to come down dramatically. We had a 12¼ percent or something loan on our first home in Georgia just off post in Fort Benning. It may have been 12¾ percent. Some folks told me that was crazy—it was too high—but it wasn't long before interest rates some places were 18 percent, so 12 wasn't so bad. Now, interest rates came down under Reagan, but it was Laffer who said bring down the taxes by 30 percent, and you'll do dramatic work on creating a better economy.

I love the story Art Laffer tells about getting a call from President Reagan. He said, Art, great news. We got your tax cut.

Art said, in essence, this is my paraphrase: That's great, Mr. President. Congratulations.

Art, you don't seem excited. Why aren't you excited? This is great news. We got the tax cut with the Democratic House and Senate. They're going to cut it 30 percent.

He said, Congratulations, Mr. President. That's great.

President Reagan said, Why aren't you more excited?

He said, Mr. President, I understand you're going to cut it like half a percent the first year, 10 percent the next year, and another 20 percent the third year.

He said, Well, that's the deal we had to cut with Congress. We couldn't get all 30 percent at once.

As I recall, he said something like, Mr. President, if you were going shopping and the place you were going to go shopping had a half of one percent sale this month and then 10 percent sale next month and then 20 percent sale the next one after that, when are you going to go shopping?

He said Reagan was quiet for awhile and then finally said, Are we going to have a couple of bad years?

He said, Yes. Now it's going to be 3 years before the economy heals. We could have had it this year.

President Reagan got the best he could in 1981 and 1982, and those were not good years. In 1983, the economy surged, and more money was brought into the coffers.

The problem, though, is that the Democratic Party got so excited controlling the House and Senate—Reagan and Laffer had set up such a situation here, and there was so much more money coming into the coffers, the Federal revenues—that they started spending like never before. They can blame Reagan, but the Constitution makes very clear, Congress spends the money.

So really, this year, we are still working off of what Congress did or didn't do last year under Speaker PELOSI. Next year, beginning October 1, will be the first full year we are back at least as Republicans being in control of one House. So I think it is very, very important what we try to do to generate jobs and when you know that these provisions are going to devastate independent oil companies that do 95 percent of the drilling in continental America and won't hurt Exxon, British Petroleum, and, in fact, because 95 percent of the drilling will not get done in the continental United States.

I guess that's why the President was trying to do this. They apparently don't like drilling. They don't like mining. They don't like any of this stuff occurring on our soil. They would rather it go somewhere else where they pollute a lot more. But we are talking about millions of jobs that will be lost because of the devastating effect of destroying independent oil and gas businesses—and all of that when we've gotten such great news over the last few years. We went from having basically no natural gas reserves to having 100—some say 200, some say 300—years of natural gas reserves.

Some fleets of trucks are starting to convert to natural gas. If we converted cars and trucks—you can't order them from Detroit yet that come equipped with natural gas. You can get them done after they leave the factory. But if we started getting natural gas vehicles like some fleets have done, travel is a lot cheaper. You don't have the pollution you have with gasoline. It burns clean. You do have CO_2.

So look out. We're going to grow more plants, because plants have to have CO_2 in order to have photosynthesis, in order to produce O_2 as a byproduct from growing as a plant. So, gee, if we use more natural gas, we may end up with more healthy plants. So that may be a difficult thing if people don't like green plants.

I couldn't help but notice on page 155—and I have read through here—the President has things like eliminating deductions. He says this bill is paid for. In his speech he says—and I want to read it correctly. He told us back 2 years ago during his health care speech, if you misrepresent my bill, I'm going to call you out. So let me read what he says.

He says, ''And here is the other thing I want the American people to know. The American Jobs Act will not add to the deficit. It will be paid for.''

That's what he said.

What he's counting on, what he references on page 4 of his speech—and it's on page 155—yes, there is elimination of deductions. In reality, it's going to cost this government revenue. It's not going to create more Federal revenue.

□ 1650

It's going to cost jobs. There will be fewer people paying as much income tax. That will hurt the Federal coffers more. We'll have more deficit spending. We can't get that under control. But we just passed a deficit bill I didn't support because it didn't have adequate cuts in there. There was no restraint on spending that was really adequate. If you only cut $1 trillion over a 10-year period, and we all know—everybody in here knows—you can't bind future Congresses. So all the cuts that do not occur within the next year or year and a half, there's no reason to think that they will happen. You can't bind future Congresses.

Anyway, even if we did cut $1 trillion—not much the next year, but it gets heavier toward the end of the 10 years. If we were to cut $1 trillion over 10 years and we were to do that every 10 years, within exactly 150 years we will finally balance the budget, and we will have only added $120 trillion to the $14.3 trillion or $14.6 trillion that we've run up in deficit spending now. If we were able to reach this wonderful goal of $2 trillion in cuts in the next 10 years and do that ever 10 years, then we can balance the budget in only 80 years. We'll only add around $72 trillion in additional deficit spending to our deficit.

So the joint committee was charged: Find $1.5 trillion somewhere between now and basically Christmas, the end of the year. Actually, we found out today they're really going to need to find it by the 1st of November. This is how the President pays for his $450 billion spending spree, where we create the American Infrastructure Financing Authority—a new Fannie and Freddie on steroids. We create a new massive government bureaucracy.

The FCC wanted to have a fairness doctrine and control what people said on the airwaves. They want to dictate everything that gets done in the media on the airwaves, but they were realizing more and more people are going to broadband and less and less to the airways. They're losing control of things. So the President addresses that. It's not a jobs bill in the private sector, but it creates a brand-new authority, government entity. Well, actually, he describes it in his bill as a private nonprofit group. He appoints the directors, of course, and it's called the Public Safety Broadband Corporation. Wow, it's going to kill the private sector. But more government jobs. Good news there.

And here's the pay-for. If we had a drum roll, Mr. Speaker, we could ask for it. The Budget Control Act of 2011 is amended by striking $1.5 trillion that they have to find in cuts in the next month or so and inserting $1.95 trillion in cuts. That's it. Magically, he just found $450 billion in cuts, but it's because he told the supersubcommittee: Go find this extra money. What a great revenue-enhancing deficit spending cut that is.

This bill is a disaster. It sets up a program that will allow people who have their hours reduced by 10 percent to start collecting unemployment compensation. It requires State agencies to start mandating that those employers involved certify that even if they cut an employee's hours, they're going to still have the same health care benefits, retirement benefits. I talked to some employers today about it. They said, We'll have to give up providing health care and retirement benefits because we need the flexibility. If we're all taking a cut, then let's take a cut.

I want to challenge my own Republican leadership, Mr. Speaker. Most of America is not even aware that this year we put our mouth where our money is, and we actually voted to cut our own budgets by 5 percent. And next year we're cutting our own budget by 6 percent. Well, we haven't done enough with that. I would challenge our own leadership, and I hope that we'll seize the day—seize the moment—and be able, because we would have the right to do this since we're cutting our own budgets. America doesn't know that, but we are.

Okay. All Federal Government, here's the deal. We're cutting our own budget in Congress by 5 percent this year, 6 percent next year, and we're doing it to every department In the country. We have the moral authority to do that since we're cutting our own. We should do that. Let's get spending under control. But the President uses, apparently, Rahm Emanuel's own philosophy about: Don't let a good crisis go to waste. So he's got this 155-page bill that he finally made available Monday night but that nobody has filed here in the House.

We need American jobs. We need American jobs now. I am convinced that if we eliminated the corporate tax altogether, you would hear a gigantic sucking sound, I believe Mr. Perot used to say, of manufacturers leaving other countries and flocking back to America, making more income than they had in the past, because for the first time—Donald Trump is a sharp man. He has made a lot of money. He has advocated that we put a 25 percent tariff on everything we buy from China.

If you studied the situation and understand the treaties—I don't like most of them, but if you look at what we've done, if we set a 25 percent tariff on everything America buys from China, we

have violated a number of contracts and agreements. There's penalty phases to that. We start a trade war. I don't think China wins, but I know we don't either. I don't think anybody wins a trade war that that would start.

So inspired by Donald Trump saying, Why don't we put a 25 percent tariff on everything we buy from China—and I've talked to Art Laffer. He likes the idea. He's got some other alternatives as well, but one of them is you eliminate the corporate tax altogether. I really think it's one of the most insidious taxes in America because people have had to be sold a bill of goods to believe that you won't have to pay it. We're going to make these evil, greedy corporations do it.

And I will admit to you, sometimes unions are very helpful because greed does take over. But the thing is, if you eliminate the corporate tax, who's been paying that? The consumers and lower wage earners in those corporations. In some cases, there are studies that have indicated that. But it's the consumers that have to pay the corporate tax. If a corporation doesn't pass that tax on, they can't stay in business.

If you eliminate the corporate tax, you'll have jobs flooding back into America, and you'll have more people paying income tax. The Laffer curve won't be zero taxes on this side with zero revenue. It will be zero corporate tax. But even at the same tax levels, you will have dramatic increases in the Federal revenue because so many more people will be employed, things will be going well, and the economy will have a jump-start like we've never seen before.

So after nobody else would file an American Jobs Act, as the President proposed, and having examined it over and over in the last couple of days, having checked today at noon to see if anybody had the nerve to file this disastrous bill that will kill jobs, run up the price of gasoline and oil and make everybody's life more miserable, more government intrusion into broadcast, more government intrusion into financing things—not Fannie or Freddie because we've still got them around, but a new infrastructure financing authority—I realize this is a disaster for America.

So I filed not a 115-page bill but actually a 2-page bill today at about 1:20, and it says: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the corporate income tax. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and Congress assembled. This Act may be cited as the ''American Jobs Act of 2011.'' It repeals the corporate income tax, repeals the alternative minimum tax, and there will be so many more people paying income tax, people will not believe the kind of money that will flow into the Federal Government, not that that's a good thing, but we can at least pay down our debt if we're responsible.

□ 1700

I'm so excited that the Tea Party is getting fired up. I see people from all races, all walks of life in the Tea Party. The one thing they seem to have in common is they're paying income tax, and they're tired of carrying half of the country on their backs. So this is a start, I believe—it is a jobs bill—and you will see jobs flood this country, and we'll get on track.

In the few minutes I have left, let me just tell you about a man that probably had the most influence on my life behind my father. His name was Sam Parker. There have been wonderful men in my life, women in my life, teachers in my life that affected me.

Sam Parker was hired by the Mount Pleasant School Board in 1952 to be a coach and to teach history. He was the head coach of the Mount Pleasant Tigers football team. In 2 years' time, in 1953, he had led them to being undefeated after the first nine games. He turned the program around. He was a devoted Christian, belonged to the Methodist church there, started teaching Sunday school. His wife, Norween, was the librarian at the junior high.

After nine games, we went to play Sulphur Springs, and people were saying, This looks like the best team in 3A, in Texas; they very well could win the State. They went to Sulphur Springs. Some team members told me it was their fault; they didn't take it serious enough, and they lost by one touchdown. That was Friday night. Monday morning, the school board fired Sam Parker.

Then he and his wife had a tough decision. They believed that God had called them to Mount Pleasant to plant their roots, invest their lives, and change America from that small place. Well, he did the unthinkable. He stayed and taught American history after being fired as head football coach.

And 7 years later, I met him in a park recreation program he put on for young kids in the public park down there each summer. I worked with him one summer as a teenager with the kids. He taught more kids how to play baseball in Mount Pleasant during those years than anybody else in town. He was my scoutmaster. He had a troop there. He was my scoutmaster through my becoming an Eagle Scout there at Mount Pleasant, and he taught me American history. He continued to teach Sunday school.

The man that coached 2 years at Mount Pleasant High School changed Mount Pleasant in an incredible way. He was still alive in 1991. Before he died, they renamed the football field Sam Parker Field. He taught me American history. He served in World War II. He loved this country. His son was my best friend—is still a dear friend.

Those are the kinds of people that have changed America. Those are the kinds of people who are the reason we have been blessed like we've been blessed, And if we don't have more people willing to put pettiness aside, goofy ideas that enrich their cronies, goofy ideas that increase power for some people and get back to what made America great, we're going to lose this country. As Ben Franklin said in 1787, we will become a byword down through future generations because we had the greatest country ever given to mankind, and we became irresponsible and lost it.

It's time for major changes.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1841

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD) at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and September 15 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and September 15 on account of a family emergency.

Mr. BARLETTA (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of severe flooding in his district.

Mrs. NOEM (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for September 12 until 2 p.m. and September 13 on account of family reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 15, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3094. A letter from the Director, Regulatory management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Change of Address for Region 1; Technical Correction [FRL-9449-3] received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3095. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cobalt Lithium Manganese Nickel Oxide; Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2009-0922; FRL-8878-2] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3096. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — TSCA Inventory Update Reporting Modifications; Chemical Data Reporting [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2009-0189; FRL-8872-9] (RIN: 2070-AJ43) received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3097. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0157; FRL-9447-6] received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3098. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0158; FRL-9447-7] received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3099. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Attainment Demonstration for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard, and Approval of Related Revisions [EPA-R08-OAR-2010-0285; FRL-9276-8] received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3100. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Limited Federal Implementation Plan; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; California; North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2011; FRL-9448-5] received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3101. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Adjustments to the Allowance System for Controlling HCFC Production, Import and Export [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-1040; FRL-9448-4] (RIN: 2060-AQ82) received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3102. A letter from the Chief, Broadband Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 101 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate the Use of Microwave for Wireless Backhaul and Other Uses and to Provide Additional Flexibility to Broadcast Auxiliary Service and Operational Fixed Microwave Licensees Petition for Rulemaking Filed by Fixed Wireless Communications Coalition to Amend Part 101 of the Commission's Rules to Authorize 60 and 80MHx Channels in Certain Bands for Broadband Communications [WT Docket No.: 10-153, RM-11602] received August 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3103. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Extreme Sailing Series Boston; Boston Harbor, Boston, Massachusetts [Docket No.: USCG-20114-0103] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1070. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to authorize the Securities and Exchange Commission to exempt a certain class of securities from such Act; with an amendment (Rept. 112–206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 2910. A bill to require parental consent to release records of home-schooled students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. MICA, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 2911. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the corporate income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 2912. A bill to establish the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area in the San Juan Islands, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado (for himself and Ms. FOXX):

H.R. 2913. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the termination of further retirement benefits for Members of Congress, except the right to continue participating in the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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 Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. BASS of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 2914. A bill to create an emergency jobs program that will fund 2,242,000 positions during fiscal years 2012 and 2013; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Agriculture, the Judiciary, Science, Space, and Technology, 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. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 2915. A bill to repeal the Western Area Power Administration borrowing authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 2916. A bill to enforce the tenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States as it relates to the autonomous sovereign police powers of the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 2917. A bill to restore State sovereignty, and to dedicate excess grant funds to deficit reduction; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 2918. A bill to strengthen and clarify the commercial, cultural, and other relations between the people of the United States and the people of Taiwan, as codified in the Taiwan Relations Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BROOKS, and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 2919. A bill to eliminate the reimbursement requirement for certain tornado shelters constructed with Federal assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 2920. A bill to establish the Detroit Jobs Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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 Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 2921. A bill to amend the Small Business Act with respect to assistance under section 8(a) of that Act and goals for procurement contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2922. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana:

H.R. 2923. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan for security contractors operating in Afghanistan and in support of other contingency operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 2924. A bill to expedite the deployment of highway construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2925. A bill to establish a smart card pilot program under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOWDY (for himself and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 2926. A bill to abolish the National Labor Relations Board and to transfer its enforcement authority to the Department of Justice and its oversight of elections to the Office of Labor-Management Standards of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 2927. A bill to give priority to local and State artists when selecting appropriate artwork for Federal buildings; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2928. A bill to provide relief to the Pottawatomi Nation in Canada for settlement of certain claims against the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 2929. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide an exception to that Act for actions carried out against grizzly bears in self-defense, defense of others, or a reasonable belief of imminent danger; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 2930. A bill to amend the securities laws to provide for registration exemptions for certain crowdfunded securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2931. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to eliminate the statutory cap on the public debt and to place limitations on the purposes for which public debt may be issued; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 2932. A bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2933. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to remove the exclusion from Federal copyright of sound recordings fixed before February 15, 1972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 2934. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of certain retirement plan contributions picked up by governmental employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 79. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Libya's frozen assets be utilized to pay for NATO's military campaign; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 2910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article I Section 8 Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes...

U.S Constitution—Amendment XVI

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution, ''the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States.'' As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.'' I was elected in 2010 to serve in the 112th Congress as certified by the Secretary of State of Washington state.

Article III, Section 2 states that the Supreme Court has ''the judicial power'' that ''shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States.'' Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land when stating ''The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court.''

The power of judicial review of the Supreme Court was upheld in Marbury v Madison in 1803, giving the Supreme Court the authority to strike down any law it deems unconstitutional. Members of Congress, having been elected and taken the oath of office, are given the authority to introduce legislation and only the Supreme Court, as established by the Constitution and precedent, can determine the Constitutionality of this authority.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 2913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power of Congress to make law regarding the compensation for the services of Senators and Representatives, as enumerated in Article I, Section 6, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, as amended by the 27th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 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. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 2915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 1 and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment, Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment, Constitution of the United States

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 2918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

(The Constitutional authorities cited in our Committee reports on legislation during the past several years are highlighted on the other side of this page.

The overwhelming majority have cited ''article I, section 8 of the Constitution.''

A handful had slightly more specific citations to ''article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution.''

A couple bills with trade/sanctions components have cited ''article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution.''

And one anti-trafficking bill (with significant domestic law enforcement components) cited ''article I, section 8 of the Constitution and the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution.''

The one consistent exception is Resolutions of Inquiry, which always cite ''article I, section 1 of the Constitution.'')

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 2919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States).

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 2920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 2921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill, the ''Expanding Opportunities for Small Business Act of 2011'' is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and amends the Small Business Act with respect to assistance under 8(a) of that Act and goals for procurement contracts.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana:

H.R. 2923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14 and 16) grants Congress the authority to raise and support Armies, provide and maintain a Navy, make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, and regulate the militia.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 2924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 2925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOWDY:

H.R. 2926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 2927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 2930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, sec. 8, cl. 1 (to pay Debts), cl. 18 (To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof).

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 2932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Amendment I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Amendment XVI: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several states, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 79.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 23: Mr. LOBIONDO and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 36: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 58: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 104: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 192: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 250: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 333: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 369: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 409: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 420: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 451: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 618: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 640: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 646: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 674: Mr. PETERS, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 687: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 719: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 734: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.R. 735: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 817: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 876: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 923: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 931: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 984: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 1001: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1090: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1167: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1172: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1173: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1175: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1195: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1259: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. TURNER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1283: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1297: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1307: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1314: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1335: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1340: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 1348: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1356: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1366: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1370: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1404: Mr. KISSELL and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1416: Mr. WATT.
H.R. 1418: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1427: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 1456: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1465: Mr. OLVER and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1558: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1612: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1672: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BILBRAY, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1699: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 1744: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1749: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. HOCHUL, Ms. LEE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 1756: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 1834: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1864: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1916: Mr. KEATING and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1941: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1971: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
H.R. 1993: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 2009: Mr. MACK.
H.R. 2016: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2042: Mr. KIND and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2069: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2077: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 2092: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 2108: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2193: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2236: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2245: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2250: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2267: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2299: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 2304: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2307: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 2324: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2369: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. DENT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. STARK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 2401: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2407: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2432: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2453: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2457: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2471: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2483: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2485: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2499: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2505: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2514: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2524: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2528: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2529: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.R. 2568: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 2569: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2579: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 2580: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2634: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2674: Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 2681: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 2752: Mr. FLORES, Mr. LANDRY, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 2759: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 2760: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2763: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 2815: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 2820: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 2822: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 2830: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 2833: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2834: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 2840: Mr. LANDRY.
H.R. 2847: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2848: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 2852: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HERGER, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 2853: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2854: Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. LONG, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 2855: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. LEE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2865: Mr. LONG and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2867: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 2882: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2884: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. STARK, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2885: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WEST, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.J. Res. 20: Mr. WOODALL.
H.J. Res. 69: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.J. Res. 72: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 134: Mr. NUGENT.
H. Res. 137: Mr. MORAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. OLVER.
H. Res. 241: Mr. AUSTRIA.
H. Res. 333: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. CARDOZA.
H. Res. 378: Mr. TOWNS.
H. Res. 385: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H. Res. 394: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2883, the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 2883, the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 79, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2012, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 2881: Mr. Hastings of Washington.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2011 No. 136

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

As we come into Your presence today, O Lord, we, like Isaiah of old, need to be cleansed from our sinfulness. Forgive us for our failures and cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

Today, use our lawmakers so that their actions will help provide for the security and well-being of all people. Sustain our Senators with the protection of Your providence and give them Your peace. Give them also a spirit of unity and the wisdom to have respect one for the other.

Lord, thank You for the redemption You provide for Your people. Holy and awesome is Your Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

The assistant bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 14, 2011.

To the Senate:

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

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in morning business for 1 hour. The Republicans will control the first half and the majority will control the final half. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 66, which is now a resolution regarding Burma sanctions and the legislative vehicle for additional FEMA funding. We expect to be in consideration of this legislation today. We also hope to consider the FAA and highway extension, which was received from the House yesterday. Senators will be notified when votes are scheduled.

FEMA VICTIMS

Mr. REID. Madam President, the House sent us a package, and I appreciate that very much. It funds the highway bill for 6 months, and it funds the FEMA bill for 4 months. That is terrific. We should move to this as quickly as we can; however, we are told it is going to be held up by the Republicans. If someone wants to have a vote on an amendment as it relates to this, I will be happy to discuss this with the Republican leader and see if we can work something out. In the instance I am talking about, however, the Senator said he doesn't want to vote; he just wants to hold up the bill. He said if we put in what we got from the House and stuck his provision in that, then he would be happy. Well, I guess anyone would. It is a pretty good way to legislate around here—just be a dictator and say: Either take this or leave it. That isn't the way things work around here. We have to have votes on issues to find out how people feel.

I am convinced his issue would lose overwhelmingly, but he is holding up this legislation, and we are in a position now legislatively that I can't get to this bill. We cannot get to this bill prior to Friday, when the FAA expires. So it is unfortunate that is the position we are in. One Senator is holding this up, and what it will do is—the highway bill does not expire on Friday; FAA does. But they are a package. If this continues, we will have about 80,000 people out of work by Saturday, 4,000 who work for the FAA and about 70,000 or 75,000 who are working on airport construction jobs. In Las Vegas, for example, there is a new tower being built because of McCarran Field being overwhelmed—the old tower can't handle things well—and those people will be laid off. That is the way it is all over the country. That is very unfortunate.

I really appreciate, Madam President, and I have tried to say individually—I have been to each Republican Senator—the Senators who have voted to help us move forward on funding for FEMA, I really appreciate it. As you know, we have a majority, but it is not a huge majority, and to get things done on issues that are specialized, we need seven Republicans, and we have eight Republicans in this instance who helped us pass this legislation. All the Democratic Senators voted for this, and we got those Republicans. This allows us now to fund FEMA.

I have told my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, if it is something that—if they want to change the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

numbers around, let's have a discussion on that. But right now, people are desperate.

Last night around 6 or 6:30, I spoke to the man who is in charge of FEMA, and he said we are spending money every day on Lee and on Irene. These are not a couple of women; one is a tropical storm, and the other is a hurricane. They are not spending money other places. Why? Because they don't have the money.

As the Presiding Officer knows, there are people in her State who have lost their homes. This is all up and down the coast, from the coast of Florida up to Maine, and even places inward. As we talked about yesterday, some of the very severe damage was not on the coastline but, for example, in the State of Vermont, the worst storm likely they have ever had, and those people are trying to get from one place to the next, but they have scores of bridges that are inoperable. And that money—what money they have left in FEMA—will run out I think he said on the 25th. If things keep going the way they are, on the 25th of this month, they will be out of money—no money.

So we need to get this done. Procedurally, we are on this, and I can't move to the highway bill and the FAA bill. And, I repeat, the FAA bill expires. So I hope we can have something worked out with this Senator so we can get this bill done.

The disasters facing this country are untoward. Forty-eight States have already had emergency declarations. Some States have had multiple emergency declarations. Only two States—West Virginia and Michigan—have not had emergency declarations. We have had in the State of Texas, as an example, 20,000 fires since the first of the year; on Sunday alone, 19 fires. Millions of acres have burned, and 2,000 homes have burned to the ground. That is what FEMA is all about.

FEMA is an organization that is relatively new, but as a country we have been helping people who have experienced disasters since we have been a country.

In the early 1800s, there was a big fire in the State of New Hampshire. I believe the date was 1813. The Federal Government stepped in to help with the rebuilding there. That is the way it should be. That is what our country is all about. I am sorry, Madam President, it was 1803. In 1803, the Federal Government played a role in rebuilding after a calamity in New Hampshire. Congress passed legislation that year to help New Hampshire recover from the devastating fire they had.

FEMA was established in 1979. To this point, it appears this could very likely be the worst disaster year in the history of the country. Irene alone is one of the five worst disasters monetarily we have had in this country.

So I hope my Republican colleagues will work with us and help us move these things along. It is important that we do that. It is important that we do that as quickly as we can so that people in Joplin, MO, and other places in the country that have been devastated can receive the help they deserve from the Federal Government.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1549, H.R. 2832, AND H.R. 2887

Mr. REID. Madam President, there are three bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bills by title for the second time en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1549) to provide tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs.

A bill (H.R. 2832) to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 2887) to provide an extension of surface and air transportation programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to these three bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bills will be placed on the calendar.

The Senator from Nebraska.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. JOHANNS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to engage in a colloquy with my Republican colleagues—Senators ROBERTS, PORTMAN, HOEVEN, BLUNT, and ISAKSON—and in the event the minority leader does appear to offer comments, that we interrupt our colloquy for the minority leader to speak.

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

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. JOHANNS. Madam President, I rise today with my colleagues to talk about trade and the importance of trade and specifically to talk about three pending trade agreements. And when I say ''pending,'' man alive, am I emphasizing ''pending.'' These agreements have been around a very long time. And I am referring to Korea, Panama, and Colombia.

We all know the benefits of trade in the United States. In Nebraska, my home State, more than 19,000 jobs and more than $5.5 billion in revenue were directly tied to exports last year.

In trade discussions, we often hear about the need to level the playing field. Well, these agreements do exactly that. They eliminate tariffs and a whole host of other barriers on most agricultural products, including products that are important to my State: beef, corn, soybeans, and pork. No doubt about it, they increase the economic opportunities for Nebraska farmers and ranchers, for businesses and for workers.

Well, for 3 years, we have heard the President say the right thing. In fact, every time he would say something about this, I thought, finally, the trade agreements are going to bust loose and we are going to have an opportunity to vote on them.

He said in last year's State of the Union:

> If America sits on the sidelines while other Nations sign trade deals, we will lose the chance to create jobs on our shores.

Then again in May, the President called for a ''robust, forward-looking trade agenda that emphasizes exports and domestic job growth.''

Just last week, the President noted that now is the time. He said, of ''a series of trade agreements that would make it easier for American companies to sell their products in Panama, Colombia and South Korea,'' now is the time. If now is the time, why is the administration continuing to fail to act? It has been 1,538 days since the Korea agreement was signed. It has been 1,540 days since the Panama agreement was signed. It has been 1,758 days since we completed negotiations with Colombia.

As I said, I have colleagues with me today who are in a much better position than I would be to explain the positive impacts of these trade agreements. I am going to ask that Senator ROBERTS speak first, Senator PORTMAN, Senator HOEVEN, Senator BLUNT, and Senator ISAKSON. It is my hope that if there is time permitting, I will wrap up.

I ask Senator ROBERTS, as former chairman of the House Agriculture subcommittee and ranking member of the Senate Agriculture Committee today, how important are these agreements to agriculture and job creation in the United States?

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I thank my colleague and dear friend from Nebraska for the question.

In the end, the biggest consequence for inaction that is now facing our Nation, our biggest challenge, is jobs. In regards to his question, the three pending trade agreements add up to $13 billion in additional exports and an estimated 250,000 jobs. From the agricultural perspective, the three pending

trade agreements represent $2.5 billion, if they are ever implemented.

The estimates are that the three agreements in total are expected to increase direct exports by $129.5 million just for Kansas farmers and ranchers and an additional 1,150 jobs for our State. For folks on the farm, these export markets are absolutely critical. Approximately one-third of our crop production is exported. For wheat, that number jumps to one-half.

The administration's prolonged delay is causing U.S. businesses and producers to simply lose market share. We are losing out. Other countries are not waiting. They are enacting trade agreements without the United States.

Let me give a very good example. The Colombia-Canada trade agreement went into force on August 15 of this year. Already, Nutresa, the largest food processor in Colombia, has announced it will source all of its wheat from Canada to take advantage of the lower duties the Canadian wheat will receive from the trade agreement. Nutresa's wheat demand alone represents 50 percent of all wheat imports to that country. Our Kansas Farm Bureau estimates that Kansas farmers stand to lose $21 million from lost wheat sales alone and $38 million from all agricultural exports just by doing nothing on the trade agreement.

Soon after the United States negotiated the trade agreement with Korea, the European Union followed suit. In July, the Korea-European Union trade agreement went into effect. According to Korean customs, within the first 29 days of July, I say to my friend, the European exports were up 34 percent.

Get this one: Notably, aerospace equipment increased by a whopping 1,693 percent. That is astounding. Kansas is a major player in the aviation sector, exporting $2.7 billion in transportation equipment last year. As the aviation capital of the world, Wichita's aviation companies and 17,000 workers have much to lose in trying to compete against the European Union.

It is long overdue time for the President to put some action behind his words. Send the three trade agreements to Congress immediately.

I am going to make a statement that I regret to say. Trade assistance notwithstanding, I am very sad to say that I do not believe we are going to see any trade agreement this year or the next. I hope my prediction is not correct. This is ridiculous.

Every third foggy night, the President makes a speech and says: We need these trade agreements. We are losing market share.

Well, I don't see the trade agreements. These are not the trade agreements. Maybe somebody can find them here on the floor or in the House. Maybe they are somewhere. But I think they are in the White House, and until we get the politics out of this and the President sends the trade agreements here, what on Earth is he doing saying we should be passing these trade agreements? We don't have the bill. Send us the bill, Mr. President.

As the administration delays moving forward on these export agreements with Korea, Panama, and Colombia, what is happening to American exports to these important markets?

Senator PORTMAN is an expert on this issue. There is not anybody in this Senate who is more of an expert on trade. If you apply the administration's own metrics, how many jobs will be created—I am not talking about lost but will be created by these pending agreements?

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank my colleague from Kansas, who has just made the case eloquently as to why we need to move forward.

To answer his question, when you apply the metrics the President of the United States and his administration have used for these three trade agreements alone, they would create 250,000 new jobs. I ask my colleagues, with 9 percent unemployment and continued bad economic news, can't we use those jobs? By the way, jobs that are related to trade tend to be higher paying, tend to have more benefits. This is exactly what we need to do in this Senate and in the House and here in Washington—put the partisanship aside and move forward on what makes sense to create jobs.

I can't think of anything that would have a more immediate impact on those exporters Senator ROBERTS talked about, who right now are seeing their market share eroded because the United States is sitting on its hands. In 2006, the Colombia agreement was finalized. It has been tinkered with since then, but we are talking 5 years ago. It is unbelievable. When we have sat on our hands and not moved forward with giving our farmers and our workers and our service providers the chance to go into that Colombian market, you are exactly right, they have gone ahead and made trade agreements with other folks.

Colombia is a great example. Back when we negotiated this agreement and completed it—and I was the U.S. Trade Representative then, as the Senator indicated, and I negotiated with the then-President of Colombia, President Uribe, who made lots of concessions, including on manufacturing and agricultural services. At that time, we had a 71-percent market share in terms of exports of agricultural products—wheat, corn, and soybeans—into Colombia—a 71-percent market share. Today, that market share is about 26 percent. Why? Because after we completed our agreement with Colombia, they engaged with other countries, including the Mercosur countries of Argentina and Brazil, and now they are buying their products instead from those countries that got their act together and moved forward with trade agreements that this President will not get his act together on and send to us.

As Senator ROBERTS said, just recently, in August, this summer, they completed an agreement with Canada. Guess what the Canadians love to export—the same kind of wheat we love to export. So the Senator is right, they are going to take the wheat market away from Kansas and North Dakota and other States that really need those jobs and need those exports.

We have to move forward. It is really a crime that we have not been able to provide our farmers, workers, and service providers these opportunities.

Mr. ROBERTS. Will the Senator yield for one quick question?

Mr. PORTMAN. Yes. Absolutely.

Mr. ROBERTS. The Senator has been there and done the negotiating. He knows these trade agreements not only apply to our exports but our national security. What has this continued delay done—what does it do to the credibility of the people who are actually negotiating, our trade representatives?

Mr. PORTMAN. Unfortunately, I think some of these countries—all three of which are great allies of the United States: Panama, Colombia, and South Korea—feel as though the United States has let them down.

We are going to move forward here, I believe. I am more optimistic than the Senator from Kansas. I believe the President will finally send these forward. He has to. The logic is difficult to escape. Why wouldn't you? And that is good. We will be able to move forward, I hope, with not just opening more markets but helping on our relationships with these incredibly important allies. But in the meantime, there has been damage done. The Senator is absolutely right. I think they believe in some respects that the rug has been pulled out from under them. They made huge concessions and commitments to the United States and politically took great risks.

Frankly, in Colombia and Panama, where they moved forward immediately to ratify these agreements in their legislature, it wasn't just the administration, it was the elected representatives of the people, as we are, who took risks to say: Yes, we want to be a partner with the United States of America, the greatest economy on the face of the Earth and this beacon of hope and opportunity, and here we are in America letting them down.

So in both its commercial impacts on the United States—we have lost market share, we have lost jobs because of it, but it also has had an impact, as Senator ROBERTS says, in terms of our standing in the world.

We have to move forward not just with these three, but the important point is that we have to move forward with additional agreements. There are over 100 trade agreements being negotiated right now around the world, and because the United States does not have a trade promotion authority, the ability for the President to negotiate and bring an agreement back here for an up-or-down vote, we are not engaged in these agreements. We are engaged in

one, which is a regional one—the transpacific partnership—but none of these bilateral ones, which is where you are really going to get these trade openings and new exports and, therefore, new jobs.

This is a bigger issue that must be addressed. This Congress, I hope, will address it in the context of the votes we are going to have in connection with the trade agreements. We are going to promote getting the United States back in the game of expanding our trade and helping U.S. jobs.

By the way, it was mentioned earlier that it is not just that we have the opportunity to create over 200,000 jobs. It is also that if we do not move forward on these three agreements, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has done some analysis showing we would lose 380,000 jobs.

This sort of goes both ways. There is a cost to not moving forward, and that is also hundreds of thousands of jobs we desperately need in States such as Ohio and the States represented by the Senators who are here with us on the floor today. The International Trade Commission now says these three agreements alone would expand exports annually by $13 billion—again meaning jobs and opportunity.

It is time for us to move forward. Senator ROBERTS has talked about what is happening with the European Union, which actually negotiated its agreements after we completed ours.

In the auto sector, by the way, there is an EU-Korea agreement that says the 8-percent tariff on imported cars has already started being reduced. That has resulted in the companies sending UK cars, including Hondas that are being produced in the United Kingdom—they are being exported to South Korea. We have a Honda plant in Ohio. I visited it recently. There are 4,200 Ohio workers there. We want to export Hondas from Ohio to Korea. We can do that with these export agreements.

It is time for us to move forward. It is not the time for us to play politics. We have to move forward because we need these jobs and because, again, the United States should be at the forefront of these agreements in order to not just protect the market share we have but expand it. Ninety-five percent of the consumers live outside of our borders, and we need to access those consumers.

I now ask, if I could, one of my colleagues to talk a little about his experience in his State.

JOHN HOEVEN was Governor of North Dakota, so he was like the trade representative from North Dakota. He was out there promoting trade as Governor, and North Dakota is a State that has a lot of exports, including wheat, as we talked about earlier, so they are being hit by what Senators ROBERTS and JOHANNS talked about in terms of what is happening in Colombia today with the Canadian agreement and also the EU agreement with Korea.

I ask Senator HOEVEN if he would talk a little about why these agreements with Colombia and Panama are so important to his State.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank Senator PORTMAN, and I thank Senator JOHANNS for organizing this discussion on a very important issue, a timely issue. It is good to be here with Senator ROBERTS, with Senator BLUNT and Senator ISAKSON. I think, coming from our different States, we show how important these trade agreements are not only to our individual States across the country but how important these trade agreements are to our Nation right now.

When we are talking trade, we are talking jobs. We need to create more jobs in this country, and it is the private sector that creates jobs. It is business investment, it is companies that create jobs. Our job, our task, our role is to create an environment where our companies and our entrepreneurs and American ingenuity that built the greatest economic engine in the history of the world—this country, this economy, this U.S. economy—we have to create that environment so they can invest and create those jobs.

One of the important ways we do that is with good trade agreements. Let's make sure our companies can export their great products and services all over the world. We have to compete in a global, high-tech economy, and these trade agreements let us do it. That is why it is so important that we move forward.

Today, we are on the floor of the Senate saying: Why do we have these trade agreements? Thursday night, we heard from the President that we need to move forward with these trade agreements. We want to move forward with these trade agreements. We are ready to go. We have been for some time. In fact, the Senators here on the floor and others have been working very hard to do everything we can to make sure we have cleared the path so these trade agreements can come to the Senate floor.

It was not too long ago that Senator JOHANNS, myself, and Senator PORTMAN went with Senator MITCH MCCONNELL and Senator MORAN over to South Korea to meet with President Lee. He wants the agreements. He is ready to go. As a matter of fact, he said, please ratify the agreements in your country, get them over to me, because I am ready to take that to my legislators and get this approved.

Second, our President said there are some concerns we need to deal with as part of these trade agreements. He said we need to address TSA, trade assistant adjustment. We said we will work with TSA. We will make sure we have enough Senators so it is squared away. We have it covered. That has been communicated. So the question is: Why at this point don't we have the trade agreements? That is the question I think that has to be asked. Where are they? Why aren't they here on the Senate floor so we can move forward with them? In our State, as others mentioned in their States, they are incredibly important.

A few big stats to follow on what Senator PORTMAN mentioned a minute ago. For every 4-percent increase in trade, we create a million jobs in this country. For every 4-percent increase in trade, a million jobs in this country are created. How important is that? The United States-South Korea free trade agreement alone means more than a quarter of a million jobs, more than $10 billion in increased U.S. exports to that country alone. I cannot think of a time when it is more important to create those jobs than right now when we have more than 14 million people out of work and many more who are either not working because they have not been able to get a job or who are underemployed. Unemployment is more than 9 percent.

This is one of the ways we create that environment that gets our people back to work by empowering the private sector to make that investment and create those jobs.

I was just back in North Dakota, and one of the many events I went to was an expansion of one of the Caterpillar company's locations in West Fargo, ND. They remanufacture a lot of their equipment in West Fargo, ND. This equipment goes all over the world. It is part of the huge machines that Cat makes. They use these machines for excavating, for mining, road building, for all these things all over the world, and they are the technology leader in the world in this huge equipment. They bought Bucyrus, which is huge in mining, so now they are big in the mining business. Getting into places such as Colombia and Panama is incredibly important for Caterpillar. It is not just about creating jobs in North Dakota, but think of the impact throughout the heartland in Indiana or in Illinois or, as Senator ROBERTS talked about, agriculture.

In North Dakota we have more cattle than people. I think we have more than 3 million cattle. Right now to send them to South Korea, we pay more than 40 percent tariff. How do we compete with Argentina or Australia in that situation? This is an opportunity. This is absolutely an opportunity. We need to reach out and grab it with both hands. We have the President right now saying, pass those trade agreements. Absolutely. Please get them down here to us. We have worked so hard to make sure we have cleared all the hurdles, TAA, or whatever else is required. Bring those trade agreements to us. We stand ready to pass them.

Mr. PORTMAN. Would the Senator yield for a second? The Senator talked about being at home and talking to his constituents about this, and I am sure all of us have stories like this, but I will tell you this morning we had one of our weekly coffees and the Ohio pork producers came. There were about 12 pork producers from around the State of Ohio. Do you know what the No. 1 issue was they raised with me? Trade

and getting these trade agreements done. Why? Because it affects their prices directly. They have to have these international sales in order to make ends meet. Particularly with the price of feed going up, they have to have these foreign markets. It was interesting that of all the issues they could have raised with me, the one they are most concerned about is to make sure we get these three agreements done, and then move forward with the additional agreements.

It is our job to provide the environment for success. Part of that environment is to give our exporters the ability to have a level playing field to access these markets. They are the best farmers in the world. We have some of the most productive land in the world. They just need a fair shake.

Mr. HOEVEN. It is absolutely true. In handing off the ball in this discussion, I want to go back to the trade adjustment assistance, which I mentioned earlier. There were a number of things the administration wanted to see before bringing these trade agreements forward to us for ratification. Senator BLUNT and Senator PORTMAN were instrumental—and along with these two, Senator JOHANNS, myself, Senator ISAKSON, and others. We even signed on to a letter not once but I think twice, to make sure we got it right. Senator BLUNT's leadership in making sure we had taken all the necessary steps so the administration was prepared and willing to bring these agreements to the Senate floor has been covered. I thank the Senator for that leadership. He may want to touch on that, but I know how important the trade agreements are to the State of Missouri. But I also thank the leadership of Senator PORTMAN, as well, in making sure we addressed TAA and all of the issues that needed to be addressed as part of moving forward with these trade agreements.

Mr. BLUNT. I think what Senator PORTMAN and I thought when the President said for these three trade agreements to be voted on, we had to have trade adjustment assistance. We looked at the negotiated package. It was not exactly what any of us who signed the letter would have negotiated. We said, look, these are the jobs that are the low-hanging fruit of job creation if we get these three trade bills. We are willing to look at the Baucus camp-negotiated TAA, and support it in a way the White House can sign it and send these agreements up.

Senator HOEVEN mentioned, as he and I and all of us were sitting in the House Chamber last Thursday night, listening to the President's remarks when he said we need to pass these three trade agreements, I was almost sure the next sentence would be: And so tomorrow, I am sending these trade agreements up. That next sentence did not occur. Just like the week in August where the President was on his bus tour and every single day on the bus tour he said Congress can do something right now that would create more American jobs if they will pass these three trade agreements. Every time he said that, even though I was hearing it on the TV, I could not help but talk back to the television or the radio and say: Well, we cannot pass them unless you send them up. You are absolutely right, this is one of the easiest things we could do to create jobs, Mr. President, but we have to have the agreements from you before we can vote on them. Don't tell the American people all we have to do is pass the bill when you know that you have to send the bill up before we can pass the bill. We need these three agreements. As Senator PORTMAN has pointed out, we need more agreements, but that is not happening right now. We do need the President to have the authority that I, and I think all of us, would be more than willing to give him, but that is not part of this package, the trade promotion authority we wish to see extended into the future.

Right now we have three agreements that have been negotiated for a long time, and whether it is the Missouri and North Dakota beef industry or the Missouri and Ohio pork industry or the grain industry that we all are impacted by, there is a real opportunity here and these markets are waiting for us.

To look at our State, since 2002, exports have increased more than three times faster than the State domestic product has grown. So for those who say, well, exports cost American jobs or Missouri jobs, they clearly provide those jobs. U.S. farm exports reached an all-time high in 2010, amounting to more than $115 billion in sales. For every $1 billion worth of agricultural exports, there are an estimated 8,000 jobs. So these countries are waiting for agreements that will increase trade in soybeans and beef and corn and pork and dairy products and processed food; in fact, in processed goods of all kinds. We cannot get to those markets until we pass these trade agreements.

All of us are eager to work with the President to get that done. All of us are eager for him to send us those trade agreements. Since these agreements were negotiated, others have negotiated agreements and launched them—and it may have been mentioned already this morning, but if it has not, it is important to understand that on July 1, the European Union trade agreement with South Korea went into place and they had a 1-month, 38-percent increase year over year the first month of that trade agreement.

The Canada-Colombia agreement went into place on August 15. Having been to Colombia and worked on this for some time, there is no question there is a preference for our goods, but once they start buying these other products, then you have to convince them you need to come back to the product you would rather have had to start with if that product had had an even shot at the marketplace.

Panama is negotiating all kinds of work agreements and expansion agreements on the canal we are disadvantaged in because we have not passed that agreement.

Let's get these three agreements done. Let's start creating the private sector jobs these agreements clearly will lead to. As we have talked to the White House and the President about that, my good friend from Georgia, JOHNNY ISAKSON, has been in the middle of all of those discussions. We know what can happen. For it to happen, we have to get these agreements sooner rather than later. Let's get them up here. Let's get them passed. Let's get them back in the hands of our new trading partners and see these jobs increase.

I am pleased to recognize and encourage the ongoing efforts for this effort with my good friend, Mr. ISAKSON.

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank Senator BLUNT.

I thank Senator JOHANNS for organizing this colloquy.

I represent a State that is home to the second largest port on the eastern seaboard in the United States of America. The port is Savannah. We are talking about creating jobs in America. The port of Savannah directly employs 300,000 people in the southeastern United States. Can you think of what an impact this is going to have to increase that employment if we get these free trade agreements?

Let me give you an example that is amazing. South Korea surpassed Japan in 2010 as the second largest Northeast Asian destination for South Atlantic exports behind only China—second largest in all of Asia behind only China—most of that going out of the port of Savannah, most of that being agricultural products from your State and from your State and from mine.

Senator PORTMAN talked about pork. In Georgia it is all about chickens and cattle. We are No. 1 in poultry, and South Korea is a huge importer of our poultry. They would be a lot bigger with a free trade agreement.

Let me give another number that is chilling. South Korea's imports from South Korea into the United States went up by 26 percent last year. Our exports to them went up by 15 percent. That is an 11-percent negative in the trade deficit, which causes us tremendous problems.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I ask for unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes to close.

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

Mr. ISAKSON. So my point is very simply this: We can help to balance our trade deficit. We can help to increase employment in the southeastern United States. We can help poultry, we can help pork, and we can help beef. It has been 968 days since the President could have sent us these free trade agreements, and he has not. My point in this debate is very simple. There is

one person in the United States of America standing between us and more job creation, and it is the resident of the White House, President Obama.

I wish to turn it over to the organizer of this event, Senator JOHANNS.

Mr. JOHANNS. Madam President, I end my comments today by saying to all of my fellow Senators, thank you so very much for coming to the floor today and making the case. There is an old saying in a profession I used to be engaged in: I rest my case. Well, after hearing from these fine gentlemen about the importance of these agreements and why we need to have the President send them here, I rest my case. It is going to improve job creation. It is going to improve our opportunity to export our products. It is going to level the playing field. It is going to give our producers the opportunity to reclaim market share that has been lost while we have been waiting for these agreements to come here.

The final point I wish to make is this. I come from a State where unemployment is right above 4 percent. In this recession in Nebraska, unemployment never went over 5 percent. In fact, as I was doing my townhall meetings across the State, I had members of my business community coming to me and saying: One of the challenges we are facing is finding the workers for the jobs we are creating. Therefore, in my State, trade adjustment assistance would not be the high priority it is in many States. Notwithstanding that fact, when Senator BLUNT came to me and said, look, the President is insisting on trade adjustment assistance as a condition to move these agreements and would I sign on to a letter that will back trade adjustment assistance, I said I would. Why? Because the trade agreements are important to us.

It is my hope that after the many speeches we have all given—the many speeches I have given on the importance of these agreements not only on the Senate floor but across this country—the President is listening and will finally send us these agreements so we can work with the President. We can join forces on these agreements and do everything we can to get the votes in the Senate and in the House to pass them and to put them on his desk and create 250,000 new jobs.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, over the past 2 weeks, I have traveled the State of Connecticut, as the Presiding Officer has done in the State of New York, and she has described eloquently the damage she has seen in her State. I have seen much the same in mine. I have seen the destruction of small businesses, of homes; rivers swelling, flooding of historic dimensions causing significant destruction; the wind and rain striking Connecticut with a fury, its ferocity virtually unmatched in recent memory.

I met with families and community leaders, farmers and small businesses, about the help they will need to rebuild their homes and their businesses and their lives and their livelihoods. It is a powerful and moving struggle. The citizens of Connecticut, similar to the citizens of New York and others struck by this storm, have acted with determination and resolve, not with desperation or despair. They are determined and dedicated to rebuild and recover from this storm, but they need the help that is provided by FEMA. We are here, hopefully in a bipartisan effort, to make sure these communities and others like them throughout the Northeast and throughout the United States have the help and the real consequential aid they need to make this recovery in rebuilding their lives.

The early estimates suggest that the damage caused by Irene could reach more than $10 billion, making it one of the 10 costliest disasters in U.S. history. The suffering and real sadness of Connecticut citizens gives us a bond and a cause in common with millions of other Americans who have suffered from hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, and other natural disasters across the country. This year alone, we have seen flooding on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers and other rivers in the Midwest, devastating tornadoes in the South, wildfires in the South and West, and now Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee.

In times of natural disaster, Americans come together. In times when they face crises, Americans rally as neighbors, as a community. Regardless of specific States where they live, they come together to rebuild their homes, to make common cause, to recognize our bonds as a nation. The spirit of our Nation is that we put people above politics every time, without exception; that we provide disaster relief for victims, such as Connecticut residents now, and with the resources they need to rebuild.

Currently, FEMA is funding disaster relief for over 550 disasters, including 29 in Oklahoma, 21 in Kentucky, 17 in Texas, 19 in Mississippi, and 18 in Kansas. Yet 2 weeks ago, House majority leader ERIC CANTOR stated that relief funds for Hurricane Irene would need to be offset by savings found elsewhere in the Federal budget. I reject that contention and so should this body and my colleagues from those States I have just named and all the other States in the Union. In fact, all but a handful or less have received and are receiving disaster relief just since January of this year.

We need to do everything we can to put Connecticut and America back to work, to make sure our economy moves forward again, to create jobs, and to reduce the deficit. Yes, we need to reduce the deficit and the debt and cut unnecessary and wasteful spending. However, we cannot permit Washington politics to create a legislative logjam and gridlock that bogs down these efforts for disaster relief. The need is too urgent for thousands of families and businesses in Connecticut and around the country that have been devastated by these unprecedented floods and other natural disasters, such as hurricanes, wildfires, floods, and tornadoes.

Turning disaster assistance into a political football is unacceptable and unconscionable. It is a recipe for gridlock and it is just plain wrong. It is wrong and a disservice to the men and women whose homes and businesses have been hit by the forces of nature that are unpredictable and unpreventable. Now they are attempting to rebuild their lives, and we owe it to them to match their courage and resilience with efforts from FEMA.

We can't prevent those hurricanes or tornadoes or wildfires, but we can step forward when these disasters occur and lend a hand to our neighbors, as we have done throughout our history, and we can provide these communities with the real resources they need to recover, without distinguishing between what State or what part of the country.

There is one story from Connecticut which I think tells a lot about the choices we face right now. Mel Goldstein and his wife Arlene, whose home was completely destroyed by flooding caused by Hurricane Irene, are being told their homeowners insurance will not cover the damage. Their only hope of recovery is FEMA flood insurance and other FEMA assistance. Right now, they are using their savings to stay in a hotel while they rebuild their lives. Mel is one of the best known weathermen in the State of Connecticut. He is an icon in the broadcasting world and a hero to many of us for his struggle against cancer. His treatment in this unstable environment at this point in his recovery adds an unnecessary toll and stress to their lives. As we have in the past, we must come together to help folks such as Arlene and Mel Goldstein move on after the unthinkable happens in their lives. The unthinkable happened to them and to many of their neighbors in East Haven along the shores of Connecticut.

I have heard their voices and seen their faces throughout our State, in communities big and small, where flooding has put a small business out of business and where homes have been destroyed and people are living in shelters or with their neighbors or were for awhile. These kinds of human stories are part of the fabric of the larger story we need to recognize. I hope my colleagues will come together, as we did on the vote yesterday, to approve this measure. The vote yesterday signaled perhaps a return to the bipartisanship that should prevail when the Nation confronts crisis and disaster. Our No. 1 goal, which should be a bipartisan goal, must be to deliver help to our fellow Americans as quickly as possible.

Thank you. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee left a trail of devastation across New York State. I saw firsthand the impact they left on our communities: hundreds of families living in shelters, complete homes destroyed, belongings piled up on people's front yards, small businesses uncertain whether they would even reopen and worrying about whether they could hire back their employees, farms that had no feed for livestock for days, crops and livelihoods vanishing without any trace in a single day, crumbling bridges, washed-out roads, heating oil soaking into buildings and the ground. I was born and raised in upstate New York, and I can say we have never seen this kind of devastation—certainly not in my lifetime.

America has always stood by those who have suffered greatly from disaster and we have always helped them to rebuild. We have an obligation to these families, businesses, and farmers to help them rebuild today.

This picture is of downtown Binghamton. I met with hundreds of families displaced and placed in a Red Cross shelter at the University of Binghamton. They were on day four at the shelter, unclear if they would be able to see what was left of their homes.

I can't fully describe the worry and fear in the eyes of parents who are in a shelter with their children. I talked to one mother who has 10 children, the youngest of whom was 2 years old, trying desperately to keep them fed, keep them safe but literally having no sense of when she could return to her home and what it would look like when she returned.

I talked to one father whose daughter turned 13 years old that day in the shelter and his worry was mostly: I don't know what is in front of us. I don't know when we will be able to go home. I don't know how much has been destroyed, and I don't know how I will rebuild.

One parent I talked to was a young mother. She held a 6-week-old infant in her arms, and she said to me: I have everything I need right here. That exemplified the courage of Americans when they fight through suffering—the strength of New Yorkers that they will pull themselves up by their own bootstraps and make the difference. But we in Washington must help.

In Schoharie County, on the main street of the villages of both Schoharie and Middleburgh, every single home was flooded. The water mark was at about 7 feet. As you drive down the main street and begin to talk to the business owners and the families, you can see there was not one left untouched. Every piece of these families' belongings is literally on the front lawns of these homes and businesses.

But I watched these business owners begin to rebuild. I could see them literally bringing the mud from the basements, bringing the mud from their ground floors, pulling down all the drywall because obviously the damage was so great it would cause long-lasting damage. People are very worried about how they can make sure their business is safe.

This is just a snapshot right here in this picture of the town of Middleburgh. This is the farming community within Schoharie County. These farmers have lost everything. I can tell you, the water was so strong, the surge was so great, it literally took trees out of the ground, completely uprooted and overturned. The crops that we could see on this farm—they were so covered with silt from the river, we could not even recognize what kind of crops they were. I saw potatoes that had been uprooted from the ground all over the road. That farmer could salvage nothing of their farm.

We had one farmer who came down to meet with me because her cows were stranded. They had 800 cows stuck because the roads had been completely washed out. They had no way to get feed up to those cows. They had no way to deal with manure and dump all the milk that had to be destroyed. They needed a rescue effort. Because of the efforts of our Governor—he reacted quickly—our National Guard got up there, got food and water up to those farmers, they fixed the road, and the feed was delivered. But this is the kind of reaction we need from government. This is why the Federal Government must be there to help and protect these families and businesses.

Our next picture is of Greene County. In Greene County, waters rushed down the main street of Windham—this is a picture of Windham—and destroyed all businesses in its wake. The homes of families were also destroyed. There was absolute destruction throughout Greene County.

I talked to just one business owner, and she had a business for children's clothing, children's needs, children's toys. She had just a couple employees, but she said: I have nothing to rebuild. I have no way that I can rebuild my business. I don't think I could rehire those employees.

So there is the feeling of hopelessness and worry and dread and concern on top of a very tough economy anyway. These are the businesses and families and farmers we need to help because we need them to rebuild. We need them to have the ability to rehire those employees, to produce food for our families, to make sure we have thriving communities once again.

The last picture I wish to show is of Keene, up in the North Country. In Keene, the river rose 22 feet above the flood stage, washing out roads and bridges, and it left much of the town actually stranded for days. Half the town's firehouse was ripped apart and swept away by the river. Up in the High Peaks, the rain came down so hard it brought huge chunks of the mountainside with it, creating slides that have changed the face of the Adirondacks for generations.

As you can see, this is just four communities. Throughout New York State—the North Country, the Capital Region, the Mohawk Valley, the Hudson Valley, the Southern Tier, and Long Island—no one can question the absolute devastation that these storms have left in our communities. We must stand with them in their greatest time of need.

Federal assistance is essential to help these families, these farmers, these businesses, and communities not only recover but rebuild and be stronger than they were before.

We need immediate funding for FEMA and the USDA disaster assistance to provide relief for these communities all across New York and for all the other States that were affected by these storms.

SYRIA SANCTIONS ACT OF 2011

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I would now like to address a second issue that is causing me very grave concern. I would like to talk for a moment about a piece of legislation I have introduced with Senators KIRK and LIEBERMAN to toughen the sanctions on Syria.

Syrian President Assad has killed over 2,000 of his own people in an alarming torrent of violence from one of the world's most repressive regimes—2,200 people are estimated to have died so far.

Assad's aggression against the Syrian people is matched by his subversive aggression abroad. His regime is a state sponsor of terrorism, one of Iran's closest allies, and a key backer of Hamas and Hezbollah. Assad's regime has for years helped foreign fighters enter Iraq and kill our U.S. soldiers.

In response to this violent crackdown, I introduced the bipartisan Syria Sanctions Act of 2011 to hold Assad's regime accountable. This legislation would block access to the U.S. market for companies that invest in Syria's energy sector, purchase the county's oil, and sell gasoline to Syria. This sanction is critical, since Syria's energy sector accounts for one-third of that state's revenue.

I ask my colleagues to sponsor S. 1472 and send a clear message to Syria that until the Assad regime responds to the democratic urging of its people, halts its nuclear development, and ends support for terrorism, Syria will not and should not have access to the global economy, and any company that does business with Syria will no longer have access to the global economy.

This legislation is very clear and simple: that no company should be allowed to put their profits before our national security.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

APPROVING THE RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN THE BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 66, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the consideration of a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 66) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise to speak about the need to have a disaster assistance effort to support those in New York, your State, as well as across the country and the tremendous needs we have as a result of what has happened regarding the weather. This year we have seen a terrible string of natural disasters that have shut down businesses, farms, and left families homeless all across our country. As chair of the Agriculture Committee, I am particularly focused, of course, on what has happened to our farmers in America.

I am concerned about the flooding along the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, the record droughts that have devastated the livelihoods of men and women who grow our food all across America. Earlier this year we had the worst drought in recorded history in Oklahoma, with about $1.6 billion in crop losses. In Kansas I have had the opportunity, and my staff has, to join with my ranking member, my colleague, Senator ROBERTS, to talk with folks and a chance to see that the drought had wiped out about $2 billion in crops.

Floods in the Mississippi River Valley washed over 3 million acres—3 million acres—of farmland. Hurricane Irene destroyed more than 450,000 acres of cotton and 300,000 acres of corn in North Carolina. In New York we have seen similar damage to corn, soybeans, alfalfa, fruits, and vegetables. In Vermont crop losses are estimated at more than $5 million.

All across our country we have serious challenges that are creating hardships for our businesses, our farmers, and our families. We need to respond. That is our responsibility. Right now the droughts are worse in Texas where the damage is also in the billions of dollars. We have more than 1,000 homes that have been lost.

Already this year there have been natural disasters in 48 of our States—48 out of 50 States have had natural disasters. Michigan, thank goodness, is one of the two States that has not been affected by the weather. But throughout our Nation's history when men and women in one part of the country were hit with a natural disaster, all of America came together to support them and to help rebuild.

That is what this effort is about, coming together as Americans. That is who we are as Americans. We stand with each other in times of trouble. This is not the time to play politics, not when hundreds of thousands of families, farmers, and businesses have been devastated by an unprecedented string of floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, wildfires, and other natural disasters.

Already, FEMA has had to halt rebuilding efforts in 41 States. So it is critical that we get this done. This legislation in front of us needs to pass, and it needs to pass quickly.

But I also want to tell you about another emergency that has taken place in my State and in too many other States. It is called a jobs emergency. We may not have been affected by the natural disasters of the weather, but as we look over the last decade in a global economy, as the economy has changed we have been through the same kind of devastation—over a longer period of time, but our people are affected as much as any other State disaster.

We have 14 million people out of work in this country—14 million people out of work. We have a huge national deficit. We will never get out of debt with more than 14 million people out of work. We have to make smart decisions on cutting what is not important, and we have to grow. We have to create jobs for people and support the efforts of the private sector to create jobs.

For each and every one of those families, their job search is an emergency. It is an emergency every time they think about how to put food on their table. It is an emergency every month when they have to scrape together money for the rent or the mortgage. It is an emergency every minute of every day when those men and women are filling out applications, going to job fairs, trying their best to get back to work.

So I find in the middle of all of this, in the middle of support for all that is going on around the country in terms of natural disasters, it is extremely concerning—and in fact outrageous to me—that the House Republicans have proposed a job-killing offset to pay for the help that is critically needed for natural disasters; that would pull the rug out from under businesses and families all across our country and put up to 50,000 American jobs at risk. That is what they are proposing.

I absolutely oppose this. They propose paying for this critical disaster bill by taking dollars out of a very successful advanced manufacturing retooling program that we passed in the 2007 Energy bill—and it took a while to get it up and going. The previous administration never administered it. I thank the Obama administration for coming in in 2009 and beginning the process of putting it together and all of the rules it took, and so on. So it took a while to get up and going. It has not moved as fast as I would like at all. But, thank goodness, the Obama administration saw it as a priority and has moved forward to put it in place.

So what has happened already? Well, these retooling loans have meant 41,000 jobs in Tennessee, California, Indiana, Michigan, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, Ohio, and Missouri. These retooling loans have helped companies retool older manufacturing plants to build the products of the future in America rather than shipping those jobs overseas. It has been extremely successful.

In Michigan retooling loans made it possible for Ford Motor Company to save 1,900 jobs at the Michigan assembly plant in the city of Wayne so they could build the all new Ford Focus and the battery-electric Focus in America. In the process of that, as we partnered with them on battery funding as well—in the process of that, with the help of these retooling loans they are bringing jobs back from Mexico to support the work they are doing on the new vehicles.

I do not know how many economic development efforts we can stand on the Senate floor today and talk about in the Senate or House that are actually bringing jobs back from overseas. This is the program that the House Republicans want to cut. This loan—and it is a loan, so it has to be repaid—is allowing them to be able to have lower costs to be able to do the retooling on those older plants, to be able to make these new high-tech vehicles.

As I said, in the case of the Ford Motor Company, they have saved 1,900 jobs and are bringing jobs back from Mexico. Another Michigan company, Severstal North America, was able to secure a retooling loan to retool an old steel mill, the Rouge steel mill in Michigan, into a cutting-edge plant building advanced, high-strength steel for automotive production.

Jobs here. That does not count what is happening in States across America. That loan, along with private loans and a billion-dollar investment from the company, will help create over 2,500 constructive jobs and will bring the total number of permanent manufacturing jobs at that plant, again, to

1,900. That is a pretty good investment from a loan that is going to be paid back while creating jobs.

These are the kinds of things that we need to be doing—we need to be doing—to address the jobs emergency that Michigan and States all across the country are feeling and have been feeling. Right now there are 35 to 40,000 jobs at stake in this proposal by the House Republicans.

We have other companies that want to use the retooling loans to make things in America—in Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Louisiana, and Florida. These loans are expected to be approved in the next few months. They are very close, and we would see 35 to 40,000 jobs disappear—the opportunity for those jobs to disappear—if we were to accept the House proposal.

After the next round of manufacturing retooling loans, we could see another 10,000 jobs created across the country. But if these retooling loans do not happen, those jobs will not happen either. To add insult to injury, these companies have been working closely with the Department of Energy, in some cases for several years, in order to qualify for these loans.

They have had to undergo the must rigorous screening to make sure the products and companies are in sound financial shape, as they should. We need to make sure they are going through rigorous screening not only so they can be successful but to make sure that we are making products in America. It is an important project and partnership.

These companies have invested countless hours and, frankly, a lot of money to get these projects off the ground and to get to this point. As I indicated, we have a number of companies in States around the country that are within a month or 2 months or 3 months from being able to complete the deal and create the jobs.

We are so close, and the rug will be pulled out from under not only the companies but the communities and the families who are affected. These businesses are America's job creators. They are doing the right thing. They want to invest in America. While others have been on the sidelines waiting, they have jumped in. They are committed to creating jobs. They want to make things here, and they have moved through a process, spent time, money—a tremendous amount of time. In fact, in my judgment, it hasn't moved as fast as it should. But they are now at a point to actually make it happen.

I am outraged that we would see an effort to end the creation of these jobs. There is no question, as I said, that we have had a series of natural disasters, and families, businesses, and farmers who are affected across this country. Even though those natural disasters, fortunately for us, did not come to Michigan, I support the effort to address them. We are all in this as Americans. But I will not—I will not—support an effort that, in the process, takes tens of thousands of jobs away, because the crisis for Michigan is a jobs crisis. We were the first ones in it. We have been in it the longest. We are coming out of it now but way too slowly. We are coming out of it because we have been creating partnerships to support the private sector to make things in America again.

I strongly urge everyone involved not to come forward with something that will in fact jeopardize these jobs. It makes absolutely no sense to me, and it is certainly something I will strongly oppose if it does.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

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

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that I speak as if in morning business.

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

IRS TAX SCAM

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, there is a tax scam that is going on in this country for which you certainly have to give some creativity to these thieves and robbers—and that is exactly what they are.

I first started to get wind of this when people in the Tampa Bay region of my State called in saying an interesting thing happened. They had sent in their income tax return, and they got back a notice from the IRS that their return had already been filed. What they found out was that somebody had stolen their Social Security number, had in their name filled out a tax return, and then, guess what. It showed they had a tax refund due.

When I started hearing from about 25 or 30 people, I knew there was something going on. Sure enough, law enforcement in the Tampa Bay region—the sheriff's office, the city police, combined with the State attorney and the U.S. Attorney—a couple of weeks ago had a bust and arrested 49 people who were in a scam whereby they procure people's Social Security numbers. What is unbelievable is the amount of money they were getting back, estimated at being, just in the Tampa Bay region, something like $100 million in refunds. That is a rip-off of the American taxpayer because that is their money.

But the story doesn't stop there. Oh, if you were one of the victims whose Social Security number had been stolen and you wanted to file your tax return, the IRS is telling you you can't do it because you have already filed a tax return. Guess what a nightmare that is for the legitimate taxpayer.

So we have filed legislation. A number of Senators have joined me. No. 1, one of the unbelievable things was that it was difficult to get the IRS to cooperate with the local and State law enforcement agencies, because the IRS is prohibited because of privacy from sharing any of this information. And, of course, we want to protect the privacy of people, but we also want to go after these crooks.

We had done it a few years ago with regard to inmates in the Federal prison system by allowing the IRS, under the law we passed back in 2008, to cooperate with the Federal prison system in order to get the inmates who were filing false tax returns to get tax refunds. That was extended administratively into the State prison system with the IRS. But then this has been taken to a new level, one in which it is a great rip-off of the taxpayers.

What was incredible is when the Tampa police department and the sheriff's department ended up arresting some of these people, it was as if they didn't know they had done anything wrong.

What is going on? They did not know they had done anything wrong, and they are driving around in BMWs, with Rolex watches and gold chains all over them. It is the use of tools in the electronic age just the same as yesterday, when the thief used a crowbar to break in and steal somebody's possessions. This has to stop.

What we do not know is the extent to which this is all over the country. So the first thing we have to do is get the legal ability for the IRS, without divulging people's private financial information, to be able to cooperate with local and State law enforcement and the U.S. attorney to be able to go after these people, to identify them so the U.S. attorney and the State attorney can prosecute.

Additionally, we have to help the victims. In this legislation we filed, we say the IRS will give the victims a special PIN number so they can file a return and that PIN number will identify them as a victim and it will not be kicked out of the system.

Additionally, since so much of this is being done electronically, we have to give the taxpayer the option to file what we called in the old days a paper tax return and in the process see if we can stop this; otherwise, if $100 million has been stolen from the American taxpayer just in the Tampa Bay region of Florida, you can imagine how extensive this crime probably is across the entire country.

It is important we act and that we get to the bottom of it. If we pass a law, a crook will try to figure out a way to get around it. But when somebody in this electronic age can just sit at a computer, steal a Social Security number and then file a false tax return, enough is enough.

It is my delight to see my colleague from Maryland. It looks as if he has some good stuff to tell us.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I am not sure it is good stuff, but it is what has happened in our State. I thank the Senator from Florida for his leadership on so many of these issues and his comments on the floor of the Senate.

About 2 weeks ago, right before Hurricane Irene struck, I was at the Maryland Emergency Management Center located in Reisterstown, MD. I was with Governor O'Malley, the Governor of our State, and other leaders. I saw our team there to prepare the people of Maryland for the onslaught of Irene and later from Tropical Storm Lee. I saw Maryland preparing the best it possibly could to minimize the risk to the people of our State from a natural storm. I saw the local officials do the right thing and tell people in our coastal areas to evacuate their homes because of the potential risk to life and property from this massive storm.

I also saw another agency that was located right there, side by side with the Maryland agencies, and that was FEMA, the Federal officials. These were people I met for the first time. They were not from Maryland. They had come in from other States to help the people of Maryland and provided the expertise to our State officials so we could properly prepare for this storm that was potentially damaging to the people of Maryland. They were there.

I thank President Obama for declaring, before the storm hit, emergency declarations to Maryland so we could utilize Federal resources and we could take maximum steps to minimize the loss of life and property. It was the right thing to do.

I take this time on the floor—I am going to talk a little bit about the damages that occurred in my State—to point out that we have always come together as a nation to stand by those who have been devastated through these natural disasters. This has been a particularly rough year. We have seen hurricanes and storms and tornadoes and flooding and even an earthquake on the east coast of the United States. This has challenged our ability to respond in a timely way. We have a responsibility to make sure our Federal agencies have the resources to respond—how they were able to be about Maryland before the storm, during the storm and after the storm and they are there now to help the people of Maryland. Our governments—our local governments, our businesses, and our residents are counting on that continued Federal purpose to get us through this very difficult period.

Hurricane Irene caused severe storms, flooding, and strong winds in the State of Maryland. It was followed by Tropical Storm Lee, which aggravated the flooding and other damage throughout the State, including damage to roads, water treatment plants, and agriculture. Our agricultural community was hit hard. Our water treatment facilities, the plants we depend upon to keep our waters clean and to keep our neighborhoods safe, were damaged severely by this storm. I have talked to our transportation people. Roads were knocked out. Damage was caused.

On the Eastern Shore of Maryland, as I have already indicated, there was a mandatory order for evacuation of Ocean City the weekend before the Labor Day weekend, resulting in heavy economic losses during one of the most profitable periods during the summer for that city. The flooding in Queen Anne's County destroyed railroad tracks. I have a photograph. This is, by the way, railroad tracks. They have been knocked out by the hurricane. As you can see, this required emergency attention.

Multiple roads were closed and numerous homes were flooded in the town of Millington after the Chester River flooded over its banks. In Millington, the wastewater treatment plant was disabled, also affecting the residents in Kent County. The storm in Talbot County caused roads and pipeline damage.

Let me show you this photograph, if I might, because I think it points out the problem. When that amount of water goes through the storm pipes, it can cause significant damage because these pipes were not able to handle the amount of water that was brought down by the hurricane and tropical storm. As a result, the pipes burst, causing the road which the pipe was under to give way, bringing about a road closure. That was terribly inconvenient, of course, to the people of that area, the businesses, et cetera. I am showing an example in Talbot County, MD, on the Eastern Shore. We could show numerous other examples of the failure of stormwater management pipes as well as roads that had to be closed for public safety. In Caroline County, the towns of Federalsburg and Greensboro experienced major flooding of the Choptank River, including the malfunctioning of a wastewater treatment plant. In Cecil and Harford Counties, Irene led to the opening of a significant number of floodgates at the Conowingo Dam, due to rising water levels feeding in from the Susquehanna River. This was the first time the engineers took such measures since Tropical Storm Isabel hit Maryland in 2003. Opening the floodgates led to flooding and property damage in many areas, and mandatory evacuation orders were issued for Port Deposit and Havre de Grace, in Maryland.

People had to leave their homes. The streets were underwater. When the water receded, there was muck and damage to the towns.

In southern Maryland, damage from metal on a roof that was blown into a transformer forced the shutdown of a reactor at Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant. In Calvert County, many of the substations were damaged and rendered inoperable during Irene, resulting in widespread power outages for many customers and that forced businesses to close for several days. You heard about power outages. We had whole counties where everyone was out of power—everyone. In most of our counties the majority of people lost their power, not for a couple hours, for many days, causing major disruptions to our businesses, to our families, to schools that could not open and, therefore, parents who could not go to work because they had to deal with the unexpected news that the schools would be closed because there was no power in the schools themselves.

In the Washington metro region, Irene and the additional storms caused severe power outages and flooding in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties. In Prince George's County, the loss of power caused thousands of basements to flood. As you know, without power you cannot use your sump pumps. Without that, there is significant damage.

Frankly, because the water came in from the low level rather than from the roof, these property owners are now being challenged as to whether their insurance will cover this damage. That raises the importance, I might say, of the Federal protections that are available when a disaster is declared an emergency by the President because of the altercations over what insurance does not cover. All the more reason why the Federal Government must be there in its traditional role to help communities when a storm or emergency occurs.

Hurricane Irene and subsequent storms required governments to incur additional expenses due to overtime needed for first responders who save lives and property after the storm. I must tell you, I saw those first responders. I saw them out there working 24-hour shifts in some cases. They didn't get home to their families because they were there to help us maintain order and help reduce the loss of life and the loss of property. I thank President Obama for making a timely major disaster declaration for the State of Maryland in advance of the hurricane. Maryland is now eligible for Federal disaster recovery dollars through the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The State budget has already been very much impacted. We all understand our States do not have the flexibility of our country. It is during emergencies that our State and local leaders look to Washington, look to their Federal Government to be there as a partner to deal with this issue that States cannot deal with.

Congress has always acted in a bipartisan manner to help Americans and their communities recover from natural disasters. Congress has never insisted that disaster fund being offset.

Let me explain this issue because it may be confusing to the people who are watching. Yes, the Federal Emergency

Management Agency has a budget. FEMA has a budget. But you cannot predict the number and scope of natural disasters. No one had predicted this storm would be as widespread as it was. Hurricane Irene affected the entire east coast of the United States. FEMA did not have in its budget that type of a scenario, along with the tornadoes we had, along with what has happened in the Midwest. During this period, we have seen 48 of our States declared eligible for FEMA assistance. This affects our entire country. Now the people on the east coast of the United States are looking to the Federal Government to be there. We have always done this, as I said, in a bipartisan manner, without the requirement that if additional moneys are needed, those moneys will be appropriated by Congress. We will not ask other agencies to have to contribute toward that because that was not anticipated when we did the budget. I might point out that we had a very contentious fight over the Budget Control Act. That is the bill we passed that allowed us to increase our debt ceiling and set our budget allocations for fiscal year 2012, the year that will start on October 1.

As you know, there was an agreement in that Budget Control Act that permits the modification of the fiscal year 2012 discretionary cap to be adjusted to accommodate additional disaster relief funding without an offset. That is what we did. We came together as one entity recognizing we cannot predict the next hurricane, storm, earthquake, flood, or tornado. We just cannot predict that. Therefore, Democrats and Republicans said adjust the cap. Meet whatever disaster is out there. Whether it was Katrina in Louisiana, whether it is a bridge falling down in Minnesota that the Presiding Officer had to deal with, whether it is tornadoes as we had in the Midwest, droughts and floods that occurred in our country, we will be there to help the people of America. We helped rebuild countries around the world. We want to make sure we help the communities.

I was with my colleagues from Vermont, and they shared with us the number of bridges that had been wiped out, people who have been isolated as a result of Hurricane Irene and then Tropical Storm Lee. We have a responsibility, and we recognize that in the budget agreement, that we adjust the caps without setoffs so the Federal Government can be there as a true partner in dealing with these issues. We were there for preparation. It is now time to help restore the communities. In some cases it will take months before we are back to normal. We know that, the people know that, but they have a right to expect that the Federal Government will be there to help.

I commend Senator LANDRIEU, the chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee; Senator INOUYE and the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They recognize that. They have given us a budget that will accommodate the extra needs so FEMA will have the resources it wants.

I thank President Obama. His budget request to us reflects the resources we need so we have the recommendation from our Appropriations Committee. We have the leadership from the White House. Now it is time for us to act. We have the vehicle on the floor of the Senate. It is time for us to give the resources to the Federal agencies so they can be there in all parts of this country—including helping the people of Maryland cope with the disaster of Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee and the other natural disasters that have happened in other parts of the country by—taking up this issue now, passing it at this moment so the funds are there and the resources are there.

We can live up to the historical mission of the United States to always be there to help any part of our Nation affected by a natural disaster. I hope we will be able to bring up this issue quickly. As the vote in the Senate Appropriations Committee indicated, it should not be delayed because of offset issues. We should get the needed funds and resources to the agency, working with our State and local governments, working for our local communities so we can try to restore and rebuild those areas that have been devastated by these natural disasters. I would urge us to do that as quickly as possible.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO TIM O'KEEFE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to bid a fond farewell to a man who has been a fixture in the Senate for 33 years. Mr. Tim O'Keefe of the Senate Disbursing Office is retiring today after more than three decades of service to this body and his country. Known to many as a loyal friend and well liked by nearly everyone he has met in these halls—including most of my colleagues and thousands of Senate staffers—he will be greatly missed.

Tim began his career with the disbursing office, and in the Senate, in 1978. Every Senate employee becomes familiar with that office early in their tenure because that is the office in charge of the Senate payroll as well as everything relating to an employee's compensation, payroll deductions, retirement, life and health insurance, and other benefits. The disbursing office used to be located in the Capitol when Tim started. In fact, it was located in S–233, which is now part of the Republican leader's office. During Tim's early years on the job, staffers and Senators alike would line up in the hallways on payday to receive their paychecks. Maybe that is how Tim became legendary for never forgetting a face or a name for so many members of this very large Senate family, and always having a kind word for every one of them.

The disbursing office moved in 1980 when my predecessor, Howard Baker, expanded the Republican leader's suite of offices. That is how Tim and his coworkers ended up in their now familiar location on the first floor of the Hart Building. Tim has kidded me about that a few times over the years. So on behalf of the Republican leader's office, let me take this opportunity to apologize to him for being booted from his perch.

Tim is a native Washingtonian. He attended St. John's College High School and the University of South Carolina, which has a heck of a good football team this year. Just as Tim is loyal to the Senate, he is a loyal alumnus of both those institutions. He goes to Columbia, SC, every year to see South Carolina play football. Tim is also a great fan of the Washington Redskins who, amazingly enough, are off to a good start this year. He has season tickets, and has been attending their games since his boyhood. He loves to talk football, college or pro, with folks in the office, but be careful if you are a Cowboys fan.

Tim's father George O'Keefe was a distinguished veteran who fought in World War II. His mother Gisela O'Keefe worked for the District of Columbia school system at Alice Deal Middle School. I know they would both be proud to see how well liked and well respected their son has become. Tim also has a brother, Dennis, who lives in South Carolina, and Tim lives in Alexandria with his teenaged son Connor.

When the disbursing office held a retirement party for Tim a few weeks ago, he got quite the sendoff. It was the day of the historic earthquake, felt all along eastern North America from Quebec City to Atlanta and centered about 90 miles away in central Virginia. As Tim was opening his presents, the ground began to shake and the Capitol complex was soon evacuated. It is almost as if Washington, DC, itself was protesting that it did not want Tim to go.

Indeed, it will be hard for many to imagine the Senate with Tim gone. He has the longest tenure of anyone in the disbursing office today, and thousands of Senate staffers know him as the man who led them in the Federal oath of office they take on their first day on the job—the same oath the Vice President of the United States administers to Senators at the beginning of their 6-year terms.

In his retirement, Tim will have time to pursue his many interests, including his love of horse racing. He is particularly a fan of Lexington, Kentucky's Keeneland racetrack. And I would be

remiss if I didn't mention that today, the day of his retirement, is also Tim's birthday.

I know many on Capitol Hill, after hearing about his retirement, have taken a moment to say thank you and goodbye to Mr. Tim O'Keefe. I wanted to make sure I was one of them. He will be missed here in the Senate, and we are very grateful for his 33 years of service.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

POVERTY IN AMERICA

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, yesterday the Census Bureau released information about poverty, income, and health insurance in our country, and the news was, in short, devastating. The number of people in poverty is at an all-time high. Income gains over the last decade have been totally wiped out. Americans are struggling more than ever before.

I am appalled by these facts and I know my colleagues are too. Today I wish to talk about these numbers, but I wish to talk about what we can do about them and about where our country's priorities must be and how we have to focus on rebuilding the middle class in light of the new census numbers.

Yesterday we learned that 46.2 million people in America were poor last year. That is more than 15 percent of Americans. Let me remind my colleagues what this means. The poverty line for a family of four with two adults and two children is $22,000—just slightly over $22,000 a year. Can anyone here in this body—and we all know what we make; every Senator, every Congressman, except leadership who get paid a little bit more, makes $174,000 a year. If we think to ourselves: Could we and our spouses and two children live on $22,000 a year, $425 a week? But, beyond that, we also learned that deep poverty; that is, families with incomes less than half the poverty line, is also at the highest rate on record. More than 20 million Americans lived in deep poverty last year. That is just over $11,000 a year for a family of four. That is almost mind-boggling. How do people live like that?

Our children are suffering incredibly high levels of poverty. The Census Bureau pointed out that 22 percent—1 out of every 5 kids in America—were poor last year. When compared to other industrialized nations—the OECD countries—the United States has one of the highest rates of child poverty in the world. That is inexcusable. It is a national crisis. It is something we should be discussing here on the Senate floor daily.

In addition to our children, other vulnerable populations are suffering as well. People with disabilities continue to face higher poverty than people without disabilities. About 28 percent—almost 1 out of 3 individuals with disabilities in America—are poor, compared with 12.5 percent of those without disabilities. That is twice the amount.

Minorities also face devastating levels of poverty. More than a quarter of Blacks and Hispanics—more than 25 percent or 1 in 4—are in poverty in America. Again, keep in mind, for a family of four, that is just $22,000 a year. So 25 percent of Blacks and Hispanics are in poverty, 10 percent of Whites, 13 percent of Asians. These disparities are deeply troubling. More than 10 million Black and Hispanic children woke up this morning in a household struggling with poverty.

Again, we have to remember, while I talk about these as numbers, there is a real story, there is a real family, a real individual, a real child behind every one of them.

There are 46 million stories about families sitting around their kitchen table—if they are even lucky enough to have one—struggling to figure out how to make ends meet, stories of people choosing between whether to pay the rent or pay the utility bills, choosing whether to pay for diapers or medication for their kids, choosing whether to put food on the table or gasoline in the car—so they might get to a minimum wage, part-time job someplace. This should not be happening in America.

We have heard a lot of talk and I have heard Senators and Members of the House in speeches recently talking about how we cannot afford this and we cannot afford that because, let's face it, we are broke, we are deeply in debt in this country and we are broke. I beg to differ. The United States of America is today the richest country in the world—the richest country in the history of the world.

If we are so rich, why are we so broke? We are not poor. We are the richest country in the world. So what this census report yesterday points out is this is a wake-up call that we are failing. We are failing our most vulnerable citizens. We are failing to provide a ladder of opportunity for people to become part of the middle class. We are destroying futures, destroying hope among our children.

First and foremost, I think this report yesterday graphically illustrates how dangerous it would be if we as lawmakers give in to the current atmosphere of budget hysteria—budget hysteria—fear, and fatalism that is now going on on Capitol Hill. By giving in to it, we eviscerate the essential economic security programs just because somehow we want to score political points.

Well, people all know that most people in poverty have a higher rate of not voting than wealthier people. We know that. So I guess, if you want to get votes, you appeal to people who have money. If you want to get elected, you appeal to people who have money because they are the ones who give you money to get elected by, like big corporations. So the poor are kind of forgotten about. So if we give in to this budget hysteria, the first people who are usually hurt are the most vulnerable of our citizens.

The Census Bureau's numbers show, again, without question how effective and important these safety net programs are to keeping millions of people out of poverty. Social Security alone—according to the census numbers, kept 20 million people above the poverty line. Unemployment insurance kept 3.2 million more people out of poverty.

We have always known these are crucial programs, but now we know just how important they are. And other programs, if they were counted by the official poverty measure, which they are not, would have lifted millions more people out of poverty. For example, the SNAP program—food stamps—would have lifted 3.9 million people above poverty. The earned-income tax credit would have lifted 5.4 million people. Without these crucial safety net programs, the poverty situation would be much worse. Yet, mark my words, with this supercommittee that is meeting or whether we go into some kind of a sequestration or whatever that means around here, are we going to cut back on the food stamp program, are we going to cut back on unemployment insurance, maybe cut back on Social Security, as some would want to do, and Social Security benefits? That just means more people will fall below the poverty line.

I think the second lesson we can learn from this report is about the crippling effect falling paychecks and rising inequality are having on our economy. Income went down again last year. Real median household income was $49,500. That is down 2.3 percent from the year before and down 6.4 percent since the start of the recession. This is not just the effect of the recession; these are long-term economic trends that have caused a dramatic increase in the income inequality in this country, and it has been going on for at least the last three decades, little bit by little bit by little bit, to the point now where we have a huge disparity in income equality in this country.

Again, paychecks for American workers are not falling because they are not working as hard or producing less. According to testimony from former Secretary of Labor Robert Reich to the HELP Committee, the typical American family is working more than 500 hours longer per year now than they were in 1979. Got that. The typical American family is working 500 hours longer per year than they were in 1979. In addition to working longer, their productivity, as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, has continued to rise.

So what has happened? People are working longer. There is more production, more units per person per hour worked, and yet wages have fallen. Why is that? You would think wages and benefits would have gone up with longer hours and more productivity. Well, that is not what happened. It is not that companies cannot afford to pay their workers more. Profit margins of Standard & Poor's 500 companies are at their highest levels since the late 1960s. So what has happened during the last three decades, since 1979, is that the executives have shifted revenues from workers' paychecks to the corporate bottom lines and their own pockets—more to profit, more to capital, less to labor.

We cannot allow these trends to continue. Economists across the political spectrum agree that a major cause of our current economic stagnation is a chronic lack of demand. For nearly three decades, workers' incomes have been stagnant. Working families lack the purchasing power to drive America's consumer economy. Without adequate demand, businesses are reluctant to invest and hire. Simply put, until we raise the numbers on people's paychecks and the number of people working and making a paycheck, the economy will never recover.

The final lesson I think we can learn from yesterday's census report is about health care. There is a small silver lining here. While the recession is obviously continuing to impact health care coverage, there are some signs that the early stages of implementation of the affordable care act, that is, the health care reform bill, are making a difference. While the census data shows that the number of uninsured increased from 16.1 percent to 16.3 percent of the population—the Census Bureau deemed this ''not statistically different''—the affordable care act's requirement that health plans provide dependent coverage to young adults to stay on their parents' policy until age 26 is making a difference.

The data from the Census Bureau shows that the 18-to-24 age group was the only group ''to experience a significant increase in the percentage with health insurance over the past year,'' up to 72.8 percent from 70.7 percent in 2009. So, again, there is a small silver lining there in terms of health care coverage for our younger population. So it is a modest step forward for young Americans.

But the overall picture the census report reveals is a nation—the United States of America—on the brink of a crisis. It should be a call to action. I think the President's jobs bill is a good start. We have to create more jobs, not just any job but good-quality jobs that pay decent wages and benefits, a job to lift a family out of poverty and not to keep a family in it.

Again, I have been paying attention a little bit to some of the debates that have been going on in the other party.

I was looking at the figures from the State of Texas that more jobs have been created in Texas than any other part of the country. Well, when you look closely, Texas had by far the largest number of minimum wage jobs than any other state, and the number of minimum wage workers more than doubled between 2007 and 2010. That is our future—minimum wage jobs at $7.25 an hour? That is barely $15,000 a year, under the poverty line for a family of four. Is that something to brag about, that we are creating more minimum wage jobs that will just keep families in poverty? As I said, we need jobs to lift families out of poverty, not keep them down, under the poverty level.

Lastly, I have said so many times here on the floor that we will not be able to tackle the problem of poverty in this country until we have a strong middle class and a clear path for people to become middle-class citizens. That means we should invest more in education, more in innovation, more in infrastructure-building in this country. It means restoring a level playing field with fair taxation—fair taxation. To repeat something the President said the other night—why should Warren Buffett pay less of a percentage of his income than his secretary? You wonder why people get cynical about government. Of course they are cynical. They have every reason to be cynical when we pass these laws around here and we tax capital at a lower rate than we tax labor. Why should someone who is laboring and working be taxed at a higher rate than a wealthy person who maybe invested a lot of money, and they are putting it all into capital gains, and they are paying a lower rate of taxes than someone who is out there working for a living? Why is that fair?

Well, we also need vibrant unions, vibrant unions that can bargain collectively for their people for wages, hours, conditions of employment. We need a strong ladder of opportunity to give every American access to the middle class.

So, again, yesterday's poverty numbers told a bleak story about 46 million Americans who cannot make ends meet. I hope that next year at this time, when the new census numbers come out, we can begin to tell a different story about how we acted boldly, with imagination and vision, to help these people turn their lives around and build a better future. In a nation as strong and as vibrant and, yes, as rich—as rich—as the United States of America, no one who works hard for a living should have to live in poverty, and we should not rest until that vision becomes a reality.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SPIRIT OF COOPERATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, there has been a promising new tone in Congress since our return from the summer recess. It has taken some by surprise. But even more striking than the new tone is that it has brought with it a few modest signs of a new spirit of cooperation.

The House this week sent us the highway extension and an aviation extension that are clean. During August, there were clamors from some corners in the other party to mount a fight over the gas tax or insist on harmful cuts to road and bridge repair, even if these demands risked a shutdown of road construction projects. As recently as last Friday, Republicans were planning to insist on a 5-percent cut to the FAA budget—a move that could well have threatened another shutdown of that agency like we saw in August. But both fears, fortunately, have receded. Barring a setback in the Senate, we should be able to extend both the FAA and highway measures on time and without controversy.

This is a very positive sign. There was a sour taste left in everyone's mouth at the end of the debt ceiling debate, and that is causing a change in behavior. It is actually bringing us together. That process was made unnecessarily difficult because of the extreme tactics of a bloc within the House. The political process broke down and the public noticed.

In the aftermath of that debate, it seems everybody finally realizes there is a premium on reasonableness. The public does not want to see more of the ''my way or the highway'' approach that has been exhibited by some in the House. That is why there was head scratching earlier this week to hear a new rumor in the Capitol that the House Republican leadership might consider seeking to reopen the debt ceiling fight, ignoring the agreed-upon spending level for the 2012 fiscal year. As you know, the deal included a top-line budget number of $1.043 trillion for the fiscal year that begins October 1. This was a significant cut, an actual cut from the fiscal 2011 level of $7 billion. This agreement was ratified by all of those who voted for the final debt ceiling agreement. It was hailed as one of the better aspects of the overall debt ceiling deal because it would mean a lesser likelihood of another budget fight on September 30.

However, since this number was agreed to, some extreme Republicans have started looking to cause trouble. They have tried to see the $7 billion in cuts represented by the $1.043 trillion figure as a floor, not a ceiling. This would be a violation not just of the spirit of the debt limit deal but the letter of it.

The public will not stand for another budget fight. Republicans should understand that more brinkmanship on

the budget at the end of September is not in either side's interest. Some, thankfully, in the House leadership seem to realize this. Majority Leader CANTOR, in a memo to the House Republican caucus sent in August, warned against picking another budget fight on the CR. Leader CANTOR wrote:

> While all of us would like to have seen a lower discretionary appropriation ceiling for the upcoming fiscal year, the debt limit agreement set a level of spending that is a real cut from the current year. I believe it is in our interest to enact into law full-year appropriation bills at this new lower level.

Leader CANTOR affirmed these remarks earlier this week:

> I say to my Republican colleagues, a deal is a deal. It's hard to imagine you would go back on the debt limit agreement, but if you are even considering it, please stop.

We already will likely need to take time next week resolving what level of FEMA funding we should appropriate for fiscal year 2012. Earlier indications are that some House Republicans may want to shortchange the level of funding FEMA says it needs for next year. I can't imagine why anyone would want to play games with disaster relief. But if they want to debate that, they should not also be tying it to another budget fight that we have already resolved and that nearly caused a default for the first time in American history. We should not go back over those pages. We have had enough debates on the docket without reopening the ones we have already done.

The public is tired of these fights, and the public understands who keeps instigating them. To the House Republicans I say: Don't go back on your word on the CR. Leader CANTOR was right when he said in August you should abide by the level agreed to over the summer. Stick with that decision and let's move on to other issues.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I am very happy to announce to the Senate that today NASA announced its new, big rocket design, with the President stepping forth to indicate that he will request funding for the design and building of this rocket.

I want to take the opportunity to share with the Senate what this rocket is going to be. To set the stage, you will recall that we have the International Space Station up in orbit now. There is a combination of six astronauts on board. It is an international crew. The space station itself—people don't realize how big it is. If you think about sitting in a football stadium on the 50-yard line, and looking from one end zone to the other, that is how big the space station is—120 yards long.

The space shuttle has been the vehicle that we have used now for 30 years, the last 10 of which have been used to build the International Space Station. The Russians have been taking up some components, but the major components, the heavy components are being taken up in the cargo bay of the space shuttle and assembled over the last decade into the station. We have six astronauts doing research in the zero gravity of orbit.

The future rockets going to and from the space station—a space taxi, if you will—are a competition among commercial rocket companies, and we think that competition will bring down significantly the cost of those rockets to take cargo and crew, and at the end of this year one version of those rockets will in fact launch, rendezvous, and dock with the space station and deliver cargo.

To make those human rated, with all of the redundancies and escape systems to save human life, it is going to take another few years. Of course, it is a disappointment for so many of us that the new rocket, ready to go to and from the space station, as the space shuttle used to, is not ready for humans, even though we are launching cargo. Thus, in the interim, we have to rely on the Russians with their spacecraft, which we have done before, because when the Space Shuttle *Columbia* was destroyed on reentry back in 2003, for well over 2 years we were down and not flying the space shuttle, until we could make sure that it was fixed. We relied on the Russian Soyuz to get to and from the space station.

All right, that is going to low-Earth orbit. But NASA, with its human space program, has another mission. Now, with the nonmanned space program, we just launched to Jupiter, we just launched a mission to the Moon, next month we are going to launch a mission on Earth observations, and before Thanksgiving we are launching a Volkswagen-size Recovery to Mars, with six wheels powered by a plutonium source so it doesn't have to go to sleep in the Martian night. This will rove all over.

It has a pole that will stick up, with a laser, and it can zap rocks so we can analyze their chemical content. It has a big scooper that can also get us additional samples. It has two eyes that will pop up as it roams around so we can see in real time the surface of Mars.

So we have a vigorous space program. But we still have to do what NASA is supposed to do; that is, leave the orbit of the Earth and venture out into the heavens with humans. That is what was announced today—announced by Senator HUTCHISON and myself, with NASA Administrator General Charlie Bolden making the formal announcement. The President has signed off on the specifics.

I am going to explain this rocket. But before I do, let me say there have been a lot of critics saying: Oh, it will cost too much. Remember, last year we passed the NASA bill unanimously in the Senate and passed it in the House with an overwhelming three-quarters vote. That set the parameters on the funding for this new rocket, and all of NASA's figures have come in underneath those levels that we set in the NASA authorization bill. Those are the numbers the Office of Management and Budget and the White House have scrubbed to make sure they are realistic, and that is what has been announced today.

Here it is. This is the rocket. Just to give an idea of the scale of this monster, the space shuttle in the stack, with the external tank and the two solids on either side, the tallest point of that stack is the top of the external tank. From here that would come up to right there. That gives an idea of how much larger this rocket is. This rocket will launch more payload than any rocket in America's space program and probably the Russian/Soviet space program, certainly, now. Back in the old Soviet days I don't think the Soviets had one that was anywhere near this one.

What this rocket has is a core, and this is a core with liquid oxygen, liquid hydrogen fuel tank. It is taking the space shuttle engines—so we can keep the cost down, and a lot of this has already been developed—and putting five in the tail of this first stage. So first stage, liquid hydrogen, liquid oxygen. But it is boosted on either side by those solid rocket boosters—in this case a new one. Under the space shuttle it was four segments, but this one has five segments. So it is elongated and gives more thrust. These, on future versions, will be competed as to whether it is going to be solid rockets—and, by the way, the consistency of this pencil eraser is what the solid rocket material looks like—or whether those in the competition will be liquid boosters.

All right, that is the core. That comes up all the way to here. Then there is the second stage. We have second-stage engines we have been using in the past called the J–2. They are now updated with a new, more powerful version called the J–2X. So we have a lot of history on these engines. That is what is going to be the second stage, which then takes the housing for a lot of the electronics, and then the capsule.

The tower at the top is an escape tower. We could actually have an explosion right here on the pad, and the crew could survive because they would eject in the full capsule, being thrust away from the explosion, and then the parachutes would deploy and the crew saved; likewise, we could save the crew on this rocket all the way to orbit. So if there was a problem, we could still save the human life of the four to seven astronauts who are going to be in this crew capsule. We could save their lives, and that was one of the mandates after we lost Columbia in the reentry over Texas. The investigation board said: Build a safer rocket, and certainly one that is more economical.

This is now on a schedule for its first test—this version. This is the smaller version. This thing can evolve. This is

about 70 to 77 tons. This thing can evolve to 150 tons, and then we are talking about a monster. On this version they will test it on a schedule for 2017. They will have several other tests, and they are on a schedule to put a crew into this rocket in 2021. They are then scheduled to rendezvous, or land, on an asteroid—this will be the first time that has ever been done—as a way of preparing us to then go to Mars.

So that is what NASA has announced today. I want to give great credit—great, great credit—to Senator HUTCHISON. She has been the ranking member and, alternately, chairman of the Subcommittee on Science and Space and is now the ranking member of the full Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. She has been a princess in helping guide, first of all, the NASA authorization bill and the funding. Tomorrow, she and Senator MIKULSKI—the chair of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations—will be taking up NASA's budget as they get ready to come to the floor.

This rocket will now allow us to get out of low-Earth orbit, assemble components—heavy components—that ultimately will take us out into the heavens exploring in ways we never have even started to design. Remember, 40 years ago we went to the Moon. That was quite an accomplishment. But the Moon is about 250,000 miles from Earth. With rockets like these, we are going to go far out into the heavens to explore the origins of the universe, to explore that which we have never even dreamed of, as we fulfill our destiny as a people who are explorers and adventurers by nature.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mrs. HAGAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in imploring Congress to provide needed assistance to our families, our communities, and our businesses suffering from the rash of natural disasters that have hit our country hard this year.

While many of us who represent States on the east coast planned to spend our final week of our August work period traveling our State, touring factories, stopping by schools, and visiting military bases, Mother Nature had other plans.

We still traveled to our States, but we saw a very different scene: whole streets and towns flooded, homes and businesses washed away from their foundations, destroyed crop fields, and constituents worried about the loss of their homes and mourning their loved ones.

Over 2 weeks ago, Hurricane Irene barreled down our eastern seaboard, and early estimates suggest it could be one of the top 10 costliest disasters in U.S. history. I am here to tell the story of North Carolina.

In the early morning of August 27, Irene first touched down over eastern North Carolina's Outer Banks. Even before it made landfall, the storm brought on several tornadoes along the coast that swept away entire homes.

This is a photo of what is left of three homes hit by tornadoes in Tyrrell County. I was there, and it was truly devastating. One elderly man who had one of these homes was there the next day with a rake, forlorn look in his eyes, and said: The only thing I own now are the clothes on my back.

By the time Irene finally moved beyond the State of North Carolina, six North Carolinians had been killed, storm surges 6 to 9 feet high had flooded many towns, more than 500,000 were without power, and countless homes, businesses, and schools had been destroyed or severely damaged.

Fortunately, our State had prepared diligently for days leading up to the storm, boarding up houses and businesses and declaring mandatory evacuations for tourists and residents in our most at-risk towns.

A lot of pundits woke after Irene hit and started saying: Hey, it wasn't that bad. I wish to invite those individuals to come to eastern North Carolina and see what I saw in the wake of Hurricane Irene.

I saw small business owners in downtown Manteo emptying stores they have run for decades, tossing their waterlogged inventory, moving their furniture to the curb, moving out carpet totally destroyed, and these business owners wondering if it was even worth reopening their stores.

There was a bookstore, and a resident in the community came up to me and he said: Senator HAGAN, I have raised my children by sitting on this man's knees having books read to him day in and day out. We need this bookstore back in Manteo.

I wish to be sure it gets there.

I also saw crops that had been beaten by wind and rain for 15 hours, and it looked like they had gone through the spin cycle of a washing machine. I saw flooding in the fields so severe that Agricultural Secretary and former Iowa Gov. Tom Vilsack said it was the worst agricultural flooding he recalled seeing.

I saw families clearing and burning debris, pumping floodwater, tossing aside their soaked possessions that were beyond saving.

I also stood along Highway 12, eerily quiet, a highway that is usually busy with traffic, totally still at the point where Irene had left a gaping hole, blocking any vehicle travel to and from Hatteras Island and the towns of Rodanthe, Waves, Salvo, Avon, Buxton, Frisco, and Hatteras. We can clearly see the breach of the highway here. It actually breached in three separate points along Highway 12. The only way to get to the island now is by ferry; and, according to local reports, the line for that ferry was 15 miles long this weekend.

That is the picture in North Carolina. It is not the only picture. While there were scenes of destruction and loss, I also saw tremendous acts of determination and kindness. If winds and rains may have swept away our possessions, they also stirred up the best parts of North Carolina spirit. Our intrinsic devotion to community and to assisting those in need produced countless heroes across our State the past 2 weeks.

Everywhere I went, I saw emergency workers, volunteer organizations, and members of the community reaching out to their neighbors in need. In Craven and Tyrrell Counties, the American Red Cross and the North Carolina Baptist Men and Women provided hot meals. The North Carolina Baptist Men and Women were there, distributing 5,000 meals one afternoon when I was with them and also helping shelter and debris removal for those affected by the hurricane.

The North Carolina National Guard activated 400 members—including a member of my own staff who serves in the Guard—to provide emergency water, food, and supplies to some of the hardest hit areas. Emergency workers throughout the State continue to help families, businesses, and entire communities recover and rebuild.

While the people of the great State of North Carolina are committed to getting themselves and their neighbors back on their own feet, we have to do the same in Congress. For the North Carolina families, farmers, fishermen, educators, seniors, and small businesses struggling to recover, government assistance cannot come fast enough. It must not leave too soon.

Here is my bottom line: Congress must fully fund Irene recovery efforts now. But we must also fund the emergency funding needs in tornado-devastated Joplin, MO, and Alabama, and the flooded communities of the Midwest, also, and in the wildfire disaster currently in Texas.

Without a doubt, this year, our country has been ravaged by an unprecedented series of natural disasters. Since January 1, the President has issued disaster declarations in 48 States, and the hurricane season is far from over.

We are aware of this trend all too well in North Carolina. Just about 4 months before Irene hit, 28 tornadoes touched down across central and southern North Carolina, the most severe weather to hit our State since 1984. More than 20 North Carolinians were killed, 6,200 homes damaged, and about 440 homes were completely destroyed;

21 businesses, including the largest employer in the town of Sanford, were demolished, with another 92 significantly damaged, leaving at least 2,000 North Carolinians in that one area out of work. Shaw University, located in downtown Raleigh, was forced to close for the remainder of the semester due to the immense damage to its campus.

We will never be able to predict the whims of Mother Nature, but we are able to prepare and prepare we must. Right now, FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund is running dangerously low. Even before Hurricane Irene arrived we were using $400 million a month on disaster relief efforts. Today the fund is down to $377 million, not enough for a week of spending before Hurricane Irene hit, and we still have 3 weeks to go in this fiscal year.

If we do not act now to fix this shortfall, millions of Americans will be left behind. Already, FEMA is shifting funds away from vitally needed reconstruction projects in previously hard-hit areas to what they call ''immediate needs'' assistance. I do not believe any one of us wants to be in the position of telling one of our constituents—one of our small business owners, one of our school principals—that we can't help because they are not considered an ''immediate need.'' American victims of natural disasters should not be left at the mercy of a rob-Peter-to-pay-Paul system. That is not who we are as Americans.

We have a choice right now. In my mind and in the minds of all North Carolinians affected by the storms of Irene and the tornadoes that took place in April, the choice is clear: Congress must make these FEMA supplemental funds available.

The Budget Control Act that we passed in early August established strict spending caps to get our fiscal house in order while also allowing for a limited amount of funds to be made available in case disaster struck. Disaster struck, and now is the time to make those funds available. Meeting these needs is not just a necessity for the people of my State and many others, but it is also wholly consistent with the fiscal discipline that we agreed on and voted on in August.

But FEMA funding is not enough. Our farmers in North Carolina and across the eastern coast were devastated by Irene, and they are in desperate need of assistance. North Carolina is an agricultural State. Agriculture generates about $78 billion a year in economic activity, and it employs close to one-fifth of the workers in North Carolina. Our agricultural industry, particularly our cotton and tobacco farmers, are in trouble.

At the end of the day, when all of the damage assessments are completed, our farmers could be out more than $400 million from Hurricane Irene, and these crops were just getting ready to be harvested. Our farmers in our State absolutely cannot afford a blow like this one. We in Congress need to work together so assistance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture can be expedited and delivered in a timelier manner. We need to act soon.

I want to end with a story from my State that I believe is particularly relevant at this time when communities across the country are in the process of recovery. Back in April, one of the most recognizable scenes from the post-tornado coverage was of a Lowe's store in Sanford, NC. Unlike with Irene, there were few warnings of the tornado's arrival. But when Michael Hollowell, the store manager, saw the storm approaching his store—and it was very fast—he calmly moved every customer to the back corner where he knew—because he had been trained—they would be the safest. I saw that Lowe's the very next day.

This is what that store looked like. It was completely demolished. But every single person in the store when the storm hit was alive. Mike Hollowell is a hero, not just to those people in the Lowe's store but to people all over North Carolina. Last week, not even 5 months after this devastation, that same Lowe's reopened, and it reopened with 2,000 more square feet than it had before. It just shows that North Carolinians and people across the country are committed to a recovery that will leave our communities better than ever.

The people of this great country are stronger than any storm. They will rebuild and recover. But that process may take many months, it may take many years. As their representatives, we have a responsibility to provide a reliable, comprehensive program of relief for that duration. To do any less is a dereliction of duty.

I call on all my colleagues to pass this FEMA supplemental bill as soon as possible.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STIMULUS BILL

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, in recent days the President has repeatedly told Congress to pass the stimulus package immediately. This began during his joint address to Congress last week when he said at one point:

> I am sending this Congress a plan that you should pass right away. You should pass this jobs plan right away. Pass this jobs bill—pass this jobs bill.

Immediately following the President's joint address to the Congress, Press Secretary Jay Carney declared:

> The President will submit a bill early next week, the American Jobs Act, which will specify how he proposes paying for the American Jobs Act.

As ranking Republican on the Budget Committee and wrestling with these difficult issues—I know Senator CARDIN is a member of the committee—we tried to figure out what this means and how much money the spending will be. But the bill that was transmitted to Congress Monday afternoon does not contain any fiscal tables, costs for any of his provisions, actually how those provisions will be paid for and when the pay-for will occur, or even an overall pricetag for the bill.

How can the President call on Congress to ''pass this bill immediately'' when no one even knows how much it will cost or where the money is coming from?

I sent a letter yesterday to the President's Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Jack Lew, asking that this information be provided to the Congress at once. But so far we have had no response. Part of the reason we need this information is that the total cost of the President's bill may be much higher than advertised. That has been the pattern around here. No one should be surprised. When the President said his plan would be ''paid for,'' he did not specify if he meant the total cost—to include increased interest resulting from the borrowed money to be spent immediately—or just the cost of the jobs provisions alone, actually how much goes out the door. Depending on whether the money is spent out and when it is paid back—assuming it is ever paid back—interest costs resulting from just this bill's borrowing could top $100 billion. In other words, the interest on the money over the 10-year window, the 10-year budget we are talking about—if we spend $450 billion now, we pay interest on that money. It is borrowed money. People loan us the money and we pay interest. Interest rates alone now—CBO projects them to go up, our Congressional Budget Office. Certainly they will. They are extraordinarily low today. But, at any rate, we could easily see the interest on this money over 10 years reaching $100 billion.

The problem with looking at it as a 10-year scenario is that the debt is probably not going to be paid off in 10 years. Most of the debts we run up will be part of our deficit. If we want to raise taxes to fund a new program, maybe we ought to raise taxes to pay off the debt we have instead of spending it on a new program. The debt we have distributes American wealth to people who hold our debt all over the world.

In my letter to OMB, I request tables showing the year-by-year data for this bill's budgetary impact, including projected changes to the deficit for each of the next 10 years. In other words, how will it play out? If we spend $450 billion in 1, 2, or 3 years, how much does that run up the debt? When does the repayment begin? How will it be paid, and at what rate? If the President wants to advocate for a sharp, near-term increase in the deficit in exchange for the possibility of some undefined economic future, with the possibility of a

stimulus, he ought to make that argument clearly to the American people.

I believe the President also needs to be honest in admitting that the bill's short-term costs would wipe out—obliterate—the $7 billion in savings next year resulting from the debt limit deal. In other words, we went through this long, painful exercise that resulted in an agreement in the eleventh hour and the 59th minute to save $900 billion, and then, hopefully, form a committee that would save another $1.1 trillion to $1.5 trillion, only a fraction of this $2.1 billion in savings, of the $13 trillion the Congressional Budget Office tells us will be added to the debt in the next 10 years. So it would save a little over $2 trillion over 10 years but, at the same time, we are running up over $10 trillion in debt. So it is not a big enough step. It is a step. There is progress. I certainly respect that, but it wasn't much.

To show us how small it is, next year we are projected, under the agreement Congress ratified, to reduce spending by $7 billion. That is all. That is all it would be reduced from this year to next year in actual spending levels. So I ask my colleagues: Don't we need to be careful? After all the effort we took to achieve that much savings, shouldn't we think very carefully about a new stimulus plan that would spend $450 billion, obliterating that savings? I think we should. But, at any rate, we do need to know precisely how much it is going to cost and precisely how the money would be spent.

Let's flash back to February. The Office of Management and Budget Director, Jack Lew, said this. This was when the President submitted his budget for the next 10 years. It was brought up here on the floor of the Senate. In fact, I brought it up. It was voted down 97 to nothing. But this is what Mr. Lew said about that budget:

> Our budget will get us, over the next several years, to the point where we can look the American people in the eye and say we're not adding to the debt anymore; we're spending money that we have each year, and then we can work on bringing down the national debt.

We all know there is a certain amount of political license people get to utilize in the political world, and exaggeration sometimes is forgiven. But let me tell my colleagues, this is the Office of Management and Budget talking about the President's budget that he had just submitted to Congress. He said:

> Our budget will get us, over the next several years, to the point where we can look the American people in the eye and say we're not adding to the debt anymore; we're spending money that we have each year, and then we can work on bringing down our national debt.

What is the truth? The Congressional Budget Office scored this budgetary plan and this is what they concluded: that over a 10-year period there would be huge deficits every single year. In about year 6 or 7, the lowest deficit would occur—$750 billion would be the lowest annual deficit that would occur—and by the 10th year we would be back up to $1 trillion. President Bush's largest deficit he ever had was $450 billion and he was criticized for that. So we are going to have the lowest—and he says this is going to pay down the debt and wouldn't be adding more to the debt if we passed his budget, when his budget spent more, taxed more, and ran up more debt. I believe this is the most irresponsible budget ever submitted to the Congress of the United States, at a time of national crisis, when all experts are telling us the greatest threat to our national security is our debt.

Forgive me if I want to see the fine print on this legislation, when an administration tells us that—and the President said very similar things; the President himself said very similar things—we would not be adding more to the debt.

We in Congress raised the legal debt limit—I did not vote for that particular bill—but we have breached, I am afraid, our economic debt limit. America's $14.5 trillion gross debt is now 100 percent of our GDP, our economy. Experts tell us we have already crossed a dangerous threshold. Our debt is pulling down growth and putting a damper on job creation right now.

We have to ask ourselves: Can we continue to borrow, running up even more debt in the hope that we can spend it today in a sugar-high type stimulus to create jobs in the short run? The Congressional Budget Office scored the first stimulus package 2 years ago that has come nowhere near achieving what was promised for it. They said, OK, if you spend $825 billion now, you will get some short-term economic benefit, but scored over a decade, we would have an economic decline. The net growth of the United States would be less over 10 years than if we didn't pass a stimulus package at all. When we get up to 100 percent of GDP, I submit it is even more dangerous to keep running up debt.

This is a dilemma. We are in a fix. The economy is not growing the way we wish it to grow. CBO was projecting in January of this year that economic growth for the first 6 months would be about 2.9 percent. We were hoping that would be true. But what happened? The first quarter of this fiscal year it was .4 percent—not 2 percent, not 2.9 percent—and the second quarter was extremely low also. We have averaged about 1 percent growth the first half of this year.

We want to do something to help this economy grow. I submit we should do everything we can that would help our economy grow now that does not run up the debt. What are some of those things? Producing more energy at home, creating jobs here; pumping more energy supply which could bring down the cost of energy. We can bring down the cost of energy, create jobs, create tax revenue, and create growth that way. We should eliminate every regulation that is not beneficial to this economy, and there are a lot of them. Some regulations are good. Many of them add costs to the entire economy for little or no benefit. We need to have the kind of tax reform of a permanent nature that creates confidence in our economy—the kind of tax reform that advances economic growth rather than increasing taxes to give Washington more money.

Those are my suggestions about how to deal with this. First and foremost, we are going to look at this proposal. We certainly are worried about the status of the economy today. We are deeply disappointed in the job numbers that continue to fall and, hopefully, we will find the key to changing that. But fundamentally the economy will come back and jobs will come back when growth occurs and growth will occur not in the public sector but in the private sector. We need to ask ourselves what it is we can do to create a better climate for growth and job creation. We need to be rigorous in analyzing the President's proposal, and to look at the details of it and how much it is going to cost and how we plan to pay it back. I think at a very minimum, we are entitled to that.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Alabama who has come to the floor. We see the world differently, but we both acknowledge we are at a moment where action is the only alternative. Doing nothing is unacceptable. When President Obama came to speak to us in a joint session of Congress last week, that is what he told us. He basically said, Let's roll up our sleeves, work together, both parties in Congress, for a change, and do something about this economy.

There are 14 million Americans out of work. The report now from the Joint Economic Committee and others cites the highest level of poverty in our country in decades; the problems working families are having week to week, month to month, and year to year, falling behind, despite all of their hard work. Their wages aren't rising to keep up with the cost of living. Many are surviving paycheck to paycheck.

A survey was taken recently across America asking working families the following question: Could you come up with $2,000 in 30 days if you had to, either from savings or borrowing it? Fifty-three percent of working families said yes and 47 percent said no. That is how close to the edge almost half of working families are living. A $2,000 medical bill at an emergency room is almost nothing these days—it is for a minor injury—and these families could not come up with it. That is what they are facing. That is why the President said let us focus on doing things that will help these families and equally, if not more importantly, help small businesses create jobs.

There is no argument here about creating an army of government jobs. That is not even on the table. The President is not proposing that. Here is what he said: Let's give a tax cut, a payroll tax cut to working individuals so they have more take-home pay. I took a look at what it would mean in the State of Illinois. It would mean that for the average income, which is $53,000 a year, that family would get $1,400 in tax cuts or $120 a month. I think it is worth something to working families to have that much more in their pockets to meet the needs of their families and perhaps make some critical purchases for their children, for their future, whatever it might be. That is a tax cut the President has proposed.

He also proposed a tax cut for small businesses if they will hire unemployed people, a tax credit of up to $4,000 to hire these folks, take them off the unemployed rolls, and put them to work.

I went to several job centers during the August recess. One was in McHenry, IL, and one was in Elgin, IL. I spent the better part of the day sitting with unemployed people and talking to them. You ought to go there. If you think unemployed Americans—the 14 million on whom we hear the statistics—are living the life of luxury on their unemployment checks, they are not. Most of them are struggling to survive, and many of them come each day to a job center to brush up their résumé, to find out the latest people asking for new workers and put in new applications day after day. Many of them are discouraged after submitting hundreds of applications with no response. Some go back to school. I met a few who really made the right life choice by going back to take courses at community college, where they could afford it, or at job-training centers where there would be no charge to them, so they could pick up a new skill in an area in which they could get a job. That is the reality. The President is trying to create tax incentives for small businesses to hire those people.

Usually the Republicans who come to the floor applaud tax cuts. My experience is that they are for tax cuts when times are good and bad, but this time they are against these tax cuts. What is the difference between these tax cuts and the ones the Republicans historically support? There are two differences: The President's tax cuts are focused on middle-income families, not the wealthiest, and they are the President's tax cuts. Those are the two differences.

I hope some on the Republican side will reflect on the fact, as the President said, that the American people are not going to reward us for our campaign rhetoric if this economy does not turn around. They want us to work together to solve the problems facing our economy. They want tax cuts for working families. They want small businesses to have an incentive to hire people. They want us to focus on creating good-paying jobs here at home. What kinds of jobs? Building America.

As the President said, if we are going to succeed in this world, we need to outeducate our competitors, outinnovate our competitors, and outbuild them.

I went to China over Easter. What is happening in that country is incredible. They are building in every direction—building cranes and construction activity everywhere. They are building the infrastructure in China to become the No. 1 economic power of the world in the 21st century. What are we doing? We are hearing speech after speech saying that because of the deficit, we cannot invest in America. Some say we cannot invest in education. They argue that we cannot invest in research, we cannot invest in building America. I think they are wrong.

The deficit is a serious challenge. Even the Bowles-Simpson Commission, which I served on and voted for, said: When you get serious about cutting spending, do it when this recession is behind you. They know, we know you can't balance the budget with 14 million Americans out of work.

Let me say a word about the safety net in America. I made a visit in Champagne, IL, to a food-distributing operation. They distribute food to pantries and soup kitchens all around central Illinois. Unfortunately, their business has never been better. More and more families are showing up in these places for a helping hand. I went in there to hear how they are doing. They are getting a lot of help from the private sector that donates food that is near expiration, for example, and a lot of contributions from churches and charitable individuals. It is very heartwarming to see it.

As I went to tour this place, there was a young woman there. She was an attractive, well-dressed woman. I assumed she worked for this food depository. She said to me that she had a job in a local school district as a teacher's aide. I was a little bit puzzled as to whether she was on the board of directors or what her connection was. She came there to tell me that as a single mom with two little kids, even with a job in the school district, which she was happy to have, she still needed food stamps to put food on the table every day for her kids.

I don't think Americans—those of us lucky enough to never have to worry about the next meal—know what families are going through, working families struggling with low income, trying to keep their kids well-fed and to do what every parent wants to do. More and more of these families are going to soup kitchens very quietly because that is a meal they don't have to pay for. They are going to the pantries to pick up the groceries. I have seen them in one of the nicest and most prosperous counties in my State, DuPage County. I went to the pantries there, and I saw the people coming through the door. You would not be able to pick them out, but they are working families who need a helping hand. That is the reality. That is why the safety net is so important.

I am troubled that so many people today are on food stamps. I am not troubled that they are on food stamps; I am troubled because they have to be on food stamps. I hear critics come to the floor who say: There are too darned many people on food stamps. There is something wrong here.

What is wrong is not the food stamps; what is wrong is hunger and low-income and working families struggling to get by paycheck to paycheck. That is what is wrong. The number of Americans now qualifying for this food stamp assistance is even going up among those who are employed, such as the lady I met in Champagne, IL. That is a reality.

Something else is happening too. As more and more people lose their jobs, they lose their health insurance. When I sit down with the unemployed, that is one of the first items that comes up. Once you have lost that health insurance premium your employer helps you pay, most folks can't afford it. It is just way beyond them. So they are out there without insurance, and they are vulnerable. Some of them have sick kids, chronically ill children, and they worry about it. They go to the free clinics. We are seeing more and more working families showing up at free clinics across America. That is a reality of this economy too.

When we talk about cutting spending on Medicaid, keep in mind who receives Medicaid payments in America. In my State of Illinois, 36 percent of Illinois children are covered by Medicaid insurance. When it comes to births in the State of Illinois, 52 percent of all births in Illinois are paid for by Medicaid. But the biggest single expense in Medicaid is neither one of those. Mr. President, 20 percent of the Medicaid recipients in my State account for 60 percent of the cost of the program: the elderly—parents, grandparents, great-grandparents in nursing homes and convalescent centers, on Medicare and broke and stay there because Medicaid steps in and helps them keep things together, so they have at least some care and some attention in the late years of their lives. When we talk about cutting spending in Medicaid, we are talking about hurting the most vulnerable people in America: children, such as the kids of that single mom I met; those who need prenatal care so their babies will be healthy; and, of course, the elderly who are stuck in that situation.

The same thing is true with Medicare. I understand Medicare costs are going up dramatically. I also understand the number of people under Social Security and Medicare is going to rise as baby boomers reach that age. But we have to take care that at the end of the day we protect the basic premiums and benefits that are presently available under Medicare. For a lot of

seniors, it is their only health insurance. It is what keeps them independent and strong. We can't compromise that basic protection by privatizing Medicare or raising the cost of Medicare beyond the reach of senior citizens.

Finally, when it comes to Social Security, let me just say that this is a program which means a lot. For 70 percent of Social Security recipients, it is a majority of their retirement. For 25 percent of the Social Security recipients, it is all they get. That is it. So guarding Social Security and protecting its future is important for our parents and grandparents. It is important for our country and for its future as well.

The President came forward, and he said: This is my jobs bill. This is what I think will help move America forward, put more spending power in the hands of working families, create incentives for small businesses to hire people, focus on putting firefighters, cops, and teachers back to work. That is a priority in our country for sure, and investing in building in America.

One of the few lines the President had that got a bipartisan standing ovation—and there were not many last Thursday—was when he said it is an embarrassment that 10 percent of our returning veterans are unemployed. Let's put our veterans back to work. That is part of our President's plan.

When I listened to the Senator from Alabama—he doesn't like the way the President is paying for the plan, but he does pay for it. How does he pay for it? One thing he does is he reduces the Federal subsidy to oil and gas companies. Filled your tank lately? Take a look at what they are charging at the pump. In Illinois and most places, it is over $4. That is translating into the highest reported profits in the history of American business. Oil companies have never ever had it so good. President Obama has said—and I agree with him—that if there were ever a moment in time when the Federal subsidies to these oil companies should come to an end, this is it. The money saved should go to small businesses and families across America in this difficult economy.

The President also believes—and I agree with him—that the wealthiest among us, those who are most comfortable, should be asked to share in the sacrifice. There are some on the other side who would not accept one penny more in taxes on the wealthiest people in America. I don't get it. As I travel around Illinois, a lot of families are sacrificing in this tough economy. They know they have to. It is the only way they are going to make it. They know that some of the government programs which have been around in the past are not going to be there in the future or may be not as generous.

If working families and middle-class families across America accept that reality, why can't the wealthiest families in America accept it too? Honestly, I think they can. By and large, the people I know who are blessed with a lot of wealth and a pretty comfortable life have said to me: Senator, I don't need all of this. I don't need all of that Social Security payment. I can get by without it. I don't mind paying a little more in taxes.

Those are the people I run into. But you hear from the other side that is totally unacceptable. Some of them have said the President's plan is going to fall flat on its face because it taxes the wealthy in America. I think the wealthy should pay their fair share, and I think the President's plan is an honest, good plan that moves us forward. So for those who are critical of it, give me your alternative.

I wrote down here what the Senator from Alabama suggested. He wants more energy produced here at home. I am for that. I think we ought to go to places where it is environmentally responsible and produce more energy here in the United States. But I will say two things to keep in mind:

No. 1, all of the known oil and gas reserves in the United States of America that we could reach onshore and offshore equal 3 percent of the known oil and gas reserves in the world. Each year, the United States of America consumes 25 percent of the oil and gas consumed in the world.

We cannot drill our way into energy independence. We can expand the base and do it in an environmentally responsible way, perhaps find better sources, newer sources for things such as natural gas, but this is not the answer to our prayers.

Secondly, moving toward energy efficiency is not only good for the environment, it is good for the bottom line for a family and for a business, promoting efficiency.

My wife and I take a little pride in the fact that we own a car, a Ford Fusion Hybrid, and we were kind of patting ourselves on the back a little bit. As we came back from vacation in Michigan, we were getting 36 miles a gallon. We felt pretty good about it. I was bragging to my friends about it, and now I am bragging on the Senate floor. It can be done. We can create more fuel-efficient vehicles. We didn't compromise anything, and we bought American.

I think that is what we need to encourage in this country: cars and other energy-saving equipment made in this country, creating jobs, reducing the need for energy to be imported from overseas and reducing the pollution that, unfortunately, hinders our environment and our health. I think that is a good thing.

So on the Senator's first point, sure, more energy at home, but put it in perspective. That is not the answer to America's economic needs.

The second point he says is to eliminate certain regulations. That could be true. I am sure the President agrees there are regulations now that don't make any sense. Get rid of them. I am not sure this is a big ball and chain being dragged around by our economy, but there is no sense in wasting time or money on regulations that really don't serve a good public purpose.

The final point he said—and I couldn't agree more—tax reform. We lose $1.2 trillion a year to the Tax Code. Credits and deductions and exclusions and special favors written in the Tax Code for businesses and individuals have to come to an end. I actually think that is a good way to raise revenue and maybe even reduce marginal tax rates for corporations and individuals in the process.

That is what Bowles-Simpson said. So even my friend from Alabama who spoke earlier—even he and I can find some common ground. I hope he will agree with me and the President: doing nothing is unacceptable. The President has said: No more games, no more delay, no more politics. Do something. That is the message I got in August, as I returned to Illinois. It is a message I hope my colleagues share as well.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

A SECOND OPINION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor, as I do almost on a weekly basis, to talk about the health care law and, I do that as a physician, someone who has practiced medicine in Wyoming for a quarter of a century, taking care of Wyoming families. I come to the floor because I have great concerns about this health care law.

We know—history proves—that landmark pieces of legislation written in Congress often contain drafting errors at one stage or another during the bill's development. This is one of the main reasons most landmark bills are written and negotiated in an open and transparent manner. Writing and negotiating bills in this way helps Members of Congress minimize mistakes. It helps uncover any unintentional consequences. It helps fix problems. This is done through rigorous committee and floor debate, as well as House-Senate conference committees, as the bills go through the process.

Most importantly, doing something in an open and transparent manner gives the American people, the folks at home, an opportunity to read a bill, to study it, to think about it, to discuss it during townhall meetings with their Members, and ask questions and weigh in.

Well, unfortunately, we all know the largest health care law ever enacted did not undergo an open, transparent, or bipartisan process. President Obama

promised the American people they could watch the discussions and the writing process—he said—on C–SPAN. Well, instead, the President and Democrat leaders in both the House and the Senate sealed themselves behind closed doors. Their strategy? Pass sweeping health care legislation based on stealth and speed. Use sound bites to sell America about expanding coverage, about cutting costs, about improving quality, and then offer very few details explaining exactly how the bill would impact individual Americans, nor what it would cost the country.

Well, while this entire strategy was being played out, the President and Washington Democrats were writing the legislation behind closed doors. Why? Well, to limit the time the bills could be read and reviewed by the American public. Some in Washington thought rushing a health care bill into law before America could read it was the perfect way to avoid public debate and public questioning.

Many of us recall when former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI infamously said: First, you have to pass the bill to find out what is in it. Well, the President passed his health care law, and the American people continue, on a daily basis, to find out what is in it. They do not like it, and it is easy to understand why.

As the American people had a chance to read the details, they started asking more questions. The numbers simply were not adding up. Health care costs, they were seeing, were going up, even though the President promised that health care costs would go down. There were costly mandates on small employers, and that was going to discourage hiring. NANCY PELOSI said they would hire 400,000 people immediately. They have not been hired. She said 4 million new workers would be hired ultimately. We have not seen it yet.

Mandates we have seen come out of the health care law do nothing to spur economic growth and help the 9.1 percent of individuals nationwide—14 million Americans—who are currently unemployed and are looking for work. Then there are even more government orders forcing individuals to buy one-size-fits-all, government-approved insurance or face a fine.

The American people have had 17 months to find out what is in the President's health care law. One news report after another has been uncovering a laundry list of so-called glitches in the health care law. Well, former Speaker PELOSI wanted the American people to find out what was in the law, and 17 months later the American people are finding out that the President and Washington Democrats did not even write it correctly.

On Wednesday, September 7, of this year, Investor's Business Daily printed an article titled, ''Oops! No ObamaCare Tax Credit Via Federal Exchanges?'' The article explains that the way ObamaCare was written, individuals who qualify for a taxpayer-funded subsidy to buy government-approved health insurance in the new State exchanges may not get it. Section 1311 of the health care law requires the States to set up a State-run ''exchange.'' This State-based exchange is a place where individuals can use their government subsidy to buy health insurance. Now, if a State declines to set up their own exchange, then section 1321 mandates that the Federal Government set it up and run it for them.

Here is the catch: The health care law, as written, as signed by the President, explicitly says the taxpayer-funded subsidies can only go to people who are enrolled in exchanges set up by the State. Nowhere does the health care law mention that the subsidy can be given to people enrolled in the Federal exchange.

So the American people are now finding out that their family might actually qualify for government help to buy health insurance, but they are not going to receive the help. Instead, individuals enrolled in federally run exchanges could be forced to buy health insurance that, absolutely, they cannot afford.

Not only might this law cause individuals to spend money they do not have, the law may also offer taxpayer-funded subsidies to people who do not actually need it. Let me repeat that. The law may actually offer taxpayer-funded subsidies to people who do not actually need it.

At a time when our country can hardly afford to spend money we do not have, Medicare's Chief Actuary, Richard Foster, exposed yet another glitch in the President's health care law. The law allows approximately 3 million middle-class early retirees to qualify for Medicaid. Well, Medicaid is a safety net program designed to help low-income Americans.

Here is how this one works: The health care law defines how the Federal Government will set an individual's Medicaid eligibility. The calculations are all based on income. Here is the glitch: The health care law excludes a large part of an individual's Social Security income from that calculation. Well, today, Federal low-income assistance programs are required to count Social Security benefits as part of an individual's income. Thanks to the health care law, early retirees earning up to $58,840 a year could now be eligible for Medicaid.

Here is what Mr. Foster said in an Associated Press article. He said:

> I don't generally comment on the pros or cons of policy, but that just doesn't make sense.

This is the Chief Actuary of Medicare. ''I don't generally comment,'' he says, ''on the pros or cons of policy, but that just doesn't make sense.''

Well, I agree. That is why I cosponsored legislation introduced by Senator MIKE ENZI closing this loophole. Senator ENZI's bill, S. 1376, changes the health care law subsidy eligibility calculation to include all nontaxable Social Security income.

The Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation estimate if we enacted Senator ENZI's bill, we will save the Federal Government and the American people about $13 billion. The Senate should immediately take up S. 1376 and pass it. This is $13 billion we can save right now, today. Let's show the American people that when we see our country spending money that it shouldn't, we will take a stand, collectively as a Senate, and stop it.

These examples—these two examples—inevitably beg the question: What next? Clearly, the self-described ''most transparent Administration in history'' has a lot of explaining to do. I do not believe my friends on the other side of the aisle, who wrote this very flawed health care law—and they did it behind closed doors—I do not think they knew what they were doing when they wrote these provisions. How do I know that? Well, if they understood how devastating their policies would be, I think they might have had second thoughts.

How many more disruptive, ticking time bombs are there lurking in this law and in the regulations that still have not been written about this health care law that was signed a year and a half ago? We do not know. We do not know because many of the provisions do not even go into effect until the year 2014 or later.

As a physician who has practiced medicine a long time, cared for patients all around the State of Wyoming, been active in the Wyoming health fairs, bringing low-cost health screenings to people all around the Cowboy State, I intend to fight each and every day in this Senate to make sure the American people will not have to find out what kind of additional ticking time bombs there are in the health care law. That is because I am more committed than ever to repeal the health care law and replace it with patient-centered care, replace it with health care reforms that help American families get the care they need, from the doctor they want, at a price they can afford.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I know we have had several speeches over the last couple of hours on very important topics—the jobs bill, our efforts to stimulate the recovery, a response from one of our Democratic leaders to Senator SESSIONS, and the good Senator who was just speaking talking about health care—but I have

come to focus our attention, if I could, again this afternoon on a particular issue. We spent most of yesterday talking about a matter that is absolutely right at hand; that is, disaster relief funding and calling on this Senate and the House of Representatives to focus some immediate and comprehensive thought and attention on this subject, which is affecting so many of our constituents—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—in big cities, small towns, and rural areas all over this country.

In fact, this is the first year in our memory and in, I think, the recorded recent history, we have had a Presidentially declared disaster in 48 of our 50 States. Just a few days ago, we along the eastern seaboard and the gulf coast, where I am from representing Louisiana, suffered from the original hit and then remnants of Tropical Storm Lee and then Hurricane Irene.

There are some Senators who joined me in a press conference earlier today. I think it was the Senator from North Carolina who said it has actually been three disasters: an economic disaster, in terms of an economy that is weak and fragile and we are doing our best to lift it and to strengthen it, and then Tropical Storm Lee and then Hurricane Irene.

It has been millions and millions of dollars of damage. Unfortunately, we on the gulf coast tragically are getting to be experts in this field because we, as Senators and House Members from the gulf coast, have battled multiple disasters over this last decade. Katrina and Rita, which broke all records, surpassed any planning this government has ever done.

We had a FEMA that showed up not ready, not comprehensive enough in its view. Our people have suffered. But we have made a lot of changes since then, and here we are today with actually a better FEMA, from all accounts. I wish to give a lot of credit to this administration, particularly, and not just Homeland Security. But the Cabinet of this President has been extraordinary in their reasonableness when it comes to this subject.

I have seen the opposite. So I think I am in a position to see the difference. It is a big difference in this Obama administration in terms of the Cabinet. They want to say yes to disaster victims. They did not want to say no. That is very important. They cannot always say yes to everything, to rebuild every building, repave every street, elevate every home. But they are trying to say yes. Most importantly, the lawyers have been instructed to find a way forward, as opposed to instruction that came from the last administration which was to find a way to say no.

So let me give credit where credit is due, to the Obama administration and their willingness to be flexible, to be forward leaning, to have attorneys who are trying to be on the side of the taxpayer, on the side of the victims, and not shortchanging people in times of desperate need.

Having said that, the administration cannot do it all on its own. They need Congress, as the Constitution says, to provide the funding so the executive branch can do its job. The executive branch, by all accounts, even Republicans have come to the floor from States that have been hard hit and said: It is a more muscular FEMA, it is a more dynamic FEMA, it is a more flexible FEMA.

I wish to thank Senators LIEBERMAN and COLLINS. They are the authorizers. Yes, I have had a part of it—others have, but they have worked tirelessly after Katrina and the disaster that happened on the gulf coast, where we were all shamed when we saw what did not happen that should have.

We fixed a lot of it, and that is something to be happy and proud about. When government does set its mind to improve things, it can. But we cannot do anything without the funding. Right now, FEMA is empty. The pot of money is empty. Projects, millions, hundreds of millions of dollars today, not just in my State but in California, in Tennessee, in Iowa, in Texas, and in North Dakota—and I could go on and on—but for the Record let me say a couple.

In Tennessee, mitigation of private residences from the 2010 floods has been halted. For those who might not be familiar with the word ''mitigation,'' which most people are, it means one could be elevating their house, one could be putting shutters or storm windows on their windows. Let's see what else. A person could be potentially strengthening the frame of their house if they are trying to mitigate against high winds from a tornado. There are rules that allow people to try to improve their home so the next time it happens not only are they not homeless, but taxpayers are not paying again for the same sort of incident.

The Federal Government, under good policy, requires a certain portion of all disaster funding to be specific, to go to mitigation because taxpayers think, when we are trying to rebuild from a flood or a storm or a tornado or a bridge collapse, do not just build the same old thing, try to mitigate so it does not happen again. That is smart because then we are not double, triple spending taxpayer money.

But in Tennessee this family, let's say, is in the middle of elevating their home. Let's say they have gotten it off the ground by 2 feet, and the contractor showed up on Monday. They were sent home because this project has been stopped. So somewhere there are homes in Tennessee—I am not sure in what particular community—where private sector contractors, many small business owners and their employees, showed up to work and were told: Go home. FEMA is out of money.

We have to fix this this week before we leave and, if not, at the latest by next week.

In Iowa, repairs for an electric utility—I am not sure who provides utilities in Iowa. Potentially, it may be, as in my State in rural areas, the local rural co-op. Everybody knows what a rural co-op is. Their project has been shut down. Potentially, people are still receiving electricity. I do not think people are sitting in the dark. I am hoping not. But whatever they were planning to repair and fix in Iowa has been halted because we have run out of money.

In Texas, repairs to the University of Texas medical facility have been stopped. In Louisiana, roadway construction has been stopped. In fact, there was an article in our paper, the Times-Picayune, just this week that said $100 million for Jefferson Parish—$100 million—that is just 1 of my parishes, 1 of 64, the suburban parish that sits right beside Orleans that was very hard hit by these storms, not as hard as Orleans Parish but received billions of dollars of damage—those projects have been put on hold while we move that money to help the victims in the Northeast. That should not be the case.

We need to act quickly to refill the FEMA funds. In addition, I understand in North Dakota and in other places there are problems. It is not just the DRF. The Corps of Engineers in its budget last year did not have enough money for emergencies. I slipped out of the Chamber a few minutes ago to go actually meet with the mayor of Grand Isle, who was here, as he is quite often, advocating on behalf of the only barrier island that is inhabited in the State of Louisiana, and he brought up pictures. Again, they are too small to see, but I am going to have them blown up for tomorrow. But I have in my hand pictures of the levees that were just ripped up and destroyed again from Tropical Storm Lee. These were levees on the gulf that we just completed.

But because the Corps of Engineers, when they rebuild levees, in their authorizing legislation are prohibited—which makes no sense whatsoever, it is a complete waste of taxpayer money—they are prohibited from betterment. They can build back what was there, but they cannot build it better or higher, unless they are directed to do so.

I am about ready to direct them because I am tired, on behalf of my people and the people of this country and the taxpayers, from rebuilding levees 10 times in a matter of 5 years. It is a waste of money—it is aggravating to the people whose homes are behind these levees—because we do not even have a policy, when we are building levees, to be ordered to build them stronger, higher, except, of course, in the case of some levee systems in Katrina. That was specifically directed, and it is being done.

We are building around the city of New Orleans a much stronger, much better system. One would think that would be being done all over the country. It is not. Why? Because we are

short on funding, short on political will, and short on imagination and creativity when it comes to building infrastructure in this country. I, for one, am tired of it. So are the people I represent.

I am asking the other side of the aisle to step up and to provide funding, funding that is not offset in the middle of a disaster. We will figure out how to pay for these later—these disaster funds later. But as I think Senator LEAHY said so eloquently in our press conference today: Do the Republicans, some people in the Republican Party, actually believe we want fire departments all over the United States, when someone's house is on fire and they show up with the engines, to debate in the middle of the street how they are going to pay for the extra overtime to put out the fire? I do not think so.

Even if the fire department is broke, even if the funding has run out, we do not want to have a debate over how they are going to pay for overtime when the fire is burning. Put the fire out. Bring the people to safety. Put the families in shelter. Then go back to the city council meeting next week and they can debate for as long as they want how they are going to ultimately pay for it.

We paid for World War II, obviously. It was a long time ago. It is completely paid for. We paid for World War I. We are paying for Afghanistan. We are paying for Iraq, which, by the way, not one, single, solitary Republican—and not many Democrats, for that matter, but not one Republican whom I can recall stood and asked or debated for 5 seconds how we were going to pay for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

But when the people of Vermont stand in front of their bridges collapsed, their homes collapsed, their schools collapsed, and say: We need help, we have to have now a month-long debate on how we are going to pay for it. We have not done this since the 1800s.

We will eventually pay for it. America has to pay for everything. We will pay for it. We do not have to have that debate now. What we do have to have a debate about is how do we repair levees and what is the best way to mitigate it. What are the new technologies that can be used to make our communities stronger and smarter? How can we streamline the process? How can we eliminate the redtape? How can we get help to people faster? That is what we should be debating.

Instead, I have CANTOR and BOEHNER making us argue about what offsets there are. So I have to go to the State of Maryland and say: Senator, what can you give up this year in your State? I have to go to Michigan: What can you up in Michigan? I have to go to California: What can you give up in California, so we can pay for people who are underwater in Vermont and North Carolina?

What kind of government is this? I do not want to be a part of that and I am not going to be. So we have to fund these disasters now. The saddest thing about all this—it is sad and it is also puzzling and it is perplexing and it is aggravating is that we already sort of made this deal 1 month ago, when we negotiated that big agreement we all came to, about how the levels of funding would be for 2012.

Everybody remembers that, before we left for August, and we had this big knock-down, drag-out—in that agreement, our leadership, Republicans and Democrats, already agreed to do something that I think is very smart. I want to show what they agreed to. They agreed—because it is a puzzlement—how do we fund in advance disasters, how do we know how much to set aside. It is a problem because every year is different.

I wish to show what our problem is, so people listening can give me their own suggestions about how to solve it. In 2003, we set aside, in the whole budget of the United States—we can see this a little bit—$800 million for disasters. But we had $1.7 billion. So we were short $984 million. We funded it. That went on our books.

The next year we said: Well, this year we had $1.7 billion in disasters. So the next year we put $1.8 in our bill, thinking we would cover it because last year was $1.7. But, lo and behold, we had an additional $3 billion worth of disaster funding. We did not know these disasters were going to happen.

So the next year we increased the amount of money in our base budget. Then, lo and behold, in that year, we put in $2 billion dollars. Katrina hit.

The levees broke. Do you know what the bill came in for? It was $43 billion. We had budgeted $2 billion because in the history of the past that is all we needed to cover disasters. It went from $2 billion to $43 billion. Who would have had a crystal ball to know that? Did we sit and debate? Some people tried to, until I said there was no way I was going to have to find a $43 billion offset before we can let the people of the gulf coast know that help was on the way. We spent what was required to help the gulf coast.

You can see the next year here. These numbers are very erratic, unpredictable. So what our leadership did, looking back on these 10 years and listening to the debate and argument, was come up with a pretty good plan. They said, OK, we will throw out the high number, we will throw out the low number—in 2009 we didn't have any emergencies. Can you imagine 1 year that you have no declared emergencies, and the next year you have one in almost every State? That is how erratic this is. It is not as though we are not trying to plan. It is just impossible by the nature of what an emergency or disaster is. You can plan for them, but you cannot always predict how many you are going to have and where they will be. Of course, everybody understands that.

What our leaders did is they threw out the top one and the bottom one and came up with an average. That average is about $11 billion—a very reasonable approach. So they put in our agreement that we made 30 days ago—we said, OK, next year, this is what the Federal Government can spend and, in addition to that, you can go up to the average. You can spend an additional $11 billion, which is a very small amount of money compared to the whole Federal budget.

You would think we would not be having this debate. Why? The need is very evident, the history would dictate that we don't have debate over disasters, and the Republican and Democratic leadership has already provided a way, over and above our 2012 numbers, to pay for these disasters.

I ask this: Why are we having to fight for this? That is a very good question. I think it is because some people on the other side of the aisle think this is a good thing to fight about. They think they have to find a pay-for for everything we do even, as I have described, when you cannot predict. Even if you do plan responsibly, you never know, as in the cases of Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. But our leadership negotiated a way forward.

Yet we have people all over the country looking to the Republican leadership and listening to Representative CANTOR and to Speaker BOEHNER saying: I want to help you, ladies and gentlemen, but we have to find an offset.

I think people might say: Why didn't we hear that when they sent troops into Afghanistan or Iraq? Why didn't we hear that when they are rebuilding Iraq and Afghanistan? The same people are not yelling and screaming—or didn't do it when we went in there. I think we have a good point.

I am saying I am proud of the Senate for last night, with Democrats mostly—and, yes, about 8 Republicans—who voted to move this debate forward. I thank particularly Senator BLUNT from Missouri, who is an outspoken leader on the Appropriations Committee, for the need to act now, act quickly, to fund the DRF, the Corps of Engineers. Of course, Missouri has had terrible tornadoes and flooding. Not only did they have Joplin, but they had the great flood of the Mississippi River, which was the highest in 50 years. It was so high along our capital city when I visited our mayor a couple months ago—that is Baton Rouge, which is our largest city, since 100,000 people left New Orleans to literally live on higher ground, although it has broken their hearts and divided their families. They have moved to Baton Rouge, as we are rebuilding levees and our flood control is stronger in the southeastern part of our State. People spend time walking on levees and riding bikes on the levees. Of course, mechanical vehicles are not allowed. You cannot have cars, trucks, and four-wheelers because that would be destructive to our levees. Our levees are quite huge. They are almost like linear parks. For the first time in the history of anybody who can remember, the mayor had to declare that

everyone stay off the levees because the water was so high and seeping through. We literally thought maybe some of these great levee systems would breach. Happily, they did not. It was a frightening situation for millions and millions.

In some parts of Missouri, and other parts north of us, the levees did breach. Sometimes the levees will blow to protect other areas. It is frightening if your business is behind one of those levees, as North Dakota residents know all too well.

Nonetheless, we should not be debating this. I hope our bill will pass this week and get over to the House for a quick vote. If the House decides to send us a continuing resolution, please, I want the leadership to hear clearly what I am saying—and I will send them a message by letter in the next few minutes—please do not think you can nickel and dime recovery efforts, that you can fund it 6 weeks at a time, or 4 weeks at a time. Disaster recovery doesn't operate that way. Our mayors, Governors, the Republican Governor of New Jersey, the Republican Governor of Virginia, the mayor of Patterson, who was with us today, and mayors up along the east coast who are with their people every day—the mayor of Joplin, MO, who has to be able to know that he can plan a year out or 2 years out—having to rebuild an entire town is overwhelming even if you have the money and the plan. Can you imagine if you sort of have a plan, but you don't know if the Federal Government will provide you money? Do you know the frustrating council meetings and school board meetings that will be had, and they will say, well, the Republican party in Washington cannot figure out if we should get funding, but it is 6 weeks at a time?

I will not allow that to happen. I am going to draw the line in the sand right now. You may get around me on it, but it will take a huge effort to get around this desk on that subject—a huge effort. If I have to shut the Senate down—and I have done it before—I will do it again, because I can tell you, as much as my name is MARY LANDRIEU, you cannot rebuild communities with 6-week plans. It took us 2 years to put together the Road Home Program—2 years after we got the funding. The reason we could not put it together before was—even though Mississippi had their money because President Bush gave it to them right away but made the people of Louisiana wait—because Congress would not decide how much money to give us. No mayor, no Governor, no matter how great they are, no matter how smart they are, no matter how many engineers they have, no matter how many Rotary Clubs are helping, no matter what the chamber of commerce is doing, I am telling you that it cannot be done without a reliable source of funding, so the planners can say something like this: We lost eight schools in this flood. They bring the community together—and these are how these discussions go—and say we might not have money to build all eight, but we have money to build six. Which six do you want to build, and where, what materials do you want to use, and which kids should go to which schools?

I have been in these meetings. I am not going to allow the mayors and Governors to call their people together and say we lost six schools and we don't know when the money is coming to build them, and we cannot make any plans because the Republican leadership has decided that every 6 weeks they are going to let us know how much money we are going to get.

That is not going to happen.

I want Speaker BOEHNER to think about this, and I want MITCH MCCONNELL to think about this, and I want the Republican leadership to think about it. I will negotiate on the top number. I will talk about maybe FEMA doesn't need quite this much. I will talk about maybe the Corps of Engineers doesn't need that much. But I will not, under any circumstances, agree to a 6-week or 4-week continuing resolution. You may run the Government of the United States that way. We have, unfortunately, gotten used to it. That is a sad commentary, I might say, that we run the greatest government ever created in the eyes and vision and hearts of mankind, but we operate it on a 6-week basis. That might be the game we play with the government, but I am not going to allow that game to be played with people who have lost their homes, lost their businesses, and who look up from a storm and say, my gosh, what happened to me? Then they don't know what is going to happen because we cannot make a decision that lasts more than 6 months or a year. So the minimum will be 6 months. I hope we can find the will to do a whole year, because without that you are going to shut down recovery operations at a time when it is heartbreaking to think of small business owners who have lost their print shop or their dress store or their shoe store, and they see everybody talking about creating jobs. They used to have three of them last week—selling printing material or selling shoes or whatever—and they are trying to get their business back, and we cannot decide—even though we have the money, even though we already budgeted the money, and although we already made an agreement about how we would do this—we are going to still argue.

I will tell you, if this is on the tea party's agenda, I suggest they take it off. If it is somebody else's agenda, please speak up. I have not had one single Republican Senator come down and defend this position, because it is indefensible. I hope when the leadership is negotiating—and they are doing so now—they will hear me in summary very quickly: The FEMA pot is empty. The Corps of Engineers is always running on fumes. Levees are breaking and flooding, and it is occurring in places that haven't flooded in a hundred years. When we wake up and realize that we have to put more money in emergency funding and be there when our people are hurting, as they are now—and we will eventually pay for this; we don't have to figure that out in the next 30 days. We have to give them a green light and the billions of dollars they need to operate for a year. Everything else is negotiable. But this is not going to be negotiated. We are not going to rebuild pieces of 48 States 4 weeks at a time. That will not happen. Whatever amount of money we give, let it be for as long as we can make it, let it be as robust as it can possibly be, and let's give a green light to our Republican Governors, Republican mayors, Independents, and Democrats out there, who are shellshocked about the work before them.

The people in neighborhoods are still crying and in shock about what they have to do in making decisions. Should we come back? Should we not come back? What should our neighborhood or community do? Maybe we should all move to higher ground. These decisions are being made right now. The last thing they should worry about is Congress debating whether there is money there to turn that hose on.

Let's do our job the way we have done it for 150 years.

Let's continue to do it and let our people know we are there for them, as we try to be there for other people in the world who are caught in situations such as this. We most certainly need to be here for our people in America.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about a site of particular historic significance to the Commonwealth of Virginia and an action we in Virginia are requesting the President make. But before I get to that subject, I want to take a moment to echo what I know the Presiding Officer said, and my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and so many other of my colleagues who have come to the floor over the last few days to express concern and talk about the series of natural disasters and calamities our various States have experienced over the last few weeks and months.

We have had, in effect, the trifecta in the Commonwealth of Virginia in the last month, where, about a month ago, we had an earthquake hit—something that was a bit unprecedented in Virginia—which shut down schools in Louisa County. That earthquake also caused damage at the Washington Monument and at the National Cathedral, but in central Virginia—in Louisa

County, in Mineral, and Culpeper, and other places around Virginia—it caused enormous damage.

We had Hurricane Irene, which—again, through central Virginia and down into Hampton Roads—caused enormous damage. Then, most recently, we had Tropical Storm Lee, where I had the opportunity to visit a community not far from where I know some of the distinguished folks who work in the Clerk and Parliamentarian's Offices live—in Alexandria. Not too far away from there is a neighborhood named Huntington, VA. This community I walked through has been flooded out three times in the last decade. So we have a 100-year floodplain. Yet three times in the last decade they have been flooded out.

So all these folks—whether in Hampton Roads in Richmond or the folks in Louisa County and central Virginia with the earthquake or the folks in Huntington—are saying: We just need that assistance that other communities have when they have been met by natural disasters. What purpose do we have for government other than to make sure there is an emergency response, and then after that response that there is an ability to get people back on their feet?

So I thank my colleagues again, particularly the Senator from Louisiana, who has been tireless on this issue of making sure FEMA has the resources it needs to address these disasters, and that we do so in a meaningful way. We recognize, of course, we can't just put these on a credit card forever; that we have to have a rational way to pay it back and figuring out a 10-year rolling cycle to budget for emergencies ought to be part of our discussions going forward. But trying to say that must be done at this moment, with the economic downturn and the recession, while communities are in need—whether they are in Oregon or in Virginia or one of the other 48 States that have had a disaster declaration issued over the last year—is not the way we ought to be doing business.

FORT MONROE

Mr. President, in addition, I rise today to encourage President Obama to use his authority under an act that probably most in this Chamber are not that familiar with—called the 1906 Antiquities Act—to designate Hampton, VA, Fort Monroe, as a national monument, which would make it an official part of the National Park Service. Our hope is that the President will consider designating this in the coming days as this historic fort is turned back over to the State of Virginia, having gone through the BRAC process, with the Federal Government disposing of it.

Let me take a moment on the Senate floor this afternoon to tell you a bit about this special place. This fort was built in the early 1800s, but, actually, the fortifications go back much earlier than that. It is an area called Point Comfort. As early as 1608 Captain John Smith recognized the importance of building a fort at Point Comfort, as the English colonists called this land.

From its very beginnings, Fort Monroe has been associated with many key figures in American history. Robert E. Lee supervised work on the fortress as a young U.S. Army lieutenant. Edgar Allan Poe, the famous poet—and I am sure our pages, at one point, hopefully, had to memorize ''The Raven'' in high school—was a soldier at Fort Monroe. Abraham Lincoln, during the midst of the Civil War, paid a critical visit to Fort Monroe. And Harriet Tubman, an incredibly important American—who was only recently, in the last 50 or so years appropriately recognized—nursed wounded soldiers there in 1865.

Another historic American figure had maybe mixed feelings about his visits to Fort Monroe. Jefferson Davis was at Fort Monroe on two very different occasions: First, as the U.S. Secretary of War, and later, as the former President of the Confederacy, he was imprisoned at Fort Monroe for 2 years.

By World War II, Fort Monroe was the headquarters of our military's successful efforts to protect the mid-Atlantic coast. After World War II and to the current day it has been home of the Army Command responsible for training our warfighters.

For all of these various events alone, I would argue, as a Virginian, that would warrant the designation of Fort Monroe as part of the National Park Service. But its true historic significance goes back, actually, to a night in May of 1861.

During the Civil War, Fort Monroe had an important strategic role as one of the very few Union military installations located in the South that was never occupied by Confederate forces. For the folks who have traveled down to Norfolk and Virginia Beach, they know that Fort Monroe is the point that sticks out right before they go through the bridge-tunnel that takes them over to Norfolk and Virginia Beach. It has a commanding view of the whole gateway into what we call Hampton Roads.

On May 23, 1861, three slaves—Frank Baker, Shepard Mallory, and James Townsend—got into a small boat in Hampton, crossed the James River, and presented themselves at the front gate of Fort Monroe seeking safety and sanctuary. For the previous many weeks, Baker, Mallory, and Townsend had been forced by their owners to help construct a Confederate artillery post aimed directly at Fort Monroe. Obviously, that was not something these individuals wanted to be part of.

I want you to think a moment about the choices that were being made by these three men—these three slaves—Frank Baker, Shepard Mallory, and James Townsend. They left behind the community where they had spent most, if not all, of their lives. At least two of the three left behind wives and children. It was entirely possible that once these three men reached Fort Monroe, the Union soldiers would simply turn them around and send them back to their owners.

One of the things I think even students of American history sometimes forget is that it was the official U.S. Government policy, even in the so-called Confederate States, after the Civil War had begun in April of 1861, to still turn slaves back over to their owners.

Baker, Mallory, and Townsend had to know if they were returned as runaways, they could expect the most Draconian of punishments. But they figured the choice should be theirs to make, so they made it. They soon found themselves standing before the new commander of Fort Monroe, MG Benjamin Franklin Butler.

Deciding it might be easier to apologize later rather than seek permission beforehand, General Butler made a huge and historically courageous decision. He classified the three slaves as ''contraband of war,'' a policy that was later adopted across the Union to protect any slaves who managed to reach Union lines. As a result, Virginia's Fort Monroe ultimately became a beacon of hope for thousands of enslaved people seeking freedom. In fact, Fort Monroe became known as the Freedom Fort.

The day after General Butler's edict, eight more slaves showed up at Fort Monroe. The day after that, 47 more appeared. By the war's end, thousands—literally thousands—had appealed for contraband status at Fort Monroe. General Butler's declaration of this decision of ''contraband of war'' helped change the course of the Civil War and our Nation's history.

This Thursday, September 15, the U.S. Army will officially hand over Fort Monroe to the city of Hampton and the Commonwealth of Virginia as part of the 2005 BRAC process. I proudly join with my colleague Senator WEBB, the bipartisan Virginia House delegation, Virginia's Governor Bob McDonnell, local residents, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in urging the President to take this opportunity to declare Fort Monroe a national historic treasure. By using the Antiquities Act to grant this designation, it also will allow us to begin the work to create a national park at Fort Monroe.

For more than 100 years, Presidents have used the Antiquities Act to protect some of America's most important and beloved historic places. As a matter of fact, it was use of the Antiquities Act that first designated the Grand Canyon as well as the Statue of Liberty. So there is obviously enormous historical precedent. And there is no dispute over the historical significance of Fort Monroe.

Over the last few years, I have spent a considerable amount of time, both as Governor and then subsequently during the BRAC process and now as a Senator, working with State and local residents and officials to explore the

opportunities to partner with the National Park Service to preserve this incredible piece of American history. I spoke as recently as last Friday with the White House about Fort Monroe. I am hopeful we will have promising news in short order.

It would certainly be timely if the President's decision could be announced this week, as the Army prepares to exit Fort Monroe, as our Nation marks the 150th anniversary of the Civil War, and as many Virginians focus anew on the future of this very special place.

I feel this is an especially appropriate time for the President to recognize the crucial role Fort Monroe has played in our Nation's history, and I again urge him to use his long-established power under the Antiquities Act to keep this process on track.

Mr. President, 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.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

TRADE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Last week, new trade figures were released. I know the Presiding Officer from North Carolina is very concerned about what has happened with these trade figures and what it means for jobs in her State and in my State.

The trade deficit with China widened from $26.7 billion in June to $27 billion in July. That is one country in one month. Granted, it is the country we have the biggest trade deficit with, but it is 1 month. President Bush, Sr., some years ago, said that a $1 billion trade surplus or trade deficit translated into some 13,000 jobs. Whether that number is precise or quantifiable or measurable is not the point. The point is that when we have persistently large trade deficits month after month, year after year, now decade after decade, we know what it means to the industrial base in our country.

I spent much of August in places such as Belmont County, St. Clairsville, Cleveland, Dayton, Mansfield, and Springfield, OH, where, in my State alone, these cities and communities had proud industrial heritages. They are places where people had real opportunity to join the middle class. After they graduated from high school, they could go and be trained and work in manufacturing and usually buy a home, a car, and send their child to college. My wife is the daughter of a utility worker, since deceased, in northeast Ohio, and she and her two younger sisters and brother were able to go to, in her case, Kent State, and other universities, in part paid for by her father's work in manufacturing—if you will, his union card—and assistance from government Pell grants and all they were able to do so the kids didn't graduate with huge debt the way they too often do now.

The trade deficit with China through July 2011 totaled $160 billion, up from $145 billion over the same period in 2010. We debate the budget deficit, as we should. But too many politicians in this city, too many editorial writers, too many pundits and economists ignore the trade deficit. They are too focused on things such as pay-fors. They ignore how the trade deficit has a dangerous effect on American jobs.

The best way to get our fiscal house in order is to get America working again, and one way to do that is by cracking down on unfair trade practices of some of our so-called trading partners. When the President steps up and enforces trade rules—and while I do not agree with the President sending the Korea, Panama, and Colombia trade agreements to the Congress for votes because I don't think they serve America's interests, I do believe this President, more than his predecessors, has been, relatively—I say ''relatively'' but blessedly so, and in some cases aggressive at enforcing trade rules. I have seen that in Youngstown in creating jobs. I have seen it in Loraine, where it has created jobs, and in Fenway, where it has created jobs, and it has helped our industry in Butler County in steel, in paper, and in tires.

It is clear that part of this problem is currency manipulation from the Chinese, which undermines American manufacturing and our very own job-creating efforts. In June, the Economic Policy Institute released a new report showing that addressing Chinese currency manipulation could support the creation of 2.25 million jobs. Put that in contrast to what they say—the ''free traders at any cost'' sort of free market, free-trade fundamentalists who preach: Pass NAFTA. It will mean hundreds of thousands of jobs. Pass CAFTA. Pass PNTR with China. It will mean millions of jobs.

It never does. It means job growth, but the job growth usually takes place—with NAFTA, it was in Mexico; CAFTA, in Central America; and PNTR, in China, which is East Asia. There is job growth, but there is nothing close to net job growth in our country. Even that, the President is saying, with this new agreement with South Korea, that it will sustain or keep or contribute to sustaining or keeping 100,000 jobs or so. So even the promises aren't that great on this new trade agreement, and we know they never live up to their promises. But we do also know if we stood up to currency manipulation, it could create 2.25 million American jobs. My friends on the other side of the aisle don't ever want to do any kind of direct spending on infrastructure in terms of job creation; that costs tax money. I think it is a good investment; they don't. But standing up on currency we know doesn't cost American taxpayers and it will, in fact, mean American jobs.

A paper mill in Butler County, down near Dayton and Cincinnati, someone who worked at that paper mill told me they are now competing with China for coated paper, which is a higher tech manufacturing of paper—the kind of magazine paper we all touch and use—that the pulp comes from Brazil, it is shipped to China, it is milled in China and shipped back to the United States and they undercut American prices. Yet only 10 percent of the cost of paper production is labor. What does that mean? It means they are gaming the currency system. They are subsidizing water and capital and land and they are paying low wages. How do we compete when they are not playing fair? Forget the low wages even for a minute. How do we compete when they are playing these currency games? By continuing the currency manipulation, we lose far too many jobs. By combating it, we help level the playing field for our manufacturers, we help our workers, we help spur our economic recovery.

That is why I introduced the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act. It would strengthen countervailing duty laws to consider undervalued currency as an unfair subsidy in determining duty rates.

So when we contest on a trade agreement, all we are saying when we contest is that undervalued currency is considered an unfair subsidy, because it is. It is not hard to convince people of that. It is not hard to illustrate or prove that. So when an industry such as the coated paper company in Hamilton or the oil country tubular steel used in drilling in Lorain or in Youngstown, where there is a new steel mill because of a trade decision the President made—thank you—or aluminum in Sidney—when an industry petitions the International Trade Commission for relief against unfair subsidies, currency manipulation under this new bill and amendment we are going to offer on the floor will be part of that investigation.

This is a designation that would ensure the government has the tools to respond on behalf of American manufacturers and workers by imposing countervailing duties on subsidized exports from China.

We have broad support here. Senator SCHUMER from New York, a Democrat, has been very involved. Senator SNOWE from Maine, a Republican, has been very involved. Senator STABENOW, a Democrat from Michigan, and Senator GRAHAM from South Carolina, a Republican, have been very involved in understanding that these kinds of currency manipulations cost us American jobs and undermine our economy. This designation would ensure the government has the tools to respond on behalf

of American manufacturers and workers by imposing these countervailing duties on subsidized exports from China. It is simple, straightforward, and achievable.

Addressing currency manipulation would decrease our budget deficit up to $70 billion a year and somewhere between $500 billion and $800 billion over 10 years if sustained. Addressing our trade deficit should be part of the debate in reducing our budget deficit. If we are going to create jobs, we have to ensure that our trading partners don't stack the deck. We want trade, and we want more of it, but we want fair trade, not this kind of phony free trade.

Almost every country in the world practices trade according to their national interests. The United States in this body and the President of the United States—typically, Presidents in both parties—have practiced trade according to some economics textbook that is 20 years out of date. If we are serious about standing for American workers and companies that continue to play by the rules, we need to pass this legislation.

With each passing week, more companies and workers are faced with the harsh realities of unfair competition and unwanted cutbacks due to Chinese currency manipulation. In towns and cities across our country—go anywhere in this country, including Texas, where Senator HUTCHISON is from and who is awaiting a chance to speak on the floor, or North Carolina, the Presiding Officer's State, or my State, and we see that companies and workers are faced with the harsh realities of that unfair competition.

Workers have the proud tradition of making products that matter to America. From the tanks made in Lima, OH, supporting our troops abroad, to steel tubes created in Lorain, equipping our energy markets, Ohio manufacturers are vital to our Nation's security and economy. Our national security, our economic security, our family security, all those are dependent on making things in the United States of America.

My State is the third largest manufacturing State in the country. We are seventh in population, but we are third in manufacturing. We have lost far too many jobs in Zanesville and Jackson and Columbus and Akron because of this undermining of currency, because of this gaming of the system by China, its gaming of the system on currency.

It is time to take bold action. It is time to stand up to China. It is time to practice trade according to our communities and our national interests. It is time to do that. It is time to pass this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

NASA'S VISION

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I wish to mark today, September 14 of 2011, as the day that NASA announced our vision for the future. Since the shuttle was retired earlier this year and we saw the last people go into space on an American flight, many of us have worried that there wasn't going to be another heavy launch vehicle that would take our astronauts to beyond low earth orbit. Today, after much study and a lot of going back and forth with NASA, I was encouraged to see the design approved by both NASA and the OMB, and I think it is going—well, it will be the heaviest, biggest, strongest, most robust vehicle we have seen since we put men on the Moon.

I was very concerned because of the long timeframe. Congress asked that this design be delivered by January of this year. We kept getting delays and delays and delays. Finally, Senator BILL NELSON and I just got frustrated about that timeline, so we had meetings.

As recently as yesterday, I met with the director of OMB, Mr. Jack Lew, who did come to my office to meet with Senator NELSON and myself and General Bolden, who is the NASA Administrator, to get his commitment that we would be on a robust timeline and that it would be as much a priority of NASA to go beyond low earth orbit as the ferry to the space station would be for NASA. We got those assurances from Mr. Lew and the NASA Administrator. Senator NELSON and myself, Senator ROCKEFELLER was represented, Senator BOOZMAN—we had all the relevant people in the loop on this issue because we want to make sure Congress and the administration are on the same goal with a timeline to achieve that goal.

What worried us about the delays were the loss of cost efficiencies and the loss of experienced personnel to design that new heavy launch vehicle.

We want to have the most experienced engineers who will use the proven technology that has been time tested and add to that proven technology the added boosters, the added capabilities that we know we must have to go to Mars, to an asteroid, and to make sure we do it in a safe manner.

I am very encouraged by the commitments that were made and the timetables we are seeing. I am told by the NASA personnel that we are now going to look, in 1 week or 2, to have the contract modifications in place that will tell the workers that they are going to have those jobs, that we are going to have that expedience, that they have a project to work on. I think it is essential we have that kind of experienced personnel to do this.

I am very pleased we now have this way forward. It is the most powerful vehicle we will have seen in many years. I think the announcement today is going to set us on a path. If we can see those contract modifications going out from NASA in the next week—or a little more, but no more than 2 weeks from now—then we will know there is progress and that we are going toward the time when we will have the building of that rocket, that we will have the design, followed by the building, and then, of course, testing, and then the launch.

I think when we saw that last flight come down this summer, so many people had very mixed feelings because space exploration has been a part of America's drive and spirit for all these years we have watched more and more things be accomplished. From President Kennedy's first challenge that we would put men on the Moon, Americans have been excited about that opportunity. They have not just been excited, though, about the exploration and the pushing of the envelope, they have also been excited with the quality of life that has been produced by what came from the research: the advancements we have had in medical treatment, MRIs, the advancements in products we have been able to discover.

I fully expect that with the space station we are going to be able to do the research on cancers that will grow in the microgravity conditions in space that will not grow the same way on Earth, and that maybe we will be able to test antidotes and medicines for those. That is why I was pleased the President did announce we would extend the space station until 2020. We have international partners as well. So we want to make sure we are a good partner, that we are a reliable partner, and that we do some things for mankind that might make a difference in our lives.

National security. We have gained so much in satellite-guided missiles for our national security. And being able to put a missile into a window from 1 mile out is because we have been able to discover in space the use of satellites. Earlier this summer the space shuttle carried the magnetic spectrometer that Dr. Ting, the Nobel laureate from MIT, built and insisted on putting on the space station, it will help us understand the nature of dark energy and its relationship to the origins and function of the universe.

We are looking at how matter was formed. We are looking at the cosmic rays. I went to the Johnson Space Center in Houston and saw from the space station the magnetic spectrometer that was getting the hits from cosmic rays. There were 60 scientists in the room who were tracking these hits, trying to determine what was happening when those cosmic rays hit the magnetic spectrometer because they want to see if we can understand the nature of dark energy. There are things we have not even thought of that we hope to find by using the space station, and then going to an asteroid or going to the Moon.

We have taken a first step today. I think many people in America were waiting for the blueprint for the future. Now I think we have one. As long as we stay on a regular timetable and with the funding levels that have been approved already in the authorization bill passed by Congress and signed by the President—if we can stick with those, this has the potential to bring us energy, health, possibly curing breast

cancer, things that will make a difference in the lives not only of Americans but of our fellow citizens all over the world. That is what the investment can be in NASA if we go forward as we have made this blueprint to do.

We are in a time where we must be more efficient. We must fund the priorities and not fund the lesser priorities.

In today's markup of our committee, our Appropriations subcommittee that does fund NASA, we have found the priorities. We also cut programs. Senator MIKULSKI said in her whole time in the Senate she has never been an appropriator who actually cut programs. But we did today. We cut programs that were lesser priorities in different areas of our jurisdiction. But we funded NASA so we would have this heavy launch vehicle. We would fund the commercial vehicle that is going to take our astronauts to the space station. That is going to be done in the private sector. That was the balance we did in our authorization bill last year. Then we fund the Webb Space Telescope because that is part of the scientific advances we must make if we are going to know what is out there in space that we might be able to utilize or utilize the knowledge for better life on Earth.

I am very pleased we have the Appropriations Committee that will, hopefully, approve the bill tomorrow and that we have made those tough decisions. We came in under the 2011 continuing resolution on our overall bill. We came in under the President's request. But we have fully funded the priorities which have the possibility to reap the benefits from exploration and assure that America remains the No. 1 country in the world in space exploration. Our economy has benefitted, our national security has benefitted, and now we are going to be looking at health care possibilities, energy possibilities, and living in space, and seeing how we can do that in a better way.

I think we have a plan that will excite the American people again about what we can do in space if we put our minds to it, if we prioritize, if we are efficient with the taxpayer dollars, and we do not lose sight of the vision that is the spirit of America.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

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

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

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I would like to spend a few minutes discussing some things in general.

In making a couple points today, I was referred to by one of our colleagues as a dictator. I am not offended at that; I understand the frustration of what is going on. But I think there are some significant points that the American people ought to hear about where we are and what we are doing.

Quite frankly, if we look at our financial situation and we look at the history of the world, no country has ever recovered from the situation in which we find ourselves in terms of our debt-to-GDP ratio and our debt-to-export ratio.

In August, before we left, we passed a piece of legislation that goes—a small amount—toward fixing the very real problems that are in front of our country in terms of spending money we don't have on things we don't absolutely need. But we have before us, and coming before us, two different pieces of legislation: One is a shell piece of legislation, and the assumption is the majority leader will utilize it to fund supplementation for disaster relief for the many areas in our country that need that funding. There is not a dispute that we should be doing that. There is a dispute about how much that should be. But the greatest dispute is, when we are running $1.3 trillion and $1.4 trillion deficits, and we know we have significant waste, duplication, and fraud in the Federal Government, whether we ought to spend another $6 billion or $7 billion by borrowing or we ought to actually reduce spending somewhere else to pay for a much more important and proper need in which the Federal Government has a role. That is the real debate.

I think we have worked a way to have appropriate amendments to try to pay for that, and we should probably go forward. There are, however, two other programs that are precarious in their funding: One is FAA—and we have coming to us the 22nd temporary reauthorization—and the Transportation bill, which is, I believe, its sixth temporary reauthorization.

Now, there are some real questions the American people ought to be asking about why 22 times we have temporarily reauthorized the FAA for a short period of time, and why now we are on our sixth temporary—or fifth; I may be wrong on one of those numbers but close—temporary reauthorization. That is because we are not prioritizing what is important for the country in terms of our legislative agenda. We don't control that, but there are some things that the American people are interested in that we do control.

The highway trust fund has received a supplementation over the last 4 years of $35 billion from the American taxpayer outside of the taxes they collect for that trust fund. Out of that amount of money billions of dollars have been spent on things other than highways and bridges.

We now have 146,000 deficient bridges in our country, some in every State in the country. We have more now after the floods in the Northeast. We have significant problems and we have a limited amount of money, and what is in front of us is another short-term extension of 6 months for the transportation funding which continues to spend money on items that are a low priority.

I am not saying we couldn't spend the money on it. But when we are short of money, and we are borrowing money to put money into the trust fund, and our No. 1 priority ought to be safety and quality roads and bridges, to spend significant funds on things that are not a priority now—not when we are head over heels in debt, not when the trust fund is precarious—then we ought to not force States to spend money they don't want to spend. Yet in this bill 10 percent of the surface transportation moneys have to be spent on enhancement.

So that tells Oklahoma, or any other State: If you have an excess number of bridges, it doesn't matter that that is a safety problem for your citizens; we are still going to make you spend this 10 percent money over here that doesn't have anything to do with safety or true transportation, but we are going to require it because we can—except, the problem is, the people in your State pay the taxes in the first place for their highways and their bridges, not for the museums, not for all the hundreds of other things that are spent that are low priority.

So I thought I might give us a little flavor of what some of those things are. If we were at a different time where we had an excess of funds, I am not saying they are necessarily bad. But when we have bridges falling down in this country, and concrete—like the summer before last in Oklahoma—falling out of an interstate highway bridge injuring somebody, falling onto their car as they drove under it, I would think that we would want to repair these 146,000 bridges rather than spend money redecorating a sign.

So I will not go through all of them—I will put all of them into the RECORD—but let me go through a few of them just to see. If the American people actually believe we should not fix bridges or roads and we ought to spend money, I am fine. If the Senate believes we ought to not fix bridges, we ought not concentrate on safety, we ought not concentrate on the quality of our roads and bridges and they vote it down, I am fine too. But the fact is, we ought not to be spending money when we have the hundreds of thousands of bridges that are dangerous to people in this country.

All we are saying is, if a State wants to continue to spend money on something other than safety and bridges and roads, fine, it can, but don't make those of us who already have a big problem with safety have to spend money on something that doesn't protect our citizens, doesn't enhance their highways by spending money on something that is called an enhancement but doesn't enhance their safety or their ability to commute.

So what are some of them? Lincoln Highway 200-Mile Roadside Museum in

Pennsylvania—it received $300,000 in enhancement funding to commemorate the historic highway along the 200-mile route. Interpretive signage, colorful, repainted vintage gas pumps, engaging murals, refurbishing a large coffee pot.

Notably, Pennsylvania ranks No. 1 in the country in terms of bridge deficiency levels. Forty-six percent of the bridges in Pennsylvania are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. Mr. President, $300,000 would have fixed two of them. So we chose to not fix two but spend the money elsewhere. At a different time, sure, or if Pennsylvania wants to spend it, let them. But don't force them to spend money on something that does not protect the quality of transportation for their citizens.

How about Chinatown Gateway, a $250,000 enhancement to supplement the construction of the Twin Dragons Gateway to the Chinatown area? California has over 7,000 bridges that are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. One out of every three bridges in California is in trouble, and we are doing aesthetics instead of fixing bridges.

How about the White Squirrel Sanctuary in Tennessee? Kenton, TN, located in Gibson County, calls itself ''the Home of the White Squirrel.'' They received $110,000 in transportation enhancement funding to construct a white squirrel sanctuary with walking trails, brick crosswalks, a footbridge, and a parking lot. There are 3,856 bridges that are structurally deficient in the State of Tennessee. They didn't necessarily want to do this. They did not have any choice. They had to spend 10 percent of their surface transportation money on things such as this.

Tuscumbia Landing in Sheffield, AL—$104,000 to investigate Tuscumbia Landing's archaeological features. The only problem is, 23 percent of Alabama's bridges are structurally deficient. That could have fixed two of them.

How about the National Corvette Museum Simulator Theater in Warren County, KY—$200,000 to build a grand simulator theater. Mr. President, 31 percent of the bridges they cross in Kentucky are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

The Pennsylvania Trolley Museum—$400,000 to construct the Pennsylvania Trolley Museum. It is a great idea if we are in the black and have a good cashflow. But when Pennsylvania leads the Nation in deficient bridges and dangerous bridges, why would we spend that money? Why would we force them to spend that money?

I can go on. I will add to the record many other examples, all the way up to 40 separate examples of where we are spending money but we are not fixing bridges.

I ask unanimous consent that those examples be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COBURN. We are not pouring asphalt, we are not laying concrete, we are not decreasing congestion, and we are not increasing safety. What we are doing is we are following the rules of Washington when we have greater needs. We are in trouble as a nation because Congress does not set priorities, and when they do set priorities, there is no connection to the reality of our financial situation.

We have some options on how to go forward. One of the options would be to take the FAA bill, split it out, approve it, send it back to the House, and FAA is taken care of. The second option would be to pass the highway extension for 6 months with the elimination of enhancements and send it back to the House. But I will not give a unanimous consent, as is my right as a Senator of the United States, for us to continue to spend billions of dollars on things that are not a priority when the country is struggling to survive. Its very survival depends on us changing the way we do business. If that means the highway transportation bill does not get approved, so be it. But there has to be a point in time in this country when we change direction and we start meeting the obligations that are put before us.

The No. 1 obligation is to start spending money where it does the most good and quit spending money we do not have on things we do not absolutely need. With a 35-percent deficit—and we are going to run another $1.3 trillion deficit next year, which will cost a significant amount of funds for our kids and our grandkids just to repay what we are going to waste next year—there ought to be a time at which we say enough is enough.

I know there will be several, including my own senior Senator, who will be unhappy with my position, but I believe it is time to draw a line in the sand for the American people, for our future. It is not popular. It is certainly not expedient. But it is absolutely the right thing to do.

If the Senate wants to solve the problem of these two bills, we can split them or we can keep them together, but we need to end the enhancements right now until we get the highway trust fund healthy again, No. 1, and, No. 2, until we get our country healthy again. When we do, I will be happy to defer.

Remember, we are not saying you cannot do it. We are just saying you ought to have the option to not do it.

EXHIBIT 1

Kalanianaole Highway, Ka'lwi Scenic Shoreline Trail—Federal Transportation enhancement funds were used to intervene in a local land use dispute in Hawaii. A decades long dispute over the preservation of Hawaiian shoreline versus local developmental interests was assisted by the Department of Transportation, which used $11 million in enhancement funds to acquire land for conservation purposes, effectively meddling in the local land use. In the mean time, 45 percent of Hawaii's bridges are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Antique bike collections—The University of California Davis received a transportation enhancement grant of $440,000 to purchase 60 unique antique bikes for its Bicycle Museum Collection.

Shrine to Tennessee state history costs federal government $23 million— Nashville, Tennessee received $23 million in federal enhancement funding to construct its bicentennial ode to Tennessee state history. The project included the building of ''a 1,400-foot Wall of History etched with historic events from the state's first two centuries, 31 fountains that each represent one of the state's rivers, and a 200-foot granite state map.'' The only thing more egregious than federal funds used for a clearly state interest, is that 20 percent of Tennessee Bridges are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

ARTwalk—ARTwalk is tagged as a unique outdoor experience that constructs pathways between shopping areas, galleries, and museums in Rochester, Vermont. The project used $234,000 in federal enhancement dollars to build the artsy outdoor museum, while 861 of Vermont's bridges remain either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Old Roman Bath House Renovation—$160,000 worth of enhancement funding was used in Berkeley, West Virginia for the renovation of the oldest building in town, an Old Roman Bath House. While local residents may be interested in visiting a bath house where George Washington used to frequent, federal taxpayers may find the connection to critical infrastructure more puzzling. Moreover, 36 percent of West Virginia's bridges remain structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Saddletree Factory Renovation—The Ben Schroeder Saddle Tree Factory, a historical factory in Madison, Indiana, received transportation enhancement funding for historical preservation purposes because the factory used to make Saddletrees, the foundation of a saddle. 21.5 percent of Indiana's bridges are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Toledo Harbor Lighthouse—The Toledo Harbor Lighthouse in Toledo, Ohio, protected by the ''phantom'' officer Frank, will receive a $500,000 enhancement grant to restore windows, doors, bricks, and shutters. This grant will not only help to restore the facade of the historical lighthouse, but also carry on the legendary ghosts of the haunted lighthouse. Unfortunately, ''phantom'' officer Frank will not be able to protect Ohio drivers from the 6,598 bridges that are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Critter Crossing—The Monkton, Vermont Conservation Commission received $150,000 in federal grant money to build a—critter crossing, to save the lives of thousands of migrating salamanders and other amphibians that would otherwise be slaughtered by vehicle traffic on a major roadway. Thousands of blue- and yellow-spotted salamanders, frogs, and other amphibians spend the winter months in the rocky uplands near Monkton, but must return to low-lying wetlands in order to reproduce. To travel between these two areas, the salamanders must cross the heavily-traveled Monkton-Vergennes Road. While some conservationists have celebrated the project, others remain skeptical. ''I certainly respect all species. However, I don't see the need to pay $150,000 for a salamander crossing'', read one email reportedly sent to the Burlington [Vermont] Free Press newspaper. ''I realize there are a lot of other stupid things my tax dollars go toward, but this one is near the top of the list.'' Maybe the local communities will prevent the critters from crossing one of the 861 bridges that are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

North Carolina Transportation Museum Spencer, North Carolina—The North Carolina Transportation Museum has received over 11 million to renovate and showcase steam locomotive artifacts. As of 2010, North Carolina has nearly 5000 bridges that are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Massachusetts bike and pedestrian allotted millions, but remain unspent—Massachusetts has received $135 million in federal funds for bike and pedestrian projects since 1991, of which it has spent little more than $51 million, according to The Boston Globe. That means nearly two-thirds of the funds provided in the last two decades by Congress to the state for such projects remain unspent. Perhaps Massachusetts would like to use their unspent funds to work on their 2,548 bridges that are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Nevada spending millions of federal transportation dollars to make Vegas highways beautiful—In 2008, Nevada received its transportation enhancement allotment of $6,287,466. They decided to spend it in a variety of ways, a few million went to biking facilities and trails, a few million went to welcome centers and interpretive centers. $498,750 even went for ''decorative rocks, native plants, some pavement graphics, a few walls, and some great big granite boulders'' to beautify an interchange to Las Vegas' 215 Beltway.

A couple miles down the highway, N–DOT beautified another interchange with ''striping in the rocks and some native plants.'' That project has cost $319,163 so far this year.

The people of Nevada might have been able to think of some better things to spend that money on. One local who uses the interchange frequently was not impressed by the expensive beautification project. ''I'm busy watching where I'm going. I'm not looking at landscape improvements and stamped concrete.''

Unfortunately, there is little that local officials can do to re-direct the money to better uses. ''We applied for the federal enhancement dollars and those federal enhancement dollars can only be used for landscaping and pedestrian type improvements,'' explains the top civil engineer at the Clark County Public Works Traffic Management Division.

The N–DOT deputy director for southern Nevada is just as frustrated as many citizens that federal restrictions prohibit states from directing money where it is really needed. ''It's really getting out of hand to where these pots of money have these constraints associated with them and you can't spend money where you want to.'' These restrictions sometimes leave states no choice but to spend money on frivolous projects or lose it entirely. The deputy director notes, ''if N–DOT doesn't spend that money and employ workers in Nevada, another state is gonna have that money up for grabs.''

Washington, DC receives Transportation Enhancement grants for murals and valet bikes—Washington, DC received nearly $2 million in transportation enhancement grants in Fiscal Year 2010, ranging from $50,000 to $579,000. These grants include items such as the stabilization of historic murals and a grant for bicycle parking and valet services, along with the creation of a ''Room to Breathe'' poster. The $2 million allotment would be much better used for bridge repair, as 158 of the 244 bridges in the District are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Railroad Caboose Relocation and Renovation—The Princeton Railroad Museum received a $78,280 transportation enhancement grant to help pay for the relocation of a historic train caboose to be displayed and restored.

Texas Highway Rest Stops—The Texas Department of Transportation uses a substantial amount of their required transportation enhancement spending to build highway rest areas. Texas plans to spend $262 million to build or overhaul roadside stops along its highways, with a majority of the funds coming from enhancement grants. However, some residents question the construction of rest stops in such close proximity to other commercial areas, leading one local resident to surmise about the $10 million Salado rest area, ''I think $10 million would have made a nice third lane in a lot of spots . . . It's pretty spectacular for a rest area, for, I guess, $2 million worth . . . $10 million? That's a lot of money.'' Additionally, the Texas Department of Transportation spent $16.2 million in enhancement funding on a Battleship Texas restoration project.

California Sculpture Competition—Federal transportation enhancement dollars were used as prize money for an art competition to find a sculpture fitting to place in a parking lot for a Laguna Beach, California Friday Film Series event.

Merchant and Drovers Tavern Museum—The Merchants and Drovers Tavern Museum in Union County, New Jersey received a $210,790 transportation enhancement grant to create a museum on the second floor of the recently renovated building. The Merchants and Drovers Tavern Museum touts its amenities by letting visitors ''experience the hospitality of the 1820s'' and ''quench his thirst in the taproom, sit for a while in the parlor or, perhaps, try a bed for size at this 'hands-on' museum.'' Meanwhile, visitors should also be wary of driving over any New Jersey bridges on the way to the museum, as 35 percent of them are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Museum uses transportation funds for its Heating and Air Conditioning system—The Sayre Historical Society Museum in Bradford County, Pennsylvania received a transportation enhancement grant of $74,704 for the ''Sayre Historical Society RR Museum Heating and AC project.'' You read that correctly, American gas taxes are being directed towards heating and air installation.

War of 1812, Bladensburg, Maryland excavation—Enhancement funding was used to excavate several historical buildings in Bladensburg, Maryland to study the ''transportation history'' of the area. Bladensburg was used for troop movements during the War of 1812, as well as being a transportation hub during early America.

Funding for a Transportation Exhibit—$300,000 in federal money will pay for a new exhibit on the history of transportation at a local museum in Missouri. The fresh display at the St. Charles County Heritage museum will explain the influence of rivers, railroads, roads, and trails in the region over the years. The grant application highlights how ''The County and its residents have had to rely on multiple forms of transportation and as technology changed, the area had to adapt to the changing transportation methods/patterns.''

Not everyone in the community agrees the federal government should fund this type of project. A county executive said, ''It's the kind of thing the federal government can't afford to do.'' Other officials however have a different perspective on the federal funding. The county parks director explained how ''the $300,000 grant is 'a pretty insignificant amount of money compared to that total pool' of federal transportation spending.'' Maybe a more significant number should be 7,021, the number of Missouri bridges that are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Iowa town receives new entrance sign—Fairfield, Iowa used $40,800 in transportation enhancement funds to upgrade its ''Welcome to Fairfield'' sign. It is likely that Iowans would welcome their transportation funds upgrading their bridges, as Iowa ranks 3rd in bridge deficiency rates in America.

Michigan Receives Transportation funds to plant flowers and rehabilitate an engine house—In 2010, the Michigan awarded $5 million in federal transportation enhancement grants to various projects including reconstructing cobblestone roads, purchasing and installing bicycle racks, and ''streetscaping'' a downtown street in Bridgetown, Michigan with ''decorative sidewalk treatments, street trees, perennial flowers and other decorative plantings, planters, and ornamental street lighting.'' One grant awarded $336,490 to rehabilitate the historic Quincy and Torch Lake Railroad Engine House while another grant awarded $1,490,280 to the Detroit Science Center to construct an exhibit depicting ''how roads, tunnels and bridges are constructed.''

Transportation Funding used to replace unaesthetic fencing around Oklahoma Capitol Oil Derricks—The Oklahoma Department of Central Services, the controller of Capitol Grounds, received $216,000 in transportation enhancement funding to replace fencing around active oil wells on Lincoln Boulevard with a more aesthetically pleasing form of fencing. Unfortunately while Capitol Complex may look better, Oklahoma bridge deficiency rates remain 2nd in the United States.

Over $150,000 in Gasoline Taxes directed towards making brochures—Over the last 10 years, federal transportation enhancement grants have been used to produce brochures for various purposes including monuments paths, scenic trails, and bicycle safety. The State of Kansas even received a federal grant to install and replace their brochure display cases at SRA.

Enhancement funds used to help construct replica of historical schooner—In 2001, Burlington, Vermont received a $20,000 grant to subsidize the building a full scale replica of the 1862-class sailing canal boat, the Louis McClure.

Crandall Farm Restoration project—Washington County, Rhode Island received a $120,000 transportation enhancement grant for renovation of Crandall Farm. The project consisted of renovating the 1870 house on the farm into a welcome center and educational tool for the traveling public.

South Carolina uses gas taxes to purchase $15,000 ''Welcome Signs''—Orangeburg County, South Carolina received a $34,965 transportation enhancement grant o help purchase three signs at a cost of $44,500, or $14,833 per sign. Unfortunately, South Carolina bridges are not as welcoming, as 22 percent of them are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

The State of Michigan receives nearly $100,000 to celebrate mysterious centennial—In 2004, Michigan received a $99,540 transportation enhancement grant for publications, historical commemorative items, and displays for a ''centennial celebration.'' The only thing more puzzling than how these activities are related to transportation is that the centennial for Michigan Statehood occurred in 1937.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, today I rise to offer my support for the President's request for immediate supplemental assistance for the Federal Emergency Management Agency. This funding will enable FEMA to continue to provide critical aid to victims left in the wake of Irene's deadly

path, and victims of other natural disasters that have struck throughout the country.

My home State of Rhode Island has experienced two major disasters in the last couple of years, so I know firsthand how hard homeowners, businesses, and municipalities have struggled to recover, even with Federal assistance programs.

This is not the time to play politics. If Congress fails to provide this emergency funding between now and September 30, we run the risk of completely running out of disaster funds. Our fellow Americans need this funding to recover from catastrophic disasters. Mother Nature does not distinguish between blue and reds States, and both Democratic and Republican Governors—and in Rhode Island's case an Independent Governor—have asked for immediate disaster aid.

This supplemental funding will help replenish FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund, which pays for Federal disaster response and recovery activities. The fund has been running dangerously low as a result of the devastating tornado in Missouri, tornados in Alabama, major flooding in the Midwest and South, wildfires in Texas, and the historic flooding caused by Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee.

This year's disasters have been particularly destructive and I urge my colleagues to remain committed to all the victims as they struggle to become whole again. We should approve this disaster aid to ensure that communities aren't left in ruins.

The shortfall in funding has already forced the administration to put certain disaster recovery activities on hold. My State, like many others, sustained a federally declared disaster last month as a result of Hurricane and Tropical Storm Irene. In order for FEMA to ensure it had the resources to provide immediate relief for new disasters such as Hurricane Irene, the agency had to freeze long-term recovery and mitigation projects.

This funding conundrum really hits home because in Rhode Island communities are still reeling from the historic flooding that occurred in the spring of 2010. Rhode Island saw more rain during that disaster than any month on record, and the devastation wrought by those storms exceeded anything in living memory.

I was on the ground during the flooding last year and have been intimately involved in the recovery process. I know how important FEMA's long-term recovery and mitigation programs are for revitalizing damaged communities, especially in States like mine that were already hurting from the difficult economic environment.

I urge my colleagues across the aisle to let us pass this critical legislation to provide supplemental funding for FEMA. Not only will it go a long way toward providing peace of mind should another disaster strike, it will also ensure that communities across the country that are still recovering from past disasters can continue to move forward in their recovery. This will make us a stronger and more resilient nation.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, Nelson Mandela once said, ''There is no easy walk to freedom anywhere.''

The walk to freedom for the Burmese people has certainly not been easy, and it is far from complete.

The military-controlled government that rules Burma continues to maintain its tight grip over the Burmese people through fear, intimidation, and violence.

According to the State Department, over the last year the Burmese regime has ''severely restricted and frequently violated freedoms of assembly, expression, association, movement, and religion.''

And in furthering its hold over Burmese society, the regime has committed crimes of murder, abduction, rape, torture, recruitment of child soldiers, and forced labor—all with impunity.

In recent months however, we have seen some encouraging steps.

Last November, the Burmese regime released Aung San Suu Kyi, the Burmese democracy leader and winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, after a long and unjustified incarceration. And the regime has made some modest movement towards dialogue with the opposition.

But it is far too soon to think that the walk to freedom has succeeded. Just 2 months after releasing Aung San Suu Kyi, the regime dissolved the National League for Democracy, which has sought to bring democracy to Burma for more than 20 years.

And the regime keeps more than 2,000 political prisoners in detention.

As Aung San Suu Kyi herself has said, ''If my people are not free, how can you say I'm free? We are none of us free.''

In order to help the Burmese people on their march to freedom, I urge my colleagues to extend our sanctions against Burmese imports for another year.

Several of our trading partners—including the European Union, Canada, and Australia—have joined us in imposing trade and investment sanctions against Burma. And these sanctions have put significant pressure on the Burmese leadership.

So let us extend the import sanctions on Burma for another year. Let us do our part to help the Burmese people complete their long walk to freedom.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator from Wyoming.

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

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

REMEMBERING MALCOLM WALLOP

Mr. ENZI. It is with a great deal of sadness I have to tell you that Senator Malcolm Wallop, the 18th Senator for the State of Wyoming, passed away this afternoon. He had been ill for some time but had had a very active life and made a great deal of difference to this body. We were very fortunate to have Malcolm Wallop represent us in the Senate for 18 years. For all of his three terms he was a powerful and effective presence in the Congress, assuring the people of Wyoming they were heard and that their concerns were being addressed. Although there are many accomplishments I could mention—and tomorrow I will probably mention quite a few more—I want to mention two of them today, as they were very significant efforts.

The first was the establishment of the Republican Steering Committee. He and two other Senators considered themselves to be the conservatives of the Senate and formed a special caucus that today has grown to include almost all the Republicans. It was for a smaller government and constitutional principles and spending constraints, and he stuck to those principles throughout his entire Senate career.

His other accomplishment—and I can think of none that would make him more proud than the mention that he started the Congressional Awards Program. This is a program for young Americans where they can do service for their community and receive an award from Congress. Congress puts no dollars into this, which would be part of the philosophy of Malcolm Wallop. He helped to provide for a number of people through the years to be able to come to Washington and receive the Gold Award. It is set up so when you do 100 hours of community service, you can get a bronze medal. When you do another 100 hours of service, you can get a silver medal. When you do 200 or more hours of service, you get a gold medal.

He helped to promote the community spirit and his community service has made a huge difference to Wyoming and has spread across the Nation. Of course, we are always very proud in Wyoming that more kids from Wyoming have gotten the gold medal than from any other State. It partly has to with his founding of it and the time and effort he put into it, and that succeeding Senators have. Over the years it has served to inspire countless young Americans to believe in themselves and their ability to change the world beginning in their own backyard and to start some good habits. Thanks to his initiative, the young people of our Nation will continue to dare to do great service in their neighborhoods and communities, and I cannot think of a better way to have Senator Malcolm Wallop be remembered.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I join my colleague from Wyoming because

today Wyoming and America lost an extraordinary man. Senator Malcolm Wallop was a dedicated public servant and great legislator. He leaves a proud legacy of a Wyoming Senator who solved problems and initiated great solutions. He set a high bar for public service, and all of Wyoming is grateful.

Whether he was serving in the Army, the Wyoming legislature, or in the U.S. Senate, Malcolm Wallop always stood for freedom. For decades he worked to strengthen America's national security and to protect States rights. His common sense and his commitment helped break down Washington's barriers to American energy development. Our Nation continues to benefit from his leadership.

There will be much more to say about Malcolm in these coming days and in the weeks ahead as we seek to honor his legacy.

I will miss Malcolm's friendship and his support. My wife Bobbi and I send our very heartfelt condolences to his family and to his friends throughout this great country. We will continue to keep the entire Wallop family in our thoughts and in our prayers.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

APPROVING THE RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN THE BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time postcloture be yielded back and the Senate proceed to consideration of H.J. Res. 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 66) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

AMENDMENT NO. 602

Mr. REID. I have a substitute amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. REID. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 603 TO AMENDMENT NO. 602

Mr. REID. I have a perfecting amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 603 to amendment No. 602.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:

SECTION ___. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this division shall become effective 2 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 604 TO AMENDMENT NO. 603

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 604 to amendment No. 603.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "2 days", and insert "1 day".

AMENDMENT NO. 605

Mr. REID. I have an amendment at the desk to the language that is proposed to be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 605 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 602.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 17, strike "on" and insert "3 days after".

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 606 TO AMENDMENT NO. 605

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 606 to amendment No. 605.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "3 days" and insert "2 days".

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Reid substitute amendment No. 602 to H.J. Res. 66, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, John F. Kerry, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Kent Conrad, Dianne Feinstein, Tom Harkin, Jeff Bingaman, Tim Johnson, Daniel K. Inouye, Richard J. Durbin, Joseph I. Lieberman, Mary L. Landrieu, Benjamin L. Cardin.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion on the underlying joint resolution which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.J. Res. 66, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, John F. Kerry, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Kent Conrad, Dianne Feinstein, Tom Harkin, Jeff Bingaman, Tim Johnson, Daniel K. Inouye, Richard J. Durbin, Joseph I. Lieberman, Mary L. Landrieu, Benjamin L. Cardin.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit the joint resolution with instructions, which is also at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to commit the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 66) to the Finance Committee with instructions to report back with an amendment numbered 607.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, strike line 17 through 19 and insert the following:

This joint resolution shall take effect on July 26, 2011.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 608

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 608 to the instructions on the motion to commit H.J. Res. 66.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "July 26" and insert "July 25".

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 609 TO AMENDMENT NO. 608

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 609 to amendment No. 608.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''July 25'' and insert ''July 24''.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived for the two cloture motions just filed.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, sadly, in just 2 days, about 80,000 people will be out of work because of the obstructionism of one man. This Senator, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, is putting his own petty priorities ahead of the thousands of safety inspectors, construction workers, and contractors who are about to lose their health care and their livelihoods for the second time in the last few months. These workers will be furloughed or laid off on Friday if we don't reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration.

The same Senator is holding up emergency funding for thousands of Americans—hundreds of thousands, actually—whose homes have been destroyed by tornadoes, floods, and wildfires. Keep in mind what I just said. We have a bill that came from the House of Representatives that funded for 4 months the Federal Aviation Administration. We have a bill that came from the House—they put them together—to fund the highway bill for 6 months. With those two bills together, almost 2 million jobs will be eliminated if we don't pass the highway bill by the end of the month but FEMA by Friday.

The Senator from Oklahoma, to whom I referred, doesn't like a provision in the highway bill. Stopping that is one thing. But now he is stopping us from doing something about people who are in desperate need of help, who have been hit hard by fires—in Texas alone, we have had 2,000 homes burned to the ground. So he is holding up emergency aid for Americans whose homes have been destroyed by tornadoes, floods, wildfires, and millions of acres of farmland are underwater, and he is jeopardizing almost 2 million jobs by blocking the highway bill. How he gets these together is something I cannot logically understand. He is stopping us from doing something on the FAA bill but also FEMA.

On Friday, as I said, it is going to cause 80,000 workers, thousands of whom are responsible for the millions of air travelers' safety every day. We have just been through this. A short time ago, we had the same issue, where the safety inspectors were paying for their own lunches when they would go out inspecting airplanes, and buying their own plane tickets, paying for their own hotel and motel rooms, and not being reimbursed.

It is interesting to note this same Senator voted for the highway bill in 2005—we do a major highway bill about every 5 years. He voted for that when his party held the White House, although the bill included the same issue he has objected to today. I have been told his big concern is over bike trails, bike paths. But the interesting part is that he can have a vote on this. He wants a vote to get rid of bike paths. He is willing to do that. In fact, we have given him the same vote on an amendment before. In 2009, the Senate voted down the very same amendment. He has had this vote before, and it has failed before. He is not willing to even take a vote anymore. This is how far afield this is. He doesn't want a vote. He wants to put whatever he thinks is the right thing for the world and the country as it relates to highways in this bill and say: Just do it; I am a dictator, and I am going to put it in the bill, and you are not going to do anything around here.

We are willing to vote on this again, but we cannot get to a vote because he is blocking us from doing so. So one Senator out of 100 is holding up the important work of this body, demanding that we make this amendment law or else put 80,000 people out of work. This kind of obstruction should end. This is not logical, not rational. I have strong feelings about this part of the highway bill. But this is a bill that has billions of dollars in it. About 1.7 or 1.8 million jobs will be eliminated if we don't get this bill passed. So I urge my Republican colleague to reconsider how this gridlock harms real people in this country. It is hard for me to explain.

In Las Vegas we have a new tower that is being built for the air traffic controllers. It is needed very much. Air traffic into Las Vegas is heavy—about 60 million people a year arrive, and so we need a new tower. We started construction on it a few months ago. It was held up once because of this problem we have with this bill. Now it is to be held up again.

But this isn't just a Nevada issue, it is all over the country. About 75,000 construction workers are working on essential parts of our airports, and these jobs are badly needed. It is just the wrong thing for my friend to do. I hope he will allow us to move forward on FEMA and allow us to move forward on the Federal Aviation Administration legislation. Of course, on the highway bill, we will give him his vote. If he wants another vote, we will give him another vote if there is another part of the bill he doesn't like. But it is something we need to get done as quickly as possible—like in the next 24 hours.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RECOGNIZING THE HAZARD HERALD

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize one of Kentucky's oldest and most respected local newspapers, the Hazard Herald of Hazard, KY. In July of this year, The Hazard Herald celebrated over a century's worth of news coverage by publishing a 100th-anniversary edition of its morning paper. The Herald is, and has been, the most trusted source of local and national news to the people of Hazard and Perry County for decades.

Founder and prominent lawyer and statesman Bailey P. Wootton, who eventually served one term as Kentucky attorney general in the 1930s, envisioned that the Herald would serve as the primary medium for progress and information for the local community when he began publishing the paper in 1911. Over the years, the Herald became the heart of the community, sharing in both the triumphs and sorrows of citizens of the county as it grew alongside them.

From the arrival of the first train to Hazard Depot in 1912, which a year later would pave the way for boosting the region's coal industry, to the decade-defining flood of 1927 that devastated the county, the Herald was front and center. In the 1930s the Herald followed Bailey during his campaign to be elected Kentucky attorney general, as well as the Hazard High School boys' basketball team as they were eventually crowned state champions.

World War II in the 1940s forced the Herald to begin printing daily to keep people informed with the war efforts in Europe, and it remained so until the mid-1950s when it then alternated to a biweekly publication. The paper mourned President Kennedy's death with the nation in the 1960s, and provided an in-depth account of President Bill Clinton's visit to Hazard in 1999—which was printed in color after the paper adopted color printing technology in the middle of the decade. Most recently, the Herald has adopted online publications and social media to keep pace with the technological advancements that define news and media today.

Perry County is fortunate to have such an established and trusted news source to inform the great people of Kentucky. In the 100th anniversary edition of the Herald, printed July 27, 2011, there is an article that highlights the paper's founding and first decade of printing. To help celebrate this landmark occasion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hazard Herald, Centennial Edition, July 27, 2011]

The first decade 1911–1919: The Hazard Herald publishes first issue, begins a tradition still alive a century later.

The first edition of The Hazard Herald was hand set and came off the gasoline powered

printing press on June 22, 1911. Though we can't find a copy of that first edition, the effect the Herald had on the local community during its first decade is certainly on record.

The Herald was operated by its founder and president at the time, Bailey P. Wootton, along with officers George W. Humphries, James B. Hoge, and W.C. Trosper.

During that first year, a one-year subscription to the Herald could be purchased for one dollar as the paper's staff covered the growth of Hazard, which at the time was still looking forward to the coming of the railroad a year later, a move that would open up a town that in the years prior was a remote hamlet nearly cut off by the rough and tumble foothills of the Appalachian Mountains.

The first two years of the Herald's publication were certainly not easy ones, as noted in Perry County Kentucky: A History, published by the Hazard Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution during the 1950s. A publisher in Hazard at that time certainly lacked some of the modern conveniences that newspaper staff today may take for granted: ''With power still not available in 1911, a two H.P. gasoline engine was installed to run the press. After 1912, electricity was available and the changeover was made.''

In those first years the Herald also served as a chronicler of Hazard's history (as it still does today). One of the most important events in that history was the arrival of the railroad. In the July 20, 1911 edition, the paper's fifth that first year, a story details work being completed by the Jones-Davis Company regarding construction of a section of the L&E Railroad which extended ''from below Yerkes to the head of the river of the mouth of Buckeye Creek, about 18 miles.''

The first train arrived at the Hazard Depot in 1912, and it not only opened avenues of travel in and out of the county, but it also paved the way for a more robust coal industry, as noted in the Herald's October 7, 1912 edition: ''It will not be long before the coal from this city will be counted by the trainloads instead of the carload.''

Other notable events during the decade include a fire in December 1913 that ravaged the business section of town, destroying $50,000 worth of property, according to a headline of the day. Consumed in the fire was the D.Y. Combs Hotel as well as the offices of Dr. Gross and Dr. Hurst.

On August 17, 1914, the Herald reported on the first automobile to arrive in Perry County: ''Last Thursday, Hazard and Perry County (sic) were honored by the first automobile ever inside the county limits. We have had the railroad trains upward of two years, and that has ceased to be a wonder; we have had one autocycle, which remained for a few days and departed from whence it came. But the crowning glory of all was the advent of the Ford touring car which passed through our city last Thursday. Now we are on the qui vive for the first aeroplane.''

By 1916, Wootton was still listed as the president, with James B. Hoge and W.C. Trosper as secretary and manager respectively, and a weekly editorial appeared in the newspaper as well. In the January 27, 1916 edition, the Herald took to task the City of Hazard for allowing the city's sidewalks to fall in disrepair, writing: ''In any case, there has been no excuse on the part of either Big Bottom residents or the City government for leaving the walks up that way in the shape it has been for such a long time.''

While the Herald maintained a local flavor during its first decade, in this age before the Internet and instant news delivery, the paper also made note of issues of national importance. By 1918, World War I ended with the abdication of Kaiser Wilhelm II on November 9. The Herald carried the story with the headline: ''War Is Ended; Kaiser Abdicates.''

By the end of the decade, the paper's yearly subscription rate had increased to $1.50 while Bailey Wootton remained the president of the Herald Publishing Company, and John B. Horton had been serving as the editor.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to commend my friend and colleague, Senator MARCO RUBIO of Florida, on the outstanding speech he delivered yesterday at the Jesse Helms Center in Wingate, NC. I share Senator RUBIO's conviction that America is at our best in the world when we put our values at the center of our foreign policy, beginning with a commitment to the cause of freedom. Senator RUBIO's thoughtful warning against the danger of withdrawing behind our borders is especially timely and important. He is absolutely right that, when we do not confront monsters like al-Qaida abroad, they will sooner or later come to threaten us here at home.

I thank Senator RUBIO for delivering such a lucid and visionary speech. His remarks reaffirm for me the critical leadership role that I am convinced he will play in this chamber, and in our country, in the years to come. His voice is an important one. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senator RUBIO's remarks as prepared for delivery.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MARCO RUBIO'S REMARKS AS DELIVERED TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. First of all, thank you all for coming. I am honored and privileged to be here. I'm impressed by the good work, by the way, that the Helms Center is doing in teaching young people the foreign policy principles that Senator Helms stood for. And I'm honored by this opportunity to speak to you for a few moments eight and a half months into my Senate career on what I think is a historic and important moment in American history. And I hope by the end of our time here together tonight we'll all share that belief irrespective of where we fall on the individual issues.

I have come to deeply appreciate Jesse Helms' willingness to fight for his views—particularly in foreign policy—and his unwillingness to compromise on matters of basic principle. That made him rare in Washington, and it also made him influential. I want to read what a distinguished journalist once wrote that it was ''his relentless, unswerving application of conservative principles to practically every issue'' is what ''made him a major player in Washington and [in] national politics.''

Jesse Helms was, in particular, an unswerving champion of freedom fighters. When he was still a junior Senator, he and a former governor of California—a fellow named Ronald Reagan—they worked together to introduce a ''morality in foreign policy'' plank to the 1976 Republican platform.

Here is what it said, it said: ''The goal of Republican foreign policy is the achievement of liberty under law and a just and lasting peace in the world. The principles by which we act to achieve peace and to protect the interests of the United States must merit the restored confidence of our people.''

It also said that ''we must face the world with no illusions about the nature of tyranny.'' And it pledged that: ''Ours will be a foreign policy that keeps this ever in mind.''

Now, remarkably, this was controversial in the 1970s—the era of détente, of defeat and of retreat. The idea of placing morality at the center of our dealings with other nations was derided by supposed sophisticates as unrealistic and uninformed.

But then Ronald Reagan took these words to heart and he made them the center of his foreign policy—a foreign policy that even his critics now admit was remarkably successful.

President Reagan challenged the ''evil empire.''

''Tear down this wall,'' he demanded—and it came down. He won the Cold War not by coddling dictators but by confronting them—and by standing up for the principles that have defined us since the formation of our great Republic.

As I think about the challenges of the 21st century—challenges that range from upheavals in the Middle East to the fiscal crisis back home—I am mindful of Ronald Reagan's example and of Jesse Helms'.

I am guided by their understanding that America's strength lies in its ideals, and that if we are to make this century another American century, we must be prepared to fight for those ideals.

Now, fundamentally, I believe that the world is a better place when the United States of America is strong and prosperous. Now, I don't believe that America has the power or means to solve every issue in the world. But I do believe there are some critically important issues where America does have a meaningful role to play in resolving crises that are tied to our national interests.

If we refuse to play our rightful role and shrink from the world, America and the entire world will pay a terrible price. And it is our responsibility to clearly outline to the American people what our proper role in the world is and what American interests are at stake when we engage abroad.

At the core of our strength are the ''self-evident'' truths of the Declaration of Independence: ''that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness,'' that government exists to ''secure these rights'' and that it derives its ''just powers from the consent of the governed.''

These are not just our rights as Americans. These are the rights of all human beings. Nurtured in thirteen embattled colonies along the Eastern seaboard more than two centuries ago, the blessings of liberties have since spread to more than 100 countries around the world.

Freedom's domain now stretches from Mexico to Mongolia. Some of the world's democracies are ancient nations. Others are more recent in origin. Some are poor. Others are rich. Some are Christian. Others Muslim, Jewish, Buddhist, Confucian, Hindu. All are united by their respect for certain fundamental human rights—even if they do not always achieve in practice the ideals they seek to honor. America should take pride in knowing that so many of the freedom movements we have seen around the world since 1776 draw their inspiration from the courage and the words of our own Founding Fathers.

The honor roll of free countries does not yet include the land of my parents or grandparents—Cuba—but that I believe is only a matter of time. Because sooner or later, the tides of freedom will wash against the shores of this island nation that has been trapped for too long in a prison constructed by Fidel and Raul Castro.

Why am I so confident about the future? Because in our time, we have seen how dictatorships have fallen and democracies risen—even in the most unpromising surroundings.

Just in the past year, in the Middle East—the region whose governments have been most resistant to freedom—we have seen the first stirrings of democratic upheavals. We do not know how the Arab Spring will ultimately turn out, but it has already proven one thing: that no faith, no ethnicity, no region, and no people are immune to the fundamental desire to control their own destiny.

As dissidents and freedom fighters battle dictators around the world, they look for support to the greatest democracy in the world. And America must answer their call.

We do not seek to impose our vision of government. We do not insist that every nation must have a presidency, a supreme court or a bicameral legislature. Nor do we have any intention of using force to depose every despotic regime on the planet.

But we must do what we can to champion the cause of freedom—not only with the power of our example but also with our money and our resources, our ingenuity and our diplomacy, and on rare occasion, when there is no good alternative and when our national interest is clearly at stake, our armed might.

Without our commitment to the rights of man enunciated by our forefathers, what are we? Just another big, rich country. But when we champion our ideals, we gain moral authority—and we gain physical security.

You see, we may not always agree with our fellow democracies, but seldom, if ever, do we fight them. The more functioning democracies there are—''functioning'' being the important quality—the easier we can breathe.

States that do not respect the rights of their citizens seldom respect the rights of their neighbors. They become breeding grounds for all sorts of ills—from the trafficking of humans and drugs to contagious diseases and famine, from nuclear proliferation to terrorism—that threaten our own security.

Now some suggest that America should heed the famous words of John Quincy Adams and go ''not abroad, in search of monsters to destroy.'' The problem is if America turns inward and ignores the monsters abroad, they are likely to come here.

It happened in 1917 when German U-boats torpedoed American merchant ships.

It happened in 1941 when Japanese aircraft bombed Pearl Harbor.

And it happened ten years ago when Al Qaeda carried off the deadliest terrorist attack in history from a base in the Hindu Kush. If we do not have the luxury of ignoring developments in lands as remote as Afghanistan, then there is no corner of the world from which we can safely turn our backs.

The fanatics who orchestrated the attacks of 9/11 were nurtured in lands that knew no freedom, in countries where, for too long, the people's pursuit of happiness had been subordinated to the rulers' pursuit of power. A lack of economic, social and political opportunity helped to create the conditions that enabled a radical few—deluded by demented doctrines of hate—to commit mass murder simply to make a statement.

The form of the threat was relatively novel: We were attacked not by another nation-state but by a band of terrorists who took shelter in a failed state. But this threat—like the threats of Nazism, fascism, and communism—comes from a sick and failed ideology.

With Osama bin Laden's recent demise, the founder of Al Qaeda joined a long list of tyrants—Adolf Hitler to Saddam Hussein—who have experienced for themselves the righteous wrath of a democracy bestirred from its peaceful pursuits.

I applaud President Obama for ordering the raid that finally brought Osama bin Laden to his just fate. I applaud the President, too, for his stirring words in support of reformers in the Middle East. I only wish that he had shown more commitment to the cause of freedom. He has been slow and hesitant, and we have missed some significant opportunities to alter the strategic landscape in America's favor. And the President's failure to lead has served to magnify the damage done to U.S. interests.

For example, in the summer of 2009, the young people of Iran took to the streets to protest against mullahs that had consigned them to poverty, while squandering oil riches to build nuclear weapons and support foreign terrorist groups. The President was so intent on negotiating with Iran's tyrants that he did little to help its people. As the Green Revolution fizzled, protesters demanded to know, ''Obama, are you with us or against us?''

This year, the Administration did come to the aid of the people of Libya, but only after weeks of hesitation that allowed Moammar Qaddafi—an anti-American criminal—to get back on his feet and resume slaughtering his own people.

Then it took another four months before the President was willing to recognize the Transitional National Council as the rightful government of Libya. And even then, the Administration refused to commit the resources and make the tactical decisions that could have shortened this conflict.

The regime was so lacking in popular support that it finally fell, but the fact that the war dragged on so long has, at a minimum, raised the costs of reconstruction and lengthened the toll of the dead and wounded.

An anonymous presidential adviser justified this by claiming that it was part of a deliberate strategy to ''lead from behind''.

We could see the same doctrine in effect in Syria where the President waited a full six months after the start of a popular uprising—six months that Bashar Assad and his goons spent indiscriminately slaughtering their own people—before calling for Assad's removal. And even then, the Administration refused to recall our ambassador or impose the entire list of sanctions that some of us in Congress had been pressing for.

Now the President's defenders suggest that it was right not to get more involved because they worry about the consequences of turmoil in the Middle East. I've often hear it said that: ''Better the devil you know.'' We should be concerned about what will come next in places like Egypt that have been American allies.

I can understand why President Obama hesitated before finally withdrawing our support from Hosni Mubarak, which I believe, under the circumstances, was the right thing to do. But it is hard to see why we would hesitate in the case of Iran, Syria or Libya—all avowed enemies of America. It is hard to imagine a ruler worse than Ahmadinejad, Assad or Qaddafi, and easy to imagine that their successors might be much more amenable to our interests.

Even in countries such as Egypt, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia, we simply do not have the luxury of endorsing the status quo.

Instead of tying our fate to discredited dictators, we would be better advised to build constructive alternatives. That's what Ronald Reagan did when he pushed Ferdinand Marcos out of power in the Philippines in 1986. The following year he did the same thing when he helped push a military ruler out of power in South Korea and supported the transition to civilian rule. Today, South Korea is one of the world's freest countries—and one of the richest. Yet only forty years ago, it was poorer than North Korea and nearly as poor as Syria. Its transformation shows what is possible when free people are allowed to harness their full potential.

This is the change that we must encourage in the Middle East. Now unfortunately the views of some of the protestors distasteful. I certainly condemn the anti-Israel sentiments uttered by protest leaders, and I can understand why many Israelis are alarmed by the recent turn of events.

Israel is one of America's closest allies in the world, and our closest and most reliable friend in the Middle East. It is a shining bastion of democracy, liberty, and opportunity in one of the most blighted parts of the world. But the naïve strategy of trying to appease Islamist extremists like Iran, and turning our back on Israel, will only embolden our common enemies and weaken the prospects for peace—and for democracy itself.

For the sake of peace, and out of principle, the United States must strongly affirm its commitment to Israel, not just in words but in deeds.

At the same time, the people of Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Syria, Yemen, and other Middle Eastern lands are in the streets because they want a better life for themselves and their children. They aren't asking for the imposition of a Taliban-style rule. They are asking for the ballot box and for economic opportunity. And if their desires are fulfilled, they will move closer to Thomas Jefferson's vision of the world than Osama bin Laden's.

That is why I am so concerned that the Administration may let this historic opportunity pass. I am glad that the President is trying to bring along our allies. But our allies would be the first to tell you that nothing important or difficult happens without American leadership. Unfortunately, that leadership has been missing at a critical juncture during the last few years.

Most recently, for example, it has been suggested that the advice of military commanders in Iraq be completely ignored in favor of a dramatic troop drawdown that even Iraqis say is too drastic.

It's a reminder that, in our republic, elections have consequences not just at home, but all over the world. Because while previous generations of leaders—and even some I serve with today—have stood up for unpopular but necessary measures, even at the risk of losing elections, others are simply too willing to do what is politically self-serving. America, and the entire world for that matter, needs resolute leadership in this era of historic but volatile transformation, particularly in the Middle East—and particularly in Iraq.

Beyond the Middle East, in our own hemisphere, a combination of narco-trafficking networks, anti-American strongmen, and the increasing penetration of Iranian influence is raising dangers of a special kind. Individuals like Hugo Chavez, who have no business running anything in the first place much less a country, have worked strenuously to build a bloc of countries to work against U.S. interests—and at great risk to great friends like Colombia.

Again, the Administration has missed easy opportunities to stand with our allies, for instance, through free trade agreements. We cannot continue to ignore or be complacent about Latin America, nor can we relegate our friends in the region to anything less than high priority partnerships for us to continue nurturing.

After all, the security of our democratic society depends on the success of liberty in our own hemisphere. The fight against drug

and human trafficking, and the infiltration of Islamist terrorists requires the success of economic and political freedoms—and of the rule of law—in Latin America. We must be more vigilant—and more decisive—in defending our interests in our own hemisphere.

And by the way, the notion that we should ''lead from behind'' would have been incomprehensible even to the Democrat who preceded President Obama. In his second inaugural address, President Bill Clinton said that ''America stands alone as the world's indispensable nation.'' That is as true today as it was in 1997.

If America refuses to lead, who will combat international outlaws? Who will stop terrorists and weapons proliferators? Who will deal with the Iranian and North Korean nuclear programs? The rising disorder in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia? The growing challenge from China which seeks to dominate East Asia, but won't even let its own people use Google?

The world counts on America. And whether we like it or not, there is virtually no aspect of our daily lives that is not directly impacted by what happens in the world around us. We can choose to ignore global problems, but global problems will not ignore us.

Yet our ability to lead is threatened. It's threatened not by any external foe, but rather by our own fiscal woes.

This year, the national debt surpassed the size of our economy and it will continue to grow unless we get it under control.

Now, I am a strong advocate of cutting unnecessary and wasteful spending, but the defense budget is not the biggest driver of our debt—it accounts for roughly twenty percent of our annual federal spending. By contrast, entitlement programs swallow more than half the budget and they are the main drivers of our debt.

The Pentagon already faced sharp cuts. During his last two years in office, Secretary of Defense Gates cut or curtailed procurement programs that, if taken to completion, would have cost $300 billion. This summer, the President and congressional leaders agreed to cut another $350 billion from the defense budget over the next ten years.

Those cuts by themselves alone are worrisome enough but what is more worrisome is what's looming: In the worst case scenario, if the so-called Debt Super Committee doesn't reach any deal at all, the Pentagon could stand to be slashed by more than $1 trillion over ten years.

Our new secretary of defense—himself is a well-known budget hawk—has warned that cutbacks of this scale would have a ''devastating effect on our national defense.'' I can but echo Leon Panetta's words.

The American armed forces have been one of the greatest forces of good in the world during the past century. They stopped Nazism and Communism and other evils such as Serbian ethnic-cleansing. They have helped birthed democracies from Germany to Iraq. They have delivered relief supplies, and performed countless tasks in service to our nation.

All they have ever asked for in return is that we provide them the tools to get the job done—and that we look after them and their families. They have never failed us in our time of need.

We must not fail them now. We must maintain a strong national defense.

Foreign aid is also an important part of America's foreign policy leadership. While we certainly must be careful about spending money on foreign aid, the reality is that it is not the reason we have a growing debt problem.

If it is done right, and when done in partnership with the private sector and faith-based community, foreign aid spreads America's influence around the world in a positive way. Let me give you an example: the Bush Administration's program to provide HIV medicine to Africa has not only saved lives, it has increased America's influence across the continent. These are allies in the future that can be our partners, not just in our political struggles on the world stage, but in economic trade. And a world where people are prosperous and free to grow their economies and pursue their own dreams is a better world for all of us.

I began by quoting the words of Jesse Helms and Ronald Reagan. In closing, let me recall the great words of one of the most important Democrat leaders of the 20th Century—Harry S. Truman. In 1951, speaking to the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C., this is what he said:

''I have the feeling that God has created us and brought us to our present position of power and strength for some great purpose. It is not given to us to know fully what that purpose is. But I think we may be sure of one thing. And that is that our country is intended to do all it can in cooperating with other nations to help create peace and preserve peace in the world. It is given to us to defend the spiritual values—the moral code—against the vast forces of evil that seek to destroy them.''

There are still vast forces of evil seeking to destroy us. The form of the threat has changed since Truman's time. But evil remains potent—and America remains the strongest line of defense, often the only line of defense.

I pray that we will continue to find the wisdom and courage—and resources—to act effectively in the defense of our moral code—the same code that we share with all civilized people. The world needed a strong America in Truman's time. And if this is to be another American Century, the world needs a strong America now.

Because freedom cannot survive without us.

Thank you so much for having me. May God bless all of you and may God bless our country. Thank you.

REMEMBERING COMPTROLLER GENERAL ELMER B. STAATS

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the memory of Elmer B. Staats, one of the great civil servants of the post-World War II era. A former Comptroller General of the United States and head of the General Accounting Office, as GAO was then called, Mr. Staats died July 23 in Washington at the age of 97.

Elmer Staats had the distinction of serving under every U.S. President from Franklin Roosevelt to Ronald Reagan. But more important than the longevity of his career was his record of professional achievement. A leading figure in the world of public administration and government accountability, Elmer Staats was renowned for his dedication to constructive change and good government principles.

Appointed Comptroller General in 1966, Elmer Staats helped lay the foundation for the modern-day GAO. He transformed it from an agency primarily known for financial audit work to one that evaluates the effectiveness of virtually every Federal activity at home and abroad, from antipoverty programs to military spending to investments in infrastructure.

At the start of Staats' tenure at GAO, accountants comprised more than 95 percent of the agency's professional staff. By the time he retired in 1981, the agency's workforce included such diverse professionals as economists, social scientists, attorneys, and computer experts—all career employees hired on the basis of their knowledge, skills, and ability.

Under Elmer Staats, GAO took a lead role in issuing auditing guidance. In 1972, the Comptroller General issued the first edition of what has come to be known as the ''Yellow Book''—the final word on government auditing standards. He also directed GAO to issue guidance to help state and local auditors and was instrumental in establishing intergovernmental audit forums in the 1970s.

In addition, Elmer Staats sought to strengthen ties with the international auditing community through his active involvement and leadership in the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions. He founded GAO's International Auditor Fellowship Program in 1979, which enables auditors from other countries to meet with GAO staff and acquire new knowledge and perspectives.

His is a living legacy that is still delivering results, both for Congress and the American people. Just name a Federal program or policy, GAO has probably reviewed it and made suggestions for improvement. Last year, measurable financial benefits from GAO work totaled nearly $50 billion, an $87 return on every dollar invested in GAO.

Elmer Boyd Staats was born in Richfield, KS, in 1914. His family were wheat farmers. The only one of his eight siblings to attend college, Elmer Staats graduated Phi Beta Kappa from McPherson College in 1935, and later earned a master's degree in political science and economics from the University of Kansas and a doctorate in political economy at the University of Minnesota, where he wrote his dissertation on the new Social Security Administration.

Elmer Staats' career in the Federal Government began in 1939, when he joined the Bureau of the Budget, now the Office of Management and Budget. His talents were recognized early on, and he served in high-level posts at the Bureau under Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. Eventually, he became the Bureau's Deputy Director before President Johnson appointed him to a 15-year term as the fifth Comptroller General of the United States. He held that post through the administrations of Presidents Johnson, Nixon, Ford, and Carter, and into the early months of the Reagan administration.

After leaving GAO, Elmer Staats became the president and later chairman of the board of trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation. He was a member of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board from 1984 to 1990. During the 1990s, he served as the

first chairman of the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board.

Elmer Staats helped found the American Society for Public Administration in 1939 and later served as its national president and vice president. He was also a founding member in 1967 of the National Academy of Public Administration and remained a trusted advisor on many Academy projects over the years. He received numerous awards for distinguished public service, along with honorary degrees from eight universities. He was elected to the Accounting Hall of Fame in 1981.

When asked whether he was a Republican or a Democrat, Elmer always politely but firmly declined to answer. In fact, he was famous for having a needlepoint pillow in his office that featured an elephant on one side and a donkey on the other. The message about his and GAO's nonpartisan role in government was clear.

As Bob Schieffer observed in a recent commentary on ''Face the Nation,'' Elmer Staats' reputation in Washington was such that you ''knew you could take what his agency reported to the bank—its facts were seldom disputed, its neutrality never challenged, his political affiliation never known.''

I want to express my gratitude for Elmer Staat's many years of exemplary service to our Nation. His intelligence, dedication, and integrity will be missed. At the same time, Elmer Staats set an example for the type of men and women who will be needed to help lead our government in the future—individuals of outstanding ability, sound character, and a genuine commitment to the greater good.

My thoughts and prayers go to his three children—David Staats, Deborah Sanders, and Catharine Taubman—and to his three grandchildren and great-granddaughter.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this Saturday, the Nation marks the 224th anniversary of the day when the Founders signed the fundamental charter for our democracy—the Constitution of the United States. During the Constitutional Convention, the delegates debated hundreds of issues and proposals before crafting the final charter. Thankfully, the Founders had the foresight to know that their debate would not be the final word on the subject. The work of defining our Nation—ensuring protection of rights for all Americans—would continue, as we strive to create ''a more perfect union.''

It was through the leadership of the late Senator Robert C. Byrd that the Congress began to officially celebrate the signing of the Constitution, calling the September 17 anniversary Constitution Day. Senator Byrd understood the importance of ensuring that future generations value our Nation's founding charter. This week, in schools across the country, students will learn about the Constitutional Convention and the meaning of Constitution Day.

For well over two centuries, the Constitution has allowed America to flourish and, importantly, adapt to new challenges. Since the inclusion of the Bill of Rights in 1791, the Constitution has been amended just 17 times. There has been much discussion of late about amending our Nation's fundamental charter. As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, that is not something that I take lightly. Proposing amendments to the Constitution should not be a reflexive response to political threats. Each Member of Congress swears to support and defend the Constitution; it should be treated with the reverence it deserves, not as leverage in heated political debate. While I certainly believe that the Constitution has been improved over time in our effort to create a more perfect union, those amendments were thoroughly considered and debated over time. Before we alter our national charter, we must openly consider whether such amendment would hamstring future generations.

Pressure groups may demand that elected representatives sign pledges about what they will and will not do if elected to office. The pledge I follow—the one I was honored to make again at the beginning of this Congress—is to uphold the Constitution. I take that pledge seriously. ''We the People'' owe a great debt to the Framers of our Constitution. And as we commemorate the signing of the Constitution of the United States of American 224 years ago, I hope all Americans will take this opportunity to read the words of our founding charter and learn about how it protects us all.

TRIBUTE TO KEEGAN BRADLEY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, with the Senate now back in session, as a Vermonter I would like to call the Senate's attention to Mr. Keegan Bradley's first-place finish in the 93rd Professional Golf Association's Championship Tournament on Sunday, August 14. Mr. Bradley is the first male golfer born in Vermont to win a major PGA Championship.

Keegan Bradley has earned a permanent place for himself, and Vermont, in the record books. As a rookie golfer, his participation in the 2011 PGA Championship is his first major tournament, making him one of only three rookie golfers ever to place first in a major tournament debut. This win also marks the end of a six-major tournament dry spell for American golfers. In order to win this year's PGA Championship, Bradley needed to demonstrate tenacity and determination. Keegan successfully came back from a four-shot deficit in the last three holes of the tournament, proving his ability to focus and overcome obstacles.

His PGA Championship win extends Mr. Bradley's successful start to his professional golf career. Most notably, he placed first in another PGA tournament earlier this year, the HP Byron Nelson Championship in Texas. In 2011 he has also finished in the top 10 in 4 PGA tournaments, as well as having finished within the top 25 in 10 others.

Even more impressively, Keegan Bradley has spent many of his younger years living in the New England area, with seasonal weather that did not always afford him the luxury of training year-round. This resulted in much time-sensitive dedication and focus, as winter weather inhibits year-round outside practice in our part of the country.

Keegan Bradley was born in Woodstock, VT, in 1986 and attended Woodstock High School. He is the son of Mr. Mark Bradley, golf professional at Crown Point Golf Club, and Mrs. Kay Bradley. Keegan is also the nephew of Ms. Pat Bradley, a Ladies Professional Golf Association Hall-of-Famer. I am proud to recognize Keegan Bradley for his accomplishment, both as a Vermonter and a professional golfer. I join all Vermonters in wishing him many more years of success.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2218. An act to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2218. An act to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1549. A bill to provide tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs.

H.R. 2832. An act to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2887. An act to provide an extension of surface and air transportation programs, and for other purposes.

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–3219. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of the 2011 Trimester 2 Directed Loligo Squid Fishery'' (RIN0648–XA617) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3220. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish Fishery; Commercial Period 1 Quota Harvested'' (RIN0648–XA632) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3221. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Fishery; 2011 Commercial Quota and 2011 Commercial Fishing Season for Greater Amberjack'' (RIN0648–XA592) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3222. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Adjustment to the 2011 Winter II Quota'' (RIN0648–XA555) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3223. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Modification of the Retention of Incidentally-Caught Highly Migratory Species in Atlantic Trawl Fisheries'' (RIN0648–BA45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3224. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fishery; Emergency Rule Extension, Revision of 2011 Butterfish Specifications'' (RIN0648–BA86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3225. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA610) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3226. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; 'Other Rockfish' in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA613) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3227. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch, Northern Rockfish, and Pelagic Shelf Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area and the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA544) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3228. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Amendment 15 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan'' (RIN0648–BA71) received during recess in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3229. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Amendment 16, Framework Adjustment 44, and Framework Adjustment 45'' (RIN0648–AY95) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 25, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3230. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Addition of Persons Acting Contrary to the National Security or Foreign Policy Interests of the United States; and Implementation of Additional Changes from the Annual Review of the Entity List'' (RIN0694–AF22) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3231. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Event Data Recorders'' (RIN2127–AK71) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3232. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Make Inoperative Exemptions; Vehicle Modifications to Accommodate People with Disabilities, Head Restraints'' (RIN2127–AK22) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3233. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''New Car Assessment Program; Safety Labeling'' (RIN2127–AK51) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3234. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Electric-Powered Vehicles; Electrolyte Spillage and Electrical Shock Protection'' (RIN2127–AK80) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3235. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Air Brake Systems'' (RIN2127–AK84) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3236. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hours of Service: Passenger Train Employees'' (RIN2130–AC15) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3237. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection with Licensing and Related Services—2011 Update'' (RIN2140–AB08) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 25, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3238. A communication from the Deputy Chief Counsel for Regulations and Security Standards, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Cargo Screening'' (RIN1652–AA64) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3239. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Substantial Product Safety List: Hand-Supported Hair Dryers'' (16 CFR Part 1120) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3240. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Substantial Product Safety List: Children's Upper Outerwear in Sizes 2T to 12 with Neck or Hood Drawstrings and Children's Upper Outerwear in Sizes 2T to 16 with Certain Waist or Bottom Drawstrings'' (16 CFR Part 1120) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3241. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Poison Prevention Packaging Requirements; Exemption of Powder Formulations of Colesevelam Hydrochloride and Sevelamer Carbonate'' (16 CFR Part 1700) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3242. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Claims for Patent and Copyright Infringement'' (RIN2700–AD63) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 4, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3243. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report providing a statement of actions with respect to the Government Accountability Office report entitled ''Reimbursable Space Act Agreements: NASA Generally Adhering to Fair Reimbursement Controls, but Guidance on Waived Cost Justifications Needs Refinement''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3244. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report providing a statement of actions with respect to the Government Accountability Office report entitled ''Training Necessary to Address Data Reliability Issues in NASA Agreement Database and to Minimize Potential Competition with Commercial Sector''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3245. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Division of Habitat and Resource Conservation, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Marine Mammal; Incidental Take During Specified Activities (Beaufort Sea)'' (RIN1018–AX32) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 4, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1552. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide an exception to that Act for actions carried out against grizzly bears in self-defense, defense of others, or a reasonable belief of imminent danger; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1553. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate emergency medical services personnel training and certification curriculums for military veterans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1554. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in the State of Nevada except by express authorization of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1555. A bill to authorize the use of certain offshore oil and gas platforms in the Gulf of Mexico for artificial reefs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin):

S. 1556. A bill to require an accounting for financial support made to promote the production or use of renewable energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 1557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand personal savings and retirement savings coverage by allowing employees not covered by qualified retirement plans to save for retirement through automatic IRAs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1558. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply payroll taxes to remuneration and earnings from self-employment up to the contribution and benefit base and to remuneration in excess of $250,000; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1559. A bill to establish the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area in the San Juan Islands, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KOHL:

S. 1560. A bill to enhance access to controlled substances for residents of institutional long-term care facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 266. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Save for Retirement Week'', including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles and increasing personal financial literacy; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. REID, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. Res. 267. A resolution recognizing the Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to provide for the affordable refinancing of mortgages held by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 309, a bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Moldova.

S. 676

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 676, a bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 805, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to improve the business and industry direct and guaranteed loan program of the Department of Agriculture.

S. 829

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 829, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 920

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 920, a bill to create clean energy jobs and set efficiency standards for small-duct high-velocity air conditioning and heat pump systems, and for other purposes.

S. 967

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 967, a bill to establish clear regulatory standards for mortgage servicers, and for other purposes.

S. 1030

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1030, a bill to reform the regulatory process to ensure that small businesses are free to compete and to create jobs, and for other purposes.

S. 1224

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1224, a bill to amend Public Law 106–392 to maintain annual base funding for the Upper Colorado and San Juan fish recovery program through fiscal year 2023.

S. 1265

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1265, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 1392

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1392, a bill to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes.

S. 1467

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1467, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services.

S. 1472

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1472, a bill to impose sanctions on persons making certain investments that directly and significantly contribute to the enhancement of the ability of Syria to develop its petroleum resources, and for other purposes.

S. 1523

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1523, a bill to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from ordering any employers to close, relocate, or transfer employment under any circumstance.

S. 1527

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1527, a bill to authorize the award of a Congressional gold medal to the Montford Point Marines of World War II.

S. 1538

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1538, a bill to provide for a time-out on certain regulations, and for other purposes.

S. 1539

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1539, a bill to provide Taiwan with critically needed United States-built multirole fighter aircraft to strengthen its self-defense capability against the increasing military threat from China.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) 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.J. RES. 27

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 27, a joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the mitigation by States of cross-border air pollution under the Clean Air Act.

S. RES. 132

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 132, a resolution recognizing and honoring the zoos and aquariums of the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 1557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand personal savings and retirement savings coverage by allowing employees not covered by qualified retirement plans to save for retirement through automatic IRAs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Automatic IRA Act of 2011. When fully phased in, this bill will give nearly 42 million Americans nationwide an easy, effective way to take responsibility for their financial futures and plan for a secure retirement. The Act incorporates the President's call, in his Proposed fiscal year 2010, 2011, and 2012 Budgets, for Congress to enact Automatic IRA legislation.

Currently, about half of American workers have no opportunity to save for retirement at work. In my home State of New Mexico, that share is nearly 60 percent. Among those lacking coverage at work, only one in ten contributes annually to an individual retirement account, IRA; the rest generally make no dedicated savings for retirement. The result? An alarming number of American workers are woefully unprepared for a financially secure retirement. According to Boston College's Center for Retirement Research, ''in 2009 half of today's households will not have enough retirement income to maintain their pre-retirement standard of living, even if they work to age 65, which is above the current average retirement age.'' Especially in this period of economic uncertainty, it is imperative that Congress focus on this retirement savings crisis. My bill takes a common-sense approach to doing so.

Under this bill, most private-sector employees working in establishments of 10 or more employees who are not currently covered by a workplace retirement plan would be given the opportunity to save through regular payroll deposits that continue automatically, unless they elect out. The savings will be deposited into the worker's own IRA, which will be subject to the laws already in place governing IRA accounts. Employers' administrative functions will be minimal. And the arrangement is market-oriented; other than the smallest of accounts, automatic IRAs will be provided by the same banks, mutual funds, insurance carriers, and other institutions that currently provide them.

The automatic IRA approach is intended to help these households overcome the barrier of inertia. It builds on the successful use—encouraged by reforms I strongly supported the Pension Protection Act of 2006—of automatic features in 401(k) plans that encourage employees toward sensible decisions, while allowing them to make alternative choices. We have already seen evidence that automatic 401(k) enrollment can dramatically boost employee participation rates, from seven in ten eligible workers to 9 in 10. In the 401(k) context, the gains are even more striking for population groups least likely to save, including women, Latino, and low-income workers.

Of the 75 million American workers who now are not covered by employment-based retirement plans, an estimated 42 million would be eligible to save and enroll under Automatic IRA legislation. This includes more than 250,000 in my home state of New Mexico. Many of these individuals are familiar with IRAs. But when asked why they haven't used the existing program, about half point to issues relating to setup and decision-making as the key barriers. The automatic IRA would eliminate these barriers, and the Retirement Security Project estimates that automatic IRA legislation could increase net national saving by nearly $15 billion annually.

This is the fourth consecutive Congress in which I have introduced Automatic IRA legislation. The concept was initially developed by scholars at the Brookings Institution and Heritage Foundation. Indeed, the Automatic IRA concept has long enjoyed broad support across the political spectrum. For instance, Martin Feldstein, chief economic advisor to President Reagan, has described himself as ''a great enthusiast of automatic enrollment IRAs'' who thinks ''as a policy, it's a no-brainer'' and ''can't imagine why there would be any significant opposition from political players on either side of the aisle.''

Finally, this bill seeks to send a strong signal of preference for employers to offer qualified retirement plans,

like 401(k)s. Among other features, it doubles the credit for employers that newly establish qualified plans and it directs the Secretaries of the Treasury and Labor to implement final regulations and establish a model plan for Multiple Employer Plans.

I am grateful that my colleague on the Senate Finance Committee, Senator KERRY, is joining me in introducing this bill. I am also pleased to note the broad range of stakeholders supporting the Automatic IRA concept, including AARP; the American Society of Pension Professionals & Actuaries; Aspen Institute's Initiative on Financial Security; the Business and Professional Women's Foundation; CFED; Consumers Union; FINRA; the Minority Business Roundtable; New Economics for Women; the United States Black Chamber; the United States Women's Chamber of Commerce; Women Impacting Public Policy; and the Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement.

Ensuring easy access to a retirement account and the ability to have part of their wages go directly from their paycheck into this account are proven strategies to encourage retirement savings. I call on the Senate to take up this bill and give it full consideration.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1559. A bill to establish the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area in the San Juan Islands, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area Act.

The San Juan Islands in northwest Washington host some of the most beautiful, serene spots in the world. The San Juans are made up of 172 islands with over 300 miles of shoreline, some little more than rocks, others home to towns, farms, and forests. The coastlines are a mix of sandy and rocky beaches, shallow and deep harbors, and placid and reef-studded bays. And between the many islands run channels of water that support many of Washington's most important marine species, including abundant salmon runs and our majestic regional icon, the orca whale.

Included in the San Juan Islands are nearly 1,000 acres of land owned by the Federal Government, spread out over 60 separate locations and managed by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, BLM. These parcels, which range from pine forests to lighthouses, provide recreational, ecological, historical, cultural, and scientific benefits to island residents and around 70,000 tourists that visit each year.

Despite their value, no long-term comprehensive management plan exists for these Federal parcels, threatening continued preservation and public access to these sites. Many of these areas are fragile, increasing the challenge of accommodating increasing numbers of visitors.

In addition, San Juan Island residents have seen the possibility of public lands they treasure being transferred to private ownership. In 2005, the Washington State Department of Natural Resources made a unilateral decision to divest itself of all its properties in San Juan County, including Mitchell Hill, a popular and scenic hiking trail on San Juan Island. While these lands were actively pursued by a private, out-of-state, real-estate developer, I was proud to work with the San Juan Island community to help secure Federal funding to keep these lands in the public domain.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of Land Management lands in the San Juan Islands are not permanently protected or preserved in public ownership. Last July, Congressman LARSEN, the Bureau of Land Management, and I visited with residents and businesses that have been working for years to permanently protect these special places.

The legislation I introduce today is a direct result of our efforts and represents a consensus between the San Juan Island community, Congressman LARSEN, and the Department of the Interior. If enacted, the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area Act will designate all 1,000 acres of BLM lands in the San Juans as a National Conservation Area, ensuring that these natural treasures remain protected, accessible to the public, and better managed to accommodate visitor use.

National Conservation Area designated lands are considered some of the most important Bureau of Land Management properties and are therefore a higher priority for management funding than non-designated lands they manage. Specifically, National Conservation Area status would ensure the San Juan Island properties are appropriately managed to protect their unique qualities and not grouped in with other BLM lands where activities such as mining, oil and gas exploration, off road vehicle use, and grazing are allowed. Importantly, my legislation requires that the management plan drafting process allows for local input into how these properties are to be managed for the long-term.

A National Conservation Area designation will also foster a stronger working relationship with other agency partners such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and provide increased opportunities for sharing resources.

I am looking forward to working to advance this legislation through the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and through the full Senate. Through our efforts we will work to ensure that future generations will be able to enjoy these special parts of the San Juan Islands.

I would also like to thank my colleague Senator MURRAY for agreeing to cosponsor this legislation, and Congressman LARSEN for his leadership and introducing companion legislation today in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1559

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 ''San Juan Islands National Conservation Area Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in the San Juan Archipelago in the State of Washington comprising nearly 1,000 acres of small islands, rocks and reef, headlands, historic lighthouses, and ecologically important areas are of great value to people in the State of Washington and the United States;

(2) the area described in paragraph (1)—

(A) provides recreational opportunities for hiking, wildlife viewing, boating, picnicking, photography, sea kayaking, and camping; and

(B) is enjoyed by residents of the area and visitors;

(3) in 2010, the area described in paragraph (1) received more than 65,000 visitors in a county with a population of 15,769 residents;

(4) the area described in paragraph (1) preserves important local, national, and tribal cultural and historic sites, such as—

(A) lighthouses on Patos Island, Turn Point, and Cattle Point, which are registered as State Historic Structures;

(B) numerous archaeological sites, including shell middens, plank-house sites, and burial markers; and

(C) areas of cultural importance, including ancient Coast Salish camas cultivation sites, homesteads, reef-net sites, and settler cabins;

(5) the area described in paragraph (1) includes vanishing coastal flower meadows, spruce bogs, groves of Garry oaks and endemic coastal junipers, and other rare and fragile ecosystems that support numerous plant species and provide nesting habitat for seabirds, songbirds, bats, and other small native mammals;

(6) the area described in paragraph (1) is used by several nonprofit, government, and educational organizations for scientific research and education, including the San Juan Islands Experimental Education Outdoor Classroom; and

(7) establishing the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area is the best way to preserve, protect, enhance, and restore a landscape that is of local and national importance.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the ecological, scenic, wildlife, recreational, cultural, historical, natural, educational, and scientific resources of the National Conservation Area; and

(2) to protect each species that is—

(A) located in the National Conservation Area; and

(B) listed as a threatened or endangered species on the list of threatened species or the list of endangered species published under section 4(c)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1)).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The term ''Advisory Council'' means the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area Advisory Council established under section 4(e).

(2) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ''management plan'' means the management plan for the National Conservation Area developed under section 4(b).

(3) NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.—The term ''National Conservation Area'' means the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area established by section 4(a).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. SAN JUAN ISLANDS NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights, there is established in the State of Washington the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area, consisting of approximately 1,000 acres of public land in the State of Washington, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Proposed San Juan Islands National Conversation Area'' and dated June 30, 2011.

(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and in accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary shall develop a comprehensive plan for the long-term management of the National Conservation Area.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In developing the management plan required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) appropriate State, tribal, and local governmental entities; and

(B) members of the public.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the National Conservation Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the resources of the National Conservation Area; and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(ii) this Act; and

(iii) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(2) USES.—The Secretary shall only allow uses of the National Conservation Area that the Secretary determines would further a purpose described in section 2(b).

(3) MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—Except as needed for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, the use of motorized vehicles in the National Conservation Area shall be permitted only on roads designated by the management plan for the use of motorized vehicles.

(4) WILDLAND FIRE OPERATIONS.—Nothing in this Act prohibits the Secretary, in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies, as appropriate, from conducting wildland fire operations in the National Conservation Area, consistent with the purposes of this Act.

(5) INVASIVE SPECIES AND NOXIOUS WEEDS.—In accordance with any applicable laws and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the Secretary may prescribe measures to control nonnative invasive plants and noxious weeds within the National Conservation Area.

(6) TRIBAL CULTURAL USES.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with Indian tribes—

(A) ensure the protection of religious and cultural sites in the National Conservation Area; and

(B) provide access to the sites by members of Indian tribes for traditional cultural and customary uses, consistent with Public Law 95–341 (commonly known as the ''American Indian Religious Freedom Act'') (42 U.S.C. 1996).

(d) NO BUFFER ZONES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act creates a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the National Conservation Area.

(2) ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE CONSERVATION AREA.—The fact that an activity or use on land outside the National Conservation Area can be seen or heard within the National Conservation Area shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the National Conservation Area.

(3) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire non-Federal land within the boundaries of the National Conservation Area only through exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller.

(B) MANAGEMENT.—Land acquired under subparagraph (A) shall become part of the National Conservation Area.

(e) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish an advisory council, to be known as the ''San Juan Islands National Conservation Area Advisory Council''.

(2) MEMBERS.—

(A) COMPOSITION.—The Advisory Council shall be composed of 7 members, to be appointed by the Secretary.

(B) QUALIFICATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the members appointed under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) reside in or within reasonable proximity to San Juan County, Washington;

(ii) have backgrounds that reflect—

(I) the purposes for which the National Conservation Area was established; and

(II) the interests of the stakeholders that are affected by the planning and management of the National Conservation Area; and

(iii) be fairly balanced in terms of the points of view represented and the functions to be performed by the Advisory Council.

(3) DUTIES.—The Advisory Council shall advise the Secretary with respect to the preparation and implementation of the management plan.

(4) APPLICABLE LAW.—The Advisory Council shall be subject to—

(A) the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.); and

(B) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(5) TERMINATION.—The Advisory Council shall terminate on the date that is 1 year after the date on which the management plan is adopted by the Secretary.

(f) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.—Any land acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act that is located in the National Conservation Area shall—

(1) become part of the National Conservation Area; and

(2) be managed in accordance with—

(A) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(B) this Act; and

(C) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(g) WITHDRAWAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land (including interests in the Federal land) located in the National Conservation Area is withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patenting under the mining laws; and

(C) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(2) ADDITIONAL LAND.—Any land acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act that is located in the National Conservation Area shall be withdrawn from operation of the laws referred to in paragraph (1) on the date of acquisition of the land.

(h) EFFECT.—Nothing in this Act alters, modifies, enlarges, diminishes, or abrogates the treaty rights of any Indian tribe.

By Mr. KOHL:

S. 1560. A bill to enhance access to controlled substances for residents of institutional long-term care facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Nursing Home Resident Pain Relief Act of 2011. This legislation will help ensure that nursing home residents have timely access to pain medication as needed in emergency situations. By streamlining processes that can now cause delays in administering these vital drugs, the bill will also allow designated health care professionals to administer controlled substances to residents whose medical conditions warrant quick pain relief.

To accomplish these ends, the legislation amends the Controlled Substances Act, CSA, in several ways. First, it allows nurses and other appropriately licensed health professionals, designated by the nursing home and with approval from the physician, to order and administer pain medication to residents upon a physician's oral prescription. The bill also establishes a clear chain of accountability for these licensed health professionals, physicians, as well as for nursing homes and long-term care pharmacies.

Last year, the Special Committee on Aging, which I Chair, held a listening session where we heard about a recent Drug Enforcement Agency, DEA, enforcement initiative that has kept nursing home residents from receiving much-needed medication to manage their pain. For many years, nurses had been able to call urgently-needed prescriptions into pharmacies upon a physician's order over the phone. Pharmacies would fill the order, residents would get their pain medication, and physicians would follow up with written confirmation of the prescription. Now, DEA requires physicians to directly issue prescriptions in writing for Schedule II pain medications before they can be dispensed, including in emergency circumstances. This poses a problem for nursing home residents because facilities often do not have physicians on site to fill out the necessary paper work in time to provide critically needed pain medicine. The DEA's enforcement initiative has created an unintended consequence where nursing home residents often have to suffer for several hours or even days before they receive pain medication.

These delays have serious consequences. Here is an all-too-common scenario: an elderly resident that returns to a nursing home after surgery may be in more pain than his physician anticipated and need more medication than the physician prescribed to manage the pain. In order to access the medication he needs, the nursing home employees must first have his physician send a written prescription to a pharmacy. If the physician is difficult to locate or slow to respond, this can take hours or even days. The resident's

pain may become so unmanageable while he waits that he must be transported by ambulance to a hospital emergency room. The ambulance ride and emergency room admission are not only expensive; they can set back the fragile resident's recovery from surgery. Our legislation would make these situations entirely avoidable.

DEA's enforcement initiative effectively put nursing home providers in a difficult position: If they follow the letter of the law, they are in danger of violating Health and Human Services regulations requiring them to administer medications in a timely manner. Failure to do so can result in monetary penalties. In addition, pharmacies could face fines under the CSA if they respond to the nursing home's order—which is almost always transmitted by a nurse—if they fill the order. As a result, a number of pharmacies, including several in the Midwest, are facing tens of millions of dollars in fines imposed by DEA.

Last year DEA issued a policy statement to provide a way for nursing home residents to access some kinds of medication more quickly. Under this new policy, a nursing home's licensed health care professionals may, on a physician's behalf, transcribe the physician's oral prescription for Schedule III, IV or V medications to a pharmacy to be filled. While we appreciated DEA's efforts, without amending the CSA the agency does not have the statutory authority to allow licensed health care professionals to transmit prescriptions for Schedule II controlled substances, the category under which nearly all pain medications fall. Legislation is required in order to provide nursing home residents prompt, reliable pain relief when they are suffering from severe injury or illness.

Our bill would provide a remedy by modifying the CSA to permit pain medication to be dispensed in emergency situations by nursing home professionals without a direct written order by a physician prior to its dispensing. Let me explain how this would work. A physician, if he or she chooses, would be able to authorize the administrator of a long-term care facility to designate one or more licensed health care professionals employed by the facility to act as a ''facility designee.'' In emergency situations only, and upon receiving an oral prescription from the physician, a facility designee would be permitted to contact a pharmacy to have the prescription filled and then dispense Schedule II medications to long-term care facility residents.

This would allow a physician to provide the prescription information to the facility designee via phone when a resident urgently needs pain medication and the physician is unavailable to transmit a written prescription to a pharmacy for a Schedule II controlled substance. The facility designee must document the physician's prescription in writing and transmit the written document to a pharmacy so that the prescription can be filled. After the pharmacy fills the prescription, it must send a copy of the written document memorializing the prescription to the physician for his or her endorsement. The physician must then send the endorsed document, confirming the oral prescription, to the pharmacy within five business days.

Diversion of controlled substances for illicit purposes is of great concern to me. That is why we have included numerous provisions to protect against diversion in nursing homes. For example, the bill requires careful recordkeeping by facilities and pharmacies, which can then be reviewed by DEA as necessary. It requires each actor—the physician, facility designee, and pharmacist—to make a record of his or her role in the process. Long-term care facilities are asked to maintain a written or electronic logbook that memorializes prescriptions and their administration.

Additionally, the legislation enhances criminal and civil penalties for long-term care facility administrators and facility designees who divert drugs, or who violate recordkeeping requirements. These steps will help to ensure that pain medications get to those nursing home residents who need them.

I appreciate the great interest of the stakeholders, including long-term care facility, physician and pharmacy organizations, in solving this problem and I look forward to working with them to finally end the needless delay in pain relief. I would like to thank Attorney General Holder, DEA Administrator Michelle Leonhardt, and their staff for working with me on this legislation, and I look forward to continuing our work together to assure rapid approval by Congress.

Nursing home residents cannot wait for pain medication when they are in debilitating pain and our straightforward bill can help provide some needed relief. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 266—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF ''NATIONAL SAVE FOR RETIREMENT WEEK'', INCLUDING RAISING PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE VARIOUS TAX-PREFERRED RETIREMENT VEHICLES AND INCREASING PERSONAL FINANCIAL LITERACY

Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 266

Whereas people in the United States are living longer, and the cost of retirement is increasing significantly;

Whereas Social Security remains the bedrock of retirement income for the great majority of the people of the United States but was never intended by Congress to be the sole source of retirement income for families;

Whereas recent data from the Employee Benefit Research Institute indicates that, in the United States, less than ⅔ of workers or their spouses are currently saving for retirement, and the actual amount of retirement savings of workers is much less than the amount needed to adequately fund their retirement years;

Whereas the financial literacy of workers in the United States is an important factor to workers understanding the true need to save for retirement;

Whereas saving for retirement is a key component to overall financial health and security during retirement years, and the importance of financial literacy in planning for retirement must be advocated;

Whereas many workers may not be aware of their options in saving for retirement or may not have focused on the importance of, and need for, saving for retirement;

Whereas many employees have available to them, through their employers, access to defined benefit and defined contribution plans to assist them in preparing for retirement, yet many of those employees may not be taking advantage of those plans at all or to the full extent allowed by Federal law;

Whereas the need to save for retirement is important even during economic downturns or market declines, which make continued contributions all the more important;

Whereas all workers, including public and private sector employees, employees of tax-exempt organizations, and self-employed individuals, can benefit from increased awareness of the need to develop personal budgets and financial plans that include retirement savings strategies and to take advantage of the availability of tax-preferred savings vehicles to assist workers in saving for retirement; and

Whereas October 16 through October 22, 2011, has been designated as ''National Save for Retirement Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of ''National Save for Retirement Week'', including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles as important tools for personal savings and retirement financial security;

(2) supports the need to raise public awareness of the availability of a variety of ways to save for retirement which are favored under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and are utilized by many people in the United States, but which should be utilized by more;

(3) supports the need to raise public awareness of the importance of saving adequately for retirement and the continued existence of tax-preferred employer-sponsored retirement savings vehicles; and

(4) calls on the States, localities, schools, universities, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe National Save for Retirement Week with appropriate programs and activities, with the goal of increasing retirement savings for all people in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 267—RECOGNIZING THE HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH AND CELEBRATING THE HERITAGE AND CULTURE OF LATINOS IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE IMMENSE CONTRIBUTIONS OF LATINOS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr.

WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 267

Whereas beginning on September 15, 2011, through October 15, 2011, the United States celebrates Hispanic Heritage Month;

Whereas the Census Bureau estimates the Hispanic population in the United States at almost 50,500,000 people, making Hispanic Americans the largest ethnic minority within the United States;

Whereas 1 in 5 United States public school students is Hispanic, and the total number of Hispanic students enrolled in public schools in the United States is expected to reach 28,000,000 by 2050;

Whereas the purchasing power of Hispanic Americans is nearly $1,000,000,000,000, and there are more than 2,300,000 Hispanic-owned firms in the United States, supporting millions of employees nationwide and greatly contributing to the economic sector, especially retail trade, wholesale trade, food services, and construction;

Whereas Hispanic Americans serve in all branches of the Armed Forces and have bravely fought in every war in the history of the United States;

Whereas, as of May 31, 2011, there are 29,204 Hispanics serving with distinction in Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas 140,000 Hispanic soldiers served in the Korean War;

Whereas more than 80,000 Hispanics served in the Vietnam War, representing 5.5 percent of individuals who made the ultimate sacrifice for their country in that conflict even though Hispanics comprised only 4.5 percent of the United States population at the time;

Whereas, as of May 31, 2011, 605 United States military fatalities in Iraq and Afghanistan have been Hispanic;

Whereas, as of September 30, 2009, there were approximately 1,332,033 Hispanic veterans of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas 41 Hispanic Americans have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force that can be bestowed upon an individual serving in the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas Hispanic Americans are dedicated public servants, holding posts at the highest levels of government, including 1 seat on the Supreme Court, 2 seats in the Senate, 24 seats in the House of Representatives, and 2 seats in the Cabinet; and

Whereas Hispanic Americans harbor a deep commitment to family and community, an enduring work ethic, and a perseverance to succeed and contribute to society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month from September 15, 2011, through October 15, 2011;

(2) esteems the integral role of Latinos and the manifold heritage of Latinos in the economy, culture, and identity of the United States; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe Hispanic Heritage Month with appropriate programs and activities that appreciate the cultural contributions of Latinos to American life.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 601. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 602. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

SA 603. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 602 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, supra.

SA 604. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 603 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 602 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, supra.

SA 605. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, supra.

SA 606. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 605 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, supra.

SA 607. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, supra.

SA 608. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 607 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, supra.

SA 609. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 608 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 607 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 601. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. OFFSET.

There is rescinded on a pro rata base from the unobligated balances made available to the President, the Department of State, or the United States Agency for International Development for foreign assistance programs for fiscal 2011 an amount equal to the amount appropriated under this Act to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for disaster relief for fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

SA 602. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

DIVISION A—RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

SECTION 1. RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) and section 3A (b)(1) and (c)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This division shall be deemed to be a ''renewal resolution'' for purposes of section 9 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This division shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution or July 26, 2011, whichever occurs earlier.

DIVISION B—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster relief for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

EMERGENCY CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For ''Emergency Conservation Program'' for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), $78,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended.

EMERGENCY FOREST RESTORATION PROGRAM

For ''Emergency Forest Restoration Program'', for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), $49,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 99–177), as amended.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

EMERGENCY WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM

For ''Emergency Watershed Protection Program'' for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), $139,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for ''Economic Development Assistance Programs'' for expenses related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, and restoration of infrastructure in areas that received a major disaster designation in 2011 pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), $135,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For an additional amount for ''Mississippi River and Tributaries'' for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief

and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), $890,177,300, to remain available until expended for repair of damages to Federal projects: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance'', $60,000,000, to remain available until expended to dredge navigation channels and repair damage to Corps projects nationwide related to natural disasters: *Provided*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the amount in this paragraph is designated by Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance'' for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)) to dredge navigation channels and repair damage to Corps projects nationwide related to natural disasters, $88,003,700, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for ''Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies'', as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), for necessary expenses to prepare for flood, hurricane and other natural disasters and support emergency operations, repair and other activities in response to recent natural disasters as authorized by law, $244,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the amount in this paragraph is designated by Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

For an additional amount for ''Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies'', for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)) and as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), for necessary expenses to prepare for flood, hurricane and other natural disasters and support emergency operations, repair and other activities in response to recent natural disasters as authorized by law, $66,387,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended.

TITLE IV

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for ''Disaster Relief'', $500,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph is designated by Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

For an additional amount for the ''Disaster Relief'' for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), $4,600,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended. This Act may be cited as the ''Emergency Supplemental Disaster Relief Appropriations Resolution, 2011''.

TITLE V

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

For an additional amount for the ''Community Development Fund'', for necessary expenses related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, and restoration of infrastructure, housing, and economic revitalization resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)) in 2011, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended, for activities authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–383): *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended: *Provided further*, That funds shall be awarded directly to the State or unit of general local government at the discretion of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That prior to the obligation of funds a grantee shall submit a plan to the Secretary detailing the proposed use of all funds, including criteria for eligibility and how the use of these funds will address long-term recovery and restoration of infrastructure: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this heading may be used by a State or locality as a matching requirement, share, or contribution for any other Federal program: *Provided further*, That such funds may not be used for activities reimbursable by, or for which funds are made available by, the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Army Corps of Engineers: *Provided further*, That funds allocated under this heading shall not adversely affect the amount of any formula assistance received by a State or subdivision thereof under the Community Development Fund: *Provided further*, That a State or subdivision thereof may use up to 5 percent of its allocation for administrative costs: *Provided further*, That in administering the funds under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or the use by the recipient of these funds or guarantees (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), upon a request by a State or subdivision thereof explaining why such waiver is required to facilitate the use of such funds or guarantees, if the Secretary finds that such waiver would not be inconsistent with the overall purpose of title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register any waiver of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers pursuant to title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 no later than 5 days before the effective date of such waiver.

This division may be cited as the ''Emergency Supplemental Disaster Relief Appropriations Resolution, 2011''.

SA 603. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 602 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:

SECTION ___. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this division shall become effective 2 days after enactment.

SA 604. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 603 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 602 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''2 days'', insert ''1 day''.

SA 605. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

On page 2, line 17, strike ''on'' and insert ''3 days after''.

SA 606. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 605 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''3 days'' and insert ''2 days''.

SA 607. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

On page 2, strike line 17 through 19 and insert the following:

This joint resolution shall take effect on July 26, 2011.

SA 608. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 607 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''July 26'' and insert ''July 25''.

SA 609. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 608 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 607 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''July 25'' and insert ''July 24''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 14, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''Moving Intercity Passenger Rail into the Future.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 14, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Tax Reform Options: Marginal Rates on High-Income Taxpayers, Capital Gains and Dividends.''

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Securing the Pharmaceutical Supply Chain,'' on September 14, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 14, 2011, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 14, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Trafficing Victims Protection Reauthorization Act: Renewing the Commitment to Victims of Human Trafficking.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs' Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 14, 2011, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''New Ideas for Refinancing and Restructuring Mortgage Loans.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 14, 2011, at 2 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCE, AND INVESTMENT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs' Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 14, 2011, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Emerging Issues in Insurance Regulation.''

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Christina Wright of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's proceedings.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sarah Babcock and Danielle Fidler from Senator BAUCUS's staff be allowed floor privileges during the consideration of the pending Burma and disaster relief bill.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATIONS DISCHARGED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of PN 828, Mary B. DeRosa, to be Alternate Representative to the United Nations; PN 829, Frank E. Loy, to be Alternate Representative to the United Nations; and PN 830, Kendrick B. Meek, to be Representative to the United Nations; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mary B. DeRosa, of the District of Columbia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Frank E. Loy, of the District of Columbia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Kendrick B. Meek, of Florida, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 267.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 267) recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 267) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 267

Whereas beginning on September 15, 2011, through October 15, 2011, the United States celebrates Hispanic Heritage Month;

Whereas the Census Bureau estimates the Hispanic population in the United States at almost 50,500,000 people, making Hispanic Americans the largest ethnic minority within the United States;

Whereas 1 in 5 United States public school students is Hispanic, and the total number of Hispanic students enrolled in public schools in the United States is expected to reach 28,000,000 by 2050;

Whereas the purchasing power of Hispanic Americans is nearly $1,000,000,000,000, and there are more than 2,300,000 Hispanic-owned firms in the United States, supporting millions of employees nationwide and greatly contributing to the economic sector, especially retail trade, wholesale trade, food services, and construction;

Whereas Hispanic Americans serve in all branches of the Armed Forces and have bravely fought in every war in the history of the United States;

Whereas, as of May 31, 2011, there are 29,204 Hispanics serving with distinction in Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas 140,000 Hispanic soldiers served in the Korean War;

Whereas more than 80,000 Hispanics served in the Vietnam War, representing 5.5 percent of individuals who made the ultimate sacrifice for their country in that conflict even though Hispanics comprised only 4.5 percent of the United States population at the time;

Whereas, as of May 31, 2011, 605 United States military fatalities in Iraq and Afghanistan have been Hispanic;

Whereas, as of September 30, 2009, there were approximately 1,332,033 Hispanic veterans of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas 41 Hispanic Americans have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force that can be bestowed upon an individual serving in the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas Hispanic Americans are dedicated public servants, holding posts at the highest levels of government, including 1 seat on the Supreme Court, 2 seats in the Senate, 24 seats in the House of Representatives, and 2 seats in the Cabinet; and

Whereas Hispanic Americans harbor a deep commitment to family and community, an enduring work ethic, and a perseverance to succeed and contribute to society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month from September 15, 2011, through October 15, 2011;

(2) esteems the integral role of Latinos and the manifold heritage of Latinos in the economy, culture, and identity of the United States; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe Hispanic Heritage Month with appropriate programs and activities that appreciate the cultural contributions of Latinos to American life.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., tomorrow morning, Thursday, September 15; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each during that time, 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 resume consideration of H.J. Res. 66, a joint resolution regarding Burma Sanctions and the legislative vehicle for additional FEMA funds; and I also ask that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. We are now considering the Burma Sanctions and FEMA regulations. As a reminder, I filed cloture on the substitute amendment and the joint resolution today. If no agreement is reached, a cloture vote on the substitute amendment will occur Friday morning. The filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to H.J. Res. 66 and the substitute amendment is 1 p.m. tomorrow. However, we hope to reach an agreement to complete consideration of H.J. Res. 66 and the FAA and highway extensions during tomorrow's session. Senators will be notified when votes are scheduled.

As things now stand, we will have a series of votes on Friday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order, as a further mark of respect to the memory of Senator Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:12 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 15, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

DAVID CAMPOS GUADERRAMA, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE DAVID BRIONES, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL ANTHONY MCFAUL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KURT B. HINRICHS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO SERVE AS THE DIRECTOR OF THE COAST GUARD RESERVE PURSUANT TO TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 53 IN THE GRADE INDICATED:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

RDML DAVID R. CALLAHAN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RAYMOND V. MASON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

HYUN S. SIM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

OLGA BETANCOURT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

MICHAEL C. FREIDL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

NATACHA L. MILLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

BENJAMIN D. OWEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

HEIDI J. COX

To be major

JORDY C. COX
CHRISTOPHER A. KOVELL
RAFAEL NUNEZ
MARK A. RICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

COLIN A. BITTERFIELD
KENNETH H. SCHLORF II
STEPHEN J. SHANK
ANDREAS W. WOOTEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

RICHARD J. ALLINGER
DALE J. BECK
JAMES D. BELLAMY
KENNETH W. BRACE
DANIEL W. CLARK
WILLIAM J. CLERKIN
CLAUDE N. CRESSY
ROBERT G. CROSWELL
TIMOTHY D. EVANS
WILLIAM G. FRANKENBERG
ELIZABETH F. HARRISON
ADRIANNE M. HOLT
ANA I. KUEHNE

JONATHAN R. LANE
KEITH L. LAWSON
WILLIAM R. MCSKIMMING III
JAMES H. MURPHY
ALAN NAPIER
FREDERICK S. REGEL
RICHARD B. SMESTAD
GREGORY J. SWATKOWSKI
PARIS D. UM
MICHAEL T. VAVREK
SHAWN A. WAGNER
ANGELA D. WOODS
MARGARET A. YOUNGBLOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

BRIAN R. BENJAMIN
THOMAS A. JOHNSON
GERALD L. LEMASTERS
CAROL M. PASCO
BRADLEY T. RICHARDSON
DELAINA L. SAWYERS
RICHARD C. SWOOPE, JR.
MARK D. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TERESE B. ACOCELLA
DANIEL F. BOHMER
WALTER H. CONNERY
JUAN J. FLORES
MARIA E. OTERO
BRYCE J. TAGGART
KIMBAL R. TAYLOR
RONALD S. WALLS
JEFFREY J. WEBB
LAURA A. WHEELER
GARY L. WILLIAMSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL D. ALPERIN
JAMES C. ANDERSON
PEDRO J. ARROYO
DAVID A. BALT
ROBERT C. BASS
JAMES L. BUDNY
DARRELL L. CASS
KEVIN B. COSTELLO
TIMOTHY C. COUNIHAN
MANUEL A. ECHANDI
EDGAR A. FIKE IV
VICENTE E. FONT, JR.
JOE B. FOX
LAURENCE W. GEBLER
BERNARD T. GEISER
DENNIS A. GORT
JONATHAN R. GREIFER
PIETRO GUADALUPI
SIMON HAMID
CARL T. HASSELMAN
JOHN W. HUNNICUTT
CYRUS S. KUMP
EDWARD A. LELONEK
CHARLES D. MAGRUDER
LAWRENCE MARTINEK
TAMARIN L. MCCARTIN
BRIAN P. MCGLINCH
JEFFREY J. MCINTURFF
ALEXANDRE F. MIGALA
CARL M. MINAMI
EDWARD A. PEREZCONDE
ANDREW C. PETERSON
SCOTT D. PICKER
STEPHEN E. POST
FABRIZIO REMOTTI
RICHARD A. REUTLINGER
HERBERT W. RIDYARD, JR.
STEVEN L. ROMITI
NELSON G. ROSEN
BROOK D. SCOTT
ROBERT L. SHERIDAN
LANCE S. SMITH
WILLIAM J. STANTON
JERRY J. SVOBODA
JACQUELINE S. THOMPSON
JOHN E. TIS
GINO T. TREVISANI
KURT VONFRICKEN
BARRY K. WADE
STEVE W. WAXMAN
DAVID S. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CLAYTON T. ABE
DANIEL W. ALLEY
ROY G. BASSETT
NATHANIEL F. BROWN
WAYNE A. CAROLEO
PAUL N. CERVONE
PHILIP A. DINGMANN
ALBERT F. DINICOLA
SANTOSH DODDAMANE
STEVEN C. ESHENAUR
CLARENCE L. KEMP
RONY R. LEE, JR.
MICHAEL D. MONETA
JONATHON L. PARK
LEE A. PIETRANGELO
CARL T. REESE
HECTOR L. ROSADO
STEPHEN B. SHOOP
TERRENCE A. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

GEORGE V. HANKEWYCZ
SU T. KANG
RALPH W. OGILVIE
DEAN J. ROBINSON
BARRY STEINBERG
HENRY K. THOMAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOHN F. BOWLEY
ROBERT C. BYRD
LILLIAN M. CONNER
CHRISTOPHER M. COSHATT
GLENN E. GARLAND
RICHARD J. GREEN
ROBERT D. HARRINGTON
ROBERT B. KOHL
MARY D. LEE
CAM W. LITTLE
DAVID C. MATHIS
TERRY A. MCCOOE
KRISTIN L. RAJALA
JAMES H. TIMMONS
MAUREEN E. WEBER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DAMON M. ARMSTRONG
CODY B. AULL
CHARLES D. BAKER
SARAH B. BALLARD
JASON S. BALLIN
DEBRA D. BANKS
SEAN M. BARANIAK
PATRICK D. BARKER
THOMAS K. BARLOW
PETER J. BAUMEISTER
CARRIE A. BEATY
JASON R. BERNHARD
DANA L. BOE
STEVEN P. BOE
DENISE BOGGSWILKERSON
FRANK J. BOGNI
JACK R. BRANDAU
KENT C. BRANDEBERRY
ANDREW M. BRANHAM
NICHOLAS J. BREMER
BRIDGET S. BROWN
KEVIN A. BROWN
ANDREW S. CAMARATA
JACOB L. CAMP
HELEN L. CANN
AMY A. CANUSO
SAMUEL N. CAOILE
GREGORY G. CAPRA
PETER N. CARBONE
BROOKE A. CAUFIELD
KAI Y. CHENG
REGINA R. CHINSIOKWONG
CHRISTINA M. CHIRICO
ANNA Y. CHOE
JAMES K. CLARK
JUSTIN S. CLARK
THERESA R. CLARK
JOHN T. CLEAVES
JAMES C. CLIFFORD
CAROLYN F. COGHILL
JOSHUA S. COLMAN
KRISTIN A. CONLEY
JONATHON COOKE
JAMES S. CORTES
WILLIAM J. COTTER III
STACY L. COULTHARD
BRADY B. COX
PATRICK D. CRONYN
BRYAN A. CURRIE
GREGORY A. DADEKIAN
BRANDON L. DAVALLE
LAWRENCE C. DECKER
KRISTINA L. DEPAOLO
JENNIFER R. DERBY
JOSHUA P. DETTMER
JAY R. DIAZPARLET
ANGELA M. DICARLOMEACHAM
BRIAN M. DIMMER
MARK S. DOUGLAS
ROBERT W. ENGELEN
JEREMY S. ENNIS
SARAH M. ESCOTT
LINETTE J. EWING
JERRY J. FASOLDT
DARYL B. FICK, JR.
SETH Y. FLAGG
DANIEL A. FOSTER
ELIZABETH M. FOWLER
JAMES R. FREDERICK
JON R. FREDERICK
KYLE D. GADBOIS
MICAH J. GASPARY
SARAH B. GENDERNALIK
ANTONINO GERMANA
ANTHONY A. GIBERMAN
LISA K. GIBSON
ERIC E. GLASS
JOSEPH P. GORMLEY
RYAN K. GOULD
SUZANNE R. GUDEMAN
PHILIP A. HAGAN
JESSICA M. HAMEED
NATHAN C. HAMMEL
JUSTIN A. HARDER
TRAVIS E. HARRELL
NIEKA K. HARRIS
JARED L. HARWOOD
ERIC W. HEWITT
YOREL C. HICKERSON
AMANDA I. HIGGINSON
JENNIFER L. HIPFLORES
GEORGE J. HNATH
ERROL C. HULL
MARK E. HUMPHREY
MEGHAN E. HUNTER
MATTHEW S. IRWIN
ASHLEY Y. JACKSON
SHANE D. JENSEN
PAUL D. JOHENK
CHARLES E. JOHNSON
JAMIE S. JOHNSON
JULIE L. KAESBERG
JEAN D. KEMP
JONATHAN S. KERR
CECILIA M. KIPNIS
LEAH K. KOHLER
KELLY G. KOREN
KATHERINE J. KOSS
JENNIFER A. KRUSE
TREVOR L. KUTTLER
MARCY G. LAKE
IAN A. LANG
MATTHEW A. LANGFORD
MICHAEL F. LAROCHELLE
KELLY S. LARSON
SUZAN M. LEWIS
SCOTT LIU
DEREK N. LODICO
DAWN M. LONG
ADRIENNE M. LOPATA
KATHLEEN M. LOVE
MARTIN W. LUNCEFORD
DIANA M. MACIAN
JOHN S. MADDOX
PATRICK W. MAGAJNA
RYAN A. MAKAR
KATHERINE L. H. MALOZZI
VENKAT R. MANGUNTA
DALICE A. MARRIOTT
MALCOLM C. MASTELLER
DOUGLAS C. MCADAMS
ELEXIS C. MCBEE
AMANDA C. MCCAULLEY
JONATHAN D. MCDIVITT
CHRISTINE E. MCDONALD
PATRICK T. MCVEY
ELLIE C. K. MENTLER
CAROLINE T. MESSMER
MATTHEW F. MESSOLINE
JORDAN J. MICHELENA
DEREK M. MILETICH
JONATHAN P. MILLER
CHRISTINE M. MINEROWICZ
TINIKA A. MONTGOMERY
HEIDI K. MORGAN
LUCAS A. MUELLER
LYNITA H. MULLINS
KRISTINE B. MUNOZ
NOREEN E. MURPHY
ERIK J. NAGEL
JOSHUA D. NASSIRI
BENJAMIN E. NELSON
NICHOLAS T. NELSON
LUKE C. NICHOLAS
ANDRES A. NIETO
JUSTIN J. NORK
THAYS S. NOVIKOFF
MICHAEL J. OKASINSKI
NIELS H. OLSON
CHRISTIAN W. ORAM
YAN T. ORTIZPOMALES
BENJAMIN J. OSBORNE
AMANDA E. OWENS
ALFRED J. OWINGS II
MICHAEL B. PAUL
JAMI J. PETERSON
HOANGANH PHAN
AARON J. PHARISS
CHRISTOPHER R. PHILLIPS
HUY Q. PHUN
KEVIN A. PINKOS
ALEXANDRA L. PINON
MARINELLE PLATON
AJA E. POLLARD
MICHAEL W. PRUITT
TAMEKA J. PYLES
SARA J. QUAN
JOSHUA D. QUICK
JODIE D. RAPPE
ROBERT M. REED
SHANNON F. REEVE
KEITH E. REID
AARON J. REILLY
JASON P. RICE
JAMES R. RIPPLE
JOHN S. ROBERTSON

MATTHEW W. ROSE
JONATHAN M. ROTH
LEAH S. SAG
ADAM M. SANBORN
MICHELLE J. SANGIORGI
BRENDA J. SCHMIDT
BRIAN L. SCHMIDT
BREMEN K. SCHULTZ
PETER G. SEGUIN
JEREMY K. SELLEY
KELLI K. SHANNON
ANDREW E. SHEEP
ANGELA Y. SHEN
ALEXANDRA L. SINGER
MANISH SINGLA
KRIS SIRIRATSIVAWONG
MONIQUE E. SMITH
ROBERT B. SMITH
JENNIFER L. SOGGE
JEFFREY S. SORENSEN
CLAIR K. J. ST
SHANNON M. STACY
JAMES E. STANTON
EDWARD T. STICKLE, JR.
CORRIE E. STOFCHO
CHAD A. STORCH
JIMMY SUVATNE
NICHOLAS N. SWEET
AARON W. SWENSON
NADINE S. TASSIN
VIRGINIA P. TETI
ANGELA L. TOMASCHKO
ARTURO G. TORRES
KATHERYNN H. TRAN
DOUGLAS M. TURNER
ROBERT N. UNISZKIEWICZ
TYLER A. VACHON
FRANK E. VILLAUME IV
SHELTON A. VIOLA
CATHERINE M. VISINTAINER
HERRMANN P. F. VON
ROBERT B. WALTON
KARA B. WANCHICK
WILLIAM H. WARD
REX S. WATSON
AMY M. WELLS
NICHOLAS J. WELLS
DARYL W. WILLIAMS
RAQUEL T. WILLIAMS
DERIC M. WILSON
MATTHEW R. WILSON
BENJAMIN D. WIND
KRISTI M. WOOD
JEFFREY C. WORTHLEY
BRUCE A. YEE
MARISOL C. ZIEMBA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JAMES P. ALDERETE II
JENNIFER D. ANDERSON
RANDY L. BALL
ERIC F. BAUMAN
SAMUEL S. BECK
ROBIN C. BENNETT
KITTIMA BOONSIRISERMSOOK
MARK A. BUCKNER
JORDAN N. BUZZELL
LAURA N. CARLE
JOSHUA E. COHEN
ANTHONY L. DAVIS
JEFFREY A. DRAUDE
MICHAEL G. FOUST
EDWARD J. GIVENS, JR.
JAYSON H. HUBER
DIANA H. KIM
PAUL E. KOCIAN
JASON W. MATHYS
DAVID C. MYHRE
CALEB J. NOORDMANS
CHRISTOPHER S. OSWALD
KENNETH J. OTTERSTEDT
MELANIE A. PERRY
BARRY E. PETERSON
JOHN J. PETRINI, JR.
AARON E. QUITMEYER
VERNE F. REED II
ANGELA C. SESSA
ANDREW D. SILVESTRI
SHAWN D. TEUTSCH
PHILLIP S. TIMMONS
VINH T. TON
JOSHUA C. TREESH
DUANE A. VANNIEUWENHUYZEN
WALTER B. VOLINSKI, JR.
JOHN P. WALSH
EVAN R. WHITBECK
SETH T. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

SAAD M. ALAZIZ
DAVID H. ALLGOOD
EFLAND H. AMERSON
CLEMIA N. ANDERSON
JOHNFRITZ E. ANTOINE
RAOUL ARCHAMBAULT
JANETTE B. ARENCIBIA
LAURA J. BARKER
CHRISTOPHER E. BARNES
ALLISON L. BENNETT
WILLIAM O. BENNETT
WILLIAM R. BERG
HYRUM T. BROSSARD
FELECIA E. BROWN
JERRY BROWN III
ROXANNE G. BURRUS
LINDA P. BYRNE
TILFORD L. CLARK
JANIESE A. CLECKLEY
HEATH M. CLIFFORD
KAARIN E. COE
KATHLEEN A. COLTER
JOHN O. COOKE
BARRY A. COOPER
WILLIAM T. CRIDER
TIMOTHY V. CRUICKSHANK
MICHAEL A. CZIGLER
GRAHAM T. DANYLEYKO
DAVID P. DAY
CHRISTOPHER S. DEANGELIS
NANCY C. DELAHOYA
PRASAD B. DIWADKAR
KYLE D. DOHM
EMILY M. DOVER
MARIA D. EDUSADA
TESHARA E. FELDER
JOHN J. FRASER
REINA GOMEZ
PAUL C. GRAF
DANIEL O. GRAJEDA
TOBIJAH T. GRIFFIN
FERNANDO S. GUEVARRA, JR.
SAACHA L. HAKE
MELISSA J. HARNLY
JOHN R. HAWLEY
WILLIAM P. HAYWOOD
SCOTT A. HAZELRIGG
AMY E. HENDRIX
NATALIA C. HENRIQUEZ
MONICA E. HERNANDEZ
MATTHEW J. HORNER
WILLIAM J. HOWES
DANIEL L. IMMEKER
SAMUEL H. JARVIS
ELMER L. JIMENEZ
BRADLEY E. JOHNSON
JASON M. JONES
PAMELA M. KLEPACTULENSRU
AUSTIN W. LATOUR
SAMUEL Y. LEVIN
CHRISTOPHER P. LINGARD
CARL E. LONG, JR.
DAVID J. LOOMIS II
KEVIN J. LYLE
SHAWNNA M. LYNCHCHEE
MICHAEL R. A. MABRY
RESSURRECCION J. MACASPAC
NICHOLAS J. MARTIN
KIMBERLY L. MARYMAN
ELENA M. MATHIS
VENANCIO MAYSONET
JOHN W. MCAFEE
KEVIN P. MCMULLEN
TERRY D. MILES
JOSHUA A. MILLER
WILFREDO MORALES
GINA L. MOROSKY
MARLO M. NARRO
JULIA A. NEFCZYK
JAMES F. NOEL
JAMES M. NOGLE
KIMBERLY A. OELSCHLAGER
AYODELE O. OLABISI
TERRI K. OSNER
ANTHONY D. OWENS
EMILY A. OWENS
TOBY W. PALMER
MARGARET M. PARKS
MICHAEL S. PAYNE
TREVOR S. PETROU
DARREN J. PIERCE
ROBERT A. PILLITIERE
BRYAN L. PYLE
ADAM C. RAE
CALVIN W. RALLS, JR.
JEROME E. RANDLE
MATHEW A. RANDOLPH
ROY J. RANGLIN
ALBERT RICCARDI III
MEGAN J. RIEMAN
DAVID R. ROBISON
CARMEN F. ROWE
MICHELLE L. SCHOLL
NATHAN L. SEAMAN
ANTON SHUFUTINSKY
NATHANIEL M. SMITH
JOSEPH A. SORCIC
DARCY L. SOWARDS
LOREN R. STANDLEY, JR.
KEVIN L. STARKEY
JOSEPH G. STASTNY
SAM STEPHENS
GEORGE H. STERNS
MELISSA J. STRAHAN
LEEDJIA A. SVEC
FRANCIS TAM
ELMER F. TAYLOR, JR.
JESUS S. THOMPSON
SHANNON K. THOR
TYLER J. TOWERS
JAMES R. TUBERSON
MONIKA J. TURNER
KATHERINE L. VOGEL
DEAN J. WAGNER, JR.
SCOTT F. WEIDNER
JEREMY D. WILKINSON
BRANDON J. WILLIAMS
THOMAS M. WILLIAMS
SEAN O. WILSON
CHRISTINE M. ZOHLEN
MICHAEL A. ZUNDEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MICHAEL W. BLOOMROSE
DYLAN T. BURCH
HEATHER L. CASSIDY
JASON W. CONNORS
BRETT D. COOK
MARIO M. CORREA, JR.
MATTHEW P. CUTCHEN
CHRISTOPHER J. DEERWESTER
JONATHAN T. FLYNN
NATHANIEL R. GROSS
JUSTIN C. HENDERSON
JAMES M. KENNEDY, JR.
RUSSELL A. LANNUTTI
GREGORY W. MANZ
DAVID A. MELSON
BENJAMIN C. ROBERTSON
JACOB W. ROMELHARDT
LISA M. SENAY
DAVID M. SHULL
CHRISTOPHER C. SWAIN
JAMES M. TOOHEY
CHRISTOPHER P. TOSCANO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

HECTOR ACEVEDO
ERICA L. ARNOLD
DAVID M. AUERBACH
RAFAL B. BANEK
DORA M. BERRIOS
SHAWN R. BOWDOIN
ARON W. BOWLIN
KELLY J. BOWMAN
JENNIFER M. BROOKS
BRANDI M. BROWN
CORNELIUS B. BROWN
JEAN E. BRUTON
CRYSTAL A. BRYANT
MELISSA K. BURKE
MARGARET A. S. BUSH
REGINALDO F. CAGAMPAN
LORI A. CAMPBELL
RICHARD B. CANONG
WARREN L. CANTRELL
TREVOR W. CARLSON
CECILIA R. COLEMAN
TAMERA A. CORSON
CURT P. CUNNINGHAM
JOANNE E. DANA
CHRISTINE D. DAVIES
DIANE L. DAVIS
WALTER J. DAVIS
CHEVAUX DAWKINS
LISA L. DOBISON
DANA DONES
LANCE K. DOWNING
JAMES J. DRISCOLL
NICOLE J. DUFFY
STEPHANIE L. DUFFY
CHRISTA D. DUNCANARFAA
VANESSA R. DUNN
BRIAN E. ELLIS
CAROL M. ELLSWORTH
BROOKES A. ENGLEBERT
JAMES L. ESTOESTA
ARNOLD FAJAYAN
CHERIE D. FERRIS
KIMBERLEE P. FLANNERY
THOMAS N. FULLER
GERALD T. GAMBALA
LACY L. GEE
ERINN V. GELAKOSKA
ELIZABETH K. GLOOR
KOREY A. GOULETTE
NOELLE M. GRIFFITH
STACEY M. HAMLETT
JASON A. HARRISON
BRADLEY S. HAZEN
JOHN F. HENLEY
LAWRENCE B. HENRY
RACHEL S. HERNANDEZ
DANETTE R. HINELY
JAMES T. HINKLE
TINA M. HITCHNER
TODD A. HLAVAC
PATRICIA A. HORN
PENNY J. JIMENEZ
ROBERT D. JOHNS
GREGORY A. JONES
ELIZABETH A. JORDAN
JAMES A. KETZLER
CASEY V. KIRBERGER
SHERRI L. LAMMERDING
SHANE E. LAWSON
SARAH A. LEDFORD
BRANDON J. LIMTIACO
MARY F. LISEC
JOHN LITCHFIELD
LEAH M. LIZADA
RODRIGO F. LOPEZ
RUBEN A. LOPEZ
CAROLE N. LOUIS
SCOTT M. MACDONALD
JOSEPH D. MCBEAIN

CHRISTOPHER J. MCCOMB
TONIA M. MCGHEE
ALEAH J. MCHENRY
HILARY A. MEYER
ERIC J. MILLER
JESSICA M. MILLER
MARK J. MILLER
ERIN C. MOHAN
SHAYNE O. MORRIS
AARON C. MYERS
DENISE D. NEUMANN
SO Y. NEWTON
ERIN R. OCKER
KAREN L. ORTOLANI
NANCY M. PEREZ
GLORIA C. PIERCE
JOSE L. PINON
TINA PLAGGEMEYER
TREVA POERSCHMANN
SHANNA C. POWELLSEARCEY
SHARON QUALLIO
JAMES D. REICHERT
MICHAEL J. RIEGLER
JESSICA J. ROBINSON
WILLIAM J. ROLFES
GAYLORD M. ROMEROSA
MICHELLE E. SANABIA
STEVEN K. SARRO
PETER W. SCHENKE
EILEEN SCOTT
ANGELA M. SMITH
FIDEL S. SORIANO
CHAD M. SPRINGER
KIMBERLY STUART
STACEY M. STUMP
KENDER W. SURIN
JAMES A. TAMPLEN
STEPHEN V. THATE
FRANK D. TRATCHEL
BETTY A. ULMER
SHERWIN VALDEZ
LIGIA B. VILLAJUANA
MICHELLE L. WESTCOTT
CAROL E. WHEELER
ABIGAIL T. WHITE
MARIA WILLIAMS
RILEY L. WILLIAMS, JR.
ALFONZA WILLIS
BRANDON K. WOLF
DARCY T. WRIGHT
ANTHONY D. YARBROUGH
JAY ZULUETA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JAVIER ARAUJO
FLORENCE D. BEATO
KRISTINA J. BICKING
BRYAN A. BOGGS
CLINTON S. BRYANT
TIMOTHY J. CALVO
KURT A. CELIS
PETER CHANG
KELLY M. CHUFO
BRIAN D. COLBURN
ERIC J. COOMES
TANYA K. CORMIER
AUTUMN L. DANIEL
EUGENE DAWSON, JR.
ANTHONY R. DICOLA
KIRK A. ENGLER
LEE H. EUBANKS
JOEL B. FREY
MONICA M. FREY
SCOTT W. FUTRELLE
PHILLIP J. GAGEN
JESUS M. GARZON
JUAN C. GONZALEZ
TERRY C. GRIGSBY
IVAN R. GUMBS
ANTHONY D. HARPER
JARRED S. HENLEY
JACKIE B. HURSE
SCOTT T. HUTTLESTON
WILLIAM M. JAKUBOWICZ
KEVIN J. KENT
MORDOCAI KIFLU
CRAIG A. KNOX
WALTER L. LAPTEW, JR.
SCOTT A. LONG
TAQUINA T. LUSTER
MICHAEL J. MACOMBER
MICHAEL H. MALONE
THELMA L. MANNING
ERIC A. MELO
JOHN R. MEYER
JAMIE L. MITCHELL
JASON A. MORGAN
SEAN A. NEER
THUAN M. NGUYEN
TONY N. NGUYEN
DAVID J. OZECK
ANNE R. PAINE
DERRICK L. PASLEY
MICHAEL J. PEREIRA
DOUGLAS M. QUINN
CHRISTOPHER C. RADKE
RICO A. REYES
RICARDO R. RODRIGUEZ
DAVID M. ROSS
JASON W. ROSS
ERIKA M. SCHOENTHAL
FRANK W. SHERMAN
MATTHEW J. SHIELS
MICHELLE A. SIMMONS
ALBERT T. SONON IV
JOSEPH K. SPEDE
ROBIN L. TAYLOR
NICHOLAS A. ULMER
ERNESTO M. URETA
THOMAS G. WALKER
LAWRENCE S. WATKINS, JR.
MATTHEW D. WILCOX
KRISTOPHER F. WILLIAMS
CHRISTOPHER T. WILSON
RYAN J. WODELE
RAYMOND C. YAU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

THOMAS T. COOK
JERRY D. DURHAM
PAUL B. GREER
SONG S. HWANG
JEFFERY B. JENKINS
JOHN F. KEITH
RONALD J. KENNEDY
NEAL R. KREISLER
TAVIS J. LONG
HARVEY C. MACKLIN
MYRON D. MCCONVILLE
ROBERT S. NELSON
MICHAEL Q. OBANNON
GLENN W. ORRIS
JEFFREY B. PARKS
CARL P. RHOADS
RAY F. RIVERS
LESZEK M. SIKORSKI
TIMOTHY A. SPRINGER
MICHAEL A. TAYLOR
GUY A. THOMPSON
COREY T. THORNTON
WAYNE N. TOMASEK
ULYSSES L. UBALDE
LEROY C. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ADNAN S. AHSAN
CHRISTOPHER L. ALMOND
PETER R. BENSON
BLAKE E. BURKET
PETER R. CALI
JUAN CHAVIRA
BRIAN J. CRYSTAL
ARCE D. DOBLE, JR.
JAMES M. DOHM
GRADY D. DONATHAN IV
ELIZABETH A. DURIKA
ALAN W. EICHELMAN
TIMOTHY W. GLEASON
CRYSTINE M. GOOD
MICHAEL A. GUZZI
JACKSON R. HABECK
PHILLIP R. HAMROCK
BENJAMIN P. HOFMAN
DANIEL E. LUTZ
CHAD M. MARSHALL
ANDREW W. OLSEN
ERNESTO S. PADILLA
BRYAN M. PARNELL
WILLIAM R. PITCAIRN IV
AARON J. RIPPLE
CHARLES E. ROY
CLINTON R. ROY
DANIEL J. SCHMITT
BRIAN B. SCHONEFELD
JACOB W. SEGALLA
JAMES W. SHEFCHIK
SPENCER L. SHIH
THOMAS J. SOLETHER
JUSTIN D. SPINKS
BENJAMIN H. TURNER
REBECCA L. WALDRAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

FABIO O. AUSTRIA, JR.
MARVIN G. BOONE
NOEL A. FONTANILLA
ERIC W. HASS
RHYSS B. HIZON
DANIEL C. LEWIS
ROLANDO R. PAGADUAN
LEON QUARLES
DONNA L. SMOAK

DISCHARGED NOMINATIONS

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of the following nominations by unanimous consent and the nominations were confirmed:

MARY B. DEROSA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

FRANK E. LOY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

KENDRICK B. MEEK, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 14, 2011:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARY B. DEROSA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

FRANK E. LOY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

KENDRICK B. MEEK, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMEMORATING THE 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF WARMINSTER TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the township of Warminster, Pennsylvania, upon the celebration of its 300th anniversary.

The township derives its name from the town of Warminster, in Wiltshire, England. Warminster is the twin township of Southampton, Pennsylvania, which lies immediately southeast and adjoining. It is also bounded by the townships of Northampton, Warwick, and Warrington, all of which lie in my Congressional district, the 8th District of Pennsylvania. To this day, Warminster has the same limits as when originally laid out, with an area of over six thousand and ninety-nine acres.

Warminster was one of the earliest townships settled in America, with roots tracing all the way back to the 17th century. John Hart and John Rush were among the most prominent early settlers in Warminster, both arriving shortly after William Penn in the latter part of the 17th century. Combined, Hart and Rush owned over one thousand acres of land in the Warminster area. They, along with many other early settlers and statesman, helped to foster growth in Warminster by aiding in road and church construction, and farm development, thus laying the groundwork for the beautiful township of Warminster.

Many years later, Warminster became a refuge for American soldiers during the Revolutionary War, at the battle of Crooked Billet. In the skirmish action, British forces launched a surprise attack against Brigadier General John Lacey and three regiments of Pennsylvania militia, forcing them to retreat into the farms in Warminster.

During the wake of WWII, Warminster also became the home of one of the largest naval modification units in the area. At the Naval Air Development Center in Johnsville, large quantities of aircraft parts were modified for use in the war, and progress was made on the development of guided missiles. The NADC also played a critical role in training mercury astronauts and establishing the United States as the world leader in technology and space exploration. During the cold war era, the NADC employed over 2600 people, including 1600 scientists and engineers, and 300 members of the military.

With such a rich history, it is clear that Warminster Township deserves much recognition and praise. I am honored to represent the people of Warminster Township, and wish them all the best on this momentous occasion.

LETTER FROM AMBASSADOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN, YASHAR ALIYEV

HON. DAN BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, as co-chairmen of the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, Congressman BILL SHUSTER of Pennsylvania and I would like to bring a letter to the attention of our House colleagues that we received from the Ambassador of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Yashar Aliyev.

EMBASSY OF THE REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Washington, DC.

Hon. DAN BOREN,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOREN, I am writing to express my concerns of the reports that on September 13, 2011 the so-called ''Office of the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic in the USA'', the Embassy of Armenia to the United States and major Armenian-American organizations are organizing event on the premises of the U.S. Congress, dedicated to the so-called ''20th Anniversary of Independence of the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic''. According to the news reports Mr. Ashot Ghulian, who presents himself as the ''Chairman of the NKR Parliament'', will be visiting Washington D.C. and will be the keynote speaker at the event.

In this regard, I draw your attention to the fact that so-called ''Nagorno-Karabakh Republic'' is a self-proclaimed entity created on the occupied territories of Azerbaijan, supported by Armenia and essentially is under its direction and control. It is entirely unrecognized as such, even by Armenia.

As a result of the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict hundreds of thousands of the Azerbaijanis were expelled from the Nagorno-Karabakh region and surrounding territories of Azerbaijan. Four UN Security Council resolutions adopted in 1993 following the armed seizure of Azerbaijani territory reaffirm the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Azerbaijan, demand immediate, complete and unconditional withdrawal of the occupying forces from all occupied regions.

By engaging in public campaigns using the Congress premises the agents of the separatist regime pursue the goal of distracting the attention of the Members of Congress and broad American public from the continued occupation of the territories of Azerbaijan by the Armenian armed forces, accompanied by gross violation of human rights of hundreds of thousands of the Azerbaijani IDPs. Their ultimate goal is to consolidate the occupation of these territories and to prevent return of the displaced Azerbaijani population to their homes and properties from which they were forcibly expelled.

Allowing organization of such activities on American soil encourages the Government of Armenia to hold on to its uncompromised position in peace negotiations and complicates the already difficult settlement process. Participation of Members of Congress in these events may be qualified as support for the separatist regime and negatively affects the honest broker image of the United States as a Co-Chair of the OSCE Minsk Group tasked to find just and peaceful solution to the conflict.

Azerbaijan is an important strategic partner of the United States. Azerbaijan provides multi-faceted support for U.S. operations in Afghanistan and remains a steadfast supporter of Israel. Our two countries cooperate on counterterrorism and nonproliferation issues. Moreover, Azerbaijan greatly contributes to the energy security of the United States and Europe.

I ask you to refrain from participating in this event that is directed against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Azerbaijan, a key ally of the United States in the strategic Caspian region and to voice your opposition to using Capitol grounds for such activities.

Sincerely,

YASHAR ALIYEV,
Ambassador of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

IN RECOGNITION OF NICHOLAS CARL GOTTUSO

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Police Captain Nicholas Carl Gottuso, ''Nick,'' for his 32 years of service with the Hillsborough Police Department.

Captain Gottuso began his career in law enforcement in 1976 as a Dispatcher for San Mateo County Communication. In 1980 he was hired by the Pacifica Police Department as a Patrol Officer, where he served for two years. In January 1983 he was hired by the Town of Hillsborough as a Police Office, promoted to Corporal in 1990, Inspector in 1992, Sergeant in 1993, Lieutenant in 1999, Police Commander in 2002 and achieved the rank of Police Captain that same year. During Captain Gottuso's employment with the Hillsborough Police Department, he trained as a Field Training Officer, a Background Investigator, and a Traffic Investigator; and he served as the Head Range master and was responsible for the selection and designation of a standardized firearm, the Beretta 92F.

Captain Gottuso proved to be invaluable to his community as both a field agent and an administrator. He was one of the Founding Commanders of the North Central Regional SWAT Team, served as a Sniper Team Commander and led and participated in dozens of successful operations, many of which led to the capture of criminals and the saving of innocent lives.

As a police captain, Captain Gottuso responded to numerous bank robberies and other active shooter incidents. Time and again, Captain Gottuso put his life on the line for the residents of Hillsborough, and the community will forever be indebted to him for his bravery, selflessness, and competence.

Even when Captain Gottuso wasn't on the front lines, he worked tirelessly to improve the lives of Hillsborough's residents, as well as the lives of the men and women serving our country abroad. Gottuso worked with overseas Unit Commanders during his time as the administrator of the Adopt-a-Troop program, a nonprofit organization that sends much-needed care packages to our troops fighting overseas in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In 2004, I worked closely with Captain Gottuso to redesignate the Eugene A. Doran Memorial Bridge which spans the scenic Crystal Springs Dam on I–280 in San Mateo County. The bridge was named after the slain Hillsborough police officer and we passed a California Senate Resolution to include Officer Doran's son who died in the line of duty in Vietnam. The Bridge was renamed the Officer Eugene and Marine Lance Corporal Patrick M. Doran Memorial Bridge.

Despite Captain Gottuso's extensive service on the front lines of law enforcement, he never lost his sense of humor or desire to entertain. Captain Gottuso's ability to lighten the mood delighted generations of schoolchildren during police presentations. His yearly narration of the K–9 squad demonstration made it a truly enjoyable and memorable event for anyone who witnessed it.

Nicholas Carl Gotusso was born in Ft. Carson, Colorado in 1954 and attended Mills High School in Millbrae, California. In his spare time he enjoys boating, karate, flying, coaching soccer and he is an avid Marksmanship advocate.

In 1991 he married his wonderful wife Paulette and they are the proud parents of Dominic, Marisa, Nicolette and Samantha.

Captain Gottuso's dedication to public safety, effective enforcement of the law, record of bringing criminals to justice and protecting innocent life and property while maintaining the highest level of professionalism and an infectious sense of humor all warrant special gratitude and recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of this body to join me in honoring Nicholas Gottuso upon his retirement for his dedication to public service at the Hillsborough Police Department.

EMPOWERING PARENTS THROUGH QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 13, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2218) to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Empowering Parents through Quality Charter Schools Act, H.R. 2218, which is a bipartisan bill to reform and strengthen the charter school program.

I recently gave the graduation speech at the Princeton Charter School, a high quality charter that opened its doors more than a decade ago and was recognized as a blue ribbon school by the U.S. Department of Education in 2004. And I was pleased to see the success there. But I urged them to make sure they are well-integrated in the public school system in their community.

We need to reinvigorate America's education system and give each and every child the opportunity to learn and thrive. I am an advocate of alternative forms of education including charter schools. I think these institutions can be viable and beneficial in promoting academic achievement and diversity.

It is important to remember that charter schools are part of the public school system, and we must hold them to the same standards of broad educational access and same standards of accountability—which means we have to be willing to shut down charter schools that fail to meet expectations. Otherwise, charter schools are not true to their reason for being: to inject innovation and experimentation into the public school system. I am pleased that this bill increases accountability for charter schools and ensures states use a schools performance as a primary factor for charter renewal.

I have long believed that charter school innovations and best practices must be shared with other school districts—urban, rural, and suburban school districts alike. This requires work on both sides: outreach by the charter schools and acceptance by the traditional public school system to learn what there is to be learned. I worked with Rep. POLIS to include such language in his ALL-STAR Act.

That is why I am pleased that the bipartisan legislation before us today includes provisions to require charter schools to disseminate best practices with other public schools.

This legislation also ensures that States work with charter school authorizers to put in place the quality controls necessary for holding charter schools accountable, including annual performance data and financial audits. These provisions will lead to more replication of high-quality charter schools nationwide.

I share the concerns of some that more can be done to improve the accountability, equity and transparency of charter school, and as we continue to move this bill through the process, I hope additional improvements can be made. But we should all recognize that this bill makes a great deal of progress from the existing program and deserves our support today.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN AND MARY ANNE COX, AND JIM AND PAULETTE PHILLIPS, FOR THEIR ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HEROES RUN/WALK

HON. MARK S. CRITZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary fortitude and abiding generosity of two sets of parents of fallen heroes.

John and Mary Anne Cox lost their son, Army Specialist Gregory Cox, in Iraq in September of 2004. Less than 2 years later, in February of 2006, Jim and Paulette Phillips lost their son, Marine Lance Corporal Steven Phillips, in the same war.

In the face of such horrific personal loss, the parents of Army Specialist Cox and Lance Corporal Phillips chose neither to languish in their own sadness, nor make their own emotional convalescence the focus of their lives. Instead, in the spirit of the selflessness of their courageous sons, they chose to create an event devoted to enriching the lives of others.

The event, the annual Heroes Run/Walk, will take place for the fifth time this Saturday, September 17, 2011, at Green Cove Yacht Club in Millsboro, Pennsylvania. The majority of the proceeds from the event will benefit the memorial funds that have been established to honor the sacrifices of Specialist Cox and Lance Corporal Phillips. Specialist Cox's fund provides support to graduates of Greene County High Schools entering the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) or intending to pursue a field of study that will lead to a career in public service. Lance Corporal Phillips' fund provides support to the computer-aided technology drafting program at Greene County Career and Technology Center. Part of the proceeds from the Heroes Run/Walk will also be used to fund the transportation of veterans living in Greene County who are receiving treatment at the Veterans Affairs Pittsburgh Healthcare System.

Last year, the race's over 400 registrants raised in excess of $15,000. Sponsors and organizers of the event expect a strong turnout again this Saturday, and are eager to once more honor the memory of Specialist Cox and Lance Corporal Phillips.

The Heroes Run/Walk is a testament to its founders, John and Mary Anne Cox, and Jim and Paulette Phillips, and demonstrates their capacity to turn tragedy into an amazing gift for others. They deserve both our support and appreciation.

IN RECOGNITION OF ANN BARLOW

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Ann Barlow who served as president and chairperson of the board for the Professional Businesswomen of California for the last four years. Ann has been an inspirational and effective leader of PBWC which I founded 23 years ago to help women advance professionally. The board of directors is very fortunate to retain her as a member, but will certainly miss her gracious leadership.

Ann became involved with PBWC as soon as she moved from New York to the Bay Area in 2005. She happened to move in next door to the former president, Debra Boblitt, who immediately recognized Ann as a perfect candidate for the board. She was voted in as president two years later.

Ann possesses all the qualities and qualifications it takes to be a successful business woman; she is smart, creative, professional, funny, warm, beautiful and generous. She has lent her talents to Peppercom for the last ten years. She is a partner and the president of its West Coast operations and led the founding of GreenPepper, Peppercom's environmental sustainability services.

Before she joined Peppercom, Ann led the New York office of Interpublic Group-Owned Mindstorm Communications.

Ann is a master communicator and has written numerous articles and given many

speeches on environmental issues and digital communication. In 2009, Ann was named one of the Bay Area's most influential women by the San Francisco Business Times. This year she was chosen to participate in the prestigious Tedwoman conference.

Ann was born in Davenport, Iowa on August 15, 1960. She went to Freeport High School in Freeport, Illinois and received her B.A. in Journalism from the University of Illinois.

She lives in San Ramon, California with her husband Bob, two children Chris and Vivian and her two spoiled beagles Kipper and Osgood. In her spare time she enjoys reading, cooking, playing golf, talking politics and walking with Kipper and Osgood.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body to join me in honoring Ann Barlow for her extraordinary contributions to improve the lives and careers of thousands of women in California and all over the world.

COMMENDING RANDY BURGESS FOR 33 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

HON. HEATH SHULER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Randy Burgess who recently retired from the Pisgah National Forest with 33 years of outstanding service to the U.S. Forest Service.

Mr. Burgess began his work in forests during summers while in college at Eldorado and Stanislaus National Forests in California. After he graduated from Virginia Tech with a bachelor's degree in wildlife and forest management, he worked as a ranger at several national forests such as those in Sumter, South Carolina, and Rio Grande, Colorado. He began work at the Pisgah National Forest in 2003.

During his 8 year tenure as head of the Pisgah District Operations, Mr. Burgess was instrumental in the upkeep and renovations in and around the forest. Mr. Burgess helped improve water quality through stream stabilization projects, supported various volunteer corporations, implemented upgrades at the Cradle of Forestry, provided public restrooms in the forest, and built a connector trail from the city of Brevard to the Pisgah National Forest. The 5.5-mile-long Estatoe Trail opened to the public on October 15, 2010, and has been a tremendous benefit to the citizens of that area. Mr. Burgess also served as a Forest Service Liaison to my office, lending his expertise in conservation to positively impact national policy. Mr. Burgess' leadership over the last few years has left a great mark on the Pisgah National Forest and provided positive influence on Congressional policy.

Mr. Burgess has shown extraordinary dedication to our community and has had an indelible impact on the Pisgah National Forest. The service that Mr. Burgess has contributed to Western North Carolina and the U.S. Forest Service is truly inspiring and I am proud to represent him. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the exceptional career and service of Mr. Randy Burgess.

HONORING LEO J. HULSEMAN

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation.

Whereas, seventy-five (75) years ago Leo J. Hulseman established the Paper Container Manufacturing Company in Chicago, Illinois, and by the 1940s began manufacturing a paper cone cup known as the "Solo Cup" which provides unparalleled hygiene and convenience to consumers; and

Whereas, the "Solo Cup" was such an inspiration that the company itself was renamed Solo in the 1940s and become a brand that would become ubiquitous across America and the world; and

Whereas, Solo Cup has grown to be a $1.6 billion company and has demonstrated its concern for the environment by introducing many product lines relying on compostable and renewable sources; and

Whereas, Solo Cup is a recognized industry leader in the areas of sustainability and beautification receiving the 2010 Keep America Beautiful Corporate Leadership Award; and

Whereas, The Solo plant in Conyers, Georgia is a place where 400 of our citizens are employed and is an enthusiastic participant in Georgia's Work Ready Program; and

Whereas, The Solo Company has proven to be a great corporate citizen supporting community outreach and educational initiatives by working closely with public officials, the Conyers-Rockdale Economic Development Council and the Rockdale Chamber of Commerce; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Solo Company, it's management and employees for leadership and service to our district;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim September 13, 2011, as Solo Cup Company Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, This 13th day of September, 2011.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. WILLIAM SANDERS, EDUCATOR, COMMUNITY LEADER AND BUSINESSMAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of educator and community leader, William Sanders. Mr. Sanders was born March 27, 1928, in Monticello, Mississippi.

Upon graduation from McCullough High School in Lawrence County, Mr. Sanders continued his education at Alcorn College, where he played basketball. While attending Alcorn, Mr. Sanders was called to fulfill his military duties and later completed his degree in Agriculture Research. Mr. Sanders served in the Army in the 31st Artillery Brigade and was stationed in Alaska during his tour. Additionally, he was assigned to the Special Services. He was honorably discharged from the Army at the rank of Sergeant.

Mr. Sanders's first professional job was as an educator in the Jefferson County School District, where he also served as principal, assistant principal and football and basketball coach. He would go on to teach in the Hattiesburg and Brookhaven School District, and concluded his career in education with the Hinds County School District. Mr. Sanders worked towards a master's degree during the summers in Boston and Indiana Universities. Mr. Sanders was the Chief Financial Officer for the first Head Start Program in the state of Mississippi, the Child Development Group of Mississippi (CDGM).

Mr. Sanders did not limit his education to the classroom; he remained active in his community, socially and politically, as well as entrepreneurially. Upon leaving CDGM, Mr. Sanders successfully, owned and operated the Delta Drive Texaco service station in Jackson, Mississippi, where his greatest satisfaction was employing others in his community. He was an industry pioneer and received several awards in recognition of his shrewd business sense.

Mr. Sanders married Emma Dunbar Sanders and had six children. He and his family were actively involved in the Civil Rights movement and made enormous sacrifices in an effort to amplify the voice of oppressed blacks in the segregated south. His actions helped shape future civil rights policy in the segregated south and advance the rights and freedoms of African Americans.

Mr. Sanders, a loyal Democrat, was actively involved in local, state and national politics. He attended the Democratic National Conventions in New York, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles and most recently the 2008 Democratic Convention in Denver where Senator Barack Obama received the Democratic Party's nomination. He took great pride in the election of the first African American president and viewed this as a logical result of the Civil Rights Movement.

Again, I ask that my colleagues please join me in saluting the life and legacy of educator, community leader and businessman Mr. William Sanders.

HONORING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMUNITY SHARES OF WISCONSIN

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 40th anniversary of Community Shares of Wisconsin and to recognize the commitment of its participants to serving their communities.

In 1971, amidst a deep societal divide over civil rights issues and the Vietnam War, a number of area volunteers created the Madison Sustaining Fund, America's first social action fund. Today, the fund now known as Community Shares of Wisconsin (CSW) partners with donors and non-profit member groups to address social, economic, and environmental challenges through grassroots activities, advocacy, research, and public education.

CSW continues to effect change in all aspects of our society by supporting the work of its non-profit member groups. The sixty-three non-profit member groups currently supported by Community Shares of Wisconsin are groups independently involved in tackling social and environmental issues both locally and nationwide. By working with CSW, each member non-profit group gains access to a larger network of supporters and more abundant resources with which to advance its mission.

For 40 years, CSW has utilized this pooled resource model to devise innovative solutions and ideas that generate lasting changes in social justice across the United States. It is due to the hard work of CSW member organizations like the Fair Housing Center of Greater Madison that more Wisconsinites can live in affordable housing complexes that offer permanent shelter and community safety. Other members of the CSW, like the Wisconsin Women's Network, are committed to the betterment of women's health, safety, and workplace protections. Although these are just a few examples, it is without a doubt that the civil rights and liberties of our family, friends, and neighbors stand better protected today thanks to the dedication and commitment of CSW member groups.

In addition to advancing social justice, the pursuit for environmental preservation is one of CSW's highest priorities. By supporting non-profit groups such as Clean Wisconsin, Friends of Wisconsin State Parks, and the River Alliance of Wisconsin, CSW works to improve the condition of Wisconsin's waters and its air quality. The great State of Wisconsin now thrives as a haven for residents and tourists who take pleasure in the outdoors and depend on the State's natural resources on a daily basis.

Today, CSW continues to bring together thousands of donors to benefit a multiplicity of causes through its non-profit member groups. I extend my sincerest congratulations to Community Shares of Wisconsin on its 40 years of forward thinking and its steadfast pursuit of justice and environmental protection for our community, both here in Wisconsin and across this great Nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF MICHAEL J. CRILLY

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I rise today to pay tribute to Superintendent Michael J. Crilly, who retires this month from the Jefferson Union High School District.

Superintendent Crilly came up through the ranks, spending 39 years in the Jefferson Union High School District as teacher, vice principal, principal, associate superintendent and, for the past 17 years, superintendent. During his tenure at the helm, Mike led the district through two successful bond campaigns, allowing school buildings and fields to be upgraded and modernized to better serve a growing and changing student body. He partnered with the City of Daly City to develop the Challenge Leadership Program, bringing students from various schools together to find ways to improve their education and learn important leadership skills. Mike also formed a partnership with San Francisco State University, the South San Francisco Unified School District and Serramonte Shopping Center to conduct an annual college fair, providing students access to representatives from nearly 70 colleges and universities.

In 2007, he was named Regional Superintendent of the Year by the Association of California School Administrators, a recognition justly deserved.

Mr. Speaker, Mike Crilly is not an administrator who feels that public service ends at the close of business. He gives tirelessly to his community, having served as President or Chairperson of the San Mateo County Superintendents' Association, Daly City—Colma Chamber of Commerce and Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Committee. Mike has also served on the Association of California School Administrators, Daly City Economic Development Advisory Committee, Daly City—Quezon City Sister City Committee, Pacifica Library Task Force, Skyline College President's Council and the Seton Medical Center Board of Directors.

A native San Franciscan, Mike Crilly was educated in local schools. He received his Bachelor of Arts from St. Patrick's University and his Secondary Teaching Credential and Administrative Services Credential from the University of San Francisco. Mike and his incredible wife, Patricia, raised three inspiring daughters—Jennifer, Megan and Erin—and Mike's retirement will leave even more time to enjoy his family, especially grandchildren Brayden and Ellie.

If I know Mike, retirement will also encourage more home remodeling and gardening projects but I'm sure there'll be plenty of baseball squeezed in as well.

Mr. Speaker, Superintendent Crilly has served his students and his community with the greatest honor and distinction. I am privileged to call him a friend and fellow public servant. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in thanking Superintendent Michael J. Crilly for his service to our nation and to the students and taxpayers of the Jefferson Union High School District.

EMPOWERING PARENTS THROUGH QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 13, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2218) to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965:

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I voted in favor of House Resolution 2218, the Empowering Parents Through Quality Charter Schools Act. While I support most of the legislation, I have a few concerns which I would like to highlight.

I welcome the additional accountability requirements and the increased access measures incorporated into this legislation, as well as the specific encouragement for public charter schools and traditional public schools to share best practices. However, I am worried about the authority given to the Secretary to dispense charter planning grant money. We have often seen this discretionary authority used to coerce school districts or states into adopting policies that do not fit within the state's education framework.

While I appreciate the bipartisan nature of this legislation, and the important advances it makes for accountability and access issues, I hope that the discretionary authority given to the Secretary is used judiciously.

IN RECOGNITION OF KAREN PHILIP

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with immense appreciation and a tinge of regret that I rise today in honor of Karen K. Philip, who retires at the end of this month as Deputy Superintendent of the San Mateo County Office of Education.

There is no doubt that she has earned her retirement, after thirty-eight years educating the children—and impressing the parents—of California's 12th Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that anyone has ever met Karen Philip where they did not learn something. She is the consummate educator, beginning in 1973 in the South San Francisco Unified School District, where she served for seventeen years as a teacher, speech therapist, special education administrator and principal, Karen has dedicated her life to the children of San Mateo County.

From there, she was recruited by the Millbrae School District to serve as Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction and, after just two years, was appointed Superintendent of the District, a post she held for fifteen years. During her tenure in Millbrae, the schools in her charge received many prestigious awards, including three California Distinguished School Awards and the National Blue Ribbon, awarded in Washington D.C. to Taylor Middle School.

Throughout her career, Deputy Superintendent Philip has been tapped for numerous leadership positions, including serving as President of the San Mateo County Superintendents Association, the Special Education Local Plan Area Board, and Soroptomist International of Millbrae/San Bruno. She has also been named a "Woman of Distinction" by Soroptomist International, received the California "Schoolmasters Award" in 2011 and was inducted into the San Mateo County "Women's Hall of Fame".

Mr. Speaker, as with all true educators, Karen's greatest achievement is in the many thousands of children—most who are now adults—who have benefitted from her passion and extraordinary talent for teaching. No doubt, our county's loss is Karen's grandchildren's gain. Now they get to spend even more time soaking in all the incredible lessons their brilliant grandmother has to offer.

Karen was born and raised in Michigan and attended Detroit's Wayne State University, where she received a Bachelor of Arts in Speech and English and her Master Degree in Communication Disorders and Sciences.

Mr. Speaker, I have been honored to work with this incredible woman on promoting sound education policy for more than two decades. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in thanking Deputy Superintendent Karen Philip for her remarkable service to our nation's children and wish she and her husband, Lou, a phenomenal retirement filled with exciting travel, good health and the love of their amazing family: Kimberly and her husband Keith, Jeff, and his wife Jenn, and grandchildren Lydia, Mark, Caitlin, John, Emma and Amelia.

RECOGNIZING DR. GEORGE R. CARRUTHERS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Dr. George R. Carruthers, a world-renowned scientist, an innovative leader in astronomy and engineering, and a resident of the District of Columbia.

Through the guidance and encouragement of his father, Dr. Carruthers discovered his interest in engineering. After graduating from Englewood High School in Chicago, Dr. Carruthers earned a bachelor's of science degree in aeronautical engineering, a master's degree in nuclear engineering, and a doctorate degree in aeronautical and astronomical engineering at the University of Illinois.

Though born in Ohio and raised in Illinois, Dr. Carruthers has spent most of his distinguished career as a resident of the nation's capital. Since joining the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory in 1964, Dr. Carruthers has co-invented the far-ultra violet electrographic camera, which was first used in sounding rockets in 1966 and was used during the Apollo 16 mission to the moon in 1972, giving scientists fresh, revealing images of Earth and space. He was also the first to detect molecular hydrogen in deep space in 1970. Dr. Carruthers has been a driving force in the use of ultraviolet astronomy. Not only was he involved in the review of the early design of the Hubble Space Telescope, which was carried into orbit in 1990, where it remains and continues to operate, he has refurbished the telescope in the Observatory on the campus of Howard University, enabling students, educators, families, and the general public to use the telescope to view special astronomical events.

Dr. Carruthers was inducted into the National Inventor's Hall of Fame in 2003, and has received numerous awards, including the Black Engineer of the Year in 1987, the Arthur S. Fleming Award in 1971, the Exceptional Achievement Scientific Award from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in 1972 and the Warner Prize from the American Astronomical Society in 1973.

The District of Columbia and its residents are particularly grateful for Dr. Carruthers' work in helping to develop the next generation of engineers by creating the Science and Engineering Apprentice Program, a summer program in which D.C. Public Schools high school students work side-by-side with professional scientists. Dr. Carruthers has also edited and co-authored several publications and co-produced a series of instructional videos on Earth and space science for high school students.

For more than two decades, Dr. Carruthers has been an active member of Science, Mathematics, Aerospace, Research, and Technology (S.M.A.R.T.), Inc., where he has shared his knowledge through presentations and hands-on activities with students, educators, families, and the general public. Dr. Carruthers spent six years coordinating workshops in aerospace, science and technology for African-American students in the D.C. metropolitan area for S.M.A.R.T. and the National Air and Space Museum.

Dr. Carruthers is the editor of the National Technical Association (NTA) Journal and newsletter, is the President of the D.C. Chapter of NTA, and was a secretary of the Development Fund for Black Students in Science and Technology for more than two decades.

For a lifetime of achievements and for continuing contributions to science, engineering, and astronomy, as recognized throughout the nation and the world, I ask the House to join me in celebrating the uniquely distinctive place of Dr. George R. Carruthers in science.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES A. HIMES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present to cast my vote on Mr. HOLT's amendment to H.R. 2218—Empowering Parents through Quality Charter Schools Act. I wish the record to reflect my intentions had I been able to vote.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 702, I would have voted "yes."

IN RECOGNITION OF RICHARD BOITANO

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this today to ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Richard Boitano as he retires as Associate Superintendent of Education for the Jefferson Union High School District.

Rick Boitano has served his community for 38 years as a teacher, Vice-Principal, District Director of Pupil-Personnel Services and Associate Superintendent. In addition, he has been active in numerous organizations dedicated to helping young people and the community at large, including the San Mateo County Juvenile Justice Planning Council, San Mateo County TANF Planning Council, San Mateo County Community Schools Task Force, Board of Directors of Youth Empowering Systems, Inc., San Mateo County Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Commission, Pacifica Youth Service Bureau, Every 15 Minutes Alcohol Abuse Prevention Program and the Association of California School Administrators.

In addition, Rick has been a presenter at the California State Juvenile Officers' Association Annual Training Conference, the San Mateo County Prevention Coordinators Meeting, and the National School Transportation Association Convention on Gang Awareness, School Safety and Gang Intervention.

Rick has also served as Chairperson of the WASC School Accreditation Process and the San Mateo County Gang Task Force Schools Division. In addition, Rick is a member and past-president of St. Pius Catholic Church Mens' Club.

Rick Boitano was born and raised in San Francisco, having received his Bachelor of Arts, Secondary Teaching Credential and Administrative Services Credential from the University of San Francisco. He and Beverly, his lovely wife of 35 years, have raised four boys—Tim, Jonathan, Matt and Andrew—and his retirement will provide extra time for his grandson, Jude.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Rick for his decades of service to the young people of California's 12th Congressional District. He has earned his retirement and I wish him nothing but the best, which is exactly what he gave the students and parents of the Jefferson Union High School District every day for thirty-eight years.

RECOGNIZING AZERBAIJAN AND THE AZERI PEOPLE

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, as the Co-Chairman of the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Azerbaijan and the Azeri people for their ongoing support of the United States and our allies in the Global War on Terror. Azerbaijan has been a consistent supporter of U.S. efforts in the fight against terrorism, and the Azeris have worked with us to strengthen economic and political stability in the Caspian region. It is important that we recognize the sacrifices made by our allies and continue to thank them for their support.

As we reflect back on the recently passed 10th anniversary of the terrorist attacks of September 11, we must remember that the fight against terrorism is not a fight against Islam. On September 11, 2001, Americans of all faiths and citizens from around the world tragically lost their lives.

Today, uniformed and civilian men and women around the world work shoulder to shoulder to combat the ongoing threat of terrorist attacks that don't just affect the United States, but virtually every nation. This effort is not one of faith; rather it is an effort to keep citizens of all nations safe from barbaric acts of terrorism.

Immediately after 9/11, Azerbaijan, a majority Muslim nation, was among the first to offer strong support and assistance to the United States. Azerbaijan participated in operations Iraq and is actively engaged in Afghanistan, having recently doubled its military presence there. Azerbaijan has extended important over-flight clearances for U.S. and NATO flights to support ISAF and has regularly provided landing and refueling operations at its airports for U.S. and NATO forces. Also, Azerbaijan plays an important role in the Northern

Distribution Network, a supply route to Afghanistan by making available its ground and Caspian naval transportation facilities.

Additionally, Azerbaijan provides specialized training for Afghan police, border guard officers and de-miners, education and training of Afghan civilian and military medical doctors, and medical treatment of Afghan citizens at Azeri hospitals. Azerbaijan has provided medical equipment and supplies to Afghanistan as well as assisting in the construction of schools and hospitals there.

Azerbaijan remains a reliable partner of NATO and the EU in the South Caucuses through its consistent and effective contribution to common goals and objectives. Azerbaijan is also an active partner of the United States in efforts regarding the nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction through its participation in programs such as Caspian Guard and Cooperative Threat Reduction.

On July 5, 2011, an Azerbaijani aircraft flying a support mission for NATO troops crashed as it descended into Bagram Airfield in Afghanistan. While it is my understanding that investigations are ongoing, it has come to my attention that one leading theory is that Taliban fighters may have shot down the aircraft as it made its final approach. While we await further information on exactly what happened that night in Afghanistan, it is important that we recognize the loss of life of the nine crew members on board that flight who made the ultimate sacrifice.

While we can take comfort knowing that we are not alone in this fight, we must also make sure we comfort those who make sacrifices alongside us. It is with a heavy heart that I offer my thanks and appreciation to the family, friends, and countrymen to those crew members of Silk Way Airlines IL–76. The world is a safer place due to their commitment to support and supply our troops and allies in their hunt for those seeking to harm peace-loving people around the world.

ENDING CONGRESSIONAL PENSIONS

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to put an end to the defined-benefit retirement plan currently available to Members of Congress.

These are extremely difficult economic times. We are in a debt crisis that will require sacrifices on the part of all Americans. I served in both the U.S. Army and the Marine Corps, and I was taught that leaders should never ask others to do anything that they themselves would be unwilling to do. Congress needs to set an example and lead the way for the country. I think this is a good start.

The defined benefit retirement plan gives Members of Congress an averaged percentage of their annual salary (currently $174,000) for every year they serve in Congress. To be eligible for the retirement plan they must first serve at least five years. They will then receive 1.7% for every year up to 20 that they serve in Congress, and 1% for every year after 20. For example, if a Member of Congress served for 20 years, and they were at least 62, he or she would receive 34% of their salary, or $59,160 per year, based on the current salary. Members of Congress pay 1.3% of their salary into the pension plan and are required to pay into Social Security at the same rate as everyone else. They may contribute to a Thrift Savings Plan that has a match similar to many private sector 401(k) plans.

My legislation will honor any retirement benefits accrued prior to the passage of this bill, and will keep the Social Security and Thrift Savings Plan in place.

I believe that Members of Congress should feel the same economic pressures the rest of society does, and I firmly believe that the current effort to reduce spending and constrain the size and scope of government requires that all possible solutions be taken, including cuts to the Congressional budget. I urge the passage of this bill.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE BUILDING OWNERS AND MANAGERS ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Building Owners and Managers Association of San Francisco on the historic occasion of its 100th anniversary.

BOMA San Francisco has been advocating for commercial real estate interests, training future leaders and promoting sustainable practices. I have partnered with BOMA since my days on the San Mateo Board of Supervisors and in the California Legislature and have witnessed its effective work that supports business growth which in turn creates tax dollars for important public services.

Healthy commercial real estate provides homes for countless businesses that employ our workforce. BOMA always strives to create better work environments for our future generations. It has been honored for its progressive environmental policies to help promote energy conservation and sustainable practices in office buildings. BOMA is also a tireless advocate of emergency preparedness.

For 20 years BOMA has partnered with the San Francisco Fire Department and put big smiles on children's faces. The San Francisco Firefighter Toy Program is the oldest program of its kind in the country and has donated over a million toys to disadvantaged children.

Mr. Speaker, the Building Owners and Managers Association of San Francisco has left its mark on San Francisco and made it a more beautiful, healthy and happier city for a century. I ask this body to honor BOMA on May 19, its 100th anniversary.

MASS GRAVES HOLD THOUSANDS, KASHMIR INQUIRY FINDS

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, tonight I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the most recent developments in India-controlled Kashmir. In late August, the Jammu and Kashmir State Human Rights Commission stated that it had found evidence of 2,156 unidentified bodies buried in approximately 40 mass graves, officially recognized for the first time, that pock mark the landscape of this long troubled region. This disturbing revelation, while horrific in scale and heartbreaking in scope, has the potential to serve as a catalyst to propel Kashmir forward, away from its violent past. For the first time, everyone in Kashmir, as well as the rest of the world, will be forced to acknowledge the wanton violence and unrest that have torn their communities apart.

History has taught us that in conflicts like the one propagated on Kashmir and its people, the first casualty is always the truth. The findings in this inquiry have now irrefutably confirmed the very worst fears people like myself who have been concerned about this issue since 1989. It is my sincerest hope that when finally faced with the sum of their actions to this point, those responsible for these crimes will see the error of their ways and summarily be brought to justice; I also hope that all of the well intentioned people of the region, whether they are Kashmiri, Pakistani, or Indian, can use this tragic circumstance to begin to work towards reconciliation, and finally move towards a peaceful resolution for everyone living in Kashmir. I am submitting an article from the August 23, 2011 edition of the New York Times and strongly urge my colleagues to read it.

MASS GRAVES HOLD THOUSANDS, KASHMIR INQUIRY FINDS

(By Lydia Polgreen)

NEW DELHI.—Thousands of bullet-riddled bodies are buried in dozens of unmarked graves across Kashmir, a state human rights commission inquiry has concluded, many of them likely to be those of civilians who disappeared more than a decade ago in a brutal insurgency.

The inquiry, the result of three years of investigative work by senior police officers working for the Jammu and Kashmir State Human Rights Commission, brings the first official acknowledgment that civilians might have been buried in mass graves in Kashmir, a region claimed by both India and Pakistan where insurgents waged a bloody battle for independence in the early 1990s. The report sheds new light on a grim chapter in the history of the troubled region and confirms a 2008 report by a Kashmiri human rights organization that found hundreds of bodies buried in the Kashmir Valley.

Tens of thousands of people died in the insurgency, which began in 1989 and was partly fueled by weapons, cash and training from Pakistan.

According to the report, the bodies of hundreds of men described as unidentified militants were buried in unmarked graves. But of the more than 2,000 bodies, 574 were identified as local residents.

''There is every probability that these unidentified dead bodies buried in various unmarked graves at 38 places of North Kashmir may contain the dead bodies of enforced disappearances,'' the report said.

The report catalogs 2,156 bodies found in graves in four districts of Kashmir that had been at the heart of the insurgency. It called for a thorough inquiry and a collection of DNA evidence to identify the dead, and, for the future, proper identification of anyone killed by security forces in Kashmir to avoid abuse of special laws shielding the military

from prosecution there. Thousands of people, mostly young men, have disappeared in Kashmir. Some went to be trained as militants in the Pakistan-controlled portion of Kashmir and were killed in the fighting. Many others were detained by Indian security forces. The wives they left behind are known as half-widows, because the fates of their husbands are unknown. Parents keep vigil for sons who were arrested two decades ago.

Parveena Ahanger's son Javed was taken away by the police on Aug. 18, 1990, and never seen again. An investigation found that he had been killed by security forces, but they have not been prosecuted, she said.

''I never got any response from the government,'' she said. ''I never got his dead body.''

After years of fighting in the courts to find out what happened to Javed, Ms. Ahanger was skeptical that the human rights report would get her son's body back, or bring her justice.

''If the high court doesn't give any justice on this issue, what will the state human rights commission do?'' she said.

Zahoor Wani, an activist who works with the families of people who disappeared during the insurgency, said that the report was a welcome first step but that the government must identify the dead and allow families to bury their relatives.

''It is a very good thing that they acknowledge it,'' Mr. Wani said. ''These families have been living in a hope to see these people again.

''They are neither dead nor alive,'' he said. ''We need to move them to one pole or the other.''

Hari Kumar contributed reporting.

IN RECOGNITION OF MATTEO RIZZO

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to pay tribute to Matteo Rizzo, a lifelong educator who is retiring as Superintendent of the Jefferson Elementary School District, serving the communities of Daly City and Colma, California.

In his tenure as Superintendent, Mr. Rizzo has been known for his personal involvement with all the stakeholders in his district, from teachers, to parents, to administrators and, most importantly, the students themselves. He served as the District's representative in staff contract negotiations, oversaw budget decisions, coordinated the recruitment, selection and assignment of teachers, principals and other personnel and put his imprint on every aspect of life and learning in the Jefferson Elementary School District.

As is the case in school districts across our country, Superintendent Rizzo was asked to do the impossible—educate a diverse student population in an environment of dwindling financial resources, all the while staying focused on preparing them to achieve to their utmost ability in an increasingly competitive world.

To do this, Matteo relied heavily on the skills he gained as an Assistant Superintendent, Principal, Vice-Principal and teacher—all within the Jefferson Elementary School District. His unsurpassed institutional knowledge and commitment to bettering the lives of young people will be sorely missed and not easily replaced. Fortunately, he leaves his successor with a legacy of excellence and community involvement that can be built upon in future years.

Mr. Speaker, Matteo Rizzo is a living example of the benefits of public education and the fruits of hard work. A product of local schools, he is a graduate of San Francisco State University, where he received a Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics, his California Teaching Credential and two Masters of Arts—one in Education and another in Educational Administration.

He has been honored at every step of his career, including earning a ''California Distinguished School'' award for Fernando Rivera Middle School in 2001, while serving as the school's principal.

Mr. Speaker, Superintendent Rizzo has certainly earned his retirement. On behalf of the Congress of the United States of America, I wish to thank him for his exceptional service to our nation and wish him only the best as he now has time to travel with his amazing wife, Clydie, play a lot more golf, do a little more duck hunting and, as rumor has it, learn to play the guitar.

Matteo Rizzo, simply put, is a good man who spent his entire professional career doing good for his community. There's no need to tell that to the thousands of children he educated, or his son, Matthew, and daughter-in-law, Jill, but the rest of America can benefit from knowing that extremely capable and committed professionals like Matteo Rizzo show up at school districts across this country every day with no other goal than to move our country forward, one student at a time.

It is for these reasons and more that I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Superintendent Matteo Rizzo for his service.

SURFACE AND AIR TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS EXTENSION ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. MICK MULVANEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 13, 2011

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have serious concerns about the policies of H.R. 2887, Transportation Extension, and the procedures the House used to pass it.

First, I applaud the House Leadership's numerous statements and actions on working towards fiscally responsible policies that begin to close our deficit and balance our budget. Achieving those two goals will certainly help create an environment for the private sector to create jobs. H. Con. Res. 34, the House Budget for Fiscal Year 2012, laid a solid blueprint for leaders in this Congress to follow towards that end.

Unfortunately, the actions taken yesterday fail to follow the spending plan that 235 members of the House agreed upon earlier this year. The House Budget calls for a transportation policy that puts the bankrupt Highway Trust Fund and the insolvent Airport Improvement Program back operating within their means. Unfortunately, the bill we passed today sacrifices fiscal sanity for continued chaos.

Unlike the House Budget, the policies of this Transportation Extension would continue current spending levels that, without the aid of previous bailouts, would leave the Highway Trust Fund and the Airport Improvement Program completely bankrupt. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office estimates the current policy embraced by this ''clean'' Transportation Extension would require future billion dollar bailouts in 2013 and every year thereafter over the next decade. Unlike the FY2012 plan called for in the House Budget, the action we took yesterday simply avoids the necessary dirty work associated with making sound fiscal decisions.

Second, I was appalled by the procedure the House used in passing this bill. While I recognize the need to quickly move this bill by the start of Fiscal Year 2012, October 1, 2011, I do not believe that justifies suspending the House rules to move a bill that will cost tens of billions of dollars over six months without any opportunity to offer amendments either in the Rules committee or on the House floor. While such action does not technically violate our House or Conference rules, it certainly flies in the face of the higher standards those rules and protocols promote. Most notably, this multi-billion dollar Transportation Extension was only available for no more than a 24-hour review period, as opposed to the three-day review standard. Also, the bill failed to include a Congressional Budget Office cost estimate. Finally, it was unexpectedly voice voted without the opportunity for Representatives to record the collective voice of their constituents. As a result, we are left to less desirable means to record their vote.

Ultimately, yesterday's action is a missed opportunity to ''advance policies that promote greater liberty, wider opportunity, . . . , and national economic prosperity,'' as well as, ''to make government more transparent in its actions, careful in its stewardship, and honest in its dealings.'' Had I the chance yesterday to vote, I would have voted against this Transportation Extension.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of Tuesday, September 13, 2011, I recorded an erroneous vote on Final Passage of the bill H.R. 2218. I intended to vote ''no'' on rollcall vote No. 705, on passage of H.R. 2218, the Empowering Parents through Quality Charter Schools Act.

IN RECOGNITION OF THOMAS MOHR

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to recognize the tireless public service of Thomas Mohr, who is retiring as President of Cañada College in Redwood City, California.

I have had the privilege of knowing and working with Tom for many years. He is without peer and his calm demeanor and inspired leadership will be sorely missed.

While serving as President, Tom revamped Cañada College's planning process and turned it into a state leader in the accreditation process. He helped establish new four-year degrees in art, psychology, human services and business administration by forging new relationships with nearby Notre Dame de Namur University. Under Tom's watch, Cañada started the Center for Teacher Efficacy to provide professional development opportunities for San Mateo County high school teachers. He also developed an Honors Transfer Program designed to support highly motivated students as they pursue their educational goals.

Tom attracted more than $3 million in grants for Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics education at the college, established the Veterans Resource and Opportunity Center, and expanded the school's study abroad program. For these and other accomplishments, President Mohr received the 2010 Shirley B. Gordon Award of Distinction from Phi Theta Kappa, the national honor society for two year colleges.

Tom holds a Bachelor of Science from St. Louis University and a Master of Arts from the University of San Francisco. He has been an educator on the San Francisco Peninsula since working as a Chemistry teacher in the Jefferson Union High School District in 1961. Since then, Tom has served in nearly every capacity an educator can—teacher, principal, assistant superintendent, superintendent and most recently, college president.

Ironically, Tom thought he had retired six years ago when he left the San Mateo Union High School District. But, ever the public servant, when his community came calling, Tom answered. He agreed to serve as Cañada's President on an interim basis, not knowing that it would stretch into a six-year commitment.

Mr. Speaker, everyone in this body knows that there are no easy solutions to improving education in America. Were it only possible to clone a thousand or so Tom Mohrs, our nation's students would, indeed, be in capable hands. Since we can't do that, we are best served to simply follow his example and learn from the many lessons this lifelong educator has taught us.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE BOOKER T. WASHINGTON LEARNING CENTER ON THEIR 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great enthusiasm that I rise to congratulate The Booker T. Washington Learning Center as they reach their 25th milestone. This accomplishment has been achieved through dedication and committed service to the most vulnerable children and their families in my Congressional District.

Since 1986, thousands of families have found support, opportunity and resources that have made a life-changing difference through the Booker T. Washington Learning Center. They have made it possible for people in my community to not only survive, but thrive. The center was originally founded under the parent organization, East Harlem Churches and Community Urban Center by Reverend Leroy Ricksy who decided to help four children being raised by their grandmother. Today, the learning center led by Executive Director, Reverend Kimberly Wright, has expanded its services to include an after school program, Saturday readings, adult education, summer camp, college preparation and support, and art therapy. There is a very personal approach taken at Booker T. They offer children, teens, and adults the extra that they need in order to find success.

The Learning Center is able to look back over these 25 years and feel proud of the investment that they have made in so many lives. They have watched their children grow up to be extremely responsible, hard working, and productive citizens. There are so many who have overcome learning disabilities, achieved academic success—even in a failing school system, graduated high school and gone on to college. It continues to be a cornerstone in my beloved East Harlem Community for families who would otherwise not be able to afford quality services for their children and have no place to turn. Their programs meet the needs of many who are in desperate need of guidance and academic support. The small group of young people the learning center started with are all enjoying their careers, their families, and their lives. They have overcome poverty and beaten the odds.

Booker T. could not exist if it were not for people who believe in our youngsters and their work. They are most fortunate in having the most dedicated group of staff and volunteers that continue to ensure that Booker T. offers quality enrichment programs that move people from poverty and despair to independence and hope.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in celebrating with the staff and wonderful volunteers at the Booker T. Washington Learning Center on their milestone. Let's encourage others to help programs like these to ensure that they continue to offer a helping hand to our fragile families and make certain that each child in our great nation find a second home, a second family, and a second school in our learning institutions.

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE USE OF LIBYA'S FROZEN ASSETS

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Libya's frozen assets be used to pay for humanitarian relief and military operations associated with the current conflict in that country.

Since Libyan dictator Muammar Qaddafi responded to peaceful demonstrations by attacking Libya's own citizens, the United States has been actively engaged with our international allies in thwarting the ability of the Qaddafi regime to visit violence, murder, and destruction on the people of Libya. This past February, the United States imposed economic sanctions on Libya and froze the assets of its leadership, promising to hold Qaddafi, his family, and the government of Libya accountable for its human rights abuses. It is estimated that the value of these assets exceed $30 billion.

On March 19, with the authority of the United Nations, the United States Armed Forces and our coalition partners launched Operation Odyssey Dawn in an effort to enforce the Security Council resolution. That mission has since come under NATO command and is now called Operation Unified Protector. Our Armed Forces have assisted in combat operations including providing intelligence, aerial refueling, targeting, and other aspects of NATO's daily bombardment of Libyan forces loyal to Qaddafi. We have already spent over one billion taxpayer dollars on this effort, with operations costing millions more every day.

When the United States recognized the Transitional National Council as the legitimate governing authority of Libya on July 15, it paved the way for the Council to access some of the frozen assets to be used for humanitarian relief and reconstruction efforts. With the Qaddafi regime at an end and the dictator himself on the run and in hiding, the United States will be moving into a posture that puts less emphasis on military operations and more focus on supporting the Transitional National Council's efforts to establish a working government.

The United States should pursue with the Council the viability of using some of those assets to reimburse NATO members for the cost of their military operations in support of the Libyan people. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BRISBANE

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the city of Brisbane, California. Nestled in the lower slopes of San Bruno Mountain, ''the City of Stars'' stands as a symbol of light in the Bay Area.

Back in the sixth century the Ohlone Indians enjoyed the abundance of resources the land offered. They thrived as hunters and gatherers until the Spanish conquistadores claimed the land in the early 16th century.

The deed to the land changed hands several times before any significant development occurred. The need for real estate triggered by the 1906 San Francisco Earthquake brought new focus to the valley. Developers immersed themselves in the area with new vigor, naming their new hope for future growth ''Visitacion City.''

It wasn't until the arrival of Arthur Annis that the town finally got off the ground. The ''Daddy of Brisbane'' came to the area in 1929, bringing hope to an area that desperately needed it. During the worst years of the Great Depression, Annis encouraged settlement and development through extremely cheap land prices. Between 1929 and 1933, over 400 homes were built.

Annis' signature contribution was the rechristening of Visitacion City as Brisbane. There are two competing theories about how Annis chose the name Brisbane. His daughter insists he named it after the city in Australia, while others believe he named it after the American journalist Arthur Brisbane. Whatever its origins, the name Brisbane has come to mean a city that draws its strength from hope, even in the darkest times.

This strong spirit can be seen in the tradition from which Brisbane draws its nickname, the ''City of Stars.'' In 1940, Brisbane prepared to employ its citizens in the ongoing war efforts and the future was once again uncertain. Resident Arthur Kennedy struck out against the doubt by placing a simple star above his house for the holiday season. Soon, this symbol of brightness could be found above many a house, and the tradition lives on today during every Christmas.

The city was incorporated in 1961. Since incorporation, Brisbane has had twenty-five mayors, including John Turner, James Williams, Jess Salmon, Ed Schwenderlauf, John Bell, Robert McLennan, S.J. Guardino, Julius Stern, Anja Miller, Art Montenegro, Paul Goercke, Jeannine Hodge, Don Bradshaw, Fred Smith, Bill Lawrence, Ray Miller, Lou Graham, Steve Waldo, Brad Kerwin, Lee Panza, Clara Johnson, W. Clarke Conway, Cyril Bologoff, Michael Barnes, and Sepi Richardson.

Brisbane also holds the distinction of being the first community in the United States in which a habitat conservation plan (HCP) was developed. This historic plan, developed in the 1980s, helped to save the Mission Blue butterfly and the Callippe Silverspot butterfly. The HCP served as a model for an amendment to the Endangered Species Act. In addition to legal protections related to land use, Brisbane's fog and ample rains succor the flora needed to create an environment in which these and other species of butterflies may roam largely unmolested over 3,000 acres of undeveloped land.

Brisbane's reputation as a can-do community received national attention in 1990 when residents came together to rescue Humphrey, a disoriented humpback whale who regularly became stranded at various locations around San Francisco Bay. When Humphrey found himself stuck on an embayment very close to Brisbane's Sierra Point, hundreds of Brisbane citizens gathered to cheer the Coast Guard and Humphrey onward towards the whale's successful extraction.

Brisbane hosts a thriving economy including a booming biotechnology sector, a popular harbor for private boats, and other more traditional businesses such as a 100-year-old manufacturer of fruit juices, A.C. Calderoni. Eventually, Brisbane will likely also be the site of a booming clean tech energy sector as the city redevelops vast parcels of unused lands near the bay. Brisbane's economy is so vibrant that the population of the city doubles during the workday.

While not every step in its history has been easy, its residents have always pressed towards the future. Even as it has grown from its decidedly humble origins to its current population of 4,282 residents, the sense of family and community that spurred its development has never diminished.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body to join me in celebrating the history and future of the city of Brisbane as it celebrates its 50th anniversary on September 10, 2011.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. MARGARET FUENTES GONZALEZ ZEPEDA OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Margaret Fuentes Gonzalez Zepeda on the occasion of her 96th birthday and tribute at the Guadalupe Community Center in San Antonio, Texas.

Born in 1915 Margaret ''Margarita'' Gonzalez was the daughter of Simon Gonzalez and Maria Fuentes Gonzalez. Margaret and her family grew up in San Antonio, and in April 1931, she married Manuel Zepeda, a union that would last 44 years, produce three girls and one boy.

Margaret worked for the San Antonio Housing Authority for over 20 years and rose to the position of Assistant Manager. Additionally, Margaret was extremely active in the community, and she used sports as a method to mentor San Antonio youth. Through sports Margaret developed a strong sense of discipline that she took to the Guadalupe Community Center and to the City of San Antonio as a recreation leader.

After retirement Margaret accelerated her own participation in sports, and in the late 1980s began her journey into the Senior Olympics. Since 1990 Margaret has participated in Senior Olympics in a variety of sports including: bowling; walking; horse shoes; softball and football for accuracy and distance; and each year has qualified for the National Games. At the age of 96, Margaret has won over 100 gold and silver medals. She has been to the National Games in Baton Rouge, Louisiana (twice); San Antonio, Texas; Tucson, Arizona; Orlando, Florida and has brought home the Gold or Silver (Tucson) every time.

Margaret Zepeda has a ''never give up'' spirit that impacted the self worth of each child she mentored. She instilled in them pride and discipline, and an understanding that love and command of sports was the great equalizer. For her half century of community work and leadership to the children of San Antonio, I join in celebrating the tribute hosted at the Guadalupe Community Center by the cadre of successful women who began their lives under the tutorage of Margaret Fuentes Gonzalez Zepeda.

TRIBUTE TO SHERRI WINDER

HON. JASON CHAFFETZ

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I honor Sherri Winder, a beautiful and devoted wife, mother, grandmother, and excellent member of my staff. Sherri passed away on Sunday, September 11th, 2011 in a tragic car accident in southern Utah. We are all stunned by the sudden and devastating loss of this wonderful woman.

As a faithful employee, Sherri brought grace and style to everything that she did. She was an elegant lady. She was an extremely kind, caring, and selfless person. She was a faithful volunteer in her community and church. She made an immediate and profound impact in my office. My staff and I are each deeply affected by her loss.

I am honored to have been one of the many people touched by Sherri's kindness and generosity. Sherri lived the principle of gratitude—always expressing her appreciation to others and making them feel valued. Sherri was perpetually positive and instantly brought a smile to all those with whom she came in contact. Her love of life and sincere caring was contagious and welcomed by all.

Sherri was involved in politics for all the right reasons. She was the first volunteer in Jon Huntsman's 2004 gubernatorial campaign, she was a prolific grass roots organizer, organizing the efforts to incorporate Taylorsville as a city, and she was a stalwart employee serving all who needed assistance. Sherri simply wanted to help people and strengthen our community. She was known and loved by people all across the Salt Lake Valley. But no more so than by the five loving children she and her husband Kent raised together.

Sherri Winder leaves behind a legacy of service and gratitude. She is survived by her husband, Kent, and their five adult children, Mike and Karyn Winder, Aimee and Matt Newton, Tami and Tom Larsen, Nathan Winder, and Isaac and Candalyn Winder, as well as 11 grandchildren with one on the way.

On behalf of both my staff and the constituents of the Third Congressional District who were served so well by Sherri, I extend my deepest sympathies to Kent and his family. Our thoughts and prayers go out to them during this most difficult time.

And although we mourn the loss of Sherri at this time, we will always celebrate her brilliant life, cherish her wonderful friendship, strive to emulate her amazing qualities, and work as she did to improve the world and community around us. She will be sincerely missed, but her profound legacy will never be forgotten.

SURFACE AND AIR TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS EXTENSION ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 13, 2011

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Surface and Air Transportation Programs Extension Act, which would authorize surface transportation programs through March and the Federal Aviation Administration through January.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the construction sector faced 13.5 percent unemployment in August. The programs we authorize in this bill create the projects to help put this industry back to work—to rebuild roads and bridges, renovate airports, and expand mass transit options. These are good jobs, here at home, that improve efficiency and economic competitiveness.

But this bill is not enough. We cannot continue short-term extensions and stop-gap

measures to make these critical investments. States need more certainty to plan their projects and industry needs to know that we are committed to rebuilding our infrastructure so they have the confidence to hire back employees who have been laid off.

Additionally, this bill does not include relief for those FAA employees who were furloughed through no fault of their own when Congress failed to extend authorization this summer. It is important to make these workers whole, and we should work quickly to provide retroactive pay.

Mr. Speaker, we need an ambitious agenda of investment that will put Americans back to work, repair our crumbling infrastructure, and jumpstart our economy. We need a long-term reauthorization of these critical programs. The American people are waiting—it's time to get the job done.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state for the record that my vote against the Holt amendment to the Empowering Parents through Quality Charter Schools Act was made in error. I strongly support this amendment that requires the Secretary of Education to give priority to schools that make investments in green building improvements. We must ensure that Federal investments in our schools set the highest standard for green school building practices. I remain a staunch supporter of green building innovation and I look forward to advancing this important cause in Congress.

HONORING J. CONRAD (JC) SENECA ON HIS NEW RESTAURANT, THE ARMOR INN TAP ROOM

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise today to honor J. Conrad (JC) Seneca upon the occasion of the opening of his new restaurant, the Armor Inn Tap Room, in Western New York.

An entrepreneur with a diversified portfolio of business interests, JC recently purchased the former Hoak's Armor Inn, located in the town of Hamburg. That establishment has undergone a tremendous rehabilitation, and will feature upscale dining in an historical atmosphere. Located where it is, it is certain to draw the attention of Buffalo Bills fans, tourists and the local community.

None of this comes as much of a surprise, however, because JC has been a substantial member of our community throughout his life. A native of the Cattaraugus Reservation in Irving, JC was a multi-sport star athlete while at Silver Creek High School. After graduation, JC served with honor and distinction with the United States Air Force, eventually studying at Bryant and Stratton and at Buffalo State College.

After a stint as a radio disc jockey, JC became incredibly active within the Seneca Nation and on behalf of Native Americans throughout the United States. JC currently serves as a Seneca Tribal Councilor, and has served in a number of business and government capacities on behalf of his nation. JC was a member of President-elect Bill Clinton's Transition Team and has led efforts to ensure cooperative working relationships between other governments and the Seneca people.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we all are a product of our upbringing, and JC is no different. JC's father, William Seneca, an ironworker and World War II Marine veteran, served honorably as President of the Seneca Nation, and later served as Special Liaison Officer for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. JC's mom practiced nursing, and was later elected Clerk of the Seneca Nation. Without question, JC's parents served as a strong example for the value of public service and instilled in him a dedication to make contributions back to his own community. As a result, all of those who comprise all of his communities—on a large or small scale—are better for the contributions he continues to make.

JC's new enterprise will add dozens of additional names to the list of employees—native and non-native—for whom he has helped create jobs in Western New York. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge you to join with me and with all Western New Yorkers in wishing the very best of luck to JC Seneca upon the opening of the new Armor Inn Tap Room, and to thank JC and his family for the many significant contributions that they make to life here in Western New York.

A TRIBUTE TO CHARITY CAMPBELL

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Charity Campbell, a Norwalk physical education teacher known for her leadership and high expectations, in receiving the 2012 Iowa Teacher of the Year Award from Governor Terry Branstad.

Along with teaching sixth and seventh grade physical education at Norwalk Middle School, Ms. Campbell is the Norwalk Middle School girls' track coach and girls' varsity track coach at Norwalk High School. It's her outstanding leadership qualities in addition to skills in physical education that make her special to the Norwalk community.

For example, Ms. Campbell helped her craft and create a mentoring program for first-year teachers at Norwalk schools. She instructs teachers how to use activities that will increase the student's hands-on learning directed at helping them focus and succeed in the classroom.

In 2010, Ms. Campbell's physical education program was named as a top observation program through PE4Life, a nonprofit organization dedicated to improve children's health and wellness in their everyday lives.

I am honored to represent Ms. Campbell in the United States Congress, and I wish her the best in her continuing service to the Norwalk community. I know my colleagues in the U.S. Congress will join me in congratulating and honoring Ms. Charity Campbell and her 15 years of teaching young Iowans.

TRIBUTE TO MR. R. CATER LEE

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life of a truly great American, Mr. R. Cater Lee, of Gulf Shores, Alabama, who passed away on August 13, 2011, at the age of 90.

Mr. Lee was a veteran of World War II and a member of America's ''Greatest Generation'' who helped to liberate Europe from Nazi tyranny. He flew 31 missions with the 448th Bomb Group, Second Air Division, of the Eighth Air Force in the European Theatre. He proudly served as a bombardier and navigator aboard the B–24 Liberator. For his courage and service he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters. Mr. Lee so loved his country that he continued to serve in the U.S. Air Force Reserves during the Korean War, attaining the rank of Major.

After his service to his country, Mr. Lee came home to Alabama, eventually settling in Birmingham, where in 1966 he was one of the co-founders of Vulcan, Inc. He would serve as president of the company for twenty years. At the time of his death, he was chairman of the board of Vulcan Inc., in Foley. Not only a patriot and successful businessman, Mr. Lee was also a leader in his community.

He was a past chairman of the South Baldwin Chamber of Commerce and of the Gulf Shores Water Board. He was a former member of the Gulf Shores City Council and recipient of the Free Enterprise Person of the Year Award. Mr. Lee's love of country was only rivaled by his love of family, community, and golf. He served as president of Gulf Shores Golf Club for many years.

Mr. Lee cherished all four generations of his family. The loss of Mr. Lee is one that should be mourned throughout the state and nation, as he was the embodiment of American ideals of patriotism, hard work and giving back to one's community.

On behalf of the people of South Alabama, I offer condolences to his daughter, Linda Lee Koniar and her husband, John, and his two sons, Bubba and his wife, Cheryl, and Tommy and his wife, Sandra. Mr. Lee had eight grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren, all of whom he loved with all his heart. My thoughts and prayers go out to all his family.

VOTE ON H.R. 2587, PROTECTING JOBS FROM GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE ACT

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 15, 2011, I will be absent and unable to cast my vote in favor of H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference

Act, because I will be in Florida attending the memorial service for my friend, David I. ''Dave'' Bitner. David Bitner was a great Florida statesman, my esteemed colleague in the Florida legislature, and my personal friend for over 20 years. I was saddened by Dave's death on September 8, 2011, which came soon after his diagnosis with ALS (Lou Gehrig's disease). Although I wish to cast my vote in favor of H.R. 2587, my long-time friendship with Dave and his wife, Wendy, requires me to attend the memorial service in Dave's honor.

I support the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act, and I voted in favor of H. Res. 372, the rule for H.R. 2587, in the Rules Committee hearing held on July 26, 2011. (Rules Committee Record Vote No. 121.) I strongly believe in the right of American business owners to make decisions regarding where and when to conduct business, and the right of states to determine the best labor policies for their citizens. I oppose excessive governmental regulation and interference by federal executive agencies that do not have the authority to supplant the best operational judgment of businesses in their employment, production, location, and other investment decisions. Recently, the National Labor Relations Board has taken unprecedented, protectionist actions on behalf of labor unions that fly in the face of federalism, and this cannot be allowed to continue. I am proud to represent the constituents of the 8th Congressional District of Florida, which is a right-to-work state, and I will continue to oppose efforts to impede American private enterprise, capitalism, and economic freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I would have voted ''yea'' in favor of H.R. 2587, had I been present, rather than in Florida for the memorial service for my friend, David Bitner, in support of his wife, Wendy.

HONORING LT. COL. ANTHONY SHAFFER, SENIOR INTELLIGENCE OFFICER, UNITED STATES ARMY RESERVE (RETIRED)

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to honor Lt. Col. Tony Shaffer, Military Intelligence Corps, for his twenty-five years of service as a field intelligence operative aid more than three decades of service to the nation in both the Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

Col. Shaffer's extensive career started in January 1981, while still in high school, when he enlisted in the Ohio Army National Guard.

He went on to graduate from Wright State University in 1986. And this year, 2011, Col. Shaffer was chosen as their College of Liberal Arts Alumnus of the Year.

Col. Shaffer's storied career has been distinguished by his willingness and ability to work at the cutting edge of our nation's intelligence community. He has successfully endeavored to adapt new technology and use these capabilities to ensure the protection of the American people. It is likely that most of Lt. Col. Shaffer's work will never be fully recognized—but I can assure you it is appreciated by me and the American people.

During his initial years of service, he deployed to Germany during REFORGER 85 to conduct anti-terrorism operations against the Red Army Faction, RAF, and other German based terrorism groups. He was also assigned to the Army's New York City Resident Office during a critical period when foreign terrorists were targeting the United States.

In 1988 he attended training at ''The Farm'' where he graduated first in his class of the Military Operations Training Course, MOTC, at Camp Perry, VA.

He was promoted to Captain in 1990 and was brought to active duty by the Army for the first Gulf War in 1991 where he worked to develop a key classified program named STARWATCHER B. After the conclusion of the first Gulf War, he was appointed to serve as the chief of the Army's global clandestine HUMINT collection program, and ran specific the Special Access Program, SAP, operation, unclassified nickname: CAROLINA MORNING, which netted highly significant information that was critical to the national leadership during the 1990s.

He was the senior HUMINT advisor to the J2/Senior Intelligence Officer of Joint Interagency Task Force East, JIATF–E. JIATF–E conducted counter-drug operations in the Transit Zone between Columbia and the United States southern border. During this tour he was successful in integrating highly specialized hybrid technology/human intelligence operations to obtain high value intelligence information to support the operational forces.

In 1995, Tony transitioned to Defense Intelligence Agency, DIA, as part of the consolidation of all Service, Army, Navy, Air Force, and USMC, controlled HUMINT into the Department of Defense.

He created and directed Task Force STRATUS IVY—a one-of-a-kind special mission task force that harnessed the skills of officers from the National Security Agency, NSA, Army Intelligence and Defense Intelligence Agency that conducted direct support to Department of Defense, Special Operations Command and other non-DoD agencies.

After his promotion to Major, due to his highly sought after skills, he was assigned to serve at both the HUMINT Support Element, HSE, at both Special Operations Command, SOCOM, and the Joint Special Operations Command, JSOC. He also served as a team leader of classified element that provided direct support to the Director of Operations of Defense HUMINT Service, DHS.

During this period of his career he participated in multiple highly classified operations—the most notable, a project known as ABLE DANGER—the controversial counterterrorism operation that was designed to detect, degrade and counter Al Qaeda capabilities that was successful in detecting Al Qaeda cells operating within the United States before the 9/11 attacks.

He had two peacetime overseas deployments—the first to Thailand where he was attached to the III Marine Expeditionary Force, MEF, to attend Exercise COBRA GOLD 1991; the second to New Zealand with attachment to the New Zealand Defense Force for Joint Warrior Interoperability Demonstration in mid 2001.

Just after the 9/11 attacks, in December 2001, he was returned to active duty for a 30-month period, during which he commanded a DIA operating base and had two successful combat tours to Afghanistan.

He commanded Field Operating Base, FOB, Alpha, a joint DIA/CIA brigade equivalent unit conducting classified collection and special operations support regarding terrorists just after the 9/11 attacks.

During his two undercover combat tours in Afghanistan, he participated in the search for senior Al Qaeda leadership in Afghanistan and is credited for helping to break the back of the Taliban's first attempt to return to power in Afghanistan.

Col. Shaffer received the Bronze Star Medal, BSM, for performance as an Operations Officer of the HUMINT Support Detachment in Afghanistan supporting CJTF 180 and CJFT 121.

After promotion to lieutenant colonel in 2005, he was attached to Navy's premier counterterrorism think-tank, DEEP BLUE at the Pentagon where he worked on key situational awareness and counterterrorism technology and tools.

In 2005 to 2006, Tony worked with the U.S. Congress and testified on multiple issues that relate to the 9/11 terrorist attacks and intelligence failures.

In 2006 he was assigned to and commanded the Special Troops Battalion, STB, of the 9th Theater Support Command, Ft. Belvoir, VA.

He was then, in 2007, selected to serve as the G6/Senior Information Officer, Anti-Terrorism Officer and Public Affairs Officer of the 94th Division, Force Sustainment, Ft Lee, VA—the 94th Division was re-activated in 2008 and was one of Gen George Patton's key divisions that participated in the Battle of the Bulge, Ardennes, in 1944–45. He remained with the 94th Division until he reached his mandatory retirement date, MRD, in July of 2011.

He continues to serve this great nation through his work at the Center for Advanced Defense Studies where, as a Senior Fellow, he continues to influence national defense strategy and policy through research and advocacy of critical national security issues.

Over these three decades Lt. Col. Shaffer has served with distinction and unmatched willingness to conduct high risk operations, while always recognizing the ethical and moral responsibly of his office.

Lt. Col. Shaffer's keen operational judgment and dynamic leadership has contributed substantially to the development of critical national level intelligence capabilities—many of which remain in operation today. His influence over national defense and security is indelible and significant—his service has constantly worked to identify threats and then develop capability to protect the American people. He consistently worked to influence national intelligence policy and capabilities to insure the security of the American people and has done so in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. Army.

On behalf of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I would like to recognize Col. Shaffer's outstanding accomplishments, courageous attitude and past and present devotion to this nation. I wish to congratulate him, his wife Rina, and sons Alexander and Ryan on the completion of long and distinguished career.

HONORING MACK STRONG AND ZOE HIGHEAGLE-STRONG

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a husband-and-wife team filled with love, faith, and determination. I'm proud to call them constituents and friends and I'm honored to be able to recognize their efforts on this floor today.

Mack Strong and Zoe Higheagle-Strong will be honored on Saturday evening, September 17 by the Association of Washington Generals as the Washingtonians of the Year. Mack and Zoe earned the honor by founding and leading the TEAM–WORKS Academy, a program that ''develops strong minds, strong bodies, and strong character in underserved youth.'' Founded in 2002 by Mack and Zoe, TEAM–WORKS Academy grew out of many years of dedicated community service and a strong belief in the validity of their vision for the future. I am thankful that Mack, a graduate of the University of Georgia and a longtime fullback of the Seattle Seahawks, put down roots in the community. His selfless and tireless work on behalf of at-risk youth in my District and beyond is an inspiration. And his wonderful wife Zoe, a member of the Nez Perce tribe and the Executive Director of TEAM–WORKS, is an inspiration to us all. The tandem of Mack and Zoe in the Puget Sound region represent an unstoppable force in the betterment of our communities, schools, and families.

It is clear that TEAM–WORKS is having a positive effect on the young people it directly serves. Over and over again, I hear stories and see the results of improved performance in the classroom and on the field of play. Mack, an accomplished athlete, believes that the link between consistent physical activity and school performance in our young people is a strong one. I couldn't agree more. I think the tactics of TEAM–WORKS should be replicated across this Nation. Mack and Zoe are doing remarkable things. Reading and math scores are up. Relationships at home have never been better. TEAM–WORKS is a godsend and Mack and Zoe show no signs of slowing down.

Again, Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Mack and Zoe for their efforts and congratulate them on their well deserved honor. They truly represent the best of the State of Washington. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Association of Washington Generals for recognizing their efforts and providing Mack and Zoe with the kind of official recognition too many of our best community leaders go without.

IN SUPPORT OF THE WORKERS OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 685,000 workers of the United States Postal Service (USPS), who face a devastating future which may close thousands of post offices, eliminate hundreds of mail processing facilities, lay off 120,000 of their colleagues, cut their pay, and end their collective bargaining rights.

Each day, the USPS processes an average of 584 million pieces of mail and delivers to 146 million addresses. In my home State of California alone, there are a total of 38,000 active and retired letter carriers.

These employees are fixtures within their communities and are some of the most dedicated, hardworking people out there. That is why I have been a strong advocate for letter carriers throughout my career in public service.

The United States Postal Service offers the most affordable postage in the industrialized world, while being able to sustain efficient delivery schedules at no expense to the taxpayer.

Established in 1775, the Postal Service and the thousands of families who depend on it now face an unprecedented crisis.

Since 2006, an unsustainable retiree healthcare system has saddled the USPS with a $5.5 billion overcharge to be paid in full at the beginning of every year. Based on longterm projections which are routinely called into question, this fund has established an enormous, unused surplus, estimated by the Postal Regulatory Commission and the Inspector General of the Postal Service to be between $55–75 billion.

No other Federal agency or private business is forced to pre-fund retiree health benefits in this manner. Since it is not funded by taxpayers, this requirement puts the USPS at a distinct competitive disadvantage. Fixing this problem would allow the Postal Service to compete more effectively with the private sector and return to profitability.

Without this mandate, the USPS would have actually been profitable to the tune of $611 million over the last 4 years, saving its $15 billion line of credit from the U.S. Treasury to ride out the bad economy. Instead, the entire agency, which has not taken taxpayer funds for 30 years, is facing default. Its line of credit is nearly exhausted.

Mr. Speaker, the real financial struggles at USPS do not stem from the cost of labor, but from the 2006 congressional mandate requiring the USPS to pre-fund future retiree benefits.

Unfortunately, House Republicans are bent on destroying the Postal Service as we know it and using this crisis as an opportunity to weaken collective bargaining rights.

The House Oversight and Government Reform Committee conducted a hearing in April entitled: ''Are Postal Workforce Costs Sustainable?'' Led by Committee Chairman DARRELL ISSA, this hearing was held to investigate a recent agreement between the USPS and the American Postal Workers Union.

Chairman ISSA's decision to hold a hearing to scrutinize and interfere with the collective bargaining process represents a dangerous precedent that could lead to more GOP interference in labor-management agreements.

In June, Chairman ISSA proposed H.R. 2309, the Postal Reform Act of 2011, which would establish a ''solvency authority'' with the power to unilaterally cut wages, abolish benefits, and end protection against unfair layoffs. It orders $1 billion worth of post office closures in the first year and another $1 billion worth of facility closures in the second year. It also ends Saturday deliveries.

Mr. Speaker, 6-day delivery is an important service that the USPS provides to the American people and is vital to its long-term sustainability. Ending Saturday deliveries reduces incentive for the American people to send mail through USPS and would lead to more jobs lost and larger reductions in service.

If Saturday delivery ends, it is possible that 80,000 full- and part-time jobs could be eliminated. At a time when we are still recovering from the worst economic recession since the Great Depression, now is not the time to put thousands of jobs in jeopardy.

The USPS estimates that cutting deliveries on Saturday will cut costs by 5 percent, but will slash mail delivery by 17 percent. Clearly the money saved by eliminating Saturday delivery is negligible and does not justify the lapse in efficiency and the loss of jobs that would certainly follow.

Reducing mail delivery service to 5 days a week would cause delays in the delivery of mail and would inevitably lead to increased costs due to the overtime Postal Service workers will be forced to endure in order to handle the backlog of mail. It is also vital for seniors who depend on mail-order prescription drugs and small businesses that need Saturday delivery to meet payroll.

Most importantly, ending Saturday service will remove the Postal Service's key strategic advantage over its competitors and result in a massive loss of revenue for the program.

We can't allow House Republicans to pursue an agenda that threatens the wellbeing of thousands of working families in California and across the Nation. They want to turn back the clock on the progress that has been made over the last century to ensure that American workers have the right to organize and demand fair wages and benefits.

We cannot stand by while thousands of American workers lose their jobs, and House Democrats are putting forth solutions that will take immediate steps to end this crisis without cutting jobs or resorting to taxpayer funded bailouts.

Take for instance H.R. 1351, the United States Postal Service Obligation Recalculation and Restoration Act of 2011, which would realign the Postal Service's retiree health prefunding schedule to a larger time period consistent with what the Postal Service can afford. It would do this by first establishing the exact size of the surplus and then transferring it to the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund where it belongs.

Furthermore, when the Post Office Department became the Postal Service in 1971, employees who belonged to the Federal pension fund started contributing to the new Postal Service. For employees who worked for both the Post Office Department and the Postal Service, the Federal and the postal pension funds shared responsibility. However, the Federal fund paid for retirements based on 1971 salaries, not final salaries. In essence, the Federal fund collected full contributions, but paid only partial benefits. The USPS was shortchanged $75 billion as a result of this error.

H.R. 1351 takes necessary steps to correct this by altering the methodology used to determine the allocation of costs for retirement benefits between the Federal government and the USPS. By making these changes, Congress

has the ability to significantly help the USPS cover its expected $238 billion shortfall for the next decade.

Now more than ever we must fight to preserve the legacy of the letter carrier and promote the value of the services that the workers of the United States Postal Service provide to millions of Americans every day.

H.R. 1351 is supported by the National Association of Letter Carriers, the National Association of Postal Supervisors, the American Postal Workers Union, the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association and the National Postal Mail Handlers Union. Advocating for working people is very personal and important to me. You see, you are looking at a Member of Congress who had the opportunity to have a mother who was part of a bargaining unit, who was a member of a union.

She had an opportunity to have someone advocate on behalf of not only herself, but her two daughters as well. And because my mother had that support, she was able to send her daughters to good schools, she was able to put braces on our teeth, and she was able to ensure that, yes, that little girl back in Los Angeles, California, would have an opportunity to one day become a Member of Congress.

Now more than ever, postal workers, teachers, firefighters, police officers and all other public employees must stand together to protect their jobs and their families, in California and across America.

Mr. Speaker, the alternative to H.R. 1351 is a violent downgrade of Postal Service operations which would cost tens of thousands of jobs immediately. Between their recent willingness to hold the nation's economy hostage for spending cuts and their attacks on worker's rights in Wisconsin, it appears that House Republicans would risk a total shutdown of the Postal Service if it meant further weakening the rights of public sector unions.

That is why I stand with 192 of my colleagues in our support for the thousands who play an essential role in connecting our people and building our communities. We cannot afford to lose so many jobs and hard-won benefits by failing to act on a common sense fix to an immediate crisis.

TRIBUTE TO MR. MELVIN E. PIERCE

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of a truly wonderful man, Mr. Melvin E. Pierce, a longtime resident of Semmes, Alabama, who passed away August 19, 2011, at the age of 73.

Mr. Pierce was a husband, father, friend, an entrepreneur and community leader. He wore many hats over his professional career, and is perhaps best known for his successful painting business. He began a career in painting as an apprentice and used his knowledge to later found and develop the Melvin Pierce Painting Company. He subsequently established Melvin Pierce Marine Coatings, Melvin Pierce Sandblasting, Highway Maintenance, Inc., and Dothan, Inc. of Semmes.

His community involvement ranged from president and founding member of "Friends of Semmes," which pioneered the incorporation of Semmes, to recipient of the 2005 Woodman of the World Outstanding Citizen Award. He was one of the founding members of the Dixie Youth Baseball Program in Semmes. And, in 2003, he was honored with the Award of Gratitude from the Semmes Community Park.

Professionally, he was an active member of the Associated General Contractors (AGC) and the Associated Builders & Contractors. He was a board member of the Mobile Water and Sewer Board, the Abba Shrine Temple, Trade Builder's Association and Woodman of the World. His considerable involvement with contracting gave him the opportunity to play a major role in numerous construction and renovation projects like the Mobile Convention Center and Mobile Government Plaza, the restoration of the historic Alabama Capitol in Montgomery, and the Beau Rivage Resort and Casino in Biloxi, Mississippi.

Melvin Pierce was the epitome of a community-minded businessman and volunteer and his involvement in so many different aspects of South Alabama will be hard to replace. In addition to possessing a charitable heart and an unequalled love of community, he helped found the Christmas parade, Azalea Festival, Easter Egg Hunt and a food pantry in Semmes.

On behalf of the people of South Alabama, I would like to extend my deepest condolences to his wife of 50 years, Evelyn, as well as his surviving children, George, David, Deborah, Jay, Regina and Rebecca, as well as his grandchildren, and his family and friends. You are all in our thoughts and prayers.

HONORING REVEREND CARL GILLIARD FOR TWENTY-EIGHT YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Reverend Carl Scott Gilliard for twenty-eight years of service to the Savannah, Georgia community. Reverend Gilliard, a native of Savannah, has been diligently working to make Georgia a better place through his leadership, community service and passion. Reverend Gilliard has dedicated his life to helping others and serving his community.

A graduate of Alfred Ely Beach High School and Morris Brown College, he first became active in civic affairs in 1984 when he served as the youth coordinator for the presidential campaign of Reverend Jesse Jackson. After working with Reverend Jackson, Pastor Gilliard began his public affairs talk show, "Tell It Like It Is," which became the number-one rated radio program for ten consecutive years. In 1995, Reverend Gilliard was ordained and served as pastor of the Miracle Christian Life Center for six years until he was appointed President of the Georgia Coastal Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Throughout Reverend Gilliard's years as a community activist, he has led a variety of successful efforts to improve the lives of his fellow citizens, including founding the Chatham County Youth Commission, chairing Unity in Our Community, starting the Savannah Out Marching Against Drugs movement, and organizing prayer vigils throughout Savannah.

Currently, Reverend Gilliard is the Host of "The Urban Journal." In addition, Reverend Gilliard is the CEO of Savannah Feed the Hungry where twice a week he offers a short message of encouragement and prayers to the hundreds who come seeking food at the newly opened Life Center.

I congratulate Reverend Gilliard on his many years of service. He has devoted his life and time to helping others and continues to make invaluable contributions to the city of Savannah and the state of Georgia, and I wish him many more years to come.

CONGRESS NEEDS A FRESH, BIPARTISAN START

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD, a thoughtful, clear and eloquent opinion piece written for The Washington Post by my friend Congressman JOHN DINGELL. As the Dean of the House and one of the hardest working members of this body, Congressman DINGELL has seen many Congresses come and go and has witnessed countless successes and failures. His wisdom and experience is unmatched. Every member of Congress, and those who aspire to be, will benefit from reading this and historians will find this article valuable in understanding the changes that have take place in Congress throughout the 20th century. It certainly is an important document that will continue to be a source of information about Congress for years to come.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 9, 2011]

CONGRESS NEEDS A FRESH, BIPARTISAN START

(By John D. Dingell)

I am saddened by what I heard when I was home for the August congressional recess. The American people are fed up with finger-pointing, blame games and infighting by all of us in Washington—the president, Congress and the media.

They are angry and frustrated, and they want Congress to do its constitutional duty. Only 12 percent think we are doing a proper job. It is easy to see why the public is losing confidence in the federal government.

In our debates over the fiscal 2011 spending bill and the debt limit, Congress put off its duties until the eleventh hour in favor of partisan squabbling and stubborn political games. I am ashamed of our performance—of us all, on both sides of the aisle. As a member of Congress who takes pride in this institution and holds its history and procedures in high regard, I am deeply disappointed by the unwillingness of members of all parties to come together for the common good.

Our Founding Fathers intended no parties when they created this institution. And until recently, members took the time to stay in Washington and learn the substance of issues, as well as the rules laid out by our forefathers in the Constitution and by previous generations in Congress. We learned how to draft good, bipartisan bills. Most members of Congress wouldn't remember, and for many Americans this may seem hard to believe, but there was a time not so very long ago when Republicans and Democrats worked well together. We worked long hours, typically five days a week or more for

months at a time. Members of both parties came to the table ready to work, debate and negotiate.

For many years, legislation was drafted from the middle, and we passed bipartisan bills frequently. It wasn't uncommon for an important bill to get 400-plus votes; we didn't stop just because we had 218. Members didn't engage in partisan misbehavior for the sake of a good Twitter hit or the opportunity to call out the other side on cable news. Rather, members had respect for one another and for the political spectrum. They managed to limit outside parties from disrupting the legislative process for political gain.

We in Congress are tearing our country apart and weakening the foundation established by great leaders before us. Is anyone in Congress truly proud that we have not produced a budget? That we caused the downgrading of U.S. government securities, as well as appalling disorder and confusion in financial markets? Or that this situation caused the lack of job creation and economic growth that has contributed to the hopelessness and misfortune of millions of Americans?

Wrangling by all parties, from the top down, cripples our work, and media that encourage confrontation instead of negotiation fuel the fire. Being locked into this system of starting from the far left or the far right and then doing just enough for passage may get a single bill done, but it's not a system that produces the best law that does the most good for all Americans.

This partisan viciousness needs to stop.

I am ashamed of our recent record. I am disgusted with our performance, Republican and Democratic alike. There has been failed leadership and, worse, failed following within the ranks—and we owe the country far better. My daddy taught me that if God had wanted us to talk more and listen less, he would have given us two mouths and one ear. In our most combative moments, we must remember that no cause is greater than this institution and the ideals on which it was founded; no single man or woman is greater than this body and the collective wisdom we are capable of exhibiting. If we hold on to that core principle, we can make changes that will be better for Congress as an institution and for the American people.

We must all help this body improve and call upon our colleagues to join in doing better. It is our duty. If we do not, the people, in their righteous and justified outrage, will get rid of us all—as well they should. I beg my friends in Congress and the administration to put the interests of this great nation before partisan political interests and not let the rivalries of the past prevent us from acting in ways that will better the future of our nation.

The writer, a Democrat from Michigan, is dean of the U.S. House of Representatives and a senior member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 12, 2011, I was unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote No. 699 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2076, as amended), "yes" on rollcall vote No. 700 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2633, as amended) and "yes" on rollcall vote No. 701 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1059).

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today our national debt is $14,717,868,058,346.24.

On January 6, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was $10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by $4,079,442,312,052.44 since then. This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

"CONSIDER THE POSSIBILITIES" PERSONAL ACHIEVEMENT AWARD WINNERS

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the winners of the "Consider the Possibilities" Personal Achievement award from the HealthSouth Rehabilitation Hospital of Altoona, given to encourage and reward personal achievement within its community. HealthSouth has presented rehabilitation awards to members of their community who have remained steadfast in overcoming an illness or disability. This year I congratulate: Danielle Gibbons and Frank Germino, winners of the "Consider the Possibilities" Personal Achievement Award; and Shelly Beaver, Sherri McGregor, and Joe Reed, winners of the Advocate Award.

Danielle Gibbons is the winner of the HealthSouth "Consider the Possibilities" Personal Achievement Award. On June 18, 2010, Danielle, 37 years old at the time and a single mother of two, was involved in a motor vehicle accident. Danielle was driving when another vehicle crossed the center line and hit her head on. The other driver was killed and Danielle was left with life threatening injuries. Danielle had to be cut out of the car, and was transported to the hospital where surgeons were ready to amputate her right leg. Instead, she insisted that she be flown to Pittsburgh where she underwent nine surgeries in order to keep her right leg. In October 2010, Danielle began physical therapy and she made remarkable progress. In less than one year, she was ambulating independently. Danielle has returned to work full time as a nurse practitioner. I commend her for her perseverance and good attitude.

Frank Germino is also the recipient of the HealthSouth "Consider the Possibilities" Personal Achievement Award. On October 9, 2010, Frank's life was changed forever when he fell 12 feet from a tree stand while hunting. Frank broke his back in five places. After a five hour surgery, he was told that he would never walk again due to the extensive damage that was incurred. Frank was determined to walk again and after months of rehab and therapy, Frank did just that. His courageous spirit is an inspiration to everyone around him.

Shelly Beaver and Sherri McGregor are the recipients of the HealthSouth Advocate Award. Through the efforts of Shelly Beaver, Certified Therapeutic Recreation Specialist, and Sherri McGregor, Education and Training Specialist at Penn State Altoona, "Sense-ational Endeavors" was developed. The program creates a combination of sensory activities, physical movement, and social skill development. In addition to therapeutic programs, campers engage in recreational activities and exercise tailored to their ability. Both Shelly and Sherri have dedicated their lives to enriching the lives of countless children.

Joe Reed is also the recipient of the HealthSouth Advocate Award. Joe is responsible for bringing a Miracle League to Blair County. The Miracle League provides baseball for all children with special needs. The field is constructed using a cushioned rubber surface with everything flat and level so there is nothing to trip over. Joe first heard about the Miracle League during a trip to Moody, Alabama while visiting friends in the fall of 2003. About two weeks later he read about it in the Kiwanis Magazine and knew this was something that Blair County needed. He returned to the Moody field, and then went to see the original Miracle League field in Conyers, Georgia. There, he met with the Executive Director of the Miracle League Association, Diane Alford. After getting permission to use the land owned by the Kiwanis Club of Eldorado, he assembled a Board of Directors in early 2004 and began fundraising and promotion. Joe raised over $150,000. Construction began in the fall of 2006. The total cost of the project was $497,000. Opening day was July 21, 2007 with 24 children. Today they have 125 players and over 175 volunteers.

Congratulations to Danielle, Frank, Shelly, Sherri, and Joe. Their accomplishments are a testament to us all that with hard work, persistence, and a big heart, we can overcome any hardship. I congratulate each of them on their perseverance, and I wish them the best as they continue to overcome illnesses and disabilities while setting an example for the rest of the community.

TRIBUTE TO LANCE CPL. TRAVIS MICHAEL NELSON

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Lance Cpl. Travis Michael Nelson who recently lost his life in the service of his country. We will always be indebted to his sacrifice for our freedom and we join his family and many friends in mourning his loss.

Lance Cpl. Nelson was assigned as a rifleman with the 1st Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, 2d Marine Division from Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. He lost his life during combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan on August 18, 2011, one month after his unit's arrival.

He was a dedicated Marine who loved his country and loved the Marine Corps. He always wanted to be a Marine and beginning at

the age of 14 he devoted his youth to preparing for his eventual role as a defender of America. Prior to his active duty service, he was a member of the Young Marines of Pensacola, Florida and the Pace High School Naval Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps program.

A native of Pace, and a resident of Bratt, Lance Cpl. Nelson, also had relatives in the nearby South Alabama towns of Atmore, Brewton, East Brewton and Daphne.

On behalf of the people of Alabama, I wish to extend condolences to his parents, Scott and Beckie Nelson; his brother, Daniel Nelson; his half brother, Chandler Case; sisters, Jenna Nelson, and Anna Nelson; and grandmothers, Anna Sanspree and Louise Nelson; as well as his fiance, Madeline Cates.

You are all in our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to this tribute the words of Sherry Digmon, publisher of Atmore magazine made in honor of Lance Cpl. Nelson.

''In tragedy, we come together. Atmore and the surrounding area came together in August as we all mourned the death of Marine Lance Cpl. Travis Nelson who was killed while on duty in Afghanistan. He was 19.

Most of us didn't know LCpl. Nelson, but we all knew him. His was the face of the young man who always wanted to be a Marine, who loved the flag and country, and who enlisted to preserve our freedoms.

On Friday, August 26, as we waited for the funeral procession to make its way down Main Street from the First Baptist Church to Oak Hill Cemetery, we looked at the people around us, almost all holding flags—the veterans lined up on the sidewalk in front of the American Legion building; the kids and the older folks; people who came out of their businesses and stood in the mid afternoon sun.

The Patriot Guard Riders came to Atmore to accompany the body of LCpl. Nelson and his family from Petty Eastside Chapel Funeral Home to First Baptist Church, then from the church to Oak Hill Cemetery. My hat is off to this fine group of men and women on motorcycles who show their respect to the fallen soldier by honoring and protecting the sanctity of his funeral and burial.

Someone in our group said, ''That's America.'' We agreed. And then I said, ''That's Atmore.''

This was one event I hope never to witness again—the funeral of a young soldier. I hope never again to think about how a mama feels when she sees the officers standing at her front door. How a fiancée feels when she finds out her intended has been killed. How the men in his unit felt when they heard he didn't make it.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on September 13, 2011, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 702 and 703.

Had I been present for rollcall 702, on agreeing to the amendment, Holt of New Jersey Amendment No. 7 to H.R. 2218, the Empowering Parents through Quality Charter Schools Act, I would have voted ''Aye.''

Had I been present for rollcall 703, on agreeing to the amendment, King of Iowa Amendment No. 8 to H.R. 2218, the Empowering Parents through Quality Charter Schools Act, I would have voted ''no.''

CELEBRATING ALYCE L. DIXON ON HER 104TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating Alyce L. Dixon on her 104th birthday on September 11, 2011.

As the nation and the city recalled a tragic day ten years ago that changed the lives of many and altered American history, the District of Columbia celebrated Alyce's birthday and applauded her for her support to the country and to the city.

Alyce Dixon has spent most of her life as a resident of the District of Columbia. After graduating from Paul Lawrence Dunbar Senior High School, she attended Howard University in the District. Ms. Dixon worked at the Lincoln Theatre, at an insurance company, and was one of the first civilian employees at the Pentagon, from which she retired after 35 years of service to the federal government.

Alyce Dixon was one of the first women to join the military and one of the first African-American women to become a member of the Women's Army Corps. While in the Army during World War II, Ms. Dixon served as part of the 6888th Postal Battalion in France, Scotland, and England, where she and other African-American women sorted mail for soldiers. Before retiring from the military, Ms. Dixon received the Good Conduct Medal to commemorate her service to the Army. She continued to serve the public by volunteering at Washington Hospital Center and Howard University Hospital for 12 years.

As a resident of the Washington, DC VA Medical Center, Alyce is loved by the hospital staff, personnel, and residents alike. She has the unique ability to bring joy to others, and is known especially for her bubbly personality and comedic storytelling.

Ms. Dixon is a member of Jones Memorial United Methodist Church, where she has graced the congregation with inspirations for a long life, filled with joy and laughter. She has also supported D.C. students in their pursuit of higher education through generous donations to church scholarships and youth programs.

In celebrating this significant milestone, we acknowledge the extraordinary personal qualities and contributions of Alyce Dixon to her family and to our community. Her birthday gives me, her family, and friends, as well as the residents of the District of Columbia, an opportunity to thank her for her many gifts of love, friendship, and consideration for others. I ask the House to join me in celebrating the 104th birthday of Alyce L. Dixon, a special woman whose service to this country and community is greatly appreciated.

RECOGNIZING THE YOUNG AMERICA'S FOUNDATION

HON. TOM McCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the attack against our nation ten years ago today was our generation's Pearl Harbor. Indeed, in many ways it was far more infamous. More Americans died on September 11th than in the attack on Pearl Harbor. It was an attack not upon some distant outpost but upon our nation's greatest city and our nation's capital city. It was an attack not upon heavily armed warships, but upon defenseless Americans peacefully going about their business.

This atrocity set new records for its ruthlessness and barbarity and depravity. Benjamin Netanyahu called it a ''wake-up call from hell,'' and that's exactly what it was. It is appropriate, though, to note one constant that defines us as a people and that guarantees us that all will come right. I speak of something that can only be described as the Spirit of America.

The attack on our nation ten years ago reminded us that the American spirit is still very much alive, and that this generation is more than capable of rising to great acts of heroism.

The attack ten years ago produced a pantheon of heroes—Americans who had gone about their business one peaceful morning, and in a few brief moments found themselves facing well prepared, intractable and barbaric adversaries.

At that fateful moment, they rose to the occasion. They resisted with everything they had. On December 7th, cooks became gunners and nurses passed the ammunition. On September 11th, office workers became rescue workers and businessmen laid down their cell phones and took up hand-to-hand combat in the skies over Pennsylvania.

Centuries from now, Americans will proudly remember the story of the young men and women aboard Flight 93 as it headed for our nation's Capitol: how they responded instantly to their country's peril — and armed only with their bare hands stopped cold those who would destroy our nation. In his last words heard over his cell phone, Todd Beamer asked—not just of his fellow passengers, but of all of his fellow countrymen: ''Are you guys ready''? His answer on behalf of us all was, ''Then let's roll.''

The memory of firefighters and police officers rushing into the burning buildings as everyone else rushed out personified duty and honor for an entire generation.

For those young people in our nation who were not alive to experience, or were too young to remember that day just over ten years ago, we have an obligation as a society to pass on our memories and the lessons we learned, purchased at the high price of innocent life and years of conflict.

I rise today in recognition of the ongoing work of the Young America's Foundation to preserve our history for future generations.

Each year Young America's Foundation helps students—many of whom comprise the ''9/11 generation''—to properly remember the anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attacks through their 9/11: Never Forget Project. Young America's Foundation began this program in 2003.

Young America's Foundation works with students to establish American flag memorials—displays consisting of 2,977 American flags representing each person tragically killed in the terrorist attacks. This year, students at more than 280 schools erected such memorials on their school grounds. Students held campus-wide moments of silence or prayer on September 11, at 9:11 a.m., hosted patriotic speakers and first responders at their schools, and provided 9/11: Never Forget posters and other materials to distribute on the anniversary. Young America's Foundation is making sure that future generations understand the events of that horrific day, remember its victims and remember the many examples of courage, patriotism and dedication which have, and will continue to inspire so many.

This tenth anniversary year is not just a time to memorialize the fallen—as important as that is. This upcoming September 11, we humbly celebrate America's endurance, strength, and goodness. In doing so, we will ensure that future generations will never forget.

While we can erect grand edifices and give speeches about 9/11, it is this simple and poignant tribute in remembrance of those we have lost and all those who serve that speaks loudest across the years. It is my privilege to rise today and thank the Young America's Foundation for its ongoing service to our nation and our posterity.

EMPOWERING PARENTS THROUGH QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2218) to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965:

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 2218, the Empowering Parents through Quality Charter Schools Act.

While there is no silver bullet to resolve all the problems facing our nation's education system, this bill represents a critical step toward better preparing our children to meet the challenges of a 21st century economy. It is also the first major element of reform to be acted on this year by either chamber of Congress.

We all want our kids to be able to attend a great school. It's like my father told me, ''If you have a good education, you can accomplish anything.''

That's why transparent and accountable charter schools are so important. They ensure greater access among our children to the high-quality education they deserve. Moreover, charter schools often operate in flexible and innovative ways that promote student success.

Unfortunately, demand for these opportunities continues to outpace supply. Over 400,000 U.S. students remain on waiting lists for enrollment in charter schools.

That's why I support H.R. 2218, which contains provisions that will remove barriers to the establishment of charter schools, improve academic performance, and reduce the number of students waiting for admission. This legislation also establishes commonsense quality controls that will protect students and taxpayers alike. The bill requires accurate assessments of schools though independent financial audits, and establishes clear academic and performance standards.

Following passage in the House, this bill will be sent to the Senate, where I hope it receives the consideration it deserves. And, should it be signed into law, I will continue to work with my colleagues to monitor its impact and ensure that our nation's charter school system continues to reflect the transparency and accountability required by this legislation.

HONORING SERGEANT KEVIN GLASER

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sergeant Kevin Glaser of Sikeston, Missouri, for his 28 years of dedicated law enforcement with the Missouri State Highway Patrol. The people of my congressional district and the state of Missouri are grateful for Kevin's commitment to ridding our communities of illegal drug activity.

For 22 years Kevin has been on the front lines of drug enforcement in Missouri as the leader of the Southeast Missouri, SEMO, Drug Task Force. The SEMO Drug Task Force's main objective is to crack down drug creation, distribution and use through the southern Missouri. Kevin commanded the task force for over 16 years.

Kevin displayed courageous leadership in the face of great challenges in the name of safer Missouri communities. As methamphetamine use spread across rural America, Kevin and his squad made record arrests and seizures. In fact, over 75 percent of their efforts in drug enforcement were fighting the scourge of meth use in southern Missouri.

In a 1997 L.A. Times article, Kevin was quoted as saying: ''It's hard to imagine a drug controlling you the way it does . . . They see their family falling apart, their bodies falling apart, but the only thing that matters to them is the dope.'' This drug was Kevin's enemy and the SEMO Drug Task Force's enemy, and they fought the enemy tirelessly.

I am thankful for Kevin's dedicated service with the Missouri State Highway Patrol. I am excited for his retirement, although I hear he is still playing an advisory role with the officers' training. Kevin, I wish you the very best on this new venture.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 15, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 20

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To receive a closed briefing on Iran.

SVC–217

Budget

To hold hearings to examine promoting job creation in the United States.

SD–608

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine intelligence community contractors, focusing on striking the right balance; to be immediately followed by a closed hearing in Senate Security Conference Room 1.

SD–342

10 a.m.

Finance

To hold hearings to examine tax reform options, focusing on incentives for innovation.

SD–215

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Housing, Transportation and Community Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine new ideas to address the glut of foreclosed properties.

SD–538

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the debt limit.

210, Cannon Building

2:30 p.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD–226

Appropriations

Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

Business meeting to markup proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies.

SD–124

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

SEPTEMBER 21

10 a.m.

Finance

To hold hearings to examine dually-eligible beneficiaries, focusing on improving care while lowering costs.

SD–215

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, to be Ambassador to Luxembourg, Thomas Charles Krajeski, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Bahrain, and Dan W. Mozena, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of Bangladesh, all of the Department of State.

SD–419

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to resume consideration of S. 1546, to authorize certain programs of the Department of Homeland Security.

SD–342

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings to examine the legislative presentation of The American Legion.

SDG–50

10:15 a.m.

Judiciary

Crime and Terrorism Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine countering terrorist financing, focusing on progress and priorities.

SD–226

2 p.m.

Judiciary

Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine Google, focusing on consumers and competition.

SD–226

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider S. 1119, to reauthorize and improve the Marine Debris Research, Prevention, and Reduction Act, S. 1207, to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a security breach, S. 1307, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey real property, including improvements, of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in Ketchikan, Alaska, S. 1401, to conserve wild Pacific salmon, and S. 1430, to authorize certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and promotion lists in the United States Coast Guard and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

SR–253

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine transforming wartime contracting, focusing on recommendations of the Commission on Wartime Contracting.

SD–342

Energy and Natural Resources

National Parks Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine a recently released report by the National Park Service, focusing on ''A Call to Action Preparing for a Second Century of Stewardship and Engagement''.

SD–366

SEPTEMBER 22

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the United States strategy in Afghanistan and Iraq.

SH–216

2:15 p.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the ''Tribal Law and Order Act'' one year later, focusing on improved public safety and justice throughout Indian country.

SD–628

2:30 p.m.

Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Irvin Charles McCullough III, of Maryland, to be Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

SH–216

POSTPONEMENTS

SEPTEMBER 20

10 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine if today's political rhetoric is true to the United States Constitution.

SD–226

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5587–S5635

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1552–1560, and S. Res. 266–267. **Page S5624**

Measures Passed:

Hispanic Heritage Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 267, recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States. **Pages S5631–32**

Measures Considered:

Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, after agreeing to the motion to proceed, and taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S5594–S5616, S5617–18**

Pending:

Reid Amendment No. 602, to provide additional appropriations for disaster relief in fiscal years 2011 and 2012. **Pages S5617–18**

Reid Amendment No. 603 (to Amendment No. 602), to change the enactment date. **Page S5617**

Reid Amendment No. 604 (to Amendment No. 603), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5617**

Reid Amendment No. 605 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 602), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5617**

Reid Amendment No. 606 (to Amendment No. 605), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5617**

Reid Motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Finance with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 607, to change the enactment date. **Page S5617**

Reid Amendment No. 608 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 607), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5617**

Reid Amendment No. 609 (to Amendment No. 608), of a perfecting nature. **Pages S5617–18**

A motion was entered to close further debate on Reid Amendment No. 602 (listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Friday, September 16, 2011. **Page S5617**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the joint resolution, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of Reid Amendment No. 602 (listed above). **Page S5617**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the joint resolution at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, September 15, 2011. **Page S5632**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Mary B. DeRosa, of the District of Columbia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. (Prior to this action, Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration.) **Pages S5631, S5635**

Frank E. Loy, of the District of Columbia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. (Prior to this action, Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration.) **Pages S5631, S5635**

Kendrick B. Meek, of Florida, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. (Prior to this action, Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration.) **Pages S5631, S5635**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

David Campos Guaderrama, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

Michael Anthony McFaul, of California, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

2 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Army and Navy. Page S5632

Messages from the House: Page S5622

Measures Referred: Page S5622

Measures Placed on the Calendar: Pages S5588, S5622–23

Executive Communications: Pages S5623–24

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S5624–25

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S5625–29

Amendments Submitted: Pages S5629–31

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S5631

Privileges of the Floor: Page S5631

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late former Senator Malcolm Wallop, at 7:12 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 15, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5632.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Service and General Government approved for full committee consideration an original bill making appropriations for Financial Services and General Government for fiscal year 2012.

APPROPRIATIONS: COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies approved for full committee consideration an original bill making appropriations for Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2012.

GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICER REQUIREMENTS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine general and flag officer requirements, after receiving testimony from Clifford L. Stanley, Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Vice Admiral William E. Gortney, USN, Director, Joint Staff, General Peter W. Chiarelli, USA, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army, Admiral Mark E. Ferguson III, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy, General Joseph F. Dunford, Jr., USMC, Assistant Commandant, United States Marine Corps, and General Philip M. Breedlove, USAF, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, all of the Department of Defense; and Benjamin J. Freeman, Project on Government Oversight, Washington, D.C.

INSURANCE REGULATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance and Investment concluded a hearing to examine emerging issues in insurance regulation, after receiving testimony from Baird Webel, Specialist in Financial Economics, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Therese M. Vaughan, National Association of Insurance Commissioners, Washington, D.C.; Mary A. Weiss, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Daniel Schwarcz, University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis.

REFINANCING AND RESTRUCTURING MORTGAGE LOANS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation and Community Development concluded a hearing to examine new ideas for refinancing and restructuring mortgage loans, including S. 170, to provide for the affordable refinancing of mortgages held by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, after receiving testimony from Senators Boxer and Isakson; Richard A. Smith, Realogy Corporation, Parsippany, New Jersey; Mark A. Calabria, Cato Institute, and David H. Stevens, Mortgage Bankers Association, both of Washington, D.C.; Ivy Zelman, Zelman and Associates, Beachwood, Ohio; Marcia J. Griffin, HomeFree-USA, Hyattsville, Maryland; Mark Zandi, Moody's Analytics, West Chester, Pennsylvania; Anthony B. Sanders, George Mason University Mercatus Center, Fairfax, Virginia; and Christopher J. Mayer, Columbia Business School, New York, New York.

INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security concluded a hearing to examine moving intercity passenger rail into the future, after receiving testimony from Joseph C. Szabo, Federal Railroad Administrator, and Mitchell Behm, Assistant Inspector General for Rail, Maritime and Economic Analysis, both of the Department of Transportation; and Joseph H. Boardman, President and CEO, and Ted Alves, Inspector General, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, both of AMTRAK.

TAX REFORM OPTIONS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine tax reform options, focusing on marginal rates on high-income taxpayers, capital gains and dividends, after receiving testimony from Dennis

Mehiel, U.S. Corrugated, Inc., New York, New York; Stephen J. Entin, Institute for Research on the Economics of Taxation, and Bill Rys, National Federation of Independent Business, both of Washington, D.C.; and Leonard E. Burman, Syracuse University Maxwell School, Syracuse, New York.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee began consideration of S. 1546, to authorize certain programs of the Department of Homeland Security, but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again on Wednesday, September 21, 2011.

SECURING THE PHARMACEUTICAL SUPPLY CHAIN

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine securing the pharmaceutical supply chain, focusing on how the Food and Drug Administration faces challenges overseeing the foreign drug manufacturing supply chain, after receiving testimony from Deborah M. Autor, Deputy Commissioner for Global Regulatory Operations and Policy, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; Marcia Crosse, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; Kendra A. Martello, Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA), Gordon Johnston, Generic Pharmaceutical Association (GPhA), and Allan Coukell, The Pew Charitable Trusts, all of Washington, D.C.; and Martin VanTrieste, Amgen, Thousand Oaks, California, on behalf of Rx–360.

TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine renewing the commitment to victims of human trafficking, including S. 1301, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2012 to 2015 for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, to enhance measures to combat trafficking in person, after receiving testimony from Mary Lou Leary, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice; Luis CdeBaca, Ambassador-at-Large, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, Department of State; and Kelly Ryan, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration and Border Security.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 25 public bills, H.R. 2910–2934; and 3 resolutions, H.J. Res. 79 and H. Con. Res. 78–79, were introduced. **Page H6180**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6182–83**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 1070, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to authorize the Securities and Exchange Commission to exempt a certain class of securities from such Act, with an amendment (H. Rept. 112–206). **Page H6180**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Denham to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6141**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:04 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6148**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2011: H.R. 2867, amended, to reauthorize the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998. **Pages H6152–56**

Motion to Proceed: Pursuant to section 3 of H. Res. 392, Representative Reed moved that the House proceed to consider H.J. Res. 77. The motion was agreed to by voice vote. **Page H6156**

Relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit: The House agreed to H.J. Res. 77, relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as submitted under section 3101A of title 31, United States Code, on August 2, 2011, by a recorded vote of 232 ayes to 186 noes with 2 voting "present", Roll No. 706. **Pages H6156–68**

Pursuant to section 3101A(c)(4) of title 31, United States Code, H.J. Res. 77 was considered as read, and the previous question was considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without

intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled. **Pages H6156–57**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, September 15th. **Page H6168**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:04 p.m. and reconvened at 6:41 p.m. **Page H6179**

Quorum Calls Votes—One recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on pages H6167–68. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:41 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FEED AVAILABILITY AND ITS EFFECT ON THE LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY INDUSTRIES

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry held a hearing on the examination of the issue of feed availability and its effect on the livestock and poultry industries. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NEED FOR PRO-GROWTH TAX REFORM

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Need for Pro-Growth Tax Reform.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FEDERAL ROLE IN PUBLIC SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Federal Role in Public School Accountability.'' Testimony was heard from Hanna Skandera, Secretary-Designate, New Mexico Public Education Department; Amy F. Sichel, Superintendent, Abington School District; Alberto M. Carvalho, Superintendent, Miami-Dade County Public Schools; and Blaine Hawley, Principal, Red Pump Elementary School.

EPA'S NEW AND PROPOSED POWER SECTOR REGULATIONS ON ELECTRIC RELIABILITY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing on the American Energy Initiative with a focus on the impacts of the Environmental Protection Agency's new and proposed power sector regulations on electric reliability. Testimony was heard from the following Commissioners of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission: Jon Wellinghoff, Philip D. Moeller, Marc Spitzer, John R. Norris, and Cheryl A. LaFleur; and Jeff Davis, Commissioner, Missouri Public Service Commission; Jon W. McKinney, Commissioner, West Virginia Public Service Commission; Stan Wise, Commissioner, Georgia Public Service Commission; H.B. ''Trip'' Doggett, President and CEO, Electric Reliability Council of Texas; and Mark Shurtleff, Attorney General, Utah.

SOLYNDRA AND THE DOE LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Solyndra and the DOE Loan Guarantee Program.'' Testimony was heard from Jeffrey Zients, Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget; and Jonathan Silver, Executive Director, Department of Energy Loans Programs Office.

CYBERSECURITY: THREATS TO THE FINANCIAL SECTOR

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled ''Cybersecurity: Threats to the Financial Sector.'' Testimony was heard from A.T. Smith, Assistant Director, United States Secret Service; Gordon Snow, Assistant Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation; Greg Schaffer, Acting Deputy Under Secretary, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

HUD AND NEIGHBORWORKS HOUSING COUNSELING

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing entitled ''HUD and NeighborWorks Housing Counseling Oversight.'' Testimony was heard from Deborah C. Holston, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Single Family Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development; and public witnesses.

U.S. AID TO THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Promoting Peace? Reexamining U.S. Aid to the Palestinian Authority, Part II.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

U.S.-INDIA COUNTERTERRORISM COOPERATION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade held a hearing on U.S.-India Counterterrorism Cooperation: Deepening the Partnership. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''United States Secret Service: Examining Protective and Investigative Missions and Challenges in 2012.'' Testimony was heard from Mark Sullivan, Director, Secret Service.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a markup of the Subcommittee print to authorize the programs of the Transportation Security Administration relating to the provision of transportation security, and for other purposes, entitled the ''Transportation Security Administration Authorization Act of 2011.'' The print was ordered reported, as amended.

INVESTOR VISA PROGRAM: KEY TO CREATING AMERICAN JOBS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement held a hearing entitled ''The Investor Visa Program: Key to Creating American Jobs.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CREATING AMERICAN JOBS BY HARNESSING OUR RESOURCES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Creating American Jobs by Harnessing Our Resources: Domestic Mining Opportunities and Hurdles.'' Testimony was heard from Tom Murphy, Mayor, Gillette, Wyoming; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on the following legislation: H.R. 200, the ''Inland Empire Perchlorate Ground Water Plume Assessment Act of 2011''; and H.R. 2842, the ''Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act of 2011.'' Testimony was heard from David Murillo, Deputy Commissioner and Director of Operations, Bureau of Reclamation; Ed Scott, Mayor Pro Tem, Rialto, California; Christopher Treese, External Affairs Manager, Colorado River District, Glenwood Springs, Colorado; Grant Ward, Water and Power Consultant, Maricopa-Stanfield Irrigation and Drainage District and Electrical District No.3, Maricopa, Arizona; and public witnesses.

HOW A BROKEN PROCESS LEADS TO FLAWED REGULATIONS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''How a Broken Process Leads to Flawed Regulations.'' Testimony was heard from Cass Sunstein, Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget; and public witnesses.

SUSTAINABILITY OF SMALL BUSINESS GRADUATES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Beyond the Size Standards: Sustainability of Small Business Graduates.'' Testimony was heard from Rep. Connolly and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup of legislation regarding the ''Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act.'' The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Business meeting to mark up proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for Defense, Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies, Financial Services and General Government, and the Legislative Branch, 2 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on the Budget: To hold hearings to examine policy prescriptions for the economy, 9:30 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Gregory Howard Woods, of New York, to be General Counsel, David T. Danielson, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, and LaDoris Guess Harris, of Georgia, to be Director of the Office of Minority Economic Impact, all of the Department of Energy, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: To hold hearings to examine tax reform options, focusing on promoting retirement security, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: To hold hearings to examine the future of employment for people with the most significant disabilities, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine improving financial accountability at the Department of Defense, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: To hold an oversight hearing to examine tribal transportation, focusing on paving the way for jobs, infrastructure, and safety in native communities, 2:15 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: Business meeting to consider S. 1151, to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to ensure privacy, to provide notice of security breaches, and to enhance criminal penalties, law enforcement assistance, and other protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personally identifiable information, S. 1408, to require Federal agencies, and persons engaged in interstate commerce, in possession of data containing sensitive personally identifiable information, to disclose any breach of such information, S. 1535, to protect consumers by mitigating the vulnerability of personally identifiable information to theft through a security breach, providing notice and remedies to consumers in the wake of such a breach, holding companies accountable for preventable breaches, facilitating the sharing of post-breach technical information between companies, and enhancing criminal and civil penalties and other protections against the unauthorized collection or use of personally identifiable information, H.R. 2480, to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States for fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014, and the nominations of Edgardo Ramos, of Connecticut, Andrew L. Carter, Jr., and Jesse M. Furman, all to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and James Rodney Gilstrap, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: To hold hearings to examine disaster recovery, focusing on evaluating the role of America's small business in rebuilding their communities, 10 a.m., SR–428A.

Select Committee on Intelligence: To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Panel on Defense Financial Management and Audibility Reform, hearing on organizational challenges in achieving sound financial management and audit readiness, 8 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing on sustaining GPS for national security, 11:30 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing entitled "Internet Privacy: The Impact and Burden of EU Regulation." 9:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "Cutting the Red Tape: Saving Jobs from PPACA's Harmful Regulations." 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Fixing the Watchdog: Legislative Proposals to Improve and Enhance the Securities and Exchange Commission." 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled "The Impact of the World Bank and Multi-Lateral Development Banks on National Security." 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup of the following: H.R. 2885, the "Legal Workforce Act"; and H.R. 2847, the "American Specialty Agriculture Act." 11:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on legislation regarding to establish in the Department of the Interior an Under Secretary for Energy, Lands, and Minerals and a Bureau of Ocean Energy, an Ocean Energy Safety Service, and an Office of Natural Resources Revenue, and for other purposes, 9:30 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1162, to provide the Quileute Indian Tribe Tsunami and Flood Protection, and for other purposes; H.R. 2087, to remove restrictions from a parcel of land situated in the Atlantic District, Accomack County, Virginia; H.R. 2336, the "York River Wild and Scenic River Study Act of 2011"; H.R. 2351, the "North Cascades National Park Service Complex Fish Stocking Act"; H.R. 2352, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust the boundary of the Stephen Mather Wilderness and the North Cascades National Park in order to allow the rebuilding of a road outside; H.R. 2606, the "New York City Natural Gas Supply Enhancement Act"; and H.R. 2687, the "Fort Pulaski National Monument Lease Authorization Act." 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on TARP, Financial Services, and Bailouts of the Public and Private Programs, hearing entitled "Crowdfunding: Connecting Investors and Job Creators." 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on National Security, Homeland Defense, and Foreign Operations, hearing entitled "Defense Department Contracting in Afghanistan: Are We Doing Enough to Combat Corruption?" 10:30 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Out of Thin Air: EPA's Cross-State Air Pollution Rule." 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce, hearing entitled "Helping Small Businesses Compete: Challenges within Programs Designed to Assist Small Contractors." 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, September 15

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will continue consideration of H.J. Res. 66, Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, with the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to the joint resolution and the substitute amendment at 1 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, September 15

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 2587—Protecting Jobs From Government Interference Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baldwin, Tammy, Wisc., E1621
Biggert, Judy, Ill., E1634
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1622
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E1628, E1631, E1632
Boren, Dan, Okla., E1619
Burton, Dan, Ind., E1624
Chaffetz, Jason, Utah, E1627
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1624, E1632
Critz, Mark S., Pa., E1620
Emerson, Jo Ann, Mo., E1634
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E1619
Gonzalez, Charles A., Tex., E1627
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1626
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1628
Himes, James A., Conn., E1623
Holt, Rush D., N.J., E1620
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E1621
Jones, Walter B., N.C., E1629
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E1631
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E1631
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E1628
McClintock, Tom, Calif., E1633
Mulvaney, Mick, S.C., E1625
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1623, E1633
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1626
Reichert, David G., Wash., E1630
Richardson, Laura, Calif., E1630
Shuler, Heath, N.C., E1621
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E1623, E1632
Smith, Adam, Wash., E1625, E1632
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E1619, E1620, E1622, E1622, E1623, E1624, E1625, E1625, E1626, E1628
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E1621
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1627
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E1633
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E1628

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.