United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2011 No. 141

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 21, 2011.

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

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

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.

PAY A FAIR SHARE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, I was initially very supportive of the President's proposed Buffett tax based on the premise that no millionaire or billionaire should pay a lower tax rate than a checkout clerk at the Albertsons supermarket or a small business owner who only earns $40,000 a year. It seemed fair to me. But, you know, then I started listening to the Republican response, and it's pretty heavy and it really gives you pause to think about whether or not this is a good idea for our country. It's class warfare. It will hurt job creation. You know, these are arguments. It won't raise money. These are arguments that certainly are very, very telling.

In fact, I have some direct quotes from one Representative: ''This is really the Dr. Kevorkian plan for our economy. It will kill jobs, kill businesses, and yes, kill even the higher tax revenues that these suicidal tax increasers hope to gain.''

Another Representative: ''Class warfare may win political campaigns, but it doesn't spur economic growth. Raising the capital gains tax may garner political capital, but it will not create any jobs.''

And then, finally, of course: ''When are we going to get it? We do not have a revenue problem in this Congress; we have a spending problem.''

Those are heavy criticisms. And just think if they proved true what a disaster it would be for America. Now, of course, these criticisms were all leveled in 1993, the last time we had a Democratic President propose that millionaires and billionaires should pay a fair rate of taxes in this country.

The first one was from Representative Christopher Cox, a total idiot who ran the Securities and Exchange Commission while Wall Street gambled our economy into the tank. He said the part about killing jobs, and we wouldn't get jobs and we wouldn't get higher revenues.

Well, actually, with the Clinton tax increases, we did get higher revenues, we did balance the budget, we did pay off debt, and we had 3.8 percent unemployment. And we were asking the job creators, the millionaires and billionaires, to pay a fair share. I guess Chris was wrong.

Well, let's see, the second one was from former Representative Pryce of Ohio about political capital not creating any jobs. Well, we already addressed that. We had 3.8 percent unemployment.

What have they done to create a single job so far this year? Nothing. In fact, they eliminated jobs. But, you know, that's because we want to give the job creators a break. We don't want to tax them, all to protect tax cuts.

And then, finally, the final quote about we don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem is from then Representative BOEHNER, now Speaker BOEHNER.

Now, of course, our taxes are at 15 percent of our gross domestic product, considerably lower than the percent of taxes that were levied in the Reagan era. And, you know, we do have a revenue problem, $5 trillion of tax cuts over the last decade, $5 trillion, 5 thousand billion dollars of tax cuts, heavily oriented toward the job creators—the millionaires and the billionaires.

Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs?

It doesn't work. First it was 8 years of Bush tax cuts, then 2 years of Bush-Obama tax cuts, and now we have President Obama's further proposed tax cuts.

Tax cuts don't create jobs.

Now, I think, actually, now I have considered their arguments, the President's right. Billionaire hedge fund speculators on Wall Street, let's think about it. Their rate of taxation is 15 percent on billions of dollars of income. A small business owner, $50,000 a year, whoa, more than twice that. Army captain, just back from defending America in Afghanistan, whoa, more than twice that.

Who gives more value to this society, the parasite on Wall Street who is speculating and driving up the price of our fuel and making billions of dollars doing it or the Army captain or the small business owner, the real job creators?

We can, by levying a fair rate of taxes on the millionaires and billionaires under the Buffett tax—the best

Printed on recycled paper.

investor in this country, who thinks this is the direction we should go—we can both create jobs, stabilize the economy, get down the deficit, and continue to fund critical programs. Ironically, in the grand deal that was adopted back here a month ago that I voted against, there was only one specified cut, one cut specified in that bill—graduate student financial aid. That's because at the country club they don't meet anybody who can't put their kids through medical school.

We need doctors. We need other professionals. We need to help the next generation succeed, education and infrastructure investment, and we need money to help pay for it.

GENERAL AVIATION

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about how our President has systematically and relentlessly attacked the general aviation industry.

You know, this is one of the few last great manufacturing gems left in America. It creates $1.2 million jobs—the gentleman before me was speaking about jobs—1.2 million jobs in America and $150 billion worth of income and a tremendous amount of exports.

This industry is enormously important to my district, but not just my district, the air capital of the world, but all across the country. These are good jobs. These are middle class jobs. They are jobs for machinists and welders and riveters and managers and purchasing people who make some of the finest airplanes in the world.

But instead of supporting the general aviation industry and welcoming those jobs, the President has attacked it. At the very least, he could just leave it alone. But this is part of his larger class warfare effort.

He demonizes general aviation users. He calls them corporate fat-cat jet owners at every turn. But it's not impacting the folks who use those as business tools; it's impacting the people who build these airplanes. They are productive. They are working to grow their businesses, and they are growing jobs.

His rhetoric kills sales of American manufactured goods and, with them, the jobs that are created when those airplanes are built. You know, he has attacked it in multiple ways.

Most recently the Department of Transportation issued something called BARR. It's a program which has long ensured basic privacy rights for general aviation users by allowing them to opt out of being tracked by everybody with an Internet connection. But on August 2, the FAA changed that rule and said, no, now anyone with an Internet connection can find out and violate the privacy rights of anybody who decides to fly in an airplane all across the country unless they specifically opt out and can state a valid security threat.

This is an unprecedented step. It will facilitate serious violations of privacy, and it doesn't help create jobs in America.

I have introduced a piece of legislation called the BARR Preservation Act, along with Kansas Senator PAT ROBERTS, and I would urge my colleagues to support that legislation. It will create jobs in America.

Now the President most recently announced, as part of his efforts to reduce the deficit, user fees on general aviation aircraft, over $100 per flight, not to mention the enormous bureaucracy it will take to collect this set of taxes. At a time when America has got unemployment of one in six or more, it's no time to add taxes on folks who are trying to fly their airplane around this country to get from Topeka to Des Moines, to get to small towns to support American manufacturing. This President wants to put taxes on general aviation users.

□ 1010

Finally, let me just talk for a moment about the taxes and the rhetoric. Mr. President, this industry is not asking for a handout. This President mistakes hardworking people for folks who are looking for something from the Federal Government. All we ask is to be left alone. We don't want the bailouts that the city of Detroit received and that the automotive folks received. We're not asking for tax favoritism. All we're asking is that you respect the hardworking people of Kansas and all across America who build the finest airplanes in the world. This is, Mr. Speaker, failed leadership.

We have $4 trillion in additional debt and a loss of 2 million jobs under this President. Don't give us a bailout; don't give us a handout. We don't want special favors. Simply leave us alone to grow and create good, middle class, hardworking people's jobs right in Kansas and right in America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

LACEY ACT PROTECTS AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last week in a speech before the Economic Club of Washington, Speaker BOEHNER used this tried and true Republican applause line: ''Excessive regulations are making it harder for our economy to create jobs.'' But then he followed up with a real-life example. ''Last month, Federal agents raided Gibson Guitar factories in Tennessee. Gibson is a well-respected American company that employs thousands of people. The company's costs were $2 million to $3 million. Why? Because Gibson bought wood overseas to make guitars in America. Seriously.''

Well, seriously, Mr. Speaker, you were seriously—well, not necessarily you, I know you can't write all of your speeches, but you were done a disservice by your speech writers who could have done a little more research about the background of what was happening there. The Federal Government was involved with enforcing the Lacey Act which actually makes it easier to protect American jobs and manufacture here at home.

In 2008, I was pleased to be part of leading an effort working with the Bush administration in a bipartisan fashion to amend the Lacey Act, which bars trade in illegally harvested species to include trade in illegally harvested timber. Illegal logging threatens some of the world's richest and most vulnerable forests, but more important, it threatens tens of thousands of jobs right here in the United States. Over 50 trade associations, nonprofits, and unions representing the entire range of the U.S. economy signed statements supporting this amendment to the Lacey Act and its proper implementation.

This is serious business. People who cheat by knowingly using wood products that are bought illegally overseas cost American jobs. The estimate was over $1 billion every year in lost opportunities and lower prices because of the illegal logging. We wanted to increase American jobs here at home, so we created a mechanism so that people would have an incentive to stop cheating, to stop competing unfairly against American businesses that are following the rules.

It's interesting to note that in 2009 when Gibson was first brought to the attention of the enforcement agencies and a process started, because of concerns that they may have taken illegal timber from Madagascar, on the floor of the House, over 400 Representatives voted in favor of a resolution I had condemning illegal logging in Madagascar.

We find there are people right here in the United States who understand this dynamic. The success of the Lacey Act rests on a simple principle: rewarding companies that follow the law while shedding light on bad actors. It ensures that American business using foreign wood, like guitar makers, pay attention to the sources of their wood. We had very powerful testimonies of what happens in illegal logging. It doesn't just destroy fragile ecosystems and threaten a scarce and dwindling supply of rare species of wood, it destabilizes those countries. The people who are engaged in the traffic of illegal timber threaten, they corrupt, and sometimes they kill. It is possible to figure this out. People need to pay attention.

Guitar makers like C.F. Martin Guitar are strongly supportive of the law. I quote: ''I think the Lacey Act is a wonderful thing. I think illegal logging is appalling,'' the company's CEO,

Chris Martin, said in a recent interview. ''It should stop, and if this is what it takes to stop unscrupulous operators, I'm all for it.''

Mr. Speaker, this is serious business. Being able to have protections to protect American manufacturers from unfair competition by people who skirt the rules, people who cheat, is in everybody's interest. Let's let the process ongoing right now work its way out. Let's see if there's a problem. But by all means, we ought to protect the integrity of the Lacey Act, which is designed to save these tens of thousands of jobs here at home and the environment abroad.

CREATING JOBS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) for 2 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to emphasize one more time that the Federal Government doesn't create jobs; it's small businesses and entrepreneurs. You just heard my friend talk about Gibson Guitar and vilify Gibson Guitar because they purchased wood from a foreign operator, an operator that violated a law of another country and brought that wood to America for Gibson Guitar, one of the oldest American producers of guitars today. Gibson Guitar employs people in America. Gibson Guitar has done things that may be reprehensible to some. Obviously to those who are employed by that company, it's not.

As we move along, you know, we need to remember what jobs are created by small manufacturers. What is the Federal Government supposed to do? This Federal Government not only raided Gibson Guitar, told them to close down their lines, laid people off from work—or hey, they have a better idea: Why don't you just move your operation to another country? That's what this administration's message is to manufacturers and the job creators in America. If you don't like it, just go ahead and move to another country. Take those jobs and give it to someone else other than Americans.

I think we are wrongheaded in our approach. We look at regulations as an end-all to everything, just not commonsense solutions. When we talk about creating jobs in America, I have gone across my district, and I ask the job creators, the small businesses: What can we do in D.C. to help you?

And they said: Mr. Congressman, just get out of our way. Allow us to do the things that we need to do to create jobs here in America.

□ 1020

THE TRAIN ACT

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the House this week will take up a bill called the TRAIN Act. The acronym stands for Transparency and Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation. It is quite a mouthful, but what it's going to do, very specifically, is delay the implementation of two very important Clean Air Act standards that protect human health and the environment. Now, we can have a lot of arguments about proper regulation, which ones are good and which ones are bad, but can we really argue about the necessity of taking appropriate action to protect the air we breathe?

The Clean Air Act has been very successful in improving air quality around this country. Obviously, much more needs to be done. But the two provisions that are under attack by the so-called TRAIN Act are:

One regulation that regulates cross-State air pollution. Now, if you live in one State and there is a coal-burning plant in another State, the law of air motion means that the pollution is going to follow the path that the air travels, and people in a State that are on the receiving end of polluted air ought to have some protection. This has a significant impact on health. It is not as though you can have appropriate regulatory safety without having the Federal Government have some role, since air does travel according to the law of physics, not according to an act of Congress.

A second provision is the power plant emissions of mercury limitation. Mercury is a known carcinogen. It is extremely dangerous to our health, particularly that of infants. And the success that we've had in limiting mercury pollution has had dramatic impacts—positive impacts—on our health. Why? Why would we delay the implementation of a mercury regulation that is going to have significant and immediate benefit?

There may be some cost to this; that's true. But what about the cost in lives? What about the cost in health care expenditures by allowing pollution to occur?

When we do something and price it cheaply by ignoring what the external impacts of allowing something to be theoretically cheap, in the terms of lives lost, in terms of health care expenses incurred, we're not saving anybody money. We're making some money for the owners of the polluting entity, but we are not making money for society, and we are certainly not protecting it.

We have to have careful regulation. We should always be willing to look at them to get rid of things that don't make sense and aren't getting the job done, but we also need proper regulation. And when it comes to health and safety, clean air and mercury, those are two provisions that should not be delayed. This legislation would do that. It's harmful to our health, and it will be harmful to our economy.

HONORING SENATOR MALCOLM WALLOP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heart that is both heavy and full of pride. On September 14, former U.S. Senator Malcolm Wallop passed away at the age of 78. Senator Wallop brought to the Congress his considerable influence, outspoken conservatism, and keen intelligence. The word ''statesman'' only begins to scratch the surface of Malcolm Wallop's accomplishments.

After serving in the Wyoming Legislature for several terms, Malcolm Wallop was elected to the United States Senate in 1976, a seat he held for 18 years. In the Senate, he served on numerous committees. He was the ranking member of Energy and Natural Resources and was the first nonlawyer in the history of the Senate to serve on the Judiciary Committee.

His efforts on the Judiciary Committee led to the enactment of the first international parental kidnapping statute, protecting children from being abducted overseas by noncustodial parents.

Through his work on Finance, Congress cut inheritance and gift taxes in 1981, which, among other things, ensured that ranching families could continue their operations upon the death of a family business partner.

He was also a tireless promoter of free trade, making new numerous trips abroad to promote GATT to reduce tariff barriers.

Due to his service on the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees, Senator Wallop served on the Helsinki Commission, which was charged with negotiating a number of complex arms control treaties, including SALT I, II, and III. Senator Wallop was one of the first persons outside of the old Soviet Union to meet with Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn while he was still a prisoner in the gulag.

In the Cowboy State, Senator Wallop was a champion of protecting the western way of life, including an amendment to the 1980 Clean Water Act prohibiting Federal usurpation of State water rights and an amendment to the Surface Mining Control Act that directed the Federal Government to compensate owners of mineral rights for the loss of the right to mine.

Senator Wallop was one of the first legislators to lead the charge against the ''War on the West,'' which subordinated States' rights and severely limited multiple use of our public lands. In 1984, the Republican Senator partnered with Democrat John Breaux of Louisiana to author the Wallop-Breaux Sport Fishing Restoration Act to promote boat safety and fish habitat conservation along with enhancing fishing opportunities, including those for the handicapped.

Senator Wallop was also committed to education and volunteerism. In 1979,

Congress passed his legislation establishing the Congressional Award Program, which is privately funded and is the only volunteer award given in the name of Congress. Wyoming is proud to have the most active participation in that program.

Upon his retirement from Congress, Senator Wallop founded Frontiers of Freedom, a conservative think tank promoting freedom, fewer Federal regulations, and smaller government.

He was a man of supreme integrity, incredible intellect and a quick wit, humble to a fault and exceedingly kind. I am told he always had time to ask a Capitol Hill elevator operator or police officer about their family on his way to a vote. He had a tremendously devoted staff, many of whom worked for him for the full 18 years of his tenure in the Senate.

Finally, Malcolm Wallop was the descendent of an entrepreneurial pioneer family who had roots in Wyoming and the British Isles as well. Senator Wallop's grandfather served not only in England's Parliament but the Wyoming Legislature. The first polo field in the United States was built on the Wallop family ranch at Big Horn, Wyoming.

Senator Wallop was a man blessed with four wonderful children, many grandchildren, and his wife, Isabel. My thoughts and prayers are with his family. In their time of sadness, let them be comforted in the knowledge that Wyoming stands strong today because of Senator Wallop's untiring love of, and commitment to, our great State.

GOOD RIDDANCE TO ''DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL''

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a truly historic day in our country's struggle for equal rights for all people. Leaders of the United States Army sent a notice to soldiers serving around the globe that simply said the following: ''Today marks the end of 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell.' The law is repealed. From this day forward, gay and lesbian soldiers may serve in our Army with the dignity and respect they deserve. Our rules, regulations, and politics will apply uniformly without regard to sexual orientation, which is a personal and private matter.''

Mr. Speaker, 18 years after this hideous policy was first implemented, it is now gone. And the thousands of soldiers who were shamefully discharged under Don't Ask, Don't Tell may apply for reenlistment.

To the men and women whose service and sacrifice have made us so proud, we say, as of yesterday: ''You no longer have to live a lie.'' To them, we say: ''You no longer have to choose between your personhood and your patriotism.'' To them, who have had the courage to do right by America, we now say: ''Your Nation now has the courage to do what is right by you.''

Air Force Lieutenant Josh Seefried, a leader among gay and lesbian servicemembers, describes the oppressive nature of this policy in this way. He said: ''It consumes your thought process, it consumes your future, because of the fear of getting caught.''

Mr. Speaker, it is incomprehensible to me that anyone—in particular, brave, selfless members of our military—should live any day in fear of ''getting caught.'' This step is hugely welcomed, and it is long overdue.

□ 1030

''Don't ask, don't tell'' was opposed by an overwhelming majority of Americans because it violated the values we claim to stand for as a Nation. It was not only tearing at our moral fabric; it was undermining our military readiness and national security as well. At a time when we're asking so much of our servicemembers, putting them on the front lines of two wars, we owe them, at the very least, and we have finally brought them the dignity of a discrimination-free workplace.

I salute President Obama, and I salute our military brass for their leadership in reversing this injustice. I salute the Members of Congress, Democrat and Republican, who voted for the repeal. And of course we all owe a debt of gratitude to those who serve with honor and integrity, those who defended American rights and freedoms even when America wouldn't afford them the same rights and freedoms.

So, Mr. Speaker, now there will be no sanctioned bigotry or homophobia in the Armed Forces of the greatest country on Earth. Our military will accept everyone who demonstrates their fitness to serve. Their sexuality will be irrelevant. They may be as open about it or as discreet about it as they choose.

Good riddance to ''don't ask, don't tell.'' Our country will be stronger, safer, and fairer without it. And while we support our troops by eliminating this wrong-minded policy, let's take the next step and support all of our troops, regardless of their sexual orientation, by bringing them home from Iraq and Afghanistan.

PUERTO RICO INVESTMENT PROMOTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, the coming months represent a defining moment for our Nation. Responsible leaders from both political parties understand that we must come together on behalf of the American people to create jobs for millions of unemployed workers and to put our Nation on the path to fiscal stability.

President Obama has transmitted the American Jobs Act to Congress, and I hope its key components will be enacted into law. The supercommittee has begun its work of proposing responsible ways to grow our economy while reducing our deficits. The work that lies ahead will not be easy, but it must be done.

With this as backdrop, I rise this morning to discuss the Puerto Rico Investment Promotion Act, which I will introduce tomorrow. The bill is designed to attract investment to Puerto Rico and to create jobs on the island, where the unemployment rate over the last decade has consistently stood six to eight percentage points above the national average. At the same time, the bill seeks to generate new revenue for the Federal Government and to encourage job-creating investment in the 50 States, where unemployment now exceeds 9 percent.

This bill is endorsed by Puerto Rico's Governor, Luis Fortuno, the leaders of Puerto Rico's two main political parties, and the island's business community.

At the outset, it is important to explain why I'm promoting legislation of this sort. Like the States, the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico faces serious economic challenges. However, the economic problems of Puerto Rico have proven to be structural and chronic, not cyclical and temporary.

I believe that Puerto Rico's economy will never unleash its tremendous potential under its current political status. And I support statehood for the island in part because history shows that every territory that joins the union experiences substantial increases in its economic activity and standard of living. However, until a majority of Puerto Rico's people express a desire for statehood and Congress welcomes the island as a full member of the American family, it is incumbent upon me to take all reasonable steps to strengthen the island's economy within the severe constraints imposed by the current territorial status.

My aspiration for Puerto Rico is that it will enjoy the political, social, and economic equality that only statehood offers; and I look forward to the day when it will no longer be necessary for Puerto Rico's leaders to petition the U.S. Congress for customized, island-specific legislation to encourage job-creating investment, and to compensate—at least somewhat—for the countless ways in which our political status does damage to our people. But until that day arrives, we must be as pragmatic about the present as we are hopeful about the future.

To explain the bill, a little background is in order. Currently, nearly all of the large U.S. firms that conduct business in Puerto Rico are organized as controlled foreign corporations, CFCs. A CFC's earnings are not subject to any Federal taxation until they're distributed, usually in the form of a dividend, to its U.S. parent, a process known as repatriation. CFCs in Puerto Rico and in foreign countries have little incentive to repatriate because

those earnings, once received by the parent, are subject to full Federal taxation. As a result, billions of dollars in CFC earnings remain in foreign banks, where they generate no Federal revenue and create no American jobs.

My legislation seeks to integrate Puerto Rico companies into the U.S. tax system. It would authorize, but not require, companies that are incorporated in Puerto Rico and that earn at least 50 percent of their income on the island to operate as domestic U.S. companies. The bill would promote consistency and uniformity by bringing the treatment of an electing Puerto Rico company in line with the current treatment of a Puerto Rico individual under section 933 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Specifically, an electing company would be subject to Federal taxation on its worldwide income, except on the income it earns in Puerto Rico. Because it is a domestic rather than a foreign firm, the Puerto Rico corporation could distribute its earnings to its U.S. parent in the form of a dividend under section 243 of the Tax Code, which allows the parent to deduct a substantial amount of a dividend, depending on the parent's ownership stake in the subsidiary. Therefore, profits that were previously kept outside of the United States are now more likely to be brought back into this country, where they may be subject to a reduced, but still meaningful, level of taxation under section 243 and used to create jobs in America.

Moreover, as I already noted, under this legislation, electing corporations that have income derived from sources outside Puerto Rico—whether in the States or foreign countries—would become subject to Federal taxation on that income. This will generate additional revenue for the U.S. Treasury, since CFCs with non-Puerto Rico-source income currently pay no Federal tax on that income.

I hope my colleagues will support this bill.

This legislation is a substantial improvement over earlier proposals put forward by leaders in Puerto Rico with the goal of encouraging job-creating investment on the Island. Those proposals were carefully considered by the Federal Government and were met with resistance, even by Members of Congress and other Federal officials sensitive to Puerto Rico's unique circumstances. The primary shortcoming of those proposals is that they sought benefits without burdens. My legislation, by contrast, is balanced. It would benefit both Puerto Rico and our Nation. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support it.

REBUILD THE AMERICAN DREAM JOBS FRAMEWORK

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, this summer I took part in the Speak Out for Good Jobs Now! Rebuild the American Dream tour. Thousands of concerned Americans packed rooms across this country to share their stories of hardship, unemployment, and struggle. From these stories, my colleagues in the Congressional Progressive Caucus and I wrote the Rebuild the American Dream Jobs Framework, which outlines how we will put America back to work and get our economy moving again. I wanted to take some time today to share some of the stories and realities that we heard on this tour.

My first story is from Kimberly Lawrence from my State of Arizona. She says, ''I waited more than 30 years to finally receive a modest inheritance from my grandmother's property. I used the money to make improvements on my home that my husband and I were buying, and to open my own childcare business. It happened that the year I opened is the same year the economy failed. I struggled to hold on, but when the new Governor of Arizona stripped away childcare subsidies and at the same time raised licensing fees by 200 percent, I lost nearly all of my clientele.

''I lived in a town that relied on hospitality jobs, which, coupled with all else, crippled the local economy and forced me out of business. My husband was laid off from his cabinet-maker job. And now, after struggling, our home is in foreclosure and set for auction. Everything I hoped for had finally taken shape, just to be ripped away. I have since left my husband and am now searching for a job in California. I have been applying and sending resumes for 6 months now and have had only two interviews. I am 50 years old, sleeping on my sister's couch, with nothing to look forward to in my retirement. I suppose I simply won't have that pleasure.''

The next story comes from Bhisma Ramdass of Florida:

''I live in Palm Beach County. I work for the largest hospital corporation in the world. I also had another job to make ends meet.

□ 1040

''I had a daughter that was born premature. The economy got bad. I lost money from the other job. Took time off to care for my wife and baby. Unable to make full payments to Chase for the mortgage, they eventually foreclosed my home. My wife and three girls moved out. Chase got money from the Federal Government for my house, and they got my house. Do I owe them money if they sell my house for less than I owe? Is that fair? I have worked hard since I was 15 years old. I have provided for my family and gladly pay my taxes. Is that fair?''

The final story is also from Arizona, Thom Reiser:

''I'm retired and moderately well off financially. I've been doing a great deal of research on the economy and the history of these United States. I believe the middle class has suffered very much in the past 30 years. There's been a great shift of wealth. However, my greatest concern is for the present economy. We need to put people back to work. A second stimulus is needed, but aimed directly at the jobless. Much of these funds should be given to states for immediate relief. Teachers, police, firefighters, and many others have lost their jobs, plus others that have to create jobs and infrastructure on our roads. Also, those unemployed should be retrained to do useful work while they're unemployed. Thank you for listening.''

The American people are demanding we do something to get America back to work. These were just three of the stories we heard. I hope that we listened, and I hope that all of Congress listened. The urgency is jobs. The demand from the American people is jobs. And our responsibility is to provide the American people with the opportunities of employment and a secure future.

THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY AND ISRAEL

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge President Obama to take a strong stance against the Palestinian Authority's efforts to seek unilateral recognition for statehood from the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, Israel is our ally, an ally that has proven, time and again, a devotion to freedom, democracy, peace, and economic stability. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, Israel is our greatest ally in the turbulent Middle East, and we need to support their efforts to resolve their issues with the Palestinians. The President must show that America is resolute in support of Israel and that he is determined that we find real solutions for peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, solutions between Israel and the Palestinians will come through good-faith negotiations and cooperation. Solutions and peace come through both sides sitting at the table with equal determination to reach an agreement.

I hope that the President realizes all of this, and that he will show America's support for Israel and be a strong voice for peace reached through negotiations and partnership. The President should make clear to the Palestinian Authority that the way to a bright and stable future for the Palestinian people will be through talking to Israel, not unilaterally seeking statehood through the U.N.

I urge all of my colleagues in this House and the Members of the Senate to join me in this call.

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 10 o'clock and 43 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

Reverend Judith Wright, First Parish Unitarian Universalist Church, Northborough, Massachusetts, offered the following prayer:

We gather this afternoon, a rich tapestry of faith woven together by diverse religious and spiritual beliefs.

In the midst of this theological diversity, may we choose acceptance and love towards one another and strive to live harmoniously and respectfully with all people of our great country and all living beings on our fragile, cherished planet.

May that which guides us towards the highest within ourselves lead us on this precious day, as well as every day of our lives, to embrace compassion, love, and equity in all relations.

May we respect the inherent worth and dignity of every person and grasp our profound interconnectedness with all.

May we ceaselessly help those who suffer, for as they suffer, so do we.

May people everywhere live in peace with each other and all living creatures without disturbing one another.

In the name of all that is holy.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCGOVERN 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND JUDITH WRIGHT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Reverend Judith E. Wright, who is serving as the House guest chaplain today.

For the past 9 years, Reverend Wright has served as the minister of the First Parish Unitarian Universalist Church in Northborough, Massachusetts. During this time, Reverend Wright has played an integral role in our community, engaging her parishioners and encouraging their support for vital safety net programs in central Massachusetts.

Under her leadership, the First Parish has directly supported many social action programs, including the Community Meals Program and Habitat for Humanity. As we continue to emerge from a damaging recession, it is more important than ever to encourage support for these organizations that assist our neighbors by helping to provide food for those who are hungry and shelter for those who are homeless.

Reverend Wright's dedication to assisting the most vulnerable members of our community is laudable, and I am deeply inspired by her work to better the lives of the people of central Massachusetts.

It is one of Reverend Wright's parishioners, Stephanie Sullivan, who first approached my office about the possibility of Reverend Wright serving as the guest chaplain. Stephanie's profound respect and admiration for the work of Reverend Wright motivated me to nominate her to serve as our guest chaplain today.

I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Reverend Wright to the Chamber and in celebrating her lifetime of service.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ONE YEAR LATER, PIRATES ON THE LAKE NOT PROSECUTED

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it's been almost a year since David Hartley was gunned down by Zeta pirates on Falcon Lake in Texas. The Hartley family still has no suspect, no body, and no justice. David's wife, Tiffany, can't get any answers from our government since it apparently has abandoned the investigation of her husband's murder, so she has actually sued the government to get information.

When ICE Agent Jaime Zapata was murdered in Mexico, the United States quickly pressured Mexico to investigate the homicide, as it should. But why is our government silent about finding who is responsible for killing David Hartley and other Americans murdered in lawless Mexico?

On Monday, at a border forum I held in Brownsville, Texas, Tiffany Hartley said: ''The men who murdered David are right across the river. They aren't in Afghanistan; they aren't in Iraq. They're in our own backyard.''

The United States hunts down terrorists around the globe. It's time we hold Mexico accountable for finding the narcoterrorists in their country who murder Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

THE END OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the end of the military's Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy. For 18 years, it forced thousands of servicemen and -women from our Armed Forces and discouraged countless other patriotic Americans from enlisting. The policy weakened our military by removing highly skilled, trained, and capable servicemembers from the ranks at a time when we were sending our men and women in uniform on multiple deployments to fight two wars.

Today, our country is stronger because we all benefit from a military that takes advantage of all the talents our Nation has to offer.

This policy ended because of the work of many, including my predecessor, Congressman Marty Meehan, who introduced the first bill in the House of Representatives to repeal this policy.

Our servicemen and -women are, first and foremost, Americans protecting freedom throughout the world. Today, at last, all these brave people no longer have to hide who they are in order to serve their country.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND ISRAEL

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, Israel is America's best and only reliable ally in the Middle East. Now the national security of Israel is being threatened by the Palestinians' rejection of the Oslo Peace Accords as they seek recognition directly from the United Nations.

America stands firmly with Israel and believes that peace in the Middle East can only be achieved through a negotiated solution.

I call on the Palestinian Authority to make peace with the democracy of Israel and the free world and to reject the terrorists of Hamas.

Prime Minister Netanyahu should be applauded for his efforts to restart direct, one-on-one negotiations with

President Abbas without the influence of outside organizations.

Today, President Abbas should abandon Palestine's push for a vote on statehood and reengage with Israel to forge a lasting peace accord.

REPEAL OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today under the dome of our Nation's Capitol to applaud the final repeal of the discriminatory policy known as Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

The men and women who fight for our country as members of our Armed Forces fight for what's right, what's fair, and what's just. They fight without asking at what cost, without asking why and how long they must endure.

This September 11 marked 10 years since that fateful day when our country was attacked. As I returned home from Chicago, boarded my plane and landed safely in Washington, I marveled at the dome that still sat, untouched by those who would do us harm, because of those who had no fear, those who gave their last full measure of devotion.

And today, I'm emboldened further by the fact that these same soldiers who have continued to fight and die for our safety can now do so without having to hide who they are or who they love. Our soldiers fight for what's right, what's fair, and what's just. Finally, we have managed to provide the same to them.

□ 1210

NO NEW TAXES

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's plans to raise taxes on small business across America will hurt the economy and kill jobs. Small business creates 70 percent of the jobs in America. Unemployment is 9 percent in the country and even higher in my State of Florida.

The threat of a double-dip recession is greater than ever. The last thing we should be doing is raising taxes on job creators.

The White House claims the $1.6 trillion tax increase won't affect small businesses and jobs. But as someone that's been in business 30 years and created thousands of jobs, they're wrong.

Millions of small businesses file their individual taxes through an individual tax code, and that means that their taxes will go up. In fact, 48 percent of small business income will face higher tax rates under the President's plan.

We need to enact pro-growth policies that create jobs, not kill them. I urge my colleagues to reject the administration's tax hikes on job creators.

DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL REPEAL

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to note that the sun indeed came up in America today even after we've allowed people who are gay and lesbian to serve in our military.

We had a discussion for about 18 years, and now we have finally taken a step forward to liberty and freedom and equality again as we have so many times in American history.

Now we need to make sure that those new families that are serving in the military get their benefits like everyone else, and that's the next thing we need to work on.

Then we have to realize that the day will come when we recognize full marriage equality in this great country as another step forward just like we had yesterday. And when that great day comes, the sun will come up in the morning in America because we were continuing our quest to be a more just, more equal society.

NEW TAXES WILL NOT CREATE NEW JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, raising taxes on hardworking American families in this economy will not create new jobs. The President already explained that raising taxes in a down economy does not make sense.

Washington's financial problems are not caused by a shortage of revenue. Washington's financial problems are a direct result of skyrocketing wasteful spending such as $16 muffins for the DOJ. Promises like the failed stimulus bill have been revealed as empty slogans, failing the promise of holding unemployment below 8 percent. Twenty-five million Americans are still seeking full-time jobs.

The best way to promote jobs is to offer solutions focused on getting Americans back to work. Providing certainty with regard to tax reform while easing the burden of unnecessary regulations will enable job creators to hire once again.

House Republicans have sought to achieve this goal by passing legislation aimed at cutting redtape involved with running small businesses. Reforms are being blocked by liberals with the threat of a Presidential veto.

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

REPEAL OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the end of a shameful and discriminatory policy, the policy of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, and to honor our brave military men and women who have served under it for almost two decades.

As Thomas Jefferson wrote in our Declaration of Independence, ''Our country was conceived on the promise 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.''

Through nearly two-and-a-half centuries, these words have guided our Nation and made our society even more free. Repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell is one more step towards full equality, but there is still so much work to be done.

Regrettably, because of the Defense of Marriage Act, servicemembers will continue to face disparities for family programs and benefits even though they've made the same sacrifices as their fellow members of the armed services. This is not right. Let us be guided by the words of Thomas Jefferson and provide these men and women with the benefits they've earned in service to our country.

I commend President Obama for bringing an end to this divisive policy and the senior members of our Nation's military who have begun to implement the change, and congratulate my colleagues here in Congress.

I'm proud to honor the service of all of our men and women in uniform who serve in harm's way and to mark the end of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER 4 DAVID R. CARTER

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a soldier who made the ultimate sacrifice and laid down his life for our freedom, United States Army Chief 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 last 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 lost when their helicopter was brought down by enemy fire.

Dave 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 personifies 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, his fellow soldiers, and all who knew him.

REPEAL OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to come before this body today to celebrate the end of the discriminatory Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy.

For too long, American service men and women selflessly fought to protect our freedoms without receiving the same freedoms and protections in return. Under this flawed policy, we dismissed 14,000 patriots from our forces, and we turned away countless more Americans who simply wanted to volunteer to defend the country that we share.

Today our Nation shows the world that we can rise above prejudice and fear and take a long overdue step towards protecting our servicemembers and reducing discrimination in America.

But I am sad to say that this weekend, we received a terrible reminder that our work is not done. A 14-year-old boy from my community who was teased by his classmates about his sexual orientation took his own life. This heartbreaking tragedy was needless and should be a reminder to all of us that there are many more like Jamey Rodemeyer who are made by some to believe that it's not okay to be who they are.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of how far we've come, but I know that there remains a long road ahead of us. I am committed to continuing this fight for full equality for all Americans and implore my colleagues to do the same.

''NO'' VOTE NEEDED BY U.N.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, Palestinian Authority President Abbas plans to seek recognition of a Palestinian state before the United Nations. A vote in the U.N. will bypass bilateral peace negotiations between Israel and the P.A. and will threaten the success of a mutual solution.

Leaders in the United States, Israel, and the P.A. have long worked toward a mutual solution, and the P.A., seeking unilateral recognition from the U.N. is not only harmful to these efforts, but also to the security of the State of Israel.

It's also important to note that the action coincides with a period of extreme volatility between Israel and their Middle Eastern neighbors. Israel's alliance with Turkey has continued to unravel over the past year, and its peace agreement with Egypt is in jeopardy.

The Palestinian Authority's move to circumvent direct talks with Israel will undermine Israel's right to exist. I call for President Abbas to withdraw his request for a U.N. vote and instead finally agree to sit down at the negotiating table with the U.S. and Israel to develop a mutual, legitimate solution.

REPEAL OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Mr. PETERS. As a former lieutenant commander in the United States Navy Reserve, I rise to applaud the repeal of the discriminatory Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy.

This backward policy has turned away over 14,000 able-bodied men and women from our military while our Nation is fighting two wars. It wasted over $1.3 billion taxpayer dollars through investigations, legal proceedings, and wasted training for fighter pilots, mechanics, medics, and even Arabic translators.

I am proud to have fought for this necessary change and feel privileged to have been able to cast my vote to make this misguided policy a relic of the past. Our military can now recruit and train qualified patriotic and courageous Americans who want to serve our country regardless of their sexual orientation.

During my service in the United States Navy Reserve, I served with many dedicated men and women who were always ready to serve their country. I was never concerned about their sexual orientation. Implementation of repeal marks not just an increase in military readiness but a significant step forward for civil rights and equality.

□ 1220

RECOGNIZING THE HISTORY AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE KANSAS SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the history and accomplishments of the Kansas School for the Deaf as we prepare to celebrate the school's sesquicentennial this week. It was 150 years ago that Philip A. Emery began teaching deaf students in a small two-room schoolhouse in Baldwin City, Kansas, using the techniques of Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet.

Throughout the years, the Kansas School for the Deaf has been noted for its academic excellence in pre-college preparation and its career and transition program, leading to job placement upon graduation.

Along the way, the school has had many exciting moments, including almost being destroyed in Quantrill's infamous sacking of Lawrence, Kansas, and even boasts of beating the University of Kansas baseball team twice, in 1897 and 1900.

As the oldest educational institution in the State of Kansas, the Kansas School for the Deaf continues to provide a world-class education to young students, and I am proud in the United States Congress to represent the school and its many families and students.

CELEBRATING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, September is the month in which we celebrate the many contributions Latinos have made and continue to make to our great country.

Hispanic Americans are our teachers, religious leaders, doctors, lawyers, health care providers, astronauts, scientists, small business owners, and entrepreneurs. They are local and national officials providing leadership in the face of unprecedented challenges both at home and abroad.

But perhaps our greatest pride comes from our impressive record of service to this country. When grave threats imperil America's freedom, Latinos answer the call. This is highlighted by the fact that Latino servicemen and -women have earned more medals and commendations per combatant than any other ethnic group.

As we celebrate the contributions Latinos have made to our country, let us not forget our future. The stories of our Nation's Latino trailblazers serve as an inspiration to young Latinos; but like all American children, they must have the opportunity to develop their talents and reach their full potential to keep our country great.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure all of America's children are prepared to lead. Only then can America realize its promise in the 21st century.

THE OFFICIAL REPEAL OF ''DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL''

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the historic, official repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Today, nearly two decades after its enactment, our lesbian, gay, and bisexual servicemembers can finally serve and defend the country they love without the fear of being discharged. Never

again will members of our military be forced to serve in the shadows, to lie about their identities, or to be afraid to talk about the people they love.

Let us remember the 14,000 loyal servicemembers who were discharged under this discriminatory policy over the years; for now they can serve alongside their military friends and family with dignity and honor. Let us also remember those individuals who served in silence and sacrificed their lives so that we, as Americans, could live freely.

As vice-chair of the LGBT Caucus in Congress, I see the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell as another step towards ensuring that all citizens, both inside and outside of the military, are never subject to discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Today signifies a crucial milestone in history and is a victory, not just for the LGBTQ community, but for America as a whole.

IN CELEBRATION OF HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, September is Hispanic Heritage Month, and we celebrate as members of the Hispanic community the contributions that have been made to the United States throughout our history.

The story of Hispanic Americans is truly the American story. Our dream is the American Dream. In America, if you work hard, play by the rules and dream big, there is no limit to what you can achieve.

Succeeding in all walks of life and serving as patriots in the American Armed Forces, Hispanics have enriched in so many different ways our way of life. Their advances in universities from their knowledge and talent have continued to play a vibrant role as we strengthen the fabric of America. Hispanic Americans' commitment to faith, family, hard work, and perseverance adds to that rich diversity and vibrancy. It makes our country a melting pot like no other place in the world.

Today and every day, we should take time to note and to celebrate the wonderful contributions of the Hispanic community in the San Joaquin Valley and across America.

''DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL'' IS FINALLY NO MORE

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, two decades after its enactment, ''Don't Ask, Don't Tell'' is finally no more. At last, gay men and women can now openly serve in our military without having to hide who they are.

Eliminating this practice is a historic step forward in our pursuit of a more perfect Union. With this progress, our country's military can now become a shining example of equality—an example to be followed by all sectors of our society.

Just as important, this change will make our Armed Forces stronger. Young Americans who had previously been deterred from joining our military will now step forward, enlist, and serve the country they love. Many formerly discharged servicemembers will reenter the armed services to serve alongside friends and family. Ultimately, our military will benefit from a broader and deeper pool of talent. Now, as we move forward in fully implementing this change, we must ensure that same-sex families receive the same benefits as other military couples.

Mr. Speaker, although our work continues, today we are one step closer to the ideal that we are all created equal.

''DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL'' IS HISTORY

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, last year, I read on the House floor a letter from an active duty servicemember in Afghanistan. He shared how he and his partner of 10 years had managed the hardship that comes along with three deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan. Despite their shared sacrifices, his partner received no support from the military and would not be officially informed of his death.

While serving on active duty, he became aware of a number of other soldiers who were gay. In one case, it was only after a friend died of wounds from an IED, and he received a letter from the deceased soldier's partner, expressing how much he had loved the Army. Of course, this letter had to be sent anonymously because, until yesterday, its very existence could have led to the soldier's discharge.

The indignity of concealing who you are and who you love in order to protect your country has ended. No longer will we subject the brave men and women who volunteer to serve our Nation to a shameful vow of silence, asking them to lie about themselves. This policy was wrong; and now it's history, and our Nation and our military are stronger as a result.

To all who serve our Nation in uniform, we are so proud of each and every one of you.

□ 1230

SUPPORTING WORKERS OF THE USPS

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 685,000 workers of the United States Postal Service who are facing a very devastating future without our action. If Congress doesn't act now, we could potentially lose 120,000 jobs, imagine that, that are in jeopardy today.

The United States Postal Service offers a very affordable system, but right now they are in jeopardy. Why? Because back in 2006, they were, I would say, in a discriminating way, required to pay $5.5 billion in overcharge into benefits that are not incurred at this time. Based on long-term projections, they have an estimated surplus—imagine that in this time—of $55 billion to $75 billion. Without this mandate, the USPS would actually have a $611 million benefit that could help out in this tough economy.

Mr. Speaker, there are 685,000 workers who are not at fault for this requirement, and this $5 billion requirement needs to stop now so our postal service can continue.

THE GREATEST HITTER WHO EVER LIVED

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ted Williams, the last baseball player to hit .400 or better for a season, a feat he accomplished 70 years ago this very month, September 1941, which has never been equaled. Ted wasn't just a remarkable baseball player; he was a remarkable American who also served his country as a Marine Corps pilot in World War II and the Korean War.

Ted Williams once said: ''A man has to have goals—for a day, for a lifetime—and that was mine, to have people say, 'There goes Ted Williams, the greatest hitter who ever lived.' ''

Not only did he have a goal, but he also harnessed the determination and hard work necessary to succeed. Today I honor a man who was a friend, a constituent and a great American on the anniversary of his greatest achievement. He will always be remembered as baseball's greatest hitter.

OFFICIAL REPEAL OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to thank my colleagues in the LGBT Equality Caucus, Leader PELOSI, Congresswoman BALDWIN, Congressman FRANK, everyone today as we celebrate the end of a discriminatory era against gay and lesbian servicemembers in America with the official repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

For too long, this failed policy unfairly denied fundamental human rights to highly qualified individuals who wish to serve our country. As a vice-chair of the congressional LGBT

Equality Caucus, I am pleased that the tireless work of our congressional colleagues, the administration, and the LGBT community resulted in the end of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

Although this is a remarkable step forward, we still have a long way to go to attain full equality. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered people continue to be targets of discrimination in our policies, our laws, and our society. I have always said that discrimination is un-American, and we as a Nation must continue to fight for policies that bring us closer to fulfilling the principles we espouse.

I encourage all of us to stay committed to ensuring that sexual orientation and gender identity are no longer a cause for inequality.

HONORING LATINOS IN THE MILITARY

(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. Mr. Speaker, this week I introduced House Resolution 404, a resolution honoring Latinos in the military; and I rise today to recognize all the great contributions and service that Latinos have given to this country.

In fact, Latinos have fought in every United States military conflict that we have had, and today nearly 163,000 Latinos—and Latinas—serve in the regular components of the Armed Forces. The contributions and sacrifices that they make to defend our Nation are often overlooked. So I encourage the Secretary of Defense to increase promotion opportunities for Latinos in the Armed Forces.

It's my firm belief that the military should invest in outreach to minority communities and to work to mitigate the barriers that hinder more Latinos from advancing up the career ladder in our Armed Forces, because our Armed Forces need Latinos. Latinos, like all those who serve, continue to sacrifice their lives daily in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation New Dawn. We have lost lives of Latinos also, 539.

I salute the dedication of our Latino servicemembers.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112–57)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice, stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2011.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism, and maintain in force the comprehensive sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 21, 2011*.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 28

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO AWARD THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on November 2, 2011, to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the event described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution honors those brave and courageous Japanese Americans who served in the U.S. Army's 100th Infantry Battalion and 442nd Regimental Combat Team, as well as those who served in the indispensable Military Intelligence Service.

The 100th Infantry Battalion fought valiantly in the treacherous Italian campaign, earning their nickname the Purple Heart Battalion because of their bravery and sacrifice.

The 442nd Regimental Combat Team was formed in 1943 from Japanese Americans living in relocation camps. A week after D-day, the 100th Battalion and the 442nd were merged into a single unit, which fought heroically in Europe, as seen in their rescue of the famous ''Lost Battalion'' in France near the German border.

□ 1240

These Japanese American units suffered enormously high casualty rates and received over 18,000 individual decorations, including 9,486 Purple Hearts. For their service in eight major campaigns in Italy and France, the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Regimental Combat Team earned eight Presidential Unit Citations.

Members of the Military Intelligence Service were Japanese Americans who served this country by intercepting radio messages, translating documents, writing leaflets encouraging opposing troops to surrender, and helping our forces understand the enemy we were fighting. In fact, according to General MacArthur's intelligence officer, Charles Willoughby, the efforts of the Military Intelligence Service ''shortened the war by 2 years.''

Mr. Speaker, Second Lieutenant DANIEL INOUYE, who received a battlefield commission in November 1944, was

one of these brave men. Gravely wounded in April 1945, Lieutenant INOUYE received the Distinguished Service Cross. It is fitting and proper that our distinguished colleague in the other body sponsored this legislation, and I'm honored to speak in support of it here today.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution authorizing use of Emancipation Hall in November for this Congressional Gold Medal ceremony.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, September 19, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write to formally notify you that the Committee on House Administration hereby waives further committee consideration of S. Con. Res. 28, a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II, in order that the legislation may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

Sincerely,

DANIEL E. LUNGREN,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On October 5, 2010, President Obama signed into law S. 1055, a bill granting the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service the Congressional Gold Medal. This concurrent resolution authorizes use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center to award the Congressional Gold Medal to these brave service men and women in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

The 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service were compromised predominately of Japanese Americans during World War II. At that time, many of the soldiers' families were subject to internment and discrimination, yet these courageous Americans fought with distinction and valor.

Collectively, the 100th Infantry Battalion and 442nd Regimental Combat Team became the most highly decorated unit of its size and length in the history of the United States Army, receiving seven Presidential Unit Citations, 21 Medals of Honor, 29 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars, 4,000 Bronze Stars, 22 Legion of Merit Medals, 15 Soldier's Medals and over 4,000 Purple Hearts.

The contributions of Japanese Americans were not limited to the front line. The Military Intelligence Service provided critical classified information that was vital to the success of the United States military in the Pacific theater.

The recognition of these Americans is overdue, and Emancipation Hall is a befitting place to bestow this award for the sacrifice and dedication that was shown in the face of discrimination.

Join with me today in supporting this concurrent resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for allowing me to speak on this important resolution.

On behalf of our chairwoman, JUDY CHU, and our Asian Pacific Caucus, I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, a resolution that would authorize the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II. I want to personally thank Senator DANIEL INOUYE for sponsoring this resolution, and I thank also my fellow Members of Congress and colleagues who join me in support of this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a Vietnam veteran and also as a former member of the 100th Battalion, 442nd Infantry Reserve Unit out of Honolulu, Hawaii, I am proud to say that we must recognize Senator DANIEL INOUYE and also the late Senator Spark Matsunaga, both of Hawaii, who distinguished themselves in battle as soldiers with the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry during World War II.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, after the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, there was such an outrage and cry for all-out war against Japan, days afterwards our President and the Congress officially declared war against Japan. Out of this retaliation against Japan, however, tens of thousands of Americans were caught in the crossfire. These Americans just happened to be of Japanese ancestry.

The Federal Government immediately implemented a policy whereby over 100,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry—men, women, and children—were forced to live in what we called relocation camps but were actually more like prison or concentration camps. Their lands, their homes, their properties were confiscated by the Federal Government without due process of law. It was a time in our Nation's history when there was so much hatred, bigotry, and racism against our fellow Americans who just happened to be of Japanese ancestry. Despite all of this, Mr. Speaker, over 10,000 Japanese Americans volunteered to join the U.S. military, despite the fact that their wives, their parents, their brothers and sisters are in prison behind barbed wire fences in these relocation camps.

As a result of such volunteerism, two combat units, the 100th Battalion and the 442nd Infantry Combat Group, were organized and immediately sent to fight Nazi Germany in Europe.

In my humble opinion, history speaks for itself in documenting that none have shed their blood more valiantly for our Nation than the Japanese American soldiers who served in these two combat units. These units suffered an unprecedented casualty rate of 314 percent. They emerged as the most decorated combat units of their size in the military history of the U.S. Army. The 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry received over 18,000 individual decorations for bravery and courage in the field of battle, many awarded posthumously. They were awarded 53 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars, 9,486 Purple Hearts, and 7 Presidential Unit Citations, the Nation's top award for combat units. And yet, ironically, only one Medal of Honor was awarded to these soldiers.

It was not until 1999 that Congress took corrective action by mandating a reexamination of why just one Medal of Honor was awarded to these Japanese American soldiers. As a result of the review process, President Clinton awarded 20 additional Congressional Medals of Honor to these brave Japanese American soldiers. And Senator INOUYE was one of the recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

We should also note that while the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry were fighting on the front lines, thousands of Japanese Americans also joined the first military foreign language school, the Military Intelligence Service, where they learned Japanese.

During the war, about 6,000 MIS agents fought in all Army units in the Pacific and were assigned to Allied forces in Australia, Britain, China, Canada, and India. They staffed theater-level intelligence centers, and their duties included the 442nd infantry.

On October 5, 2010, President Obama granted the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, as well as the 6,000 Japanese Americans who served in the Military Intelligence Service during World War II.

I believe that each one of these American heroes should be recognized for this high honor here in the heart of our Nation's capital, the U.S. Capitol, for their bravery, their patriotism, and their selfless service. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution to honor these men and women who valiantly served our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Chairwoman CHU, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, Congresswoman HIRONO, Congresswoman HANABUSA, and Congressman HONDA,

I rise today in support of S. Con. Res. 28, a resolution that would authorize the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II. I thank Senator DANIEL INOUYE for sponsoring this resolution, and I thank my fellow members of Congress who join me in support of this important bill.

As a Vietnam veteran and also a former member of the 100th Battalion, 442nd Infantry Reserve Unit in Honolulu, Hawaii, I am especially proud to say that we must recognize Senator DANIEL INOUYE, and also highly-respected, the late Senator Spark Matsunaga of Hawaii, who distinguished themselves in battle as soldiers with the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry during World War II.

As we all know, after the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, there was such an outrage and cry for an all out war against Japan and days afterwards our President and the Congress officially declared war against Japan. Out of this retaliation against Japan, however, tens of thousands of Americans were caught in the crossfire. These Americans just happened to be of Japanese ancestry.

The Federal Government immediately implemented a policy whereby over 100,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry were forced to live in what were called relocation camps, but were actually more like prison or concentration camps. Their lands, homes and properties were confiscated by the Federal Government without due process of law. It was a time in our Nation's history when there was so much hatred, bigotry and racism against our fellow Americans who happened to be of Japanese ancestry.

Despite all this, over ten thousand Japanese Americans volunteered to join the U.S. military, despite the fact that their wives, parents, brothers and sisters were imprisoned behind barbed wire fences in these relocation camps. As a result of such volunteerism, two combat units, the 100th Battalion and the 442nd Infantry Combat Group, were organized and immediately sent to fight Nazi Germany in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, history speaks for itself in documenting that none have shed their blood more valiantly for our Nation than the Japanese American soldiers who served in these two combat units. These units suffered an unprecedented casualty rate of 314 percent. They also emerged as the most decorated combat unit of their size in the history of the United States Army. The 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry received over 18,000 individual decorations for bravery and courage in the field of battle, many awarded posthumously. They were awarded 53 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars, 9,486 Purple Hearts, and 7 Presidential Unit Citations, the Nation's top award for combat units. And yet, only one Medal of Honor was awarded at the time.

It was not until 1999 that Congress took corrective action by mandating a reexamination of why just one Medal of Honor was awarded to these Japanese Americans. As a result of this review, President Clinton awarded 20 additional Congressional Medals of Honor to these brave Japanese-American soldiers.

It was while fighting in Europe that Senator INOUYE lost his arm while engaged in his personal battle against two German machine gun posts. For his heroism, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. Senator INOUYE was also one of those recipients of the Medal of Honor and I was privileged to witness this historical moment at a White House ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, we should also note that while the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry were fighting on the front lines, thousands of Japanese Americans also joined the first U.S. military foreign language school, the Military Intelligence Service (also known as the M.I.S.), where they learned Japanese.

During the war, about 6,000 M.I.S. agents fought in all Army units in the Pacific and were assigned to allied forces in Australia, Britain, Canada, China, and India. They staffed theater-level intelligence centers and their duties included translating captured documents, interrogating prisoners of war, and listening to all enemy radio communications.

At Bougainville in 1942 an M.I.S. agent translated an uncoded Japanese radio transmission describing Admiral Yamamoto's inspection schedule of the bases around the Solomon Islands, thereby leading to the successful interception of Yamamoto's aircraft. This victory resulted in a boost in morale for the Allies in the Pacific since Admiral Yamamoto had directed the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

In 1944, the M.I.S. also translated the Japanese Imperial Navy's "Z-Plan," which outlined defense strategies in the Pacific. The translation of this vital document made it possible for the U.S. Navy to gain victory in the Marianas, the Philippines, and in other areas of the Pacific.

At war's end, the M.I.S. facilitated local surrenders of Japanese forces as well as the occupation. Working in military government, war crimes trials, censorship, and counterintelligence, these silent warriors contributed to the occupation's ultimate success.

Though many would only come to know of these stories decades later, these brave Americans earned the respect of our Nation's military leaders at a time when many Americans saw them as enemies. President Harry Truman called the Japanese Americans in the M.I.S. the "human secret weapon for the U.S. Armed Forces" and General Willoughby, MacArthur's intelligence chief credited the M.I.S. Nisei with shortening the war by two years and saving possibly a million American lives. President Truman was also so moved by the bravery of the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry in the field of battle, as well as that of African American soldiers during World War II, that he issued an Executive Order to finally desegregate all branches of the Armed Services.

On October 5, 2010, President Barack Obama granted the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion and 442nd Regimental Combat Team as well as the 6,000 Japanese Americans who served in the Military Intelligence Service during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that each one of these American heroes should be recognized for this high honor here in the heart of our nation—the United States Capitol—for their bravery, patriotism, and selfless service. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution to honor these men and women who valiantly served our Nation.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to President Obama's signing into law S. 1055 on October 5 of this last year, which grants the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service the Congressional Gold Medal and also authorizes the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center to award this medal to the brave service men and women in recognition of their service during World War II, which my husband was a participant of.

For too long, we tended to ignore the contributions of our military men and women simply because they don't look traditional.

□ 1250

I know that in California, we did the same thing with the fishing village in San Pedro that had been ignored. They lost everything and were put into camps during the war.

On another matter, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to address an issue that is very, very disconcerting to many of us, especially those in the Latino community.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I yield the lady 1 additional minute.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I thank the gentleman.

Mental health in our Latino community has been ignored for too long, especially in all minority communities but mostly in Hispanic. It's an issue that we need to take the stigma out of, because we don't want to hear it, we don't want to see it, and we certainly don't want to speak about it. Suicide is the third leading cause of death for Hispanic Americans aged 15 to 24, the 13th leading cause for Hispanics of all ages. To quote Mia St. John, three-time world boxing champion, Latina, affected by mental illness growing up and a strong mental health advocate, "I was the first generation in my family born in America. All I wanted to be was American. I had stress and depression symptoms that professionals could have recognized as anxiety or psychosis. By the time I was 18 I was homeless and contemplating suicide."

We have H.R. 751, the Mental Health in Schools Act, onsite mental health delivery services for our youth, which will save lives and give hope and shares the message to never be afraid or be ashamed to ask for help.

I ask for support for mental health and H.R. 751.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a very proud honorary member

of the Nisei vets, the group that you are honoring today and in support of this resolution.

Seattle was the site of a roundup of thousands of Americans. Ordinary Americans, had businesses, had truck farms, kids were going to high school and were going to college. One of them, a young man named William Nakamura, was an 18-year-old kid at Garfield High School who was rounded up and taken out to the middle of Idaho to a camp out there. And then the government said, if you'd like to come back and join the military and serve, you can.

There was lots of debate among the people in the camps about whether they should come back or not. And as you heard, 10,000 came back and were the most decorated unit in the history of the United States military. They distinguished themselves beyond any group that has ever served for this country.

William Nakamura took out two machine gun nests and was himself killed, and the courthouse in Seattle is now named after him as a memorial to what this country really stands for. The Japanese Americans, the Nisei vets, set an example for this country we must never forget.

As we look at our Muslim brothers, and we sometimes can't distinguish just exactly—you hear ugly talk that's reminiscent of what went on in this country in the early 1940s. We must never let us act again as we did against these Japanese Americans. They proved that an American is an American, no matter what his face looks like or her face looks like, they are Americans. They deserve that respect and they deserve the due process of law. They lost all their property in Seattle, unless they could give it to someone and say, would you take care of this? Some people did get it back at the end because other, Caucasian Americans, took it and held it for them and gave it back after the war. They did not receive due process of law. There were all kinds of violations of their civil rights. And that's why this memorial is important for us to remind ourselves of how real Americans act, no matter where they came from, and how much they're willing to give to make this country the strong place that it is.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Again, I urge all Members to support this resolution. I'm extremely proud myself to support it. My father was a member of the United States Marine Corps that served in the Pacific theater, and I'm sure he was very proud of the Japanese men and women that were out there supporting and helping him.

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

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. Con. Res. 28, which will allow the use of Emancipation Hall in the U.S. Capitol for a Medal of Honor Ceremony.

During World War II, many members of University of Hawaii's Reserve Officers Training Corps, ROTC, were Nisei, the American-born sons of Japanese immigrants. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, these brave men aided the wounded, buried the fallen, and helped defend vulnerable areas in Hawaii.

Despite their bravery and loyalty to the United States, in January of 1942 the U.S. Army discharged all Nisei in the ROTC unit, deemed them ineligible for service, and segregated all Japanese-Americans out of their military units. Meanwhile, over a hundred thousand Japanese-Americans were forcibly moved from their homes to internment camps. This forced ouster forever changed the lives of these Japanese-Americans, many of whom lost their land and other property.

Nonetheless, members of the Hawaii Provisional Infantry Battalion, made up of Japanese-Americans, joined the 100th Infantry Battalion, also comprised of Japanese-Americans, to train as soldiers. President Roosevelt admired their bravery and determination, and decided to allow Nisei volunteers to serve in the military again, where they were incorporated into the 442nd Regimental Combat Team.

Members of the 100th and the 442nd risked their lives to fight for our country and allies in Europe. The 442nd "Go for Broke" unit was sent repeatedly to the front lines. The 4,000 men who started in April 1943 needed to be replaced more than three times. The unit became the most decorated in U.S. military history for its size and length of service, with the 100th Infantry Battalion earning the nickname "The Purple Heart Battalion." The 100th and the 442nd received seven Presidential Unit Citations, 21 Medals of Honor, 29 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars, 4,000 Bronze Stars, 22 Legion of Merit Medals, 15 Soldier's Medals, and more than 4,000 Purple Hearts, among numerous additional distinctions. One of these Medal of Honor recipients is Hawaii's own senior Senator, DANIEL K. INOUYE, the sponsor of today's resolution.

The Army's Military Intelligence Service, MIS, was composed of about 6,000 Japanese-American soldiers who conducted covert intelligence missions, including translating enemy documents, interrogating enemy prisoners of wars, intercepting radio transmissions, and persuading enemy combatants to surrender. The contributions of the MIS have only recently come to light and been publicly acknowledged.

Last year Congress passed and President Obama signed into a law a bill to collectively award the Medal of Honor to Japanese American Veterans of the 442nd Regiment, the 100th Infantry Battalion, and the Military Intelligence Service. It was a distinct honor to be present at the bill signing and meet several of these heroes in person.

Today's resolution allows the use of Emancipation Hall on November 2, 2011 in the U.S. Capitol for a ceremony to present the Medal of Honor to these brave Japanese-American veterans for their service and sacrifice during World War II. Many veterans from Hawaii or their next-of-kin will travel a great distance to attend this ceremony.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. Con. Res. 28, the concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II. This resolution awards well deserved recognition and the honor of the Congressional Gold Medal to the brave soldiers who dedicated their lives to service during World War II.

Emancipation Hall, located in the Capitol Visitor Center is a fitting location for recognizing these courageous patriots; in Emancipation Hall there stands a replica of the Statue of Freedom, the statue that sits atop the Capitol dome. The Statue of Freedom is described by Thomas Crawford, its creator, as an allegorical figure of freedom, "triumphant in both war and peace." Triumphant in both war and peace. I can think of no place more appropriate to honor the brave men of the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service. They chose to enter into military service, made a commitment to this country and to each other, fought for freedom, and were triumphant in war and peace.

The Congressional Gold Medal is an award bestowed by Congress for outstanding deeds or acts of service to the security, prosperity, and national interest of the United States. The Congressional Gold Medal is the highest civilian award. The men and women of the Armed Forces, past and present, devote their lives to the security, prosperity and national interest of the United States. It is a great honor and privilege to be able to recognize the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, for their dedicated service during World War II.

In 1944, the 100th battalion and the 442nd battalion merged to fight against Germany and defend freedom and democracy in Europe. Among the members of these battalions were many Hawaiians and Japanese Americans. Mr. Speaker, these are exemplary examples of bravery and the extraordinary measure of these men, who rose to meet a challenge and answered a call to defend the Nation. Their courage showed the world, and shows us today, that as a nation, our capacity to overcome may well be limitless.

The men of the Armed Forces in World War II fought to defend the very ideals on which our Nation was founded. The 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the MilitaryIntelligence Service risked their lives to defend that which Americans cherish, liberty, democracy, and the basic freedoms of the Constitution. They gave this Nation more than their support, they gave it their strength, and some gave their lives, in what Abraham Lincoln called "the last full measure of devotion."

Mr. Speaker, the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service deserve this honor, as they deserve our respect, our admiration, and our enduring gratitude. Their legacy of selfless patriotism lives on today, and serves as an example for all Americans. I am proud to support S. Con. Res. 28, a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal,

collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II. I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting this very worthy resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 28.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 846) to designate the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 846

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

SECTION 1. CHRISTOPHER S. BOND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the ''Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 846.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Senate bill 846 would designate the newly constructed federal courthouse at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the ''Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse.''

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Senator BLUNT of Missouri for introducing this legislation. I want to thank his colleague, Senator MCCASKILL, also of Missouri, for cosponsoring this bill.

Senator Bond has honorably served the State of Missouri and this Nation for many decades. He was born in St. Louis, Missouri, and went on to pursue his undergraduate degree at Princeton University and his law degree at the University of Virginia. After law school, he clerked for the Honorable Elbert Tuttle, who was then the Chief Judge of the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in Atlanta, Georgia.

After a brief time of private practice in Washington, DC, he moved back to Missouri, where he was elected as Missouri State auditor in 1970. Two years later, Senator Bond was elected Governor of Missouri, making him the youngest Governor in State history. He served two terms, from 1973 to 1977 and from 1981 to 1985.

In 1986, Senator Bond ran successfully for the United States Senate, where he represented citizens of Missouri for 24 years until his recent retirement after the 111th Congress.

During his time in the Senate, he served on several committees and was chair of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship from 1995 to 2001.

I believe it is appropriate that we honor Senator Bond's dedicated service for his State and country. I support passage of this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 846, a bill that names the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the ''Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse.''

Senator Kit Bond is a sixth-generation Missourian with a long and distinguished career in public service spanning over 40 years, serving in many different capacities as an elected official at both the State and federal levels. Senator Bond served as a law clerk to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, as a Missouri Assistant State Attorney General, Missouri State auditor, Governor of Missouri, and finally in his longest-serving post, as United States Senator from 1987 to 2010 from the State of Missouri.

□ 1300

In the Senate, Senator Bond served on the Committees on Appropriations, Commerce, Science, Transportation and Intelligence. As ranking member of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator Bond played an important role as Congress crafted its anti-terror policies in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks.

Senator Bond also worked well with Members across the aisle on many issues, including perhaps one of his proudest legislative accomplishments as a cosponsor of the Family Medical Leave Act, signed into law by President Bill Clinton in 1993.

Finally, Senator Bond was a vigorous advocate for the State of Missouri, proudly championing and pursuing Federal investment in support of public housing, university research, defense, agriculture and infrastructure throughout the State. Senator Bond and I worked very closely on a number of projects for Missouri and Illinois and the St. Louis region, including the new Mississippi River Bridge, which is under construction now.

In January 2009, Senator Bond announced that he would not run for reelection in 2010, noting that in 1973, at 33 years old, he had become the youngest Governor ever to be elected in Missouri and that he had no desire to become Missouri's oldest Senator.

Naming the Federal courthouse in Jefferson City as the Senator Christopher ''Kit'' Bond Courthouse is a fitting tribute, and I support the passage of Senate bill 846, which honors his service to our country and to this great institution.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the chairman for bringing this bill forward.

I am so excited to be here today and so proud to support Senate bill 846, which renames the new Federal courthouse in my district of Jefferson City the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse. This is such a fitting tribute to a great Missourian, who I have had the privilege of knowing and working with over the years.

Senator Bond was first elected in 1986 to the U.S. Senate and served over 24 years representing our State here valiantly in the United States Congress. And before he came here to the Senate, he served two terms as Governor and was also State auditor.

He is known for accomplishing many things—and there's not enough time to share all of them—but one thing he is certainly noted for is that he started the Parents as Teachers program and took it statewide. That has benefited thousands of children in Missouri and across this country, and certainly I participated with our daughter. It's a wonderful, wonderful program.

He is also a great supporter of free trade. He had been a champion of building highways and infrastructure, which has enabled vital investments in our roads and bridges in Missouri. He was vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and he worked for bipartisan support to renew the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

He is a strong defender of our military and our national defense. As part of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, he worked to continue operation of Boeing's F–15 production

line in a plant next to the St. Louis airport. And we always heard about how proud he was of his son's service in the military.

But being from the farm, I appreciated Senator Bond's support of agriculture. He was certainly a leader in making Missouri a leader in agricultural research. He is a leader whose service has improved the lives of thousands of Missourians, an example of patriotism that has inspired future leaders to follow in his footsteps.

Every time now that Missourians will drive by this courthouse, they will be inspired to serve their fellow man—service above self—just like Kit Bond has done all of these years.

I want to close with some words that Kit said himself about his service, and I think it's an example for all of us in Missouri and across this country. He said: ''Serving Missouri has been my life's work. I have walked the land, fished its rivers, and been humbled by the honesty and hard work of our people. The highest honor is to receive and safeguard the public trust.''

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

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 846, which would designate the name of the United States courthouse in Jefferson City, Missouri as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse. We would like to congratulate Mr. Bond on behalf of our office for this prestigious honor.

Mr. Bond served the State of Missouri for over 4 decades, beginning as the Assistant Attorney General in 1969, where he led the Consumer Protection Division. He then went on to be elected Missouri State Auditor in 1970 until 1973. Later in 1973, at the age of 33, he was elected Governor of Missouri, making him the youngest Governor in the State's history. He served as Governor from 1973 until 1977, and again from 1981 until 1985. Mr. Bond then went on to serve as a United States Senator from 1987 until his retirement in January of 2011.

Kit Bond has served our State and our Country with dedication, and naming the United States Courthouse after him is an appropriate manner in which to show our appreciation for all of his hard work over the last 40 years for the people of Missouri and all Americans. Once again, on behalf of our office and the entire State of Missouri, we would like to congratulate him and we wish him the best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 846.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SHORT-TERM TANF EXTENSION ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2943) to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through December 31, 2011.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2943

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 ''Short-Term TANF Extension Act''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES PROGRAM AND RELATED PROGRAMS THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2011.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Activities authorized by part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (other than under subsections (a)(3) and (b) of section 403 of such Act) shall continue through December 31, 2011, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2011, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose. Grants and payments may be made pursuant to this authority on a quarterly basis through the first quarter of fiscal year 2012 at the level provided for such activities for the corresponding quarter of fiscal year 2011.

(b) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—Section 409(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or 2012'' and inserting ''2012, or 2013''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2012''.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2943, legislation to temporarily extend the authorization of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and related programs.

Since it replaced the New Deal-era welfare program in 1996, TANF has been successful at cutting welfare dependents by 57 percent through the end of last year. Even more importantly, by promoting work among single parents, who are the most common welfare recipients, it helped significantly reduce child poverty in female-headed families over time.

Even at today's elevated unemployment rates, TANF continues to promote more work and earnings and less poverty. But despite this general progress, TANF can and should be strengthened to do more, especially to help more low-income families work and support themselves in the years ahead. Unfortunately, too many parents are exempted from work requirements today for a variety of reasons we learned at a recent hearing held by the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, which I am privileged to chair.

But given the current administration's support for only a straight 1-year extension of current law, which is a view shared by the other body, there are limited prospects for making needed changes to TANF before the program expires at the end of this month. That's the reason for the short-term extension before us today.

This 3-month extension will provide an opportunity for Congress, including the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, to review TANF alongside other entitlement programs this fall. Important questions need to be asked, including what is the proper funding level for these programs and how can they best be focused on engaging low-income parents in work and other productive activities so more can support themselves in the long run.

Another thing this additional time will let us do is to take action to close what some call the ''strip club loophole.'' This refers to an outright abuse of taxpayer trust permitted under current law when adults on welfare spend taxpayer funds on liquor, gambling, tattoos, or even visits to strip clubs. As recent exposes have revealed, too many welfare recipients access taxpayer funds at cash machines in casinos, liquor stores, strip clubs, and even on cruise ships.

Some States have already taken action to close this loophole by blocking access to welfare EBT cards at such establishments. There is bipartisan legislation to require all States to do that, and doing so is something of particular interest to our colleague, Senator COBURN. I share his commitment to getting this done this fall and urge all my colleagues to support action that we will take to close this loophole.

The legislation before us is designed to provide time for a closer review of and action on these sorts of issues. Importantly, it does not add to our deficit since it simply continues current TANF funding for 3 months. I note that TANF is a fixed block grant, which is not adjusted for inflation.

I wish we were debating legislation today that extended and actually improved TANF programs so that they work better; but given the impediments before us, the bill before the House today offers the best chance that we will be able to do that in the near future, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1310

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill, which I fully support, but it is important to understand what this bill does and what it does not do. It is important to understand which provisions we agree upon and which ones we accept as only being better than the alternative of allowing this important law and all those who count on it to expire next week.

Last week, the Census Bureau reported that more Americans were poor in 2010 than at any time on record. Regrettably, my home State of Texas was leading the way with one of the highest poverty rates anywhere in America.

The Texas Center for Public Policy Priorities, a nonpartisan group, recently reported that ''The heart of the American Dream is at risk in Texas.'' For the first time in generations, there are more people falling out of the middle class than joining its ranks. And what a struggle it is for those families trying to hold on.

In a neighborhood near downtown San Antonio, Andrew Ramos and his wife, Nina, are struggling just to keep food on the table for themselves and their 2-year-old daughter. Andrew lost his job, and Nina works at a local pizza parlor where she makes about $200 a week. There are so many families just like the Ramos family—almost one in five in poverty in Bexar County.

As John Turner at the Capital Area Food Bank concludes: Hunger is a result of lack of income and of a livable wage. It affects too many of our neighbors, he says, under the current Texas economic model.

The demands on our food banks, which serve as effective public-private partnerships, are immense. The Capital Area Food Bank, this year, is delivering 50 percent more food to poor people than it did 3 years ago.

But I don't really hear anyone facing up to this harsh reality—not our Governor in Texas, not the President of the United States, and certainly not the leadership here in the House. In fact, the Administration has shown little interest and almost no guidance in reforming this legislation.

Rather than respond to rising deprivation and declining opportunity, this legislation continues for another 3 months, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Act. This is a program that today provides direct assistance to only one in every five children living in Poverty in America. That's the lowest level of poor children receiving direct assistance since 1965. And of course in Texas it's much worse, where only one in every 20 poor children receive direct assistance from TANF.

The bill before us also does not address a program agreed to originally when the Welfare Reform Act was enacted—a bill that I voted for to address the particular needs of high poverty States like Texas and many in the South—called TANF Supplemental Grants. Their name is really a misnomer because they're not a supplement; they're essential to the work of States that have higher poverty rates.

Ever since that time of the Welfare Reform Act, Texas and those States have depended on supplemental TANF. It is not included in today's legislation, and that means that Texas will lose about $50 million every year that it relies on to work with child care, with preventing pregnancy, with other issues like school dropouts, programs that rely on these funds today.

Allowing these grants to expire is in sharp contrast to what happened in 2001 when Governor Rick Perry wrote to then-Whip Tom DeLay urging the extension of TANF supplemental grants, saying: ''These grants have played an important role in helping hardworking men and women in Texas achieve independence from public assistance. Congress designed the supplemental grants to address the critical program needs of States.'' Those were words of Governor Rick Perry, who is silent on this matter today about how we enable more Texans to move from welfare to work.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the funding for TANF to expire next week, and so I join wholeheartedly with this renewal legislation. But we also need to move past doing the very least that we can do and start responding to the mounting challenges that families not just in Texas but across our country face. TANF has not been adequately responsive to the increased level of needs during these bad economic times.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I think also of the words of Claudia Herrington, who works at El Buen Samaritano, dealing largely with Latino families. She writes: ''This is not the American Dream I believe in. This is not the American Dream my father believed in when he emigrated from Cuba here in the 1960s. I know our country is better than that, regardless of political affiliation. And I know that investment in our people and their ability to earn a decent living is a worthwhile policy.''

We need a policy that is more safety net than hole, and I hope eventually we can work together to achieve that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion that this legislation should be amended to revive the TANF Supplemental Grants program.

TANF supplemental grants expired in June 2011 in accordance with legislation Democrats crafted last year that President Obama signed into law. These payments have now expired and are not payable under current law. Extending them would mean spending more money to revive the program, which is beyond the scope of what we're doing today in maintaining only current TANF programs.

Since TANF supplemental grants were first paid, about $4 billion in extra TANF programs have been paid out only to a minority of States. At some point, we have to ask when such supplemental spending should come to an end. The last Congress, which, again, was led by Democratic majorities, said the end should come this past June. I respect that judgment.

The committee is obviously aware of Mr. DOGGETT's bill to extend these payments yet again, but we don't know how he would pay for that since the bill he introduced includes no pay-for. That would mean increasing our current historic deficits even more.

All States received a share of $5 billion in special welfare funds in the 2009 stimulus bill. That was on top of almost $17 billion in TANF block grant payments all States receive each year, including those that previously collected supplemental grants. The States that collected supplemental grants received about $913 million of that $5 billion in one-time funds, or the equivalent of almost three years of supplemental grant payments.

I appreciate the gentleman's argument for extending these payments by reviving the now-ended Supplemental Grants program. The legislation before us does not do that, since it simply extends current law programs. But I know he and I will continue to have fruitful discussions and work together about this and other TANF funding and related issues, and I appreciate his continued input and effort.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would yield myself 15 seconds to say that under Democratic leadership we extended the supplemental TANF program that Governor Rick Perry was so proud about in 2001. We extended it four times. The only reason that it existed in the spring of this year was because of our extensions. It should be extended once again, and I hope in the process we can do that.

I would now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. I come to the floor on this noncontroversial bill and as a proud member of the Ways and Means Committee to show the Congress and the country that we are concerned about more than just taxes.

I want to thank Mr. DAVIS for his leadership in this area and especially

my friend Mr. DOGGETT, who have stuck with the committee in trying to make certain that we improve the life of those people who are so vulnerable in our society.

To think that one out of five children in America, the United States of America, is living in poverty, to recognize that 46 million people, a family of four makes less than $22,000 is certainly not what has inspired so many people to get out of poverty and move into the middle class, which is the heart of America and the heart of our economy.

This bill does just that. It comes to us to look to give authority to the States to see what works, to make certain that people don't have to stay on welfare, that they can have a goal in being fully employed. And it takes a way the image that we have, as a country, that we applaud people who are being executed, that we applaud those people that don't have health insurance.

No, America is more than that. And during these hard times, we have to make certain that we do as the members of this committee, a classic example is Mr. DOGGETT, is Mr. DAVIS, both on a hardworking committee, but care enough about the people in our country to show that this is bipartisan. And the people that are poor, the people that are in need, the people that are without homes and without hope are not Democrats; they're not Republicans. They are people in our country. And we have an obligation to show that there is a need for government. There is a need for caring.

And I am proud to be a member of this committee and a Member of this Congress to show that's what our country is all about.

□ 1320

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State, the former chair of this subcommittee, Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I want to say just a few words about this. Obviously, I support the extension of the TANF. But I think that there is a real need—and we've been extending it 1 year at a time, 1 year at a time, 1 year at a time for some time—there really is a need to re-look at the whole concept of what this safety net really needs to be.

We wiped out welfare as we know it, as was the phrase in 1996, at a time when the economy in this country was going straight up. Anybody could find a job if they looked for one. And it was very clear that there were efforts in that bill to push people off the rolls and out into the work market. Now, it was possible to do that.

Today, however, you have a situation where there are four people that are looking for every job that's out there. You have many middle class families who have exhausted 99 weeks of unemployment and have nothing in this country except food stamps.

Now, it sort of depends on whether or not we're going to have a middle class in this country when we have a downturn like this and we decide whether we're going to help the middle class make it. We've got foreclosures that won't quit. And we've had no proposals out of the House to do anything about foreclosure prevention.

So you have middle class people who've lost their job, their unemployment is gone, they are now having their house foreclosed, and they look to their government for a safety net and find nothing but food stamps.

In my belief, there is a time when we should help the middle class in this country be able to go through what may be another year or two, we're not quite sure how long it will be, but it should not be that there is no program available to help middle class people who have fallen on very difficult times.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the House should approve this important bipartisan legislation today. To fail to approve this modest extension would cause even more people to suffer with the expiration of these programs next week.

Mr. Speaker, it may not be in vogue to discuss the problems of poor people in America today, but we need to hear more about it in this House. We need to hear more about it in Washington, DC.

Certainly we want to support and encourage the middle class in America—very, very important—but we need to create more opportunity to broaden that middle class. For the many people who struggle and hope that lives will be better for their children and that they will face less obstacles than their parents have faced, we need to provide that temporary assistance to needy families. The current program leaves out too many and forgets too many of those families in their struggle.

The omission of TANF supplemental grants, which we renewed four times in the last two Congresses, is not being renewed here, which means that in Texas and in so many high-poverty States, we will not have the support that Governor Rick Perry once called for. We will have a broadened gap and a lack of services.

Many of the dollars that we've received in that program in Texas have gone into child protective services to protect abused and neglected children. They will no longer have that assistance. I hope in the course of the legislative process of the renewal of this legislation, we might eventually get TANF supplemental grants into the bill.

Today we see so many who are losing the opportunity to share in the American Dream. We have an opportunity to continue at least a minimal level of support to them. We should do that, but we should commit ourselves to doing even more.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2943 simply is a short-term continuation of Welfare to Work programs that have successfully cut welfare dependence and promoted work. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to work with us to design a long-term reauthorization bill that fixes flaws in the system, fixes broken processes and allows agencies to communicate in a more holistic way as we address this to eliminate waste of taxpayer dollars and ultimately to design a long-term reauthorization bill that further promotes work and independence from welfare.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2943, "The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Extension Act," which extends the authorization of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) state block grant program for three months, through December 31, 2011. Under current law, the program's authorization is set to expire on October 1, 2011, at the end of FY 2011. H.R. 2943 authorizes "such sums as may be necessary" to carry out the program at the same level as FY 2011 or $16.48 billion according to CRS and extends funding for the basic block grant, healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood competitive grants, mandatory child care grants, and certain other funds.

As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I am keenly aware that the youngest among us often suffers the most when programs, like TANF, are underfunded. We must take a proactive role in protecting children from lives of abject poverty.

I represent the 18th Congressional district in Houston, Texas. In my district, more than 190,000 people live below the poverty line. Programs like TANF are vital to these families. At a time when the Census Bureau places the number of Americans living in poverty at the highest rate in over 50 years.

Across our nation the poverty rate has climbed to 14.3 percent in 2009, the highest level since 1994 and is likely to continue to climb. At this time children are again bearing the brunt, more than one in five children lived in families with incomes under the official poverty level which was $22,050 for a family of four in 2009. Similarly more than one in five children lived in households that did not always have the resources to purchase food.

In 2008, there were 15.45 million impoverished children in the nation, 20.7% of America's youth. Further, 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.

Many people assume that Texas was not hit as hard by the recession as other states because our unemployment rate is still below the national average. While our unemployment rate is low compared to the U.S. (8.2 versus 9.8 percent, respectively, in November 2010), it is still nearly double where it stood in November 2007 (4.4 percent). In fact, Texas' unemployment rate has been around 8 percent for the last 16 months, which is extremely high given Texas' recent history. This has resulted in nearly one in three Texas children living with a parent who does not have a full-time,

year-round job, making them particularly vulnerable.

When a household falls into poverty, children are exposed to increased parental distress, inadequate childcare arrangements, and poor nutrition. In past recessions, it took many years for employment and incomes to rebound, and low-income families rebound more slowly than others.

Public benefits such as TANF help families bridge the gaps in difficult economic times and are critical in reducing the effects of a recession. Cutting these supports will hurt child and family wellbeing and damage the Texas economy by taking money out of the private economy for critical local businesses such as grocery stores and medical providers.

Although TANF is not perfect, I believe that is an essential part of the safety net for very low-income families with children. These benefits do not provide families with the ability to live a lavish life style, they do provide a life line to families at a critical time in their lives, such as periods of unemployment or disability, or when a newborn joins a family. The goal of TANF is to be a temporary safety net and to help families in need to regain their balance, when a hard time causes them to lose their balance.

TANF provides access to paths out of poverty through services such as job training or counseling for mental health issues. State also uses the block grants for a wide range of work supports, including child care and transportation. For these reasons I support H.R. 2943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2943.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2883) to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend the child and family services program through fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2883

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 ''Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act''.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES CHILD WELFARE SERVICES PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 425 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 625) is amended by striking ''2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''2012 through 2016''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) RESPONSE TO EMOTIONAL TRAUMA.—Section 422(b)(15)(A)(ii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(15)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting '', including emotional trauma associated with a child's maltreatment and removal from home'' before the semicolon.

(2) PROCEDURES ON THE USE OF PSYCHOTROPIC MEDICATIONS.—Section 422(b)(15)(A)(v) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(15)(A)(v)) is amended by inserting '', including protocols for the appropriate use and monitoring of psychotropic medications'' before the semicolon.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES TO ADDRESS DEVELOPMENTAL NEEDS OF VERY YOUNG CHILDREN.—Section 422(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (16);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (17) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(18) include a description of the activities that the State has undertaken to reduce the length of time children who have not attained 5 years of age are without a permanent family, and the activities the State undertakes to address the developmental needs of such children who receive benefits or services under this part or part E.''.

(4) DATA SOURCES FOR CHILD DEATH REPORTING.—Section 422(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)), as amended by paragraph (3) of this subsection, is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (17);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (18) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(19) contain a description of the sources used to compile information on child maltreatment deaths required by Federal law to be reported by the State agency referred to in paragraph (1), and to the extent that the compilation does not include information on such deaths from the State vital statistics department, child death review teams, law enforcement agencies, or offices of medical examiners or coroners, the State shall describe why the information is not so included and how the State will include the information.''.

(c) CHILD VISITATION BY CASEWORKERS.—Section 424 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 624) is amended by striking the 2nd subsection (e), as added by section 7(b) of the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006, and inserting the following:

''(f)(1)(A) Each State shall take such steps as are necessary to ensure that the total number of visits made by caseworkers on a monthly basis to children in foster care under the responsibility of the State during a fiscal year is not less than 90 percent (or, in the case of fiscal year 2015 or thereafter, 95 percent) of the total number of such visits that would occur during the fiscal year if each such child were so visited once every month while in such care.

''(B) If the Secretary determines that a State has failed to comply with subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year, then the percentage that would otherwise apply for purposes of subsection (a) for the fiscal year shall be reduced by—

''(i) 1, if the number of full percentage points by which the State fell short of the percentage specified in subparagraph (A) is less than 10;

''(ii) 3, if the number of full percentage points by which the State fell short, as described in clause (i), is not less than 10 and less than 20; or

''(iii) 5, if the number of full percentage points by which the State fell short, as described in clause (i), is not less than 20.

''(2)(A) Each State shall take such steps as are necessary to ensure that not less than 50 percent of the total number of visits made by caseworkers to children in foster care under the responsibility of the State during a fiscal year occur in the residence of the child involved.

''(B) If the Secretary determines that a State has failed to comply with subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year, then the percentage that would otherwise apply for purposes of subsection (a) for the fiscal year shall be reduced by—

''(i) 1, if the number of full percentage points by which the State fell short of the percentage specified in subparagraph (A) is less than 10;

''(ii) 3, if the number of full percentage points by which the State fell short, as described in clause (i), is not less than 10 and less than 20; or

''(iii) 5, if the number of full percentage points by which the State fell short, as described in clause (i), is not less than 20.''.

(d) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 423(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 623(b)) is amended by striking ''per centum'' each place it appears and inserting ''percent''.

SEC. 102. PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF FUNDING AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 436(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629f(a)) is amended by striking all that follows ''$345,000,000'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016.''.

(2) DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—Section 437(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(a)) is amended by striking ''2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''2012 through 2016''.

(b) TARGETING OF SERVICES TO POPULATIONS AT GREATEST RISK OF MALTREATMENT.—Section 432(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629b(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (8);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) describes how the State identifies which populations are at the greatest risk of maltreatment and how services are targeted to the populations.''.

(c) REVISED PURPOSES OF FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES AND TIME-LIMITED FAMILY REUNIFICATION SERVICES.—

(1) FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES.—Section 431(a)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629a(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'family support services' means community-based services designed to carry out the purposes described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) PURPOSES DESCRIBED.—The purposes described in this subparagraph are the following:

''(i) To promote the safety and well-being of children and families.

''(ii) To increase the strength and stability of families (including adoptive, foster, and extended families).

''(iii) To increase parents' confidence and competence in their parenting abilities.

''(iv) To afford children a safe, stable, and supportive family environment.

''(v) To strengthen parental relationships and promote healthy marriages.

''(vi) To enhance child development, including through mentoring (as defined in section 439(b)(2)).''.

(2) TIME-LIMITED FAMILY REUNIFICATION SERVICES.—Section 431(a)(7)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629a(a)(7)(B)) is amended by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (viii) and inserting after clause (v) the following:

''(vi) Peer-to-peer mentoring and support groups for parents and primary caregivers.

''(vii) Services and activities designed to facilitate access to and visitation of children by parents and siblings.''.

(d) UNIFORM DEFINITIONS OF INDIAN TRIBE AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—Section 431(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629a(a)(5) and (6)) is amended by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and inserting the following:

''(5) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given the term in section 428(c).

''(6) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term 'tribal organization' has the meaning given the term in section 428(c).''.

(e) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF STATE SUMMARIES OF FINANCIAL DATA; PUBLICATION ON HHS WEBSITE.—Section 432(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629b(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking all that precedes ''shall'' and inserting the following:

''(c) ANNUAL SUBMISSION OF STATE REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(2) by adding after and below the end the following:

''(2) INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED.—The compilation shall include the individual State reports and tables that synthesize State information into national totals for each element required to be included in the reports, including planned and actual spending by service category for the program authorized under this subpart and planned spending by service category for the program authorized under subpart 1.

''(3) PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY.—Not later than September 30 of each year, the Secretary shall publish the compilation on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services in a location easily accessible by the public.''.

(f) GAO REPORT ON MULTIPLE SOURCES OF FEDERAL SPENDING AND FAMILY ACCESS TO SERVICES.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies alternative sources of Federal funding that are being employed by States or other entities for the same purposes for which funding is provided under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act; and

(2) assesses the needs of families eligible for services under such program, including identification of underserved communities and information regarding—

(A) the supports available for caseworkers to appropriately investigate and safely manage their caseloads;

(B) the length of the wait time for families to receive substance abuse and other preventive services; and

(C) the number of families on waiting lists for such services and the effect of the delay on healthy, successful reunification outcomes for such families.

(g) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—

(1) Section 432(a)(8)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629b(a)(8)(B)) is amended in each of clauses (i) and (ii) by striking ''forms CFS 101–Part I and CFS 101–Part II (or any successor forms)'' and inserting ''form CFS–101 (including all parts and any successor forms)''.

(2) Section 433(c)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629c(c)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''FOOD STAMP'' and inserting ''SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS''; and

(B) by striking ''benefits benefits'' each place it appears and inserting ''benefits''.

SEC. 103. GRANTS FOR TARGETED PURPOSES.

(a) EXTENSION OF FUNDING RESERVATIONS FOR MONTHLY CASEWORKER VISITS AND REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—Section 436(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629f(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''433(e)'' and all that follows and inserting ''433(e) $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016.''; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking ''437(f)'' and all that follows and inserting ''437(f) $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016.''.

(b) REVISION IN USE OF MONTHLY CASEWORKER VISITS GRANTS.—Section 436(b)(4)(B)(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629f(b)(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''support'' and insert ''improve the quality of''; and

(2) by striking ''a primary emphasis'' and all that follows and inserting ''an emphasis on improving caseworker decision making on the safety, permanency, and well-being of foster children and on activities designed to increase retention, recruitment, and training of caseworkers.''; and

(c) REAUTHORIZATION OF REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP GRANTS TO ASSIST CHILDREN AFFECTED BY PARENTAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE.—

(1) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 437(f)(3)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(f)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''2012 through 2016''.

(2) REVISIONS TO PROGRAM.—Section 437(f) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(f)) is amended—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''METHAMPHETAMINE OR OTHER'';

(B) in each of paragraphs (1), (4)(A), (7)(A)(i), and (9)(B)(iii), by striking ''methamphetamine or other'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) REQUIRED MINIMUM PERIOD OF APPROVAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A grant shall be awarded under this subsection for a period of not less than 2, and not more than 5, fiscal years, subject to clause (ii).

''(ii) EXTENSION OF GRANT.—On application of the grantee, the Secretary may extend for not more than 2 fiscal years the period for which a grant is awarded under this subsection.

''(C) MULTIPLE GRANTS ALLOWED.—This subsection shall not be interpreted to prevent a grantee from applying for, or being awarded, separate grants under this subsection.'';

(D) in paragraph (6)(A)—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (ii);

(ii) by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) 70 percent for the sixth such fiscal year; and

''(v) 65 percent for the seventh such fiscal year.'';

(E) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking ''shall—'' and all that follows through ''(A) take'' and inserting ''shall take'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(iv) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (A) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and moving each of such provisions 2 ems to the left; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF THE SECRETARY.—Not more than 5 percent of the amounts appropriated or reserved for awarding grants under this subsection for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016 may be used by the Secretary for salaries and Department of Health and Human Services administrative expenses in administering this subsection.''.

(3) EVALUATIONS.—Not later than December 31, 2012, and not later than December 31, 2017, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall evaluate the effectiveness of the grants awarded to regional partnerships under section 437(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(f)) and shall publish a report regarding the results of each evaluation on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services. Each report required to be published under this subsection shall include—

(A) an evaluation of the programs and activities conducted, and the services provided, with the grant funds awarded under such section for fiscal years 2007 through 2011, in the case of the evaluation required by December 31, 2012, and for fiscal years 2012 through 2016, in the case of the evaluation required by December 31, 2017;

(B) an analysis of the regional partnerships awarded such grants that have, and have not, been successful in achieving the goals and outcomes specified in their grant applications and with respect to the performance indicators established by the Secretary under paragraph (8) of such section that are applicable to their grant awards; and

(C) an analysis of the extent to which such grants have been successful in addressing the needs of families with methamphetamine or other substance abuse problems who come to the attention of the child welfare system and in achieving the goals of child safety, permanence, and family stability.

SEC. 104. COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) GRANT PURPOSES.—Section 438(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''; and'' and inserting '', including the requirements in the Act related to concurrent planning;'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) to increase and improve engagement of the entire family in court processes relating to child welfare, family preservation, family reunification, and adoption;''; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(4)'';

(B) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding after and below the end the following:

''(B) to increase and improve engagement of the entire family in court processes relating to child welfare, family preservation, family reunification, and adoption.''.

(b) SINGLE GRANT APPLICATION.—Section 438(b)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) SINGLE GRANT APPLICATION.—Pursuant to the requirements under paragraph (1) of this subsection, a highest State court desiring a grant under this section shall submit a single application to the Secretary that specifies whether the application is for a grant for—

''(A) the purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a);

''(B) the purpose described in subsection (a)(3);

''(C) the purpose described in subsection (a)(4); or

''(D) the purposes referred to in 2 or more (specifically identified) of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of this paragraph.''.

(c) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—Section 438(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (b)(2) that refers to 1 or more grant purposes for which an application of a highest State court is approved under this section, the court shall be entitled to payment, for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016, from the amount allocated under paragraph (3) of this subsection for grants for the purpose or purposes, of an amount equal to $85,000 plus the amount described in paragraph (2) of this subsection with respect to the purpose or purposes.

''(2) AMOUNT DESCRIBED.—The amount described in this paragraph for any fiscal year with respect to the purpose or purposes referred to in a subparagraph of subsection (b)(2) is the amount that bears the same ratio to the total of the amounts allocated under paragraph (3) of this subsection for grants for the purpose or purposes as the number of individuals in the State who have not attained 21 years of age bears to the total number of such individuals in all States the highest State courts of which have approved applications under this section for grants for the purpose or purposes.

''(3) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

''(A) MANDATORY FUNDS.—Of the amounts reserved under section 436(b)(2) for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allocate—

''(i) $9,000,000 for grants for the purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a);

''(ii) $10,000,000 for grants for the purpose described in subsection (a)(3);

''(iii) $10,000,000 for grants for the purpose described in subsection (a)(4); and

''(iv) $1,000,000 for grants to be awarded on a competitive basis among the highest courts of Indian tribes or tribal consortia that—

''(I) are operating a program under part E, in accordance with section 479B;

''(II) are seeking to operate a program under part E and have received an implementation grant under section 476; or

''(III) has a court responsible for proceedings related to foster care or adoption.

''(B) DISCRETIONARY FUNDS.—The Secretary shall allocate all of the amounts reserved under section 437(b)(2) for grants for the purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).''.

(d) EXTENSION OF FEDERAL SHARE.—Section 438(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(d)) is amended by striking ''2002 through 2011'' and inserting ''2012 through 2016''.

(e) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Effective as if included in the enactment of the Safe and Timely Interstate Placement of Foster Children Act of 2006, section 8(b) of such Act (120 Stat. 513) is amended by striking ''438(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 638(b))'' inserting ''438(b)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(b)(1))''.

SEC. 105. DATA STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED DATA MATCHING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part B of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621–629i) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Subpart 3—Common Provisions

''SEC. 440. DATA STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED DATA MATCHING.

''(a) STANDARD DATA ELEMENTS.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget, and considering State perspectives, shall, by rule, designate standard data elements for any category of information required to be reported under this part.

''(2) DATA ELEMENTS MUST BE NONPROPRIETARY AND INTEROPERABLE.—The standard data elements designated under paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable, be nonproprietary and interoperable.

''(3) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—In designating standard data elements under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate—

''(A) interoperable standards developed and maintained by an international voluntary consensus standards body, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, such as the International Organization for Standardization;

''(B) interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model; and

''(C) interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance, such as the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council.

''(b) DATA STANDARDS FOR REPORTING.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget, and considering State government perspectives, shall, by rule, designate data reporting standards to govern the reporting required under this part.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The data reporting standards required by paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable—

''(A) incorporate a widely-accepted, non-proprietary, searchable, computer-readable format;

''(B) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles; and

''(C) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

''(3) INCORPORATION OF NONPROPRIETARY STANDARDS.—In designating reporting standards under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate existing nonproprietary standards, such as the eXtensible Business Reporting Language.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2012, and shall apply with respect to information required to be reported on or after such date.

SEC. 106. PROVISIONS RELATING TO FOSTER CARE OR ADOPTION.

(a) EDUCATIONAL STABILITY FOR EACH FOSTER PLACEMENT.—Section 475(1)(G) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 675(1)(G)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''the placement'' and inserting ''each placement''; and

(2) in clause (ii)(I), by inserting ''each'' before ''placement''.

(b) FOSTER YOUTH ID THEFT.—Section 475(5) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 675(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (G);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(I) each child in foster care under the responsibility of the State who has attained 16 years of age receives without cost a copy of any consumer report (as defined in section 603(d) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act) pertaining to the child each year until the child is discharged from care, and receives assistance (including, when feasible, from any court-appointed advocate for the child) in interpreting and resolving any inaccuracies in the report.''.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF ADOPTION SPENDING.—Section 473(a)(8) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 673(a)(8)) is amended by inserting '', and shall document how such amounts are spent, including on post-adoption services'' before the period.

(d) INCLUSION IN ANNUAL REPORT OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CHILD VISITATION BY CASEWORKERS.—Section 479A(6) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 679b(6)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) the total number of visits made by caseworkers on a monthly basis to children in foster care under the responsibility of the State during a fiscal year as a percentage of the total number of the visits that would occur during the fiscal year if each child were so visited once every month while in such care; and''.

SEC. 107. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2011, and shall apply to payments under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act for calendar quarters beginning on or after such date, without regard to whether regulations to implement the amendments are promulgated by such date.

(b) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan developed pursuant to subpart 1 of part B, or a State plan approved under subpart 2 of part B or part E, of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this title, the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet any of the additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. If the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

TITLE II—CHILD WELFARE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 201. RENEWAL OF AUTHORITY TO APPROVE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS DESIGNED TO TEST INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES IN STATE CHILD WELFARE PROGRAMS.

Section 1130 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a–9) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) LIMITATION.—During fiscal years 2012 through 2014, the Secretary may authorize demonstration projects described in paragraph (1), with not more than 10 demonstration projects to be authorized in each fiscal year.''.

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) CONDITIONS FOR STATE ELIGIBILITY.—For purposes of a new demonstration project under this section that is initially approved in any of fiscal years 2012 through 2014, a State shall be authorized to conduct such demonstration project only if the State satisfies the following conditions:

''(A) IDENTIFY 1 OR MORE GOALS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The State shall demonstrate that the demonstration project is designed to accomplish 1 or more of the following goals:

''(I) Increase permanency for all infants, children, and youth by reducing the time in foster placements when possible and promoting a successful transition to adulthood for older youth.

''(II) Increase positive outcomes for infants, children, youth, and families in their homes and communities, including tribal communities, and improve the safety and well-being of infants, children, and youth.

''(III) Prevent child abuse and neglect and the re-entry of infants, children, and youth into foster care.

''(ii) LONG-TERM THERAPEUTIC FAMILY TREATMENT CENTERS; ADDRESSING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—With respect to a demonstration project that is designed to accomplish 1 or more of the goals described in clause (i), the State may elect to establish a program—

''(I) to permit foster care maintenance payments to be made under part E of title IV to a long-term therapeutic family treatment center (as described in paragraph (8)(B)) on behalf of a child residing in the center; or

''(II) to identify and address domestic violence that endangers children and results in the placement of children in foster care.

''(B) DEMONSTRATE READINESS.—The State shall demonstrate through a narrative description the State's capacity to effectively use the authority to conduct a demonstration project under this section by identifying changes the State has made or plans to make in policies, procedures, or other elements of the State's child welfare program that will enable the State to successfully achieve the goal or goals of the project.

''(C) DEMONSTRATE IMPLEMENTED OR PLANNED CHILD WELFARE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT POLICIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The State shall demonstrate that the State has implemented, or plans to implement within 3 years of the date on which the State submits its application to conduct the demonstration project or 2 years after the date on which the Secretary approves such demonstration project (whichever is later), at least 2 of the child welfare program improvement policies described in paragraph (7).

''(ii) PREVIOUS IMPLEMENTATION.—For purposes of the requirement described in clause (i), at least 1 of the child welfare program improvement policies to be implemented by the State shall be a policy that the State has not previously implemented as of the date on which the State submits an application to conduct the demonstration project.

''(iii) IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW.—The Secretary may terminate the authority of a State to

conduct a demonstration project under this section if, after the 3-year period following approval of the demonstration project, the State has not made significant progress in implementing the child welfare program improvement policies proposed by the State under clause (i).'';

(C) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''and the ability of the State to implement a corrective action plan approved under section 1123A'' before the period; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) INAPPLICABILITY OF RANDOM ASSIGNMENT FOR CONTROL GROUPS AS A FACTOR FOR APPROVAL OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—For purposes of evaluating an application to conduct a demonstration project under this section, the Secretary shall not take into consideration whether such project requires random assignment of children and families to groups served under the project and to control groups.

''(7) CHILD WELFARE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT POLICIES.—For purposes of paragraph (3)(C), the child welfare program improvement policies described in this paragraph are the following:

''(A) The establishment of a bill of rights for infants, children, and youth in foster care that is widely shared and clearly outlines protections for infants, children, and youth, such as assuring frequent visits with parents, siblings, and caseworkers, access to attorneys, and participation in age-appropriate extracurricular activities, and procedures for ensuring the protections are provided.

''(B) The development and implementation of a plan for meeting the health and mental health needs of infants, children, and youth in foster care that includes ensuring that the provision of health and mental health care is child-specific, comprehensive, appropriate, and consistent (through means such as ensuring the infant, child, or youth has a medical home, regular wellness medical visits, and addressing the issue of trauma, when appropriate).

''(C) The inclusion in the State plan under section 471 of an amendment implementing the option under subsection (a)(28) of that section to enter into kinship guardianship assistance agreements.

''(D) The election under the State plan under section 471 to define a 'child' for purposes of the provision of foster care maintenance payments, adoption assistance payments, and kinship guardianship assistance payments, so as to include individuals described in each of subclauses (I), (II), and (III) of section 475(8)(B)(i) who have not attained age 21.

''(E) The development and implementation of a plan that ensures congregate care is used appropriately and reduces the placement of children and youth in such care.

''(F) Of those infants, children, and youth in out-of-home placements, substantially increasing the number of cases of siblings who are in the same foster care, kinship guardianship, or adoptive placement, above the number of such cases in fiscal year 2008.

''(G) The development and implementation of a plan to improve the recruitment and retention of high quality foster family homes trained to help assist infants, children, and youth swiftly secure permanent families. Supports for foster families under such a plan may include increasing maintenance payments to more adequately meet the needs of infants, children, and youth in foster care and expanding training, respite care, and other support services for foster parents.

''(H) The establishment of procedures designed to assist youth as they prepare for their transition out of foster care, such as arranging for participation in age-appropriate extra-curricular activities, providing appropriate access to cell phones, computers, and opportunities to obtain a driver's license, providing notification of all sibling placements if siblings are in care and sibling location if siblings are out of care, and providing counseling and financial support for post-secondary education.

''(I) The inclusion in the State plan under section 471 of a description of State procedures for—

''(i) ensuring that youth in foster care who have attained age 16 are engaged in discussions, including during the development of the transition plans required under paragraphs (1)(D) and (5)(H) of section 475, that explore whether the youth wishes to reconnect with the youth's biological family, including parents, grandparents, and siblings, and, if so, what skills and strategies the youth will need to successfully and safely reconnect with those family members;

''(ii) providing appropriate guidance and services to youth whom affirm an intent to reconnect with biological family members on how to successfully and safely manage such reconnections; and

''(iii) making, when appropriate, efforts to include biological family members in such reconnection efforts.

''(J) The establishment of one or more of the following programs designed to prevent infants, children, and youth from entering foster care or to provide permanency for infants, children, and youth in foster care:

''(i) An intensive family finding program.

''(ii) A kinship navigator program.

''(iii) A family counseling program, such as a family group decision-making program, and which may include in-home peer support for families.

''(iv) A comprehensive family-based substance abuse treatment program.

''(v) A program under which special efforts are made to identify and address domestic violence that endangers infants, children, and youth and puts them at risk of entering foster care.

''(vi) A mentoring program.

''(8) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'youth' means, with respect to a State, an individual who has attained age 12 but has not attained the age at which an individual is no longer considered to be a child under the State plans under parts B and E of title IV, and

''(B) the term 'long-term therapeutic family treatment center' means a State licensed or certified program that enables parents and their children to live together in a safe environment for a period of not less than 6 months and provides, on-site or by referral, substance abuse treatment services, children's early intervention services, family counseling, legal services, medical care, mental health services, nursery and preschool, parenting skills training, pediatric care, prenatal care, sexual abuse therapy, relapse prevention, transportation, and job or vocational training or classes leading to a secondary school diploma or a certificate of general equivalence.'';

(2) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

''(d) DURATION OF DEMONSTRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), a demonstration project under this section may be conducted for not more than 5 years, unless in the judgment of the Secretary, the demonstration project should be allowed to continue.

''(2) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—In no event shall a demonstration project under this section be conducted after September 30, 2019.'';

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''(which shall provide,'' and all that follows before the semicolon;

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (6);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) an accounting of any additional Federal, State, and local investments made, as well as any private investments made in coordination with the State, during the 2 fiscal years preceding the application to provide the services described in paragraph (1), and an assurance that the State will provide an accounting of that same spending for each year of an approved demonstration project; and'';

(4) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h);

(5) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f) EVALUATIONS.—Each State authorized to conduct a demonstration project under this section shall obtain an evaluation by an independent contractor of the effectiveness of the project, using an evaluation design approved by the Secretary which provides for—

''(1) comparison of methods of service delivery under the project, and such methods under a State plan or plans, with respect to efficiency, economy, and any other appropriate measures of program management;

''(2) comparison of outcomes for children and families (and groups of children and families) under the project, and such outcomes under a State plan or plans, for purposes of assessing the effectiveness of the project in achieving program goals; and

''(3) any other information that the Secretary may require.

''(g) REPORTS.—

''(1) STATE REPORTS; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each State authorized to conduct a demonstration project under this section shall—

''(A) submit periodic reports to the Secretary on the specific programs, activities, and strategies used to improve outcomes for infants, children, youth, and families and the results achieved for infants, children, and youth during the conduct of the demonstration project, including with respect to those infants, children, and youth who are prevented from entering foster care, infants, children, and youth in foster care, and infants, children, and youth who move from foster care to permanent families; and

''(B) post a copy of each such report on the website for the State child welfare program concurrent with the submission of the report to the Secretary.

''(2) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate—

''(A) periodic reports based on the State reports submitted under paragraph (1); and

''(B) a report based on the results of the State evaluations required under subsection (f) that includes an analysis of the results of such evaluations and such recommendations for administrative or legislative changes as the Secretary determines appropriate.''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(i) INDIAN TRIBES OPERATING IV–E PROGRAMS CONSIDERED STATES.—An Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium that has elected to operate a program under part E of title IV in accordance with section 479B shall be considered a State for purposes of this section.''.

TITLE III—BUDGET PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2883, the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act, a bill that continues a tradition of bipartisanship in crafting child welfare legislation.

The bill we're considering today reauthorizes two important child welfare programs, incorporating a series of improvements developed during hearings held by the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources over the past few months.

In addition to continuing and making improvements to two major child welfare programs, this bill also renews authority for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve child welfare waivers during the next 3 years. Past waivers have allowed States to test new and better ways of helping children at risk of abuse and neglect.

Earlier this year, the House unanimously passed legislation renewing this authority, but the Senate has not followed suit.

This bill, which our colleagues in the Senate also support and which was favorably reported by the Senate Finance Committee yesterday, will allow innovation to continue and may yield information to improve child welfare programs in the future. The bill will also establish a process to create needed data standards in child welfare programs. This language is a first step towards improving collaboration between social service programs.

We have often heard in hearings that States and programs within States have difficulty coordinating services because of difficulty sharing data, and that this lack of coordination increases costs and decreases effectiveness. This bill directs the Secretary of HHS to work with the States to establish national data standards so that all State child welfare programs are speaking the same language.

To show the wide support for this bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert letters of support into the RECORD from the following organizations: The National Conference of State Legislatures; the American Public Human Services Association; the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators; the American Institute of CPAs; the American Humane Association; the North American Council on Adoptable Children; Voice for Adoption; the Association on American Indian Affairs; the National Indian Child Welfare Association; Youth Villages; First Focus Campaign for Children; Zero to Three (The National Center for Infants, Toddlers and Families); the National Foster Care Coalition; the Child Welfare League of America; the Children's Defense Fund; the Center for the Study of Social Policy; and the Public Children Services Association of Ohio.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE COALITION,
Washington, DC, September 13, 2011.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BAUCUS, RANKING MEMBER HATCH, CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: The National Foster Care Coalition extends its support to the reforms made through the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act of 2011.

In these challenging times we still believe important reforms can be made with the child welfare system. Waiver provisions provide an opportunity for states to strengthen their child welfare systems in some very important ways.

We appreciate and support the inclusion of important provisions we highlighted including: Greater attention placed on the care and the development of infants and toddlers who come into contact with the child welfare system. Continuation of the substance abuse grants and that these grants will have a broader substance abuse focus. Funding for child welfare workforce development and the accompanying requirements on monthly visits to children in foster care. Additional clarification on the state tracking and reporting of the adoption maintenance-of-effort provisions as enacted by PL 110–351 will provide a greater assurance that more funds are re-invested into state child welfare systems. Clarification of the education protection for children in foster care. Provisions that will help address issue young people in foster care face with identity theft. Attention to youth rights, participation in transition planning, and connections with birth family members.

We also support the increased attention to tracking the use of psychotropic medications, the increased focus on addressing trauma, the new study on the recruitment of foster, adoptive and kin parents and we want to extend our assistance in addressing the challenges of making improvements to data collection and data matching.

We appreciate your efforts to move the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act of 2011 forward in a bipartisan/bicameral way by the end of September. The National Foster Care Coalition will promote this legislation among its membership and is pleased to provide any assistance in moving the legislation forward.

Sincerely,

THE NATIONAL FOSTER CARE COALITION.

PCSAO,
Columbus, OH, September 14, 2011.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommitte on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommitte on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BAUCUS, RANKING MEMBER HATCH, CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: Public Children Services Association of Ohio supports The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act of 2011.

As a state that has shown improved outcomes related to our budget neutral Title IV–E Protect Ohio Waiver (Ohio leads the nation with a 43% Safe Reduction in the number of children in foster care between 2002–2010; AFCARS data), we strongly support Congress' recognition that children and families in other States can also benefit from Title IV–E Waivers allowing flexible funding. We encourage you to consider broader child welfare funding reform in the near future.

Ohio's child welfare system is also extremely supportive of reauthorization of the Stephanie Tubbs Jones Child Welfare Services and Promoting Safe and Stable Families programs under the present funding. Ensuring funds to strengthen families—keeping them intact, reunifying or finding and supporting alternate permanent families—is essential for our children's well being. We know that children grow best in stable, permanent families.

The Court Improvement Program in Ohio has aided in reforming our system. Courts play a critical role in decision making and oversight related to child safety and permanency, and the CIP in Ohio has focused on timeliness, improving procedures, focused well being oversight and adapting court philosophy and procedure as more children are raised by kinship families.

Ohio is struggling with too many children coming into foster care due to pervasive addictions to prescription pain killers, heroin, and other substances—we support the substance abuse grants part of this bill, and appreciate the broader application for various substances, to allow time-limited treatment services so children can safely reunify with recovered parents.

Ohio is ready to embrace other bill provisions such as addressing issues for foster children and youth including prevention of identity theft and improving transitional youth planning, improving educational outcomes, strengthening sibling connections, and addressing the developmental needs of infants and toddlers in foster care. Our Child Fatality Review system already strives to review all available data and apply lessons and recommend improved policy to prevent future child deaths, and Ohio is dedicated to re-investing saved funds as more children become eligible for Title IV–E Adoption Assistance funds.

We appreciate your efforts to move The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act of 2011 forward in a bipartisan/bicameral way by the end of September, 2011. As elected and representative Trustees of Public Children Services Association of Ohio, we urge Congress to promptly pass this important legislation.

Please contact PCSAO's Executive Director, Crystal Ward Allen, at 614–224–5802 or crystal@pcsao.org with any questions, concerns or requests.

Sincerely,

CRYSTAL WARD ALLEN,

Executive Director, PCSAO on behalf of Public Children Services Association of Ohio, 2011 Board of Trustees:

Chip Spinning, President/Director, Madison Co. Dept. of Job & Family Services;

Denise Stewart, Vice President/Director, Mahoning County Children Services;

Randall Muth, JD, Secretary/Director, Wayne County Children Services;

Moira Weir, Treasurer/Director, Hamilton Co. Dept. of Job & Family Services;

Scott Ferris/Director, Allen County Children Services;

Andrea Reik/Director, Athens County Children Services;

Dwayne Pielech/Director Belmont Co. Dept. of Job & Family Services;

Kate Offenberger/Director, Carroll Co. Dept. of Job & Family Services;

Catherine Hill/Director Hocking County Children Services;

Teresa Alt/Director, Huron Co. Dept. of Job & Family Services;

June Cannon/Director, Miami County Children Services;

Gary Crow/Director, Lorain County Children Services;

Corey Walker/Director Paulding Co. Dept. of Job & Family Services;

Lisa Wiltshire/Director, Scioto County Children Services;

John Saros, JD/Director, Summit County Children Services.

FIRST FOCUS
CAMPAIGN FOR CHILDREN,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2011.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, U.S.Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BAUCUS, RANKING MEMBER HATCH, CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: I am writing on behalf of First Focus, a bipartisan advocacy organization committed to making children and their families a priority in federal policy and budget decisions, to thank you for your leadership and commitment to moving forward The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act of 2011 in a bicameral and bipartisan manner by the end of September 2011. We are pleased that the bill reauthorizes the Stephanie Tubbs Jones Child Welfare Services Program and the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) Program, and restores waiver authority to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. We hope that Congress will follow your lead and swiftly pass this critical legislation.

First Focus is dedicated to the long-term goal of substantially reducing the number of children entering foster care, while working to ensure that our existing system of care protects children and adequately meets the needs of families in the child welfare system. We are especially concerned with increasing our federal investments in prevention efforts and providing supports and services for at-risk families to ensure they never enter the child welfare system in the first place.

As you know, initially created in 1993, PSSF was reauthorized in 1997 under the Adoption and Safe Families Act. The program was amended in 2001 and again in 2005 as part of the Deficit Reduction Act. The 2006 Child and Family Services Improvement Act extended funding for the program until 2011. It is currently authorized through September 30, 2011. The program supports a number of critical State (and eligible tribal) child welfare activities, including family preservation services, family support services, time-limited family reunification services, and adoption promotion and support services.

PSSF is a relatively small funding stream compared to the open-ended entitlement for foster care under SSA Title IV-E, but is still critical to the work of State social service agencies given that it may be used to provide services to children and families in need and to help keep families together. In contrast to the bulk of federal child welfare funding, which is targeted solely at foster care, PSSF seeks to prevent child abuse and neglect, avoiding the removal of children in the first place while supporting timely reunification. These funds are often combined with other State and local resources as well as private funds, and support a range of services, including parenting classes that promote competencies and positive relationship skills; home-visiting services for at-risk parents as well as other family-based services; respite care for caregivers of children with special needs; and a range of other innovative programs and services for at-risk families. According to the FY 2009 National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS), states reported that they provided prevention services to more than three million children. PSSF allowed states to pay for services to 30 percent of those children. These are critical services and we believe that the reauthorization of PSSF will only strengthen the program and its core goals, ensuring its success for years to come.

We also applaud your efforts to ensure that child welfare waiver demonstration projects are reauthorized and remain a critical vehicle for promoting flexibility while fostering innovation in practice at the state level. We are especially pleased that the bill authorizes ten new demonstration projects annually for a duration of five years. While we would urge you to consider extending waiver authority beyond FY 2014, we are encouraged by your efforts to ensure that demonstrations projects continue in the near term. Absent a broader reform of the child welfare financing structure, states are in need of greater flexibility in the use of available federal child welfare funds. In addition to title IV-B programs, child welfare waiver demonstration projects are a critical vehicle for providing a broad array of support services to children and families, and promote flexibility and foster innovation in practice at the state level.

Among other provisions, we are pleased that The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act includes new requirements for states to address the emotional trauma experience by children in foster care, adopt protocols for prescribing and monitoring psychotropic medications, and describe their efforts to address the developmental needs of young children in care and reduce their length of stay in care. The bill also continues grants to address substance abuse in families with children at-risk of entering into foster care, continues funding for the Court Improvement Program, and provides needed clarification with respect to a provision in the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act related to ensuring the educational stability of foster children for each foster care placement.

First Focus stands prepared to work with you to ensure swift passage of The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act. We thank you for your leadership on this and other issues impacting children and families, and look forward to working with you to ensure better care for our nation's most vulnerable children.

Sincerely,

BRUCE LESLEY.

CWLA,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Longworth, Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Longworth, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) and our public and private member agencies that work directly with abused, neglected, and vulnerable children, youth, and their families, this letter is in support of the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (HR 2883) to reauthorize Title IV–B of the Social Security Act and restore the authority of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to authorize demonstration projects via a waiver of Title IV–E. CWLA members are located in all fifty states and provide a range of child welfare services from prevention to placement and permanency services including child protection, family support and preservation, adoptions, foster care, kinship care, and treatment services provided in residential settings. As a non-profit leadership and membership-based child welfare organization, CWLA is committed to engaging people everywhere in ensuring that all children and youth have the support that they need to grow into healthy contributing members of society.

Part I, Child Welfare Services (CWS) provides critical flexible funding for a broad range of services designed to support, preserve, and/or reunite children and their families. While we know that prevention services are underfunded, in light of current austerity we acknowledge that the maintenance of this program's $325 million authorization is positive. However, with the expectation of further cuts to discretionary funding levels over the next decade, it is critical to reiterate within this context that vulnerable children and families should be held harmless in all budget balancing strategies.

State Child Welfare Services Plans serve as a lynchpin for the continuum of strategies designed to prevent and ameliorate maltreatment. Through requirements encompassing case reviews, permanency planning, program development, agency administration, and systems collaboration activities, fundamental protections and core service provision is ensured for the vulnerable populations served with these funds. CWLA commends the subcommittee for strengthening these plans. H.R. 2883 requires the plans to respond to identified emotional trauma needs associated with maltreatment and removal, strengthens oversight of prescription medication monitoring protocols, encourages activities to reduce time in foster care and address developmental needs especially for children younger than five, and mandates the reporting of child maltreatment deaths.

Part II, Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) is an important funding stream for the operation of specific service categories. Although the services overlap, the four specified categories in PSSF create important distinctions in types of families in need. The additional targeted activities bring attention and resources to pressing needs including caseworker visits, substance abuse, court improvement, and mentoring for children of prisoners. CWLA supports the way that HR 2883 maintains this structure. Again, while we see a need for additional resources, we recognize the nation's strained financial condition. Therefore, we appreciate

the continuation of $200 million in discretionary funds and the room appropriators have to fully fund the program. In recognition of the difficulty of increasing funding, we think it is important that HR 2883 amends the reporting requirements to Congress to include actual spending in addition to planned spending by service category. We believe that increased tracking of these funds will further reveal that they are supporting necessary and effective programs for vulnerable children and families.

Courts are an integral component of the child welfare system, providing pivotal decisions of maltreatment findings and approval of permanency changes. PSSF is one of the few places in child welfare law where funding is provided for the courts. We appreciate your receptiveness to our suggestions for the continuation of the $30 million annual set-aside for the Court Improvement Program and the dedication of $1 million specifically for tribal courts and are pleased to see them both included in HR 2883. In addition, we support the way the bill bolsters court improvement plans by clarifying that they should include requirements related to concurrent planning and increasing and improving the engagement of the entire family in court processes. CWLA also applauds the enhancement of the substance abuse and mentoring grants under HR 2883. Because all children affected by parental substance abuse, regardless of the particular substance used, deserve assistance, CWLA strongly agrees with the removal of the provision giving greater weight to applicants addressing methamphetamine abuse specifically.

CWLA welcomes the bill's data standardization and improved data matching section. We understand that the administration has undertaken efforts in this direction and appreciate the recognition in both branches of government of the critical importance of sharing information across systems. CWLA is also very pleased to see the changes HR 2883 makes related to foster care and adoption, including the clarification of the educational stability requirement for children in care, the efforts to address any credit issues for foster children at least 16 years of age, and the requirement for states to document savings from the de-link of adoption assistance payments. Furthermore, we support the related requirement to document spending on post-adoption services. This is a strong recognition of the importance of supporting lasting permanency.

Title II of the bill restores the ability of HHS to authorize demonstration projects through Title IV-E waivers designed to increase permanency, improve outcomes, and prevent abuse and neglect. CWLA believes that waivers can be helpful in testing and evaluating innovative approaches within the child welfare system that have promising potential. However, CWLA does not believe that the restoration of waiver authority constitutes a comprehensive solution to the problems facing the child welfare system. More ambitious approaches to reforming the federal financing structure should be undertaken. Accordingly, CWLA supports the bill's three-year restoration of waiver authority while consensus on more comprehensive approaches is being developed. CWLA specifically supports the eligibility requirements included in HR 2883. The policy conditions have the power to encourage states to implement practices that will improve their child welfare systems and the lives of those within them.

CWLA appreciates your leadership in crafting this important legislation. HR 2883 makes positive improvements to IV–B and IV–E of the Social Security Act and we support its passage. If you have any follow up questions, feel free to contact Sean Hughes, Director of Congressional Affairs at 202–590–8772 or Suzanne Ayer, Policy Associate at 202–688–4178.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE JAMES-BROWN,
President/CEO.

SEPTEMBER 19, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: We write in support for the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (H.R. 2883) and specifically to express our appreciation for the provisions that would promote the positive development of very young children in the child welfare system. Our organizations have worked together to identify ways that all levels of government could better address the developmental needs of infants and toddlers who have been abused or neglected. This work resulted in the publication last spring of A Call to Action on Behalf of Maltreated Infants and Toddlers, which advocates for child welfare policies and practices that view the care of young children through a developmental lens. We are so pleased that the legislation you have introduced would take important steps toward infusing child welfare policy with that developmental approach.

We particularly appreciate the provision requiring state child welfare plans to include a description of activities to address the developmental needs of young children. Early brain development occurs at life-altering speeds, making infants and toddlers particularly vulnerable to the effects of abuse and neglect. Maltreatment can literally alter the chemistry of the brain, weakening its architecture and placing young children at significant risk for later cognitive, social, and emotional deficits. If child welfare practices are not oriented toward supporting this sensitive stage of development, as well as families' ability to nurture their children, they can compound the effects of maltreatment. Ensuring that child welfare practices are informed by what we know from the science of brain development can promote early intervention that will improve the outlook for these babies and avoid the costs to both child and society resulting from developmental impairments.

The significance of the legislation you have authored becomes clear when we consider that infants and toddlers represent a quarter of children who are abused and neglected and almost a third of children entering foster care. We believe it will encourage states to reexamine how they are addressing child welfare cases involving young children and consider steps to systematically promote positive development for vulnerable babies.

We appreciate your leadership in highlighting the needs of young children within federal child welfare law. We stand ready to help the Congress, the Administration, and the states in building a child welfare system that helps all young children realize their potential.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION,
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL POLICY,
CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND,
ZERO TO THREE.

ZERO TO THREE
Washington, DC, September 19, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of Zero to Three, I write to offer our support for the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (H.R. 2883) approved by the Ways and Means Committee last week. Zero to Three is a national nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting the healthy development of infants and toddlers. We believe this legislation will help ensure the well-being of our most vulnerable children: infants and toddlers in the child welfare system. We particularly appreciate the provision requiring state child welfare plans to include a description of activities to address the developmental needs of young children. This provision is a tremendous step forward for children whose development is threatened by maltreatment and, at times, foster care practices that are not informed by the science of early brain development. Other provisions adding services to enhance child development and facilitate family visitation will also promote child well-being and healing parent-child relationships.

These steps are particularly important, because infants and toddlers are the most vulnerable to maltreatment and comprise 31% of children entering foster care. The first three years of life are a time of rapid brain development, when the foundation for all learning that follows is created. Relationships are the context within which early development unfolds, so it is not surprising that babies are particularly sensitive to the effects of maltreatment. Maltreatment can literally alter the chemistry of the brain, weakening its architecture and placing young children at risk for later cognitive, social, and emotional deficits. Maltreated infants and toddlers are four to five times more likely than other young children to have developmental impairments. The removal of babies from their parents' care, coupled with foster care practices that often are not guided by their developmental needs, can compound the effects of maltreatment. The good news is that intervening early with practices that support healthy development can improve the outlook for these babies and avoid the costs to society that accompany developmental impairments.

Last spring, Zero to Three joined with American Humane Association, Center for the Study of Social Policy, Child Welfare League of America, and Children's Defense Fund to issue A Call to Action on Behalf of Maltreated Infants and Toddlers. This publication advocates for child welfare policies and practices at all levels of government that view the care of young children through a developmental lens. This legislation is the first step in answering that call. We believe it will spur states to bring the science of early brain development into their child welfare systems. We applaud your leadership in infusing this perspective into federal child welfare law and promoting positive development for vulnerable babies.

Thank you for all you do for young children who face great adversity in their lives.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW E. MELMED,
Executive Director.

□ 1330

I also want to thank the ranking member of the Human Resources Subcommittee, Mr. DOGGETT of Texas, for working with me on this legislation and for his efforts to improve how we serve children and families across the country.

Finally, I want to note that this legislation does not add to the deficit since it simply extends current funding levels of the programs that are extended.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman, Mr. DAVIS, is correct. We have worked on this together. We have participated in hearings and have learned together and cooperated on this very important subject to which we may bring differing perspectives but a common goal of wanting to respond to the needs of America's most vulnerable children.

I believe that this bipartisan legislation which I do fully support, is important; however, it is also important to understand what we support and where we have differences and to understand what this legislation accomplishes and what it fails to accomplish. This bill is certainly preferable to allowing two very important laws to expire next week.

Each year, over 700,000 children here in America become victims of abuse and neglect, perpetrated by the very people who are supposed to love and care for them. I think most Americans, as do my wife, Libby, and I, when we're back home in Texas and surrounded by Clara, Zayla, and Ella, our three granddaughters, believe it's just almost incomprehensible that parents or grandparents could cause harm to a member of their own families. Yet that is the reality that too many of our children face. One expert came to our committee during the hearing and suggested that, once every 6 hours of every day, a child dies in America as a result of abuse.

I agree that both the Child Welfare Services and the Promoting Safe and Stable Families laws should be renewed for another 5 years. I disagree that these programs should be continued at their current baseline funding levels since, with need growing and funding limited, too many of our most vulnerable children cannot access the services that they so desperately need. These are the children whose neglect not only produces problems for them, but will produce more problems for all of American society in the future. They are the children we should be helping today so that we are not incarcerating them after they have done harm to someone tomorrow.

Less than half of the children in foster care in America today receive federal assistance to help with the room and board. Today, 40 percent of children who are found to be victims of abuse and neglect don't receive any follow-up or intervention at all. That is a very big gap that will likely only grow over the course of the next 5 years with the legislation that we are renewing.

In my home State of Texas, the Promoting Safe and Stable Families Act accounts for a very significant source of funding to help our youngest Texans. According to one of our witnesses in committee, Dr. Jane Burstain of the Center for Public Policy Priorities in Austin, funding from this program accounted for $2 of every $3 supporting child abuse and neglect prevention programs last year. In San Antonio, for example, these programs provide important resources to help vulnerable families through the Bexar County Child Welfare Board.

This bill also grants States support for parental substance abuse programs. My friend Darlene Byrne, a district judge in Austin, Texas, who helped establish the Family Treatment Drug Court that was partially funded by dollars from this act that we're renewing, writes that she has seen new babies who are not drug positive, moms and couples reunify with their families, and workers receive their GEDs or high school diplomas and find employment. Those are the people that these programs help.

In short, she says that this program has contributed in transforming lives and in helping to stop the cycle of drug abuse, poverty, and violence in Texas. It is important both to those who benefit directly and to all of us who have a stake in having folks participate to the full extent of their God-given potential, not posing dangers to the rest of our society.

Today's legislation also includes, as Mr. DAVIS indicated, some modest policy changes that strengthen the States' abilities to respond to at-risk children. Mr. Speaker, the bill, I believe, leaves too many problems unresolved. I think, though, in this current climate that the renewal of the legislation as it's proposed is the best that we can do for our at-risk children. This bill reauthorizes help to at least some children who become victims of maltreatment. It provides family support and activities to some vulnerable families, and it promotes adoption services for those children who cannot safely return to their biological parents.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield 4 minutes to the former chair of this Subcommittee on Human Resources, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill to renew the Nation's child welfare programs. I'm glad to see this happening as it has in the past by unanimous consent, and it's important not just to keep these programs funded and renewed. With more than one in five children in the country living in poverty and with so many odds stacked against foster kids, we need to do more. We need to make progress. That's why I'm so supportive of this bill, because it is not just an extension of the program; it has some important and targeted innovations.

Some States, especially my home State of Washington, have some truly new ideas about how they can do more to prevent children being put into foster care even in tough economic times. One of the real innovations of this bill is to give States waivers for some governmental funding restrictions so that they can test these innovative interventions in their child welfare programs. If the States can maintain their current quality and if the innovations they want to try meet solid criteria, the Federal Government should be a partner in making real progress. That's what these new waivers do.

Washington State is one of the leaders in innovating child welfare policy, and it has some things it has been eager to try out. Right now, the law doesn't allow for this kind of experimentation, but this bill gives States a way to begin. Washington State is not alone. There is room for 10 States to have these kinds of programs. There are some States already ready to make these moves.

Now, the Department of Health and Human Services allowed this kind of thing in the past, but it was allowed to lapse. This is really an extension of something we've had before. HHS was allowed to give out a number of waivers in the past, and some progress was made in a number of States. This bill restores that limited waiver authority and sets out criteria to keep the integrity and level of effort they need to have. We need to allow these States to do it.

In addition to extending the program and making more room for innovation, the bill does something else that's really important. In 2008, we passed the Fostering Connections and Increasing Adoptions law. This Fostering Connections law did a lot of good in helping foster kids have a better chance of truly making it in this country. Among other things, it addressed the health concerns of foster children who moved from home to home and from health care setting to health care setting, and it required States to develop health coordination plans for these kids so that they had some continuity of care. These plans had to include oversight of prescription medications, including psychotropic drugs.

As a psychiatrist who has worked with children in child welfare and the juvenile justice system, I am very concerned about the use of psychotropic drugs. It has bothered me for a long time. In the fostering care population, it is a particularly vulnerable group because of this question of continuity of care. You want somebody to be monitoring what's happening as they move from home to home to home. We need

to do more. We need to get a clearer picture of what is happening with these kinds of medications in the foster kids, and we need to make sure they are being used properly and are not overly prescribed.

□ 1340

One of the parts about this whole law that's crazy is that when a kid gets to 18 they could be on a medication. When they hit 18, they're done. Their Medicaid ends. They have no continuity of the drugs. They go off cold turkey. So there's some real questions that we need to answer here.

This bill takes the 2008 requirements another step forward and it requires States to adopt protocols for using and monitoring psychotropic medications among foster children.

Mr. Speaker, I speak strongly in favor of the bill and urge my colleagues to say ''yea.''

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from California (Ms. BASS), one of the leaders on this subject of foster children, who came and testified to our committee based on her long experience working in the State of California in the assembly on this subject.

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2883, the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act. As cochair of the bipartisan Congressional Caucus on Foster Care, I am proud to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in support of this important legislation.

Youth in the child welfare system fight for what so many of us take for granted—a family. In California, my home State, the Nation's largest foster care system in any given year, as many as 100,000 children can be placed in temporary out-of-home care. Foster parents and relatives are the frontline caregivers for children when their parents are unable to care for them.

A pool of dedicated, loving foster parents is critical for our Nation's foster youth as they wait to be reunited with their parents or achieve permanency with a relative caregiver or adoptive family. However, there is a significant shortage of foster parents.

In May, I introduced legislation calling for a study to find out how to best recruit and retain foster parents. This was included in the original House bill reauthorizing title IV–B child welfare programs introduced in August. I'm pleased that the modified bill before us today includes a provision that encourages States to develop and implement a plan to improve the recruitment and retention of high-quality foster family homes.

H.R. 2883 builds on some of the best practices that were shared with me as I've traveled California hearing from youth, child welfare workers, and parents. The bill also appropriately addresses challenges facing the child welfare system by requiring States to address emotional trauma in foster children and to adopt protocols for using and monitoring psychotropic medications.

I am very pleased with the comments of my colleague, Mr. MCDERMOTT, who talked about the use of psychotropics, and I would just add that, in too many cases, the children are prescribed multiple medications. And in talking with a number of youth up and down the State of California, one of the things that many youths said to me was, Can you please help me get off the medication.

I would like to thank Ways and Means Chairman CAMP, Ranking Member LEVIN, Human Resources Subcommittee Chair GEOFF DAVIS, and Ranking Member DOGGETT for their unwavering commitment to our most vulnerable youth.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who has been very active in a Foster Youth Financial Security Act.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act.

This bill includes a provision from the Foster Youth Financial Security Act that I introduced with my colleague from California (Mr. STARK) to address disturbingly high rates of identity theft among foster youth. I, along with many others, was absolutely outraged to find that foster children are disproportionately victims of identity theft since their personal information passes through so many hands.

Mr. Speaker, as I saw firsthand when my parents welcomed foster youth into our home over many years, they already faced tremendous obstacles without the increased threat of having their identity taken and their credit ruined, which prevents them from finding a place to live, accessing credit on their own, or obtaining other basic needs.

This bill would ensure that each foster youth over 16 years of age receives free credit checks before leaving the system and assistance clearing any inaccuracies that may have come to light. Reports have shown that if done effectively, the cost is minimal.

I want to thank, Mr. Speaker, the committee for their interest in this issue and the many advocates who have championed this cause. This is only the first step in providing foster youth the tools that they need and deserve to succeed, and I look forward to our continued work together on this issue.

As I pointed out so many times, the kids in foster care already face significant challenges of their own of a personal nature. It is a shame that their identity is stolen and they're further victimized. This bill would identify problems early on and clear up the inaccuracies so they can start their adult life with a fresh start with their credit intact.

I thank both gentlemen, the chair, and the ranking member for their outstanding support of this provision.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, some in this House have suggested earlier in the year that the programs embodied in this legislation, and everything else that opens opportunities through government support from Pell Grants to Title I funding for education to the school lunch program to Head Start, that all of these are ''welfare'' and should be cut. Fortunately, that approach is not being taken here today. We are reauthorizing, in a bipartisan way, these two very important programs that would expire next week.

Mr. Speaker, however, it should be noted that, much like somebody might be flatlined, we are flat funding the renewal of these programs, meaning that in 5 years we are authorizing the same amount of money for these programs, if it can be appropriated, that existed last year. That means that there are many needs in our country that will not be fully addressed in this legislation. It means that last year, if less than half of those in foster care received support for food and board, they will be in the same situation over the course of this legislation. It means that the 40 percent of children who are subject to abuse and neglect are unlikely to be able to access services as they were last year.

But renewing this legislation remains, despite those deficiencies, an important accomplishment in the current political environment. And, as Mr. DAVIS and a number of other speakers have noted, we have made some modest improvements.

Another of those not touched on yet is our work in this legislation to ensure that children in foster care can stay in the schools that they started in, even though they may be moved between families. That's an important part of adding a little certainty to the lives of children who have been abused or neglected and find themselves with a great deal of uncertainty.

It is for the improvements in this act and the recognition of what harm would be done if this act were not adopted here in a bipartisan way that so many child advocacy groups have joined in supporting it—the Child Welfare League of America, First Focus, Zero to Three—as well as groups of those organizations that are involved in administering some of these funds: the National Conference of State Legislatures, the American Public Human Services Association, and the Conference of State Court Administrators.

□ 1350

I believe this legislation is important. It's important to get it adopted promptly. I hope the Senate will respond to our bipartisan approval today, as Mr. DAVIS has suggested they have already begun to do in the committee process, and move forward to see it fully adopted by next week. I urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), for working with me to bring this measure to the floor today and thank him and thank both the majority and minority staffs for their hard work on this effort. H.R. 2883 is a bipartisan, bicameral, no-cost effort to extend and make modest adjustments to programs designed to help ensure the safety and well-being of children at risk of abuse and neglect. We need to do all we can to ensure more children remain safely in their homes, and this bill will help to do so.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF STATE LEGISLATURES,
September 13, 2011.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, House Ways & Means, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. SANDY LEVIN,
Ranking Member, House Ways & Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP AND REPRESENTATIVE LEVIN: On behalf of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), we urge you to support H.R. 2883, a bill to renew the authority of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to approve demonstration projects designed to test innovative strategies in state child welfare programs and reauthorizing the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) program. Congressmen Geoff Davis and Lloyd Doggett have fashioned bipartisan legislation that helps create opportunities to enhance the state-federal partnership to assist our nation's most vulnerable children.

NCSL supports reinstating and expanding federal waiver authority so that states can test the results of increased funding flexibility on the development of service alternatives and on the overall delivery of child welfare services. This allows states to target programs to address the needs of their youngest citizens. By renewing and extending Title IV–E waiver authority through 2014, H.R. 2883 will give states an enhanced ability to provide early intervention and crisis intervention services that will safely reduce out-of-home placements and improve child outcomes.

NCSL supports the reauthorization of the PSSF program. The PSSF program enhances state efforts to develop additional family preservation, family reunification, and family support programs. We appreciate the flexibility provided to states in H.R. 2883 and that the legislation does not preempt current state laws.

H.R. 2883 will allow states to improve the quality of their child welfare interventions and reinvest savings in their programs. It will also provide both state and federal legislators tools to develop innovative an effective approaches to transform the lives of children who are at risk of abuse and neglect. We applaud Congressmen Davis and Doggett for crafting this legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM T. POUND,
Executive Director, NCSL.

NATIONAL INDIAN
CHILD WELFARE ASSOCIATION,
Portland, OR, September 13, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS, *Chair,*
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, *Ranking Member,*
House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources.
Hon. MAX BAUCUS, *Chair,*
Hon. ORRIN HATCH, *Ranking Member,*
Senate Finance Committee.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES DAVIS AND DOGGETT AND SENATORS BAUCUS AND HATCH: The National Indian Child Welfare Association (NICWA) writes this letter in support of the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (HR 2883/S 1542) which would reauthorize programs under Title IV–B of the Social Security Act—Stephanie Tubbs Jones Child Welfare Services; Promoting Safe and Stable Families; Regional Partnerships on substance abuse; and the Court Improvement Program.

Committee staff on both sides of the aisle has been most open to meeting with us, and we thank them for their hard work and interest in more heavily involving Indian and Alaska Native communities in these programs. We especially thank Sonja Nesbit, Ryan Martin, Diedra Henry-Spires, and Becky Shipp.

NICWA has worked on several reauthorizations of Title IV–B, notably in 2006 when a number of improvements were enacted regarding tribal participation. The 2006 Act increased tribal allocations and provided common sense flexibility for tribal administration of the programs.

In fiscal year 2011, 170 tribes/tribal organizations received $6.2 million from the Child Welfare Services Program and 126 tribes/tribal consortia received $11 million from the Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program. In addition, tribes are the lead grantee in six of the 53 Regional Partnerships substance abuse grants.

The Title IV–B program that has bypassed tribes is the Court Improvement Program and we are most grateful for the breakthrough on this matter in the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act. The bill would, for the first time, make tribes eligible to apply for competitive grants for this program and would allocate $1 million annually for this purpose. There is a great need in Indian Country for assistance for tribal courts work in the area of child welfare. We also appreciate the provision which would allow tribes operating Title IV–E (Foster Care and Adoption Assistance) programs to apply for waivers for child welfare demonstration projects.

Again, thank you. We look forward to continuing to work with you on child welfare matters.

Sincerely,

TERRY L. CROSS,
Executive Director.

YOUTH VILLAGES,
September 13, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS, *Chairman,*
Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, *Ranking Member,*
Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of Youth Villages, I am writing in support of your bill, H.R. 2883, and to thank you for your leadership on this issue. This legislation provides for the extension of the important Promoting Safe and Stable Families program as well as critical authority for the Department of Health and Human Services to extend the Title IV–E waiver program, which has demonstrated substantial impact since creation in 1994. These waivers provide states with greater flexibility in the use of Federal funds for alternative services and supports that promote safety, permanency and well-being for children in the child protection and foster care system.

Youth Villages is a leader in innovative and effective services for troubled youth and their families. Since 2008, Youth Villages has had the opportunity to work collaboratively with several local, privatized child welfare organizations, known as Community Based Care agencies in implementing Florida's Title IV–E waiver. Youth Villages has three offices in Florida and is working with local entities to implement our intensive in-home Intercept services, identify and serve underserved or 'stuck' populations, and provide them with outcome data to support the impact of their waiver effort.

As a result of the flexibility afforded by the Title IV–E waiver, intensive reunification and targeted prevention services are given greater focus in the state's child welfare service approach. Without the award of the waiver, it would have been difficult for Youth Villages to expand its Intercept program into the state to serve the child welfare population. In the three years that Youth Villages has been operating in Florida, we have served over 300 children across the Central and Southern regions of the state at a significantly lower cost than traditional child welfare placement services. More importantly, they have achieved such outcomes as: over 70% of children still at home, over 80% having graduated or actively engaged in school, and over 80% having had no trouble with the law six months after discharge from services.

Youth Villages pledges its full support of H.R. 2883, as this legislation has the ability to transform the child welfare system from one that incentivizes out-of-home placement to a system that promotes in-home treatment and family unification.

Regards,

PATRICK LAWLER,
CEO, Youth Villages.

VOICE FOR ADOPTION,
Washington, DC, September 14, 2011.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Hart Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Longworth House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Hart Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Cannon House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN BAUCUS AND DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBERS HATCH AND DOGGETT: On behalf of Voice for Adoption's members I am writing to thank you for your leadership and your bipartisan and bicameral effort to introduce the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (S. 1542/H.R. 2883). Voice for Adoption (VFA) is a membership advocacy organization; we speak out for our nation's 107,000 waiting children in foster care. Our members, who are spread across the country, recruit families to adopt children and youth with special needs. VFA members also provide vital support services both before and after adoption finalization to

help adoptive families through the challenges they often face raising children with painful pasts.

Voice for Adoption supports this legislation, which acts to reauthorize two major child welfare programs, the Stephanie Tubbs Jones Child Welfare Services Program and the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) program. Under the PSSF program the adoption promotion and support services category provides funding to recruit and support families for children who are waiting to be adopted.

We commend the authors of this bill for not only acting in a bipartisan/bicameral manner, but also for making potentially impacting improvements in the reauthorization of these programs. We applaud the strengthening of language that requires states to document the use of dollars saved from the federal adoption assistance de-link, created under the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–351). Voice for Adoption hopes that through future guidance States are encouraged to spend a portion of these adoption delink funds on post-adoption support services. VFA also supports other important improvements made in the bill including: the requirement for better reporting on post-adoption services spending and transparency to access this data, the requirement of States to address the developmental needs of young children and reducing their amount of time spent in foster care, the requirement of States to address emotional trauma and the clarification of educational protections for children in foster care, the requirement for state protocols and procedures relating to the use of psychotropic medications, ID theft issues for foster youth, inclusion of state waivers and measures that include quality of care improvements for foster children.

Voice for Adoption is proud to support this bipartisan/bicameral legislation, as it exists to reauthorize programs that protect children and families and promote both permanency and support for children in foster care. We are also happy to inform and encourage our members to support this bill.

Sincerely,

NICOLE DOBBINS,
Executive Director.

ASSOCIATION ON
AMERICAN INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Rockville, MD, September 14, 2011.

Re H.R. 2883 and S. 1542.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS, *Chair,*
Hon. ORRIN HATCH, *Ranking Member,*
Senate Finance Committee.
Hon. GEOFF DAVIS, *Chair,*
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, *Ranking Member,*
House Ways and Means Committee, Subcommittee on Human Resources.

DEAR SENATORS BAUCUS AND HATCH AND REPRESENTATIVES DAVIS AND DOGGETT: Thank you for your introduction of H.R. 2883 and S. 1542, the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act. The Association on American Indian Affairs (AAIA) strongly supports this legislation.

AAIA is an 89 year old Indian advocacy organization located in South Dakota and Maryland and governed by an all-Native American Board of Directors. We have been involved with Indian child welfare issues for decades, including working closely with the House and Senate on tribal provisions in the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 and the Fostering Connections to Success and Promoting Adoptions Act of 2008.

We are particularly supportive of the provisions in both bills that would allocate $1 million for competitive Court Improvement Program grants to Indian tribal courts and allow tribes operating Title IV–E programs to apply for waivers for child welfare demonstration projects. We also appreciate and support the language that would make the definition of Indian tribes consistent in both Parts 1 and 2 of Title 1V–B.

Once again, thank you for your support of this legislation and these tribal issues and to the House and Senate staff (Sonja Nesbit, Ryan Wilson, Diedra Henry-Spires and Becky Shipp) that have been so helpful in this process.

Sincerely,

JACK F. TROPE,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION,
September 14, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives.
Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Finance Committee, U.S. Senate.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Finance Committee, U.S. Senate.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS, CONGRESSMAN DOGGETT, CHAIRMAN BAUCUS AND SENATOR HATCH: American Humane Association extends its support to the reforms made through the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act.

Through the joint efforts of the House and Senate and the leadership of both parties, we believe you have written a strong bill to reauthorize the Child Welfare Services and Promoting Safe and Stable Families programs (Title IV–B part 1 and part 2).

In testifying last June in the United States House of Representatives, the American Humane Association outlined a number of important changes that could be made through this reauthorization. We appreciate and support the inclusion of many of those recommendations as well as several other provisions in this legislation that we believe will assist children and families touched by the child welfare system. Some of the key provisions of this bill that we see as particularly important include:

The greater attention placed on the care and the development of infants and toddlers who come into contact with the child welfare system;

The continuation of the substance abuse grants and that these grants will have a broader substance abuse focus;

The bill's continued funding for child welfare workforce development, the stronger language on workforce support and the accompanying requirements on monthly visits to children in foster care;

The clarification on the state tracking and reporting of the adoption maintenance-of-effort provisions as enacted by PL 110–351 (Fostering Connections Act);

The clarification on access to education for children in foster care;

The continuation of court improvement funding; and

The attention paid to the problem of identity theft for children and youth in foster care.

In addition there are several other improvements in this legislation in regard to reports by the Department of Health and Human Services and the extension of waiver authority which we have also talked positively of in past statements to both the House and Senate Committees.

Once again we restate our appreciation of your efforts to move this forward in a bipartisan fashion with all due speed. Please feel free to reach out to the American Humane Association for any additional assistance in moving forward with this legislation and other matters before your committees.

Sincerely,

JOHN SCIAMANNA,
Director, Policy and Government Affairs, Child Welfare.

NORTH AMERICAN COUNCIL
ON ADOPTABLE CHILDREN,
St. Paul, MN, September 16, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Longworth House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Cannon House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES DAVIS AND DOGGETT: On behalf of the North American Council on Adoptable Children (NACAC), I am writing to express our support for the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (H.R. 2883). We are grateful for your leadership in introducing this important legislation and strongly believe it will improve the lives of vulnerable children and their families.

NACAC is an adoption support and advocacy organization with more than 1,000 members nationwide. We represent adoptive and foster parents, adoptees, adoption professionals, parent support groups, and adoption agencies and organizations. Since 1974, we have supported the right of every child to have a permanent, loving family and advocated for adoptive families to receive necessary supportive services.

NACAC strongly supports the Stephanie Tubbs Jones Child Welfare Services Program and the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) program. In particular, we are happy that the PSSF program has required states to designate at least 20 percent of the funds to adoption support and promotion services. These funds have been used across the country to recruit families for foster children who cannot return home and to support families raising these children with special needs.

We were pleased that H.R. 2883 will continue these valuable efforts while also adding several enhancements. We strongly support requiring states to document how they spend the funds reinvested as a result of the maintenance of effort provision of the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, which expanded federal eligibility for Title IV–E adoption assistance. In addition, however, NACAC would recommend that the legislation require states to spend a portion of these reinvestment funds on post-adoption services. Since special needs adoptions generate this additional revenue for states, it is reasonable to request that a specific portion of the funds be invested in post-adoption services. As you well know, the majority of children adopted from foster care have significant special needs, and post-adoption services ensure these children have the best chance of being adopted and for living successfully in safe and stable families.

Again, we thank you for your commitment to children and families through your introduction of the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act.

Sincerely,

JOE KROLL,
Ececutive Director.

AMERICAN PUBLIC
HUMAN SERVICES ASSOCIATION,
September 16, 2011.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BAUCUS, RANKING MEMBER HATCH, CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of the American Public Human Services Association (APHSA), I write to thank you for your leadership in introducing the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act of 2011. This legislation addresses the importance of prevention programs and support of community-based services for children and families at risk or in crisis, including through extending grant authority to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) for new child welfare waivers through 2014. This legislation also reinforces Congress's recognition of the need for state flexibility and accountability to enable public agencies to be good stewards of public funds and to manage performance, self-correct, innovate and enhance their ability to achieve positive outcomes.

The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act reauthorizes two essential prevention and family support programs and outlines key improvements to child welfare practices designed to improve outcomes for at-risk children, youth and families. APHSA members appreciate the changes to the current methodology for calculating monthly caseworker visits. These provisions are closely linked with the recommendations that APHSA and The National Association of Public Child Welfare Administrators (NAPCWA) presented before the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources during the ''Hearing on Protecting At-Risk Youth.'' The change in calculation will not only better reflect states' performance on this indicator, but also highlight the diligent efforts made by casework staff.

APHSA and our member agencies fully support the efforts to address children's emotional and behavioral health needs and welcome stronger, more collaborative partnerships with other agencies across the human service continuum to meet the enhanced data and tracking provisions outlined in the bill.

APHSA also fully supports the renewal and expansion of the HHS Secretary's authority to grant waivers for states to flexibly use IV–E funds to test innovative strategies in child welfare programs. Earlier this year, APHSA provided comments, concerns and recommendations to the previous House and Senate proposed waiver bills (H.R 1194 and S. 1013) and are pleased to see that the current bill includes provisions consistent with our member states' practices, as well as new provisions that conform to our member states' views.

APHSA members are pleased to see the time period to operate a waiver expanded to five years. We are also pleased to see that states can apply for a waiver by implementing two program improvement areas and that only one of them needs to be a new program. APHSA also appreciates the clarification that states currently operating waivers and successfully achieving outcomes will be allowed to continue those improvements as this bill expands the program to 10 new demonstration projects. In these current budgetary times, it is critical for new waiver states to innovate their practices and service array, while current waiver states increase the knowledge and evidentiary base for programs and practices that work.

APHSA also fully supports reauthorization of the Court Improvement Program. The Court Improvement Program allows our member agencies to work in close partnership with their state and local judicial system to meet the safety, permanency and well-being needs of children in a timely and complete manner. This program also supports the essential cross-system training of judges, attorneys and other legal representatives in child welfare cases.

Once again, we look forward to continuing the work of improving services and outcomes for at risk children. We continue to be available as a resource as regulations and guidance is developed to meet the provisions of the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovations Act of 2011.

Sincerely,

TRACY L. WAREING,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CPAS,
Washington, DC, September 20, 2011.

Re The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act, H.R. 2883.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of the 377,000 members of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), I am writing in support of your legislation, H.R. 2883, the ''Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act.'' The bill calls for grantees of Federal funds under the Child Welfare Services program and the Safe and Stable program to report certain data to the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), and for DHHS to develop a rule designating standard data elements and data reporting requirements for the information to be reported. The legislation specifies that DHHS ''shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate existing nonproprietary standards, such as eXtensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL).''

The use of data tagging to enhance both the transparency and the ability to analyze financial and other data has been proved time and time again. XBRL provides a detailed yet customizable approach to gathering data and will provide significant transparency to the Federal government and the American people regarding the use of taxpayer funds.

XBRL has been used for a number of years by the Federal government in areas such as Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation call reports and public company financial reporting to the Securities and Exchange Commission. Importantly, such standardized business reporting is also expanding in both the United States by state governmental agencies and worldwide, where data standards are being leveraged to significantly reduce the compliance reporting burden and, at the same time, enhance the usability and transparency of reported information. Including provisions to require reporting of information under the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act will make the reporting process more efficient and enhance comparability of such information for DHHS, the Congress, and other stakeholders who need to monitor and analyze the use of these funds.

Thank you again for your leadership on this important issue. We are also happy to discuss with you additional areas where implementation of data standards can further enhance reporting and make it more valuable to all types of stakeholders of data. If you have any questions, or if we can be of any further assistance, please contact Diana Huntress Deem.

Sincerely,

BARRY C. MELANCON, CPA,
President and CEO.

CONFERENCE OF CHIEF JUSTICES,
CONFERENCE OF STATE COURT ADMINISTRATORS,
Washington, DC.

Re Child and Family Services Act (HR 2883).

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators, we write to support the Child and Family Services Act that includes reauthorization of the three Court Improvement Program (CIP) grant programs through FY 2016 at the current $30 million level. The three Court Improvement Program (CIP) grant programs are critical for state courts as they provide the only federal funds to state courts for the purpose of improving state court oversight of abuse and neglect cases; and have been invaluable in assisting courts to improve and expedite our processes and procedures. These funds have resulted in abused and neglected children moving more expeditiously to safe and permanent homes and improved outcomes for children in need of protection. Our work, however, is not complete, so the reauthorization of these funds will allow us to continue our work to improve results for these children.

We appreciate the new purpose which would allow CIP funds to be used ''to increase and improve engagement of the entire family in court processes relating to child welfare, family preservation, family reunification, and adoption''. This new purpose provides state courts with greater flexibility in the use of the funds. We also support the provision that would allow state courts to submit a single application for the three CIP grants. This will allow state courts to eliminate duplicative paperwork and reporting, which will free up time for reform efforts. While the legislation reduces the amount of funds available to state courts, we do understand the need to also provide financial assistance to tribal courts.

Thank you again for your efforts on behalf of state courts. If we can provide you with additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us or Kay Farley, who is with the Government Relations Office of the National Center for State Courts.

Sincerely,

CHIEF JUDGE ERIC T. WASHINGTON,
President, Conference of Chief Justices.
ROSALYN W. FRIERSON,
President, Conference of State Court Administrators.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Child and Family Services Improvement

and Innovation Act (H.R. 2883). This legislation shows that we can work together across the aisle to improve our child welfare system. Yet this bill is just one step in our ongoing efforts to fix the foster care system. In this time of unacceptable poverty and inequality, we must continue to support families in order to prevent kids from being neglected or abused. As we debate how to shrink our debt, we must also ensure that preserving and improving the safety net that protects our children is a higher priority than protecting special interest tax breaks.

Despite the fact that I am not on the Human Resources Subcommittee for the first time in many years, I am pleased that my colleagues still listen to some of my ideas. Last year, Congressman LANGEVIN and I introduced a bill to reduce the high number of foster youth who are victims of identity theft and are unable to secure student loans or even get a credit card. Today's legislation includes a provision from our bill that will provide youth who are about to age out of foster care with a copy of their credit report as well as resources to help clear up any credit issues. This provision is what I hope is the first movement toward ensuring that foster youth leave the system with a clean financial slate and a chance to succeed.

There are many important provisions in today's bill: maintaining a set-aside to support caseworker visits with foster children; decreasing the overuse of psychotropic drugs on foster youth, and improving education stability for children in care.

Children in foster care are our collective responsibility. The reforms made in this bill will make children safer. I thank the Chairman, the ranking Member, and all the staff involved in crafting this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2883, ''The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act,'' which reauthorize Title IV–B of the Social Security Act, including the Promoting Safe and Stable Families and Child Welfare Services programs, while also reinstating the authority of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to authorize States to implement innovative demonstration programs through Title IV–E waivers.

As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I have been a stalwart supporter of protecting the health and welfare of children and families. Today there are more than 463,000 children and youth that are in out-of-home care. Every day, more than a half million U.S. children are in the foster care system with over 120,000 waiting to be adopted. With no permanent legal guardians, they are our Nation's children, and we have a responsibility to ensure a bright future for those who are handed a rough start in life. Foster children like all children deserve a safe environment to grow and nourish in. This piece of legislation is a step in the right direction in addressing the needs of our Nation's children when they need our help the most. There are many silent heroes who have opened their homes and taken on the role of foster parents, social workers, mentors, caregivers and volunteers to the children in this Nation. These young kids need to know someone is looking out for them and supporting legislation like the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act provides these silent heroes with additional resources and requirements to meet the needs of children in care.

There are an estimated 12 million foster care alumni in the U.S. representing all walks of life. Each and every one of the 12 million alumni has a story of their struggles, challenges and success. The Foster care system is supposed to ensure that children are cared for by members of our communities on a full-time or temporary basis when their parents are unable to provide adequate care. Often the natural parents cannot provide for a child's care for a variety of reasons such as due to incarceration, physical or mental illness, behavioral difficulties, or problems within the family environment. These issues may include child abuse, alcoholism, extreme poverty, or crime. These children often become wards of the State and we have the responsibility to protect their interests and to ensure they are provided with the care they need.

If even a single child continues to be abused or neglected while under state supervision then that is one child too many. This legislation, although not ideal, is a valid attempt to address the needs of families in crisis. In 2001, an estimated 903,000 U.S. children were found to be victims of abuse or neglect. This number is above the estimated 879,000 child maltreatment victims in 2000 but below the annual estimated highs of more than 1 million child maltreatment victims recorded through the mid-1990s. For the year 2001, States reported 59 percent of these victims experienced neglect, compared to 63 percent in 2000 and 58 percent in 1999. The percentage of physical abuse and sexual abuse victims has declined over the past 5 years but held constant between 2000 and 2001. These children need our protection. There are over 500,000 children in foster care and with this economic downturn I hope this number does not keep on rising. But hope is not enough, we need to continue to fund programs to help these children and their families.

The size of the foster care caseload rises or falls depending upon both the number of entries to foster care—children who are removed from their homes in a given year—and the number of exits in that same year—children reunited with their families, adopted, emancipated, or placed in another permanent setting. The number of entries to foster care has outpaced the number of exits for two decades.

Accountability is key, children who received ''services from Child Protective Services died as a result of abuse 16 times more often than children in the general population 16.3 percent of all fatalities were children who had received services or were 'known to the system'. These children were already in a high risk category however, we must do our best to transform these numbers and ensure their safety. Currently at least 716 thousand children received ''services'' (28 States reporting) or 1 percent of the general population. If CPS intervention had no effect, 1 percent of this group would have suffered a fatality; if CPS intervention had made an improvement, the percentage would be less than 1 percent. However, it is 16.3 times that amount. (18 States reporting)

At this time children are again bearing the brunt of families in crisis. When a household falls into poverty, children are exposed to increased parental distress, inadequate childcare arrangements, and poor nutrition. This will lead to an increase of families needing child welfare services. For these reasons I support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2883, 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. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2608, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 405 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 405

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 399 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 405 provides for a closed rule for the consideration of H.R. 2608. It's a temporary continuing resolution that will fund the operations of the

United States Government through November 18 of this year. It is important to note that the funding levels in this CR are the very same fiscally responsible levels that this Congress and President Barack Obama approved in the Budget Control Act just 1 month ago. This is not a departure from our path of restoring fiscal sanity, Mr. Speaker. We are committed to continuing on that path. But, unfortunately, the actions of the other body leave us no choice but to consider this continuing resolution today.

I take no pride, Mr. Speaker, in sharing with you—actually, that's not true. That's not true at all. I take great pride in sharing with you what the House has done over the last 6 months, 7 months, 8 months; but I take no pride at all in pointing out what has not happened on the other end of this Capitol to do the work that needs to be done.

Constitutionally, we are required to fund the operations of the government. June 2 of this year, the House passed the Homeland Security appropriations bill. To date, the Senate has not.

On June 14 of this year, the House passed the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs bill. This is the one bill that our friends in the Senate have passed as well.

June 16, the House passed the Agriculture appropriations bill. To date, the Senate has taken no action at all.

July 15, the House passed the Energy and Water appropriations bill. To date, the Senate has not.

July 22, the House passed the Legislative Branch appropriations bill. To date, the Senate has not.

Mr. Speaker, I did not run for Congress last November, I did not show up here as a freshman to continue business as usual, passing continuing resolution after continuing resolution after continuing resolution. And I know my friends on both sides of the aisle believe that's a process which has long since exceeded its usefulness.

I am so proud that we as a body have begun to pass those appropriations bills one by one by one. And what have we gotten because of that? We've gotten oversight. We've had the opportunity to discuss line by line by line what are our priorities as the House. Now, those priorities differ from time to time between my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle and my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, but we have an opportunity at least to discuss those priorities.

When the other body fails to pass the appropriations bills, what choices do we have left? What choices are available to me as a new freshman Member of the House? I could choose to abrogate responsibility. I could choose to say no. No, we're just going to wait, and if the Senate fails to act, then so be it. Let the government shut down and let the chips fall where they may. That's not the kind of operation I want to run. That's not why I came to the United States Congress. I came to the United States Congress because this is the people's House. This is where thoughtful discussion of the people's priorities takes place.

What brings me to the floor today is to consider this continuing resolution that for just 1½ short months, through November 18, will extend the operations of the government so we can continue that thoughtful discussion that I know so many of the Members here came for.

With that, I urge my colleagues to thoughtfully consider this rule today, thoughtfully consider the underlying bill; and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because our colleagues in the Republican majority have failed. They failed the most basic responsibility of this institution, as my colleague has mentioned, to pass regular and routine bills to keep the government's doors open, to keep retirement checks in the mail, and vital government services available to the American people.

In a few days the fiscal year will end; and without a stopgap measure, funding for essential government services will run out. Despite 9 months of claims from the Republican majority that things have changed and despite a pledge to America that promised a different Washington, and despite endless calls for a regular appropriations process, not a single appropriations bill has been enacted for the upcoming fiscal year which begins October 1.

Throughout this failed process, the majority has blamed everyone but themselves. They have pointed fingers at President Obama, complained about our colleagues in the Senate, and blamed the Washington status quo that they say they can't control. Throughout the process, the one group of people they won't lay responsibility with is themselves.

After 9 months with not a single bill successfully making its way through Congress, finger-pointing rings hollow. Not only has no appropriations bill been enacted, but half of the necessary appropriations bills haven't even been brought to the floor for a vote. The majority controls this body and has used their powers to pursue sideshow legislation and dangerous games of default, but they can't schedule a vote for the most fundamental pieces of legislation that we consider every year.

As I stand here today to vote on a billion-dollar Band-Aid that will allow us to scrape by until November, the hope is by November the majority will be able to do the job they failed to do all year. Growing up, every child hopes for such a homework extension. By the time we are elected to Congress, however, we should know that our work must be handed in on time.

□ 1400

Sadly, today's legislation isn't even the biggest failure of leadership that we are facing in the House. If the press reports are accurate, we may be headed for an even bigger failure in November. In recent days, reports have surfaced that the majority plans to fund the entire Federal Government with one massive, trillion-dollar omnibus bill.

This bill would explicitly break a promise that the Republican majority made to the American people. In the Pledge to America, their leadership included a goal entitled ''advance legislative issues one at a time.'' In the document they explain, ''we will end the practice of packaging unpopular bills with must-pass legislation to circumvent the will of the American people. Instead, we will pass major legislation one issue at a time.''

During a speech at the American Enterprise Institute in 2010, Speaker BOEHNER affirmed the need to consider appropriations legislation one bill at a time, saying he wanted to do away with the concept of comprehensive spending bills. On the eve of assuming the majority in the House, Speaker BOEHNER elaborated, saying, ''I do not believe that having 2,000-page bills serves anyone's best interest. Not the House, not for the Members and not the American people.'' But, if press reports are correct, a 2,000-page bill or more is what we will get.

Let's be clear. The prospect of omnibus funding is happening for two simple reasons: First, our colleagues on the other side will not work in a bipartisan manner. There are no Democrat fingerprints on any bills that come to the floor to make the compromise necessary to reach consensus. They continue to pass legislation filled with special interest favors and ideological pursuits that the American people never asked for and don't want. As a result, the legislation is built to fail, and fail it does—over and over again.

Secondly, instead of doing the tough, unglamorous, work of the House, we have spent most of the time on ideological quests and political games. Instead of fulfilling the pledge to uphold the Constitution, the majority has worked to fulfill campaign pledges to Grover Norquist and the far right. Instead of creating jobs, our colleagues on the other side have spent months on end pushing a partisan agenda that has covered everything from the trivial to the very real dangers of default.

Instead of funding the Department of Energy, the majority has tried to micromanage our lightbulbs. Instead of funding the Nation's schools, they tried to eliminate Big Bird. Instead of funding the EPA, they tried to sell the land surrounding the Grand Canyon to the state-owned mining companies of Russia and South Korea. Instead of funding cancer research conducted by the NIH, they have tried, repeatedly, to repeal health care reform. And instead of setting a responsible budget for the next fiscal year, they brought our economy to the brink of default and led to the first-ever downgrade of our Nation's credit.

Even today, our colleagues on the other side are injecting politics into a stopgap CR. Today we are considering legislation that will only provide disaster relief to hurricane victims if billions of dollars are taken from a successful alternative energy program that has created 39,000 jobs to date and is poised to create 60,000 more. We were told in the Rules Committee that this was money simply lying there.

In effect, the other side of the aisle is telling the American people that Congress will either help rebuild shattered communities or Congress will create new green jobs, but we refuse to do both. This immoral approach reflects a House of Representatives that is void of responsible leadership from those in charge.

Today I'll do the little bit that I can to provide leadership sorely lacking from those in charge. Mr. Speaker, if we can defeat the previous question at the end of this debate, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that disaster victims get the help they need. My amendment will allow Representative DINGELL to offer a motion to strike the unacceptable House language that says all disaster aid must be offset and substitute the bipartisan Senate approach.

Since 2004, American taxpayers have spent over $3.4 billion on infrastructure in Afghanistan and even more in Iraq. Not a single one of those $3.4 billion was held hostage or offset by any program in our budget. But now, as many Americans are struggling to rebuild and get their lives back to normal, the majority refuses to help unless they are allowed to defund a successful program they happen to dislike. Remember, what this says is that the American public is financing the reconstruction of Afghanistan and Iraq with taxpayer money, but taxpayer money without an offset will not be used to help the American taxpayer. That takes a lot of explaining.

Because the majority decided that pursuing a partisan agenda was more important than meeting the basic needs of the country, we face the prospect of a trillion dollar, 1,000-page bill to keep the government running because the other side will not stop playing politics and start governing as we are all expected to do. This failure is a disservice to the American people, an abdication of our responsibilities as legislators, and a shame to the expectations, responsibilities and duties of the House.

The majority rode into Washington vowing to change the ways of the past, but over the last 9 months, the American people have witnessed a case study in abandoned responsibilities and misguided priorities. Until the Republican majority begins to govern with responsibility, I fear this Congress will continue to live up to the low regard our Nation has for it, which brings shame on us all. I urge my colleagues on the other side to stop serving their political interests, start doing bipartisan bills, and start serving our country.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 5 minutes to a gentleman who has presided over the most open Rules Committee in recent memory, not just a chairman, but my chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding and congratulate him on his stellar management of this very important rule.

Mr. Speaker, I've been listening to the remarks of my very good friend and distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and I have to say that as I listen to the remarks, I'm going to keep my hands to my side. I'm not going to point the finger of blame at anybody. I'm simply going to state a few facts that I think are important for all the Members of this House to look at.

It's true, the last 9 months under this Republican majority have been very difficult, very painful, and very challenging for us as we've been tackling the challenge of job creation and economic growth. There's a reason that we have had such a difficult time in the last 9 months here in this Congress. And the reason is very simple: Last year, for the first time in nearly three decades since the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act was established, we didn't even have a budget proposed from the then-majority.

And the fact that there was no budget proposed in the last Congress to deal with the very important spending priorities that we, as a Nation, needed to address, and the fact that we had not one single appropriations bill, not one single appropriations bill, completed in the last Congress—we inherited at the beginning of this year, and Democrats and Republicans alike will acknowledge it, we inherited a hell of a mess. It was a big mess that we inherited. And guess what? We decided that we were going to tackle that mess in a bipartisan way.

My friend who has just talked about the need for bipartisanship, we began in dealing with the appropriations process with, as Members will recall, being here for hours and hours and hours because Democrats and Republicans alike were able to put their mark—their mark—on this spending bill which we, because of the lack of action in the last Congress, inherited in this 9 months.

And so my friend is absolutely right. The last 9 months have not been easy. They've not been easy at all. And I appreciate the fact that she has worked in a bipartisan way in a number of areas, because as she knows very well, the bill that we're going to be considering this week, the regulatory relief bill, we make every amendment that complied with the rules of the House in order. So many more Democratic amendments have been made in order than Republican amendments on a number of pieces of legislation, and that's so that we can do exactly what my friend has said hasn't happened, and that is work in a bipartisan way.

Now I think that probably the single largest bipartisan achievement that we've had in this past 9 months has been the agreement that we came to at the end of July, and that was an agreement that Democrats and Republicans alike recognized had to be addressed, we needed to increase the debt ceiling.

□ 1410

We didn't like the fact that there had been so much spending that had taken place, but we recognized that it had to be done. So Democrats and Republicans came together to make that happen.

We have further opportunities for bipartisan agreement coming right down the pike. Democrats and Republicans, alike, have said we need to open up new markets around the world for us to create union and nonunion jobs so that we can export more manufactured products from the United States of America into these markets. And we have three pending trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea that will go a long way towards doing what it is Democrats and Republicans, alike, want to do.

I'm not going to accuse a single Democrat of not wanting to create jobs in this country. Everybody wants to make sure that their constituents aren't hurting, that their constituents aren't losing their homes, their jobs, their businesses. I know that everybody, Democrat and Republican, alike, wants to make that happen. We will have an opportunity, in a bipartisan way, to do just that, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to these market-opening agreements in these very, very, very important countries that will help us again create union and nonunion jobs.

And I think when it comes to the issue of job creation and income growth, we need to look at the unfortunate mischaracterization that has been made time and time again of things like the tax cuts that have enjoyed bipartisan support, what I call the Bush-Obama tax cuts.

First, the '01 tax cuts, I will acknowledge, were not real growth creators, but the '03 tax cuts generated economic growth that actually enhanced the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury. And that's not my speculation. All one needs to do is simply look at the raw numbers.

In 2003, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Treasury had $1.782 trillion in revenues from all sources. That was in '03. At the time we saw those tax cuts put into place, $1.782 trillion in revenues. Up until the economic downturn in 2007, we saw an increase of 44 percent in the flow of revenues that came into the

Federal Treasury to $2.567 trillion. Now, that's an increase, Mr. Speaker, of $785 billion that came in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

That, Mr. Speaker, was a 44 percent increase, increasing by $785 billion the flow in revenues from the '03 revenue flow of $1.782 trillion to the '07 revenue flow of $2.567 trillion.

The reason I use these numbers is that we all are focused on job creation and economic growth. We all know that increased gross domestic product will go a long way towards dealing with our deficit challenges and the difficulties that we face. And, Mr. Speaker, what I want us to do is recognize that, as my friend from Lawrenceville very generously said, I presided over more open rules than we had in the Republican Congress in the past and certainly than we had in the 4 years that preceded this. And I'm proud of that. I'm very proud of the fact that we've been able to make so many amendments in order that my Democratic colleagues have offered. We have a Hastings amendment that we made in order on the bill that we're going to be considering later. I'm happy that we've done that. We will have a chance to debate these issues and I hope come to a bipartisan agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I will just say in closing that we have had a difficult 9 months. My friend from Rochester is absolutely right. It's been a challenging 9 months. And as long as Americans are hurting, it's going to always be difficult for us here. But being able to establish priorities, to come together in a bipartisan way, is important.

This measure that we're considering today is being done at the request of the bipartisan leadership of our colleagues in the other body who want to be able to move this continuing resolution through as expeditiously as possible to, as my friend from Lawrenceville said, recognize that between now and November 18 we simply want to ensure that the resources are there.

I see my friend from Vermont, and I will say to my friend that I read and looked at the photographs of the flooding that has taken place in Vermont. It has been devastating. I've looked at the disasters that have taken place across this country. My State of California suffers from earthquakes, fires, flooding, lots of disasters. An earthquake was felt in this Capitol during the month of August. We know that disasters occur. We must do everything we can to address those. But calling for an $8 billion increase in spending beyond the $1.43 trillion that this continuing resolution calls for is not the answer.

We need to prioritize to ensure that those who are really suffering can, in fact, have their needs addressed, and I believe that this House, in a bipartisan way, can and should and, I hope, will do that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today the Republican majority has made a mockery of both the process for and the content of this short-term continuing resolution.

Over the past several weeks, wildfires, floods, tornados, and earthquakes have brought tragedy to so many Americans, and, as it always has, the United States Government is responding with vitally needed resources and support. The Senate has already passed a disaster relief bill twice as large as the package contained in this CR and with the appropriate emergency designation. But House Republican leaders have decided to cut the Senate amount in half and tie it to an ideologically driven offset that takes modern technology off the table for U.S. car and vehicle manufacturers and which could cost thousands of current and future jobs.

And please don't tell me that it's all about balancing the budget and ending emergency spending that isn't paid for. The continuing resolution that we're debating today includes money to continue the misguided war in Afghanistan to the tune of $10 billion each month. None of it is paid for, not a penny. It's never been paid for. It's always been borrowed money that each week adds billions to the deficit. If my Republican friends believe we don't need to offset billions of dollars for war, then why are they demanding that we offset disaster aid for families who were flooded out by a hurricane or whose homes were burnt to the ground by a wildfire?

Mr. Speaker, we've been in Afghanistan for 10 years. We know how much it costs. Its funding is as predictable as it gets, yet each and every year money for the war receives a so-called ''emergency'' designation, but responding to unpredictable natural disasters does not? It makes no sense. And if the Republican leadership has figured out a way to accurately predict the next tornado or earthquake, I would like to hear it.

The American people are tired of the hypocrisy and tired of the Republican priorities that make it easier to invest overseas and nearly impossible to help people here at home.

I urge my Republican friends to put the American people first. I urge my colleagues to oppose this closed rule and oppose the underlying bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. LEVIN. We've heard a lot of rhetoric the first 10 minutes, or whatever, on the majority side, but rhetoric cannot mask, cannot obscure reality. The reality is this is an antijobs bill.

In '07, we put forth the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program. It has worked. Tens of thousands of jobs have been created as a result of that program in Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Louisiana, and Florida. And so now the majority says they're going to pay for this bill. How? By ending a program that has created jobs. That's the reality. It cuts it off, even though there are applications pending that will create thousands of more jobs in the manufacturing base of this country, in Indiana, Missouri, Ohio, California, Michigan, and other States.

It's inexcusable. It's inexcusable.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

You may have some information that we did not have in the Rules Committee. My understanding is that this program, which has billions that were appropriated in 2008 and have not yet been spent, not only can——

Mr. LEVIN. You've been misinformed. There are millions and millions of dollars that are already in the pipeline to be spent and applications for the balance of that money. That's a fact.

□ 1420

So if you've been misinformed, I suggest that you go back to the Rules Committee and take another look at this. This is an anti-jobs bill when we need jobs in the United States of America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to speak to what's inexcusable here. And I hate that that's where we have to end up.

The truth of the matter is what we have down here today is the re-litigation of something that we already litigated in July and August, and that is that this bill today funds just until November 18 at the level that we, as a body, agreed to. You may not like it, I may not like it, but we agreed to it: a level that's 1043, $1.043 trillion. That's a big number. That is a big number.

This resolution today, this continuing resolution to get us through November 18, does not re-litigate that decision. We spent a lot of time on that in July and August, and again, we come from different places on whether or not that's the right number. I probably say it's too high, you may say it's

too low, but this is simply a resolution that implements the will of this House.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. LEVIN. There is nothing in that decision, nothing in that action that paid for a continuing resolution that will take away jobs from the businesses and workers of the United States of America, purely and simply.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time from my friend, you're absolutely right that this bill does not define where those $1.043 trillion go, and I take issue with that too.

I go back to what you called rhetoric, the 10 minutes that we spent at the beginning where we went through line by line to talk about, golly, the work I'm so proud of that you and I have done together, the individual appropriations bills that you and I have worked through together, doing what was supposed to be done in this House. That was the time to do these things, one by one, and, golly, we did. We did.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. LEVIN. So now you're saying we're paying for it by taking away jobs from businesses and workers. That's what this does. You can't hide that fact.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, as I'm not the chairman of the committee, I will quote the chairman of the committee, who tells us that not only can we use this offset here today, but there remains not millions, but billions of dollars in the account to be used for this purpose; dollars that were appropriated, Mr. Speaker, in 2008, 3 years ago. They remain unspent, but we leave them there just in case. Just in case.

And what I would say to my friend is, if we can just get around to doing this process right again, and I have great hope that we can, if we can get back to doing the process right, we'll have this discussion not on a $1.043 trillion continuing resolution, and not even on a half-trillion dollar continuing resolution, but on the Energy and Water appropriations bill. We'll be able to get back to it, and I have that great wish for this House, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield myself 10 seconds to say that I said in my opening statement that this program has already yielded 39,000 jobs, on its way to 60,000, which will not be able to be met because you are using this as the offset.

I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who suffered great damage in the hurricane.

Mr. PASCRELL. Look, we're all Americans. We're not Democrats, Republicans.

You had 5,000 people evacuated in my district. When you see the damage in small towns and large towns, then you can appreciate it. The President came, the Governor of the State, who is not of my persuasion, came. They saw it firsthand. Homeland Security came. Mr. Fugate from FEMA came. They saw it firsthand. The damage is deep, and it's not going to be taken away and remedied within 2 weeks, 2 months, or 2 years because the ground was so saturated that trees fell without any wind, and are still falling.

Now, we are only one of 51 districts affected in 15 States, and we're talking about over 30 million people. And for the first time since I've been a Member of Congress, the other side, your side, wants to make this conditional, the aid, so that we carve out from either this program or that program, which is immaterial at this point, the money to help these very people.

The estimates are very clear as to how much this is going to cost, beyond our wildest dreams. We don't stop and ask those folks in Joplin, who had a huge tornado, where 160 people were killed, we don't say, wait till we go and rob Peter in order to respond to your emergency.

The fires in Texas—we have never done this on an emergency. This is an absolute disgrace because we're all Americans. We're not Democrats or Republicans.

Why didn't we do this, for crying out loud, in 2001 when we went to war? We didn't say, let's take from this program or that program. That was an emergency. We came up with the money and we sure as hell didn't pay for it, did we? And now look where we are economically.

We're talking about an emergency in our own country here, in our own neighborhoods. We need both sides to come together, and that's why we formed the coalition of Democrats and Republicans. And Republicans are not going to vote for this either. I'm telling you right now. So why don't we come together. They passed a clean bill in the Senate.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman another 10 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. This coalition is going to stay strong because America is more important than either party, and we need to help our brothers and sisters who are hurting right now, many that will not return to their homes. They can't. Think about that.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, to correct what may be a misunderstanding about the swiftness with which this Congress is reacting to those tragedies, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who has moved immediately on these issues, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As to the point, Mr. Speaker, of whether or not we offset these emergency bills, over the last 10 years, we have used offsets in over half of the emergency spending bills and supplementals, over half, 15 of 30, actually, including war supplementals, emergency supplementals, military construction, defense supplementals, disaster relief and recovery, in 2008, for example, and on and on.

Using offsets to pay for disaster relief is the rule here. This is not an exception. And we're only offsetting $1 billion of it. In fact, when the Homeland Security bill passed a few months ago, it included this very offset, and the bill passed by bipartisan support throughout the body. You've already voted for this, and, I might add, successfully.

Now, on that green car fund—I'm going to call it that—there's over $4 billion this minute sitting idle in that account, and it's been sitting idle for 3 years. The $1.5 billion rescission in subsidies we propose will not have a significant impact on the program, contrary to what some people say. All applications for those loans in late-term stages and negotiations will not be affected. Talk to the agency downtown, which we have. They will not be affected.

The factory in Michigan or Indiana will not be affected. In total, eight pending applications for loan guarantees totaling over $6 billion will not be impacted by this offset. Michigan has the largest stake: four applications totaling $4.7 billion in loan guarantees, which are free and clear.

□ 1430

Other States with applications in the queue that are safe from this round of cuts include Indiana and Louisiana.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains $3.65 billion for immediate disaster relief, which our people need and deserve. As this bill works its way through the process until November 18, no doubt FEMA will have by then completed their surveys and investigations of disasters and can tell Congress, through the White House, how much more money is needed; and we'll provide it. It's covered in the debt ceiling bill that passed this body a few weeks ago.

I'm telling you the Appropriations Committee will provide whatever relief is required when we get the documentation, which is traditional, as all of the Members of this body know because they helped prepare those investigations.

So this is a clean bill. This merely extends the time for us to work with the Senate to perfect a continuing bill for the balance of 2012. It gives us 5 or 6 weeks, but only 3 or 4 of those weeks will be available because both bodies will not be here all that time. This is a clean bill. And it provides disaster relief in the appropriate way. And there's plenty of money there for the immediate needs that we've been told about by FEMA.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a

member of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. HINCHEY.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and more broadly to the manner in which the House has dealt with disaster relief funding.

This year, our country has experienced some of the worst natural disasters in more than a generation. The cost of Hurricane Irene alone is estimated to be over $1.5 billion and Tropical Storm Lee's costs are still being tallied.

Yet despite these overwhelming needs, the disaster aid included in this bill is grossly inadequate and would not sufficiently help the millions of Americans who are recent victims of floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and wildfires.

My district took a one-two punch from Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee. In the southern tier of New York, we've just seen the second 500-year flood in 5 years both in Broome and Tioga counties. Scores of homes were completely destroyed, and there are over a hundred people who are still living in an emergency center in Binghamton not knowing when they'll be able to return to their homes, if they can return ever at all.

Major companies have been shut down because their facilities are flooded. The total cost to rebuild the region will likely exceed $250 million.

In the Hudson Valley, Hurricane Irene caused massive power outages and record flooding. In Ulster County, 60 percent of residents lost power; seven bridges were destroyed. In fact, two of those bridges were just washed away and not found.

Vegetable farmers in Ulster, Orange, and Sullivan Counties suffered devastating losses; and because the crop insurance program remains wholly inadequate for them, these farmers may get no assistance at all. Ulster and Orange Counties alone have an estimated $62 million in agricultural losses. Yet this bill does nothing for these farmers.

And just when some of these communities began building from Irene, a second round of flooding from Lee washed away much of their hard work. Now they need to start the recovery work again.

The Senate has already passed a $7 billion standalone disaster bill that funds the President's FEMA budget request and provides additional emergency assistance for the Department of Agriculture and other agencies that are seeing their disaster funds dwindle. This is absolutely necessary.

This bill that we are dealing with here today is a half job. It's playing politics with the lives of people who are desperate and are begging us to set aside games and get this done. Let's put an end to it now so that we can take up the Senate's bill so that we can adequately deal with this problem and solve the problems for all of these people in so many ways.

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

To get back on the topic of this continuing resolution today, that is, this number that we agreed on just a month ago, $1.043 trillion, to fund the operations of this government.

Mr. Speaker, I go back and I look at emergency requests that this body has made. Now, I'm a freshman. I was just elected in November, began my service in January. But over the last 10 years, there have been 30 emergency and supplemental bills passed.

Now, what I would say to my friends who have been here longer than I have is perhaps if you have to do it three times a year, it's really not a surprise. Perhaps we ought to be able to budget for it.

And to his great credit, and to the committee's great credit, and candidly I would say to the House's great credit, we are trying for the first time in a long time to say you know what, we can't prevent tragedy. Tragedy is going to happen. But we can plan ahead for tragedy so that the American people have the security of knowing the money's going to be there when they need it.

And when I look, Mr. Speaker, at the way we're pouring money out of this body, I worry will the money be there when the American people need it. This budget makes sure that it does.

Mr. HINCHEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HINCHEY. Thank you very much. I deeply appreciate it.

The situation that we're dealing with here is critically important. It's harming huge numbers of people.

What the Senate has done is an adequate solution to this problem. They've provided the adequate funding that is going to deal with this. There have been at least seven Republicans over there in the Senate who supported that bill and voted for it. Why are you not dealing with an adequate solution to this problem? Why are you insisting on half ways, not dealing with the kinds of issues that need to be dealt with?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will suspend.

The gentleman from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Because I hope where my friend was going to go was an acknowledgment that this process has provided twice the amount of disaster funding that the President requested, twice that amount in FY11, plus it forward-funds FY12.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am proud that we are trying to grapple with these issues. There is not a person on the floor of this House that is saying ''no'' to Americans in distress. What folks are saying is ''yes'' to making sure that when those distresses come again, we budgeted for it.

I would now like to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Let me just reiterate.

The $1 billion in the fiscal '11 portion of this bill is two times the amount the President requested. We doubled it. The amount that's in the bill for fiscal 2012, $2.65 billion, is more than the initial request that was made to us by the White House. We're here to tell you—and I've repeated this now four times—whatever the amount is needed that we see FEMA coming to us requesting, we're going to provide. Now, we've got until November 18 by this extension, by this CR, and during that period of time we will get the documentation from the White House and from FEMA about additional funds that are requested.

I assure the gentleman from New York who spoke, your concerns will be addressed during these next few weeks, and the money will be there that's documented from the White House and from FEMA for disaster relief. We will not let our people hurt.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I'm going to give myself another second here just to say I keep hearing that we're all set for next year in the budget, but who's going to tell Mother Nature just how much we can afford and hope that we don't get more than that?

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

□ 1440

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, America has had an economic disaster and a natural disaster. The economic disaster is 15 million people unemployed, and then we had the natural disasters of August. This bill tries to help the natural disaster get solved by making the economic disaster worse. It takes a program that has produced 39,000 private sector jobs and cripples it.

Now, the ostensible purpose for this is that we want to offset the spending to help deal with the natural disasters we had around this country in August; but on multiple occasions in the last 7 years, different administrations came to the Congress and asked for infrastructure spending to help rebuild Iraq—$3.7 billion worth of it to help rebuild Iraq and not a penny of offset.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we can vote to spend the public's money to rebuild roads and bridges in Iraq, let's not require an offset to rebuild roads and bridges in New York and Vermont and New Jersey. The right vote is ''no.'' Rewrite this bill, and do so in a way without worsening our economic disaster.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH). We watched Route 4 in Vermont crumble like a cookie in the rain and wash away.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

This bill is not about the offset. This bill is not about whether we're going to pay for emergency spending. We must and we will. What this bill is about is whether we're going to help 427 residents of Pittsfield, Vermont, who were in the wake of the wrath of Hurricane Irene.

That flood came down and ripped their road to the north and ripped their road to the south, and the water went in the middle, taking out homes and taking out public buildings. That's the selectboard—volunteers. It was that volunteer fire department—volunteers. They didn't have time to have an argument about offsets. They had to find out how they could get an excavator in there, and if they didn't have one, they had to borrow one. They had towns that weren't leveraging some disputes they might have had about whether they would turn back an excavator or earthmoving equipment to help them out. They did it. They had their school running the next day, not because they had a school that was functional—their kids couldn't even get out. They did one thing first, and that was to set up school on the green. They set it up on the green. Two days after this hurricane, the kids were going to school, and their parents were making them feel secure. They couldn't get to a passable road for several days. What did they do? They cut a path through the woods so that, for half a mile, kids could walk and get to transportation.

Now, they're going to have a tab even if we help them, and they know they have to pay for it; but, you know, if your neighbor's house is on fire and if you've got a boundary line dispute, you can use the leverage of his urgent necessity to get that fire hose and hold off and get it on condition that he cave—or you can do the right thing.

Every time this Congress has had an opportunity to come to the aid of your district or mine, we've stepped up. No Vermonter has ever complained to me that we used his tax dollars to help out in Texas, to help out in Ohio, to help out on the gulf coast; and we didn't make it conditional in getting our way—my offset, what might be Afghanistan, and yours might be some environmental program. We knew that was not the time to do it. We are in this together.

This Congress has an obligation to the American people. I have an obligation to the folks in your district, as you do in mine, to do the right thing when an act of God requires for its remedy an act of Congress. Let us act, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that we have the distinguished Appropriations chairman here on the floor, who has said, not only have we doubled the President's request here, but there is a commitment to making the dollars available to everyone who is in need in these disasters. That's the kind of commitment this Nation has always made to its citizens. That's the kind of commitment that this bill continues to make to America's citizens.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the President signed the patent reform bill; but before the ink is dry on the patent reform bill, the agreement that led to the passage of it that all of the fees that are collected by the Patent and Trademark Office will be used by the Patent and Trademark Office is reneged on in this continuing resolution.

This is a job-creating bill, an innovation-creating bill, and because we have been taking the money of the Patent and Trademark Office for years and diverting it to the general fund, we have, in effect, imposed a tax on innovation in this country. The appropriators promised us that they were going to correct this problem, but there is nothing in this bill to address that promise. I don't see how I can support a continuing resolution that does not honor the commitment that was made in our patent reform bill.

Just last Friday, the President signed the America Invents Act (AIA), a bipartisan bill that promises to stimulate innovation and create jobs and add fuel to our economy. The AIA created a mechanism for USPTO, beginning in FY2012, to access all of the fees it collects by allowing USPTO to notify Congress that the Office will need the excess fees to support its operations and hire the staff required to reduce the staggering backlog of patent applications. Now, despite this hard fought deal—one which I opposed precisely because it depends upon an annual commitment to honor and implement the deal—the CR before us fails to put the USPTO on the firm, stable footing we all agreed was necessary for it to dig out of the backlog, avoid a tax on innovation, and stimulate job growth.

Under the current CR, for at least 7 weeks the USPTO will be held to a spending rate based on last year's FY11 appropriations, a rate that ignores Congress's directive and authorization that the USPTO be able to use the fees it collects in order to support implementation of the act and that those funds not be diverted to pay for wars, government waste and other Federal Government operations. I will resist the temptation to say, "I told you so," because that would not advance the debate or solve the serious problem I have identified before and identify again today. What is most compelling is that ensuring that the PTO has access to all of its funds costs nothing to the American taxpayer. It is, therefore, confusing why we are again facing such a heavy lift to simply give the PTO access to the funds it earns through its operations. But what is clear to me is that, without a provision to ensure adequate funding for the PTO, the bill the President just signed will not serve the important purposes it was designed to serve. This CR does not provide such funding, and I cannot support the CR. I urge my colleagues who say they believe in reducing the tax burden on businesses, large and small, those who fought to ensure that the independent engines of economic growth run at full throttle, I urge them to vote no on the rule and against this CR and work to get the funding the USPTO needs and that this Congress promised it would have.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill is brought to us by people who know the cost of everything and the value of nothing. The hard fact of the matter is they've fought two wars on the credit card. This is one of the few times that we've ever found that they have required offsets for emergencies, so now we're trying to fix a bad bill.

I want to make the observation that we have a serious problem. We have a natural emergency, and we have people who have a lasting unemployment situation that is going to destroy the country and destroy families and people in this country.

Having said that, I am baffled as to why we are considering a measure that is going to cut funding for the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program. This is a loan program that has created or saved over 40,000 jobs so far, and if it's left alone and not destroyed, as would be done here, it will create another 10,000 more by year's end.

For all the talk in Washington on that side of the aisle about creating jobs, we find that they're out to kill jobs again, and killing ATVM just plain makes no sense. It is going to prevent job creation. The Economic Policy Institute just released a report that my home State of Michigan has lost nearly 80,000 jobs to China since 2001, where they sustain and support their industry and where we do not. If we cripple this loan program, Michigan and the rest of the country can expect to lose even more jobs and their ability to compete globally in the 21st century.

I understand we're living through tough economic times and have to squeeze every penny to make sure it counts, but I want to remind everybody here present that there are more applications in the pipeline than there is money to participate in this particular program. So we are essentially robbing Peter to pay Paul, but it is going to come at an enormous cost to the economic future of your constituents and mine.

Now, it comforts me that many of my colleagues have seen through this rascality and have observed it for what it is. Over 100 of them have signed on to a letter by my friends Mr. PETERS and Ms. ESHOO in opposition to gutting ATVM.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for what is right by defeating the previous question and by adopting my amendment. If we can't do that, let's vote

this rule down and let's vote this bill down, and let's go about the Nation's business in a wise and sensible fashion which will create jobs and not strangle economic opportunity for our people.

I want to thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York for her leadership on this matter; but I want to denounce the behavior that I see on the other side, where they are walking into one of the most important issues that this country confronts with their eyes completely closed.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

□ 1450

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, there is a not-so-thin line between being frugal and fiscally responsible and then downright cheap and stingy, and this bill demonstrates the difference.

To say to somebody who was in a disaster, to say to somebody who might lose everything, where the waters are rising, the fires are burning, the storms are knocking things down, to say, you know what, we can only help you if we cut somewhere else, is the most stingy, shortsighted, poorest form of representative government I have ever seen. It is outrageous to tell Americans facing disaster that you don't get any help unless you can find how to squeeze it out somewhere.

Americans help Americans. Americans stand up for each other at time of crisis. This is a hallmark of who we are, and it doesn't matter whether you are Republican or Democrat, whether you are from the north, the south, the east or the west, whether you are black, white, Latino, wherever you come from, when Americans are in trouble, Americans respond. And we don't reach inside and say, well, if I can afford it, we will help you out. We just jump forward and we help out.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. No, I will not yield, and I won't cede any of my time, so you don't need to ask again.

I am also just absolutely appalled, appalled, that the Republican bill will cost at least 10,000 good-paying American manufacturing jobs and perhaps tens of thousands more by cutting the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program, which is putting Americans to work at producing cleaner American cars.

This provision, perhaps more than any other, demonstrates the fraudulent nature, fraud, fraud, of claiming that the Republicans are trying to produce jobs. They are not trying to make jobs.

They run around saying that rich people are job creators, they are profit creators. And you know who is absolutely not a job creator? Anyone who votes ''yes'' on this bill.

Vote ''no,'' absolutely ''no'' on this bad piece of bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we have been able to have a conversation with one another and yield that time throughout the day.

In order to continue that, I yield 1 minute to the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you for yielding.

The previous speaker doesn't understand the bill. The $2.65 billion in the 2012 portion of the bill is not offset, only the portion for fiscal 2011 is required to be offset. And I would remind the gentleman, as well as everyone else, many of whom voted for the Homeland Security bill a few months ago, it included this provision.

The disaster relief money, twice what the President requested of us, we doubled his request. That part is offset, the fiscal 2011 moneys, but the bulk of the money in this bill, the $2.65 billion for fiscal 2012, it's not offset. So the gentleman is incorrect.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I come from the Greater Detroit area, which has been especially hard hit from this recession.

When many wanted to let the auto industry fail, I stood with President Obama, and now the Big Three auto companies are once again earning profits and creating jobs in our region.

Today, however, the House Republicans are trying to pass job-killing cuts to our auto industry by eliminating section 136 loans. We have the support of the Big Three auto manufacturers, as well as several labor unions and environmental groups but, sadly, the Tea Party can't even say ''yes'' to a program that has created and protected 41,000 jobs. In fact, according to experts, this program is directly responsible for bringing manufacturing of the Ford Focus automobile from Mexico to Michigan, with American workers making the Ford Focus.

We absolutely need to fund disaster relief for communities affected by the recent natural disasters, but that doesn't mean we need to cause an economic disaster for our workers.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and ''no'' on the continuing resolution because we need to be working to create more American manufacturing jobs, not destroying them.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that we would come to the floor of the House at this time and celebrate a continuing resolution in the backdrop of Tropical Storm Lee and Hurricane Irene, the enormity of the tragedy in Vermont.

I know that my colleagues from that area are in pain and still suffering from the devastation. I noticed upstate New York, Prattsville in particular, a city that is full of pain with individuals who are at loss of why their town is no longer.

But in that instance, as my colleagues know, my Republicans friends know, although we have had some moments that we have not been proud of, such as in the gulf region when we were not prepared for Hurricane Katrina, we have still risen to the occasion thereafter and said to the American people that if you are in a disaster, this Nation will come to your aid.

Unfortunately, this CR does not in any way befit the American way, for here we have a fix that is really a broken fix.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Rather than declaring disasters what they are, emergencies, and providing the dollars that we need, we are, in essence, if I might use the old-fashioned term, nickel and diming our responsibilities. It is patently unfair to put the American people in the crosshairs of our politics about having an offset for emergency funding.

Do you want to tell that, if we look back at 2005 to the thousand-plus that died in Hurricane Katrina, you have to have an offset? Let's think about whether we're going to send you any money.

Now, I know that there is a need for this legislation to pass, but once we concede the idea that the American people will be put in the pickle of an offset, that means that disaster knocks at your door, not at your invitation, and the Federal Government, which is, in fact, the umbrella on a rainy day, it will not be there. I will not be able to tolerate that.

What we should be doing is passing a CR that declares emergency funding what it is—to be there for the American people. And this next thing we should be doing is passing the President's jobs bill, for that is how we will ensure that we are doing the job that the American people want.

This CR is a bunch of smoke and mirrors, and I will not tell the American people that they are second-class citizens. If I can find the dime to pay for your misery, I will look for the dime. That is not the American way.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding again. I'll be very brief.

The gentlewoman who just spoke mentioned Katrina and that we should not offset expenses of emergency disaster spending. In fact, in 2006 that's exactly what we did do. We required offsets for aid for Katrina and other matters, $33.5 billion in offsets in Katrina aid in 2006. And then again in 2007, we offset $939 million in offsets for, among other things, Hurricane Katrina recovery.

As I have said before, over the last 10 years, we have offset more than half of

the disaster emergency relief bills we have passed here. It's not unusual, and the gentlelady is mistaken that we did not request offsets for Katrina. We did.

Mr. WOODALL. I say to my friend to from New York, I have no more speakers and am prepared to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order a motion to strike the unacceptable House disaster funding language and substitute the bipartisan Senate approach.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' defeat the previous question, and if we are successful in defeating the previous question and offering our amendment, then we will get on with the underlying House amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

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

I think one thing that unites us as Republicans and Democrats, and actually unites us as Americans, is when we face adversity, we say: Can we do better? Can we do better? You know, it's one thing to muddle through, but it's something else to learn from that experience and come back the next time and do better.

Now, I'm proud to be here as part of a freshman class, Mr. Speaker; 89 new Republican freshmen, 10 new Democratic freshmen. Ninety-nine Members of this House are brand new this year; 99 Members of this House. And so we look back. We look back on profligate spending where even though American families are asked to prioritize their spending each and every day, for some reason the Congress didn't. Even though small businesses are asked to prioritize their spending every day, for some reason Congress didn't.

What this new Congress has done, Mr. Speaker, this 112th Congress has done, is to say: Can we do better? And the answer is yes. Why are the American people so cynical about Congress, Mr. Speaker? Why are our approval ratings in the tank? It was less than 2 months ago, less than 2 months ago we agreed that for next year we should spend $1.43 trillion. And we're already talking about that we've got that number wrong and we want to spend more. Folks, we have to make those priority decisions. Thirty times, Mr. Speaker, thirty times in the last 10 years we came up with emergency spending. Thirty times, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just ask you, the Defense Iraq-Afghanistan supplemental in 2004, is anybody surprised that it took more money in those places than we had budgeted? Anybody think that's a surprise? I'm not surprised by that, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't here, but I'm not surprised. What I wish we could have done was budgeted better for that. Did we know in 2004 that it was going to take more money? Of course we did. But what did we do? We gamed that system.

What is this Appropriations Committee doing? What is this Appropriations Committee doing? They're saying that they know tragedy is going to befall Americans. They don't know what; they don't know when; but they know that it's going to happen. And so they're going to budget for it. Why? Because we tell Americans day after day after day that programs that they count on might not be there tomorrow. Why? Because we're broke. We tell Americans every day something that they might want to do, something they thought might be available, it might not be available. Why? Because we're broke.

But I agree with my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, when folks are facing disaster, they don't want to have to ask that question. When folks are facing personal tragedy, they don't want to have to ask that question: Will there be money there? Will there be help there?

No, in our communities, we know the help is going to be there. We know our neighbors are going to be there for us, and we know our families will be there for us. And for the first time in a long time, Mr. Speaker, we now know that the American Congress is going to be there, too, because we are changing business as usual.

We asked the question: Can we do better? And the Speaker and the committee chairmen said, Yes. Yes, we can. I encourage support for the rule, and I encourage a vote on the underlying resolution.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 405 OFFERED BY MRS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, after expiration of debate on the motion to concur specified in the first section of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the motion to amend printed in section 4 of this resolution. That motion may be offered only by Representative Dingell of Michigan or his designee, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against that motion are waived.

SEC. 4. The motion to amend referred to in section 3 is as follows:

''(1) Strike sections 125 and 126 of the House amendment (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly).

''(2) At the end of the House amendment, before the short title, insert the following:

''SEC. __ Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there is hereby enacted into law the provisions of division B of the amendment adopted by the Senate on September 15, 2011, to House Joint Resolution 66 (112th Congress), relating to emergency supplemental disaster relief appropriations.''.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools

for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 405, if ordered, and suspending the rules with regard to Senate Concurrent Resolution 28 and S. 846.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 188, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 715]

YEAS—237

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
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
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
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 (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—188

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
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
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
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
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
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
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Baca
Bachmann
Giffords
Lewis (GA)
Luetkemeyer
Paul
Reichert
Sutton

□ 1530

Messrs. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. FUDGE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. MYRICK changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 185, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 716]

YEAS—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
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)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
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 (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg

Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—185

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
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
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
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
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
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
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Baca
Bachmann
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Hastings (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Paul
Reichert
Sutton
Welch

□ 1537

Mr. ROKITA changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 717]

YEAS—424

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

NOT VOTING—9

Baca
Bachmann
Giffords
Lewis (GA)
Paul
Reichert
Sires
Slaughter
Sutton

□ 1546

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (S. 846) to designate the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 2, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 718]

YEAS—407

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

NAYS—2

Harris
Rigell

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Garrett
Mulvaney

NOT VOTING—22

Baca
Bachmann
Cardoza
Connolly (VA)
Davis (KY)
Giffords
Gohmert
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Lewis (GA)
Paul
Payne
Reichert
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, David
Sewell
Slaughter
Sutton
Webster
Welch
Woodall

□ 1552

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2608.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 405, I call up the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and have a motion at the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Program Extension and Reform Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Act entitled ''An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration'', approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742), as most recently amended by section 2 of the Small Business Additional Temporary Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–17; 125 Stat. 221), is amended by striking ''July 31, 2011'' each place it appears and inserting ''July 31, 2012''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 30, 2011.

SEC. 3. REPEALS AND OTHER TERMINATIONS.

(a) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A repeal or other termination of a provision of law made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2011.

(2) RULE.—Nothing in this section shall affect any grant or assistance provided, contract or cooperative agreement entered into, or loan made or guaranteed before October 1, 2011 under a provision of law repealed or otherwise terminated by this section and any such grant, assistance, contract, cooperative agreement, or loan shall be subject to the applicable repealed or otherwise terminated provision, as in effect on September 30, 2011.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF TEMPORARY EXTENSIONS.—A repeal or other termination of a provision of law made by this section shall have effect notwithstanding any temporary extension of programs, authority, or provisions under the Act entitled ''An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration'', approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742).

(4) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any savings resulting from this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

(b) POLLUTION CONTROL LOANS.—Paragraph (12) of section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(A) The Administration'' and inserting ''The Administration''; and

(2) by striking ''research and development'' and all that follows and inserting ''research and development.''.

(c) SMALL BUSINESS INSTITUTE.—Subparagraph (E) of section 8(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)) is repealed.

(d) DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE GRANTS.—Paragraph (3) of section 21(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (R) by adding ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (S) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (T).

(e) CENTRAL EUROPEAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION.—Section 25 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 652) is repealed.

(f) PAUL D. COVERDELL DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM.—Section 27 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 654) is repealed.

(g) PILOT TECHNOLOGY ACCESS PROGRAM.—Section 28 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 655) is repealed.

(h) NATIONAL VETERANS BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 33 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657c) is repealed.

(2) CORPORATION.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the National Veterans Business Development Corporation and any successor thereto may not represent that the corporation is federally chartered or in any other manner authorized by the Federal Government.

(i) LEASE GUARANTEES AND POLLUTION CONTROL.—Part A of title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 692 et seq.) is repealed.

(j) ALTERNATIVE LOSS RESERVE.—Paragraph (7) of section 508(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 697e(c)) is repealed.

(k) SMALL BUSINESS TELECOMMUTING PILOT PROGRAM.—Subsection (d) of section 1203 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (15 U.S.C. 657h) is repealed.

(l) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.—Section 411(i) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) Without limiting the authority conferred upon the Administrator and the Administration by section 201 of this Act, the Administrator and the Administration shall have, in the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties conferred by this part, all the authority and be subject to the same conditions prescribed in section 5(b) of the Small Business Act with respect to loans, including the authority to execute subleases, assignments of lease and new leases with any person, firm, organization, or other entity, in order to aid in the liquidation of obligations of the Administration hereunder.''.

(2) TITLE 10.—Section 1142(b)(13) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and the National Veterans Business Development Corporation''.

(3) TITLE 38.—Subsection (h) of section 3452 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''any of the'' and all that follows and inserting ''any small business development center described in section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), insofar as such center offers, sponsors, or cosponsors an entrepreneurship course, as that term is defined in section 3675(c)(2).''.

(4) VETERANS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999.—Section 203(c)(5) of the Veterans Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development Act of 1999 (15 U.S.C. 657b note) is amended by striking ''In cooperation with the National Veterans Business Development Corporation, develop'' and inserting ''Develop''.

SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF EMERGING LEADERS PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective October 1, 2011, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration may not carry out or otherwise support the program referred to as ''Emerging Leaders'' in the document of the Small Business Administration titled ''FY 2012 Congressional Budget Justification and FY 2010 Annual Performance Report'' (or any predecessor or successor document).

MOTION TO CONCUR

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Rogers of Kentucky moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2608 with an amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, insert the following:

That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2011 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this Act, that were conducted in fiscal year 2011, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2011 (division A of Public Law 112–10).

(2) The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (division B of Public Law 112–10).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) is hereby reduced by 1.503 percent.

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2011 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2011 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P–1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R–1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2011.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this Act.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this Act; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) November 18, 2011.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this Act shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this Act may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this Act may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2012 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this Act that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This Act shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the Act shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2011, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2011, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2011 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2011, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), each amount incorporated by reference in this Act that was previously designated as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 3(c)(2) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal

year 2010, is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that such amount shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates such amount and transmits such designation to the Congress. Section 101(b) of this Act shall not apply to any amount so designated.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts for ''Department of Justice—Federal Bureau of Investigation—Salaries and Expenses''.

SEC. 115. During the period covered by this Act, discretionary amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2012 that were provided in advance by appropriations Acts shall be available in the amounts provided in such Acts, reduced by the percentage in section 101(b).

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts made available by this Act for ''Department of Defense—Operation and Maintenance—Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' may be used by the Secretary of Defense for operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and personal security, and facilities renovation and construction: Provided, That the authority made by this section shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act: Provided further, That section 9014 of division A of Public Law 112–10 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding section 101, funds made available in title IX of division A of Public Law 112–10 for ''Overseas Contingency Operations'' shall be available at a rate for operations not to exceed the rate permitted by H.R. 2219 (112th Congress) as passed by the House of Representatives on July 8, 2011.

SEC. 118. The authority provided by section 127b of title 10, United States Code, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 119. The authority provided by section 1202 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2412), as extended by section 1204(b) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4623), shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board—Salaries and Expenses'' at a rate for operations of $29,130,000.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading ''District of Columbia Funds'' for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2434 (112th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under ''District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses'' as included in the Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request Act of 2011 (D.C. Act 19–92), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for the necessary expenses of the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board, to carry out its functions under title XV of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5), at a rate for operations of $28,350,000.

SEC. 123. (a) Section 9(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(m)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for ''September 30, 2011''.

(b) Notwithstanding section 9(n)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(n)(1)(A)), the Small Business Technology Transfer Program shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

(c) Notwithstanding section 9(y)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(y)(6)), the pilot program under section 9(y) of such Act shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 124. Section 8909a(d)(3)(A)(v) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''September 30, 2011'' and inserting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 125. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, of the unobligated balances remaining available to the Department of Energy pursuant to section 129 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2009 (division A of Public Law 110–329), $500,000,000 is rescinded, $774,000,000 is hereby transferred to and merged with ''Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—Disaster Relief'', and $226,000,000 is hereby transferred to and merged with ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies'': Provided, That the amounts made available by this section for the Corps of Engineers-Civil shall be for emergency expenses for repair of damage caused by the storm and flood events occurring in 2011: Provided further, That the amounts transferred by this section shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That each amount transferred by this section is designated as an emergency pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

SEC. 126. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—Disaster Relief'' at a rate for operations of $2,650,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a full accounting of disaster relief funding requirements for such account for fiscal year 2012 not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and for fiscal year 2013 in conjunction with the submission of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2013.

(b) The accounting described in subsection (a) for each fiscal year shall include estimates of the following amounts:

(1) The unobligated balance of funds in such account that has been (or will be) carried over to such fiscal year from prior fiscal years.

(2) The unobligated balance of funds in such account that will be carried over from such fiscal year to the subsequent fiscal year.

(3) The amount of the rolling average of noncatastrophic disasters, and the specific data used to calculate such rolling average, for such fiscal year.

(4) The amount that will be obligated each month for catastrophic events, delineated by event and State, and the total remaining funding that will be required after such fiscal year for each such catastrophic event for each State.

(5) The amount of previously obligated funds that will be recovered each month of such fiscal year.

(6) The amount that will be required in such fiscal year for emergencies, as defined in section 102(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(1)).

(7) The amount that will be required in such fiscal year for major disasters, as defined in section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)).

(8) The amount that will be required in such fiscal year for fire management assistance grants, as defined in section 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5187).

SEC. 127. Any funds made available pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Homeland Security may be obligated at a rate for operations necessary to sustain essential security activities, such as: staffing levels of operational personnel; immigration enforcement and removal functions, including sustaining not less than necessary detention bed capacity; and United States Secret Service protective activities, including protective activities necessary to secure National Special Security Events. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109–295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 129. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 130. Section 550(b) of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for ''October 4, 2011''.

SEC. 131. Sections 1309(a) and 1319 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a) and 4026) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for ''September 30, 2011''.

SEC. 132. Section 330 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (42 U.S.C. 1701 note), concerning Service First authorities, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 133. Notwithstanding section 101, section 1807 of Public Law 112–10 shall be applied by substituting ''$374,743,000'' for ''$363,843,000'' and ''$10,900,000'' for ''$3,000,000''.

SEC. 134. The second proviso of section 1801(a)(3) of Public Law 112–10 is amended by striking ''appropriation under this subparagraph'' and inserting ''appropriations made available by this Act''.

SEC. 135. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission—Salaries and Expenses'' at a rate for operations of $14,510,000.

SEC. 136. Sections 399AA(e), 399BB(g), and 399CC(f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i(e), 280i–1(g), 280i–2(f)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for ''September 30, 2011''.

SEC. 137. Notwithstanding section 101, section 2005 of division B of Public Law 112–10 shall be applied by substituting ''$0'' for each dollar amount.

SEC. 138. The Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for ''September 30, 2011'' in section 7 of such Act of 1945.

SEC. 139. Section 209 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6436) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for ''September 30, 2011''.

SEC. 140. Commitments to guarantee loans incurred under the General and Special Risk Insurance Funds, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–3 and 1735c), shall not exceed a rate for operations of $25,000,000,000: Provided, That total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, may be apportioned through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act, at $80,000,000 multiplied by the number of days covered in this Act.

SEC. 141. (a) RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.—

(1) 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.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall be deemed to be a ''renewal resolution'' for purposes of section 9 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(b) PAYGO COMPLIANCE.—The budgetary effects of this section, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this section, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on July 26, 2011.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall not be subject to any other provision of this Act.

This Act may be cited as the ''Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the floor the continuing appropriations resolution to keep the Federal Government operating until November 18 of this year. For procedural reasons, this is being done as an amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2608 to speed passage through the Senate, at their request; but in substance, this is the same as the continuing resolution, H.J. Res. 79, that I introduced on September 14.

This CR, Mr. Speaker, will give Congress the time needed to complete fiscal year 2012 appropriations and to adequately fund vital government programs and services by working to put Federal spending on a more sustainable course. Just as significantly, this bill provides desperately needed funding for disaster recovery and relief.

I would have preferred to have completed the appropriations process in regular order, and I believe the House made great strides in doing so. The Appropriations Committee moved on 11 of the 12 annual appropriations bills, and six bills have cleared the House; but we still need time to collaborate with our colleagues in the Senate in order to complete this work, and a short-term bill will allow us to do so.

As we saw last year and into the spring, the threat of a government shutdown causes dangerous economic instability, and at this precarious time, we need to bolster American public confidence that their representatives in Washington are working for them and are not letting politics come before people.

The CR continues government operations at a rate of $1.043 trillion—the total amount agreed to by the Congress and the White House in the Budget Control Act. It's clean of most policy provisions to ensure swift passage, but we've provided small changes for safety, security, and continuity of essential programs.

For instance, we've extended Federal flood insurance availability and the availability of defense survival equipment for our troops abroad. In addition, this CR will help meet the needs of the thousands of families, businesses, and communities burdened by recent natural disasters by providing an immediate $1 billion in emergency 2011 funding now as well as an additional $2.65 billion for the next year. We are helping our citizens get back on their feet.

The $776 million in the bill for the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund, which is $276 million more than the President or the Senate proposed, is time-sensitive and critical. That fund is now below $250 million and is running out of money fast. Unless we provide additional funding, within a matter of days the Disaster Relief Fund will soon be empty, leaving millions of people in the lurch.

The $1 billion in emergency funding for fiscal year 2011 has been offset by a cut to the Department of Energy's Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program, which has more than $4 billion in unspent idle funds in the pipeline. It has been there for 3 years. Now is the time to use those idle dollars for true and immediate purposes: aiding our fellow citizens in their times of greatest need as they cope with the aftermath of wildfires, tornadoes, earthquakes, and hurricanes—an unprecedented string of disasters in this country.

Now, the notion of offsetting emergency spending has gotten a lot of attention as of late. Let me be very clear that offsetting emergency spending is not a unique practice. In fact, over the last 10 years, the Congress has used offsets in at least 15 of 30 emergency supplemental spending bills—half of them. In total, the Congress has passed over $60 billion in emergency offsets in the last 10 years, most of which had a large amount of support on both sides of the aisle, including the support of former Speaker PELOSI.

The loan program used as an offset in this bill has had excess funds for years, and taking the money will not negatively affect that program. All entities in final loan stages will still get the funding they've worked for. Furthermore, this offset is identical to the one already passed by the House in June as part of the Homeland Security appropriations bill. We've already voted for it.

□ 1600

In addition, the committee will continue to consider additional disaster funding over the next few weeks as we bring the fiscal year 2012 appropriations process to a close, hopefully by November 18, including reviewing estimates that are still coming in from recent disasters so that families and communities can get the assistance they need while making sure that every dollar is well spent.

The Budget Control Act, which both Houses in Congress and the White House agreed to, provides for 2012 disaster funding in that capacity. But with respect to this continuing resolution, at this time we do not have all of the necessary information on the cost of the recent disasters nor the time to work out a final comprehensive agreement with the White House and the Senate.

As Members of this body know, back in their home districts, the FEMA administration works to survey the damage and report that to the White House who, in turn, makes the request to Congress for disaster funds. That's the normal procedure in which we are involved now, and I assure the Members that, as we get those estimates from the White House in the next few weeks and months, they will be addressed and monies will be available.

Therefore, we must meet the most immediate need and provide additional funding now for FEMA to keep that program going for the next several months. That's what this continuing resolution does and why we, the House and Senate, have to pass this bill immediately.

This CR lives up to the guidelines set in the Budget Control Act, as well as our commitment to responsible and reduced levels of spending. We can ride our fiscal ship while still supporting the essential government programs and services and disaster aid.

With this in mind, it is my intention that Congress complete the fiscal year 2012 appropriations work without any further delay. The sooner we pass this CR, the sooner we can focus on this long-term appropriations legislation and get it done before November 18.

I urge my colleagues in both Chambers to support this bill so we can send it to the President as soon as possible.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the continuing resolution. For the most part, it is a clean CR. It provides funding at $1.043 trillion through November 18. The amount reflects the Budget Control Act cap on FY 2012 appropriations. The CR continues funding as provided in FY 2011 with a 1.503 percent across-the-board cut to come down from approximately 1.059 to 1.043.

The CR adds a handful of anomalies requested by the administration through OMB, including provisions to cut back on overseas contingency operations funds from the level of 2011 down to the level that was passed in the Defense appropriations bill, which is approximately 118; authorize DHS work on national special security events; extend flood insurance; and delay the Postal Service payment obligation. The last provision will allow mail service to continue while Congress pursues legislative reforms.

The matter that concerns me and the Democratic Caucus is the way the majority has provided disaster relief funding. FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund is precariously short on money in FY

2011. Americans are trying to rebuild their lives after the devastating effect of floods, wildfires, and hurricanes in a record year of natural disasters, and FEMA is running out of resources to help them.

FEMA has deferred funding for all long-term rebuilding projects to focus on immediate needs. The administration requested a $500 million supplemental appropriation for the remaining days in the fiscal year. They requested 2011 emergency funds. They did not recommend an offset. This has been the practice for supplemental disaster relief.

Since 2002, Congress appropriated $95 billion in supplemental disaster relief. All of it was designated as an emergency, and none of it was offset. Some other emergencies may have been paid for during the Clinton administration; however, during the Bush administration, this was not so for disaster relief. Now, there were other categories of emergency spending and other supplementals that were offset but not disaster relief.

For fiscal years 2002 through 2006, President Bush requested supplemental disaster relief funding eight times. Each of the eight times was designated as an emergency and none were offset. With Republicans in the majority, some of the Bush emergency disaster relief bills, without offsets, were approved by voice vote and some were considered under unanimous consent.

Nonetheless, House Republicans today insist on departing from this practice. They take $1.5 billion from the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program at the Department of Energy to pay for $1 billion in disaster relief, disaster and emergency relief. We have discussed compromise with the other side. They have been unwilling to accept our suggestions.

The Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program was started in 2008 to reinvigorate American manufacturing. To date, this program has awarded $3.5 billion of credit subsidy to promote energy efficient advanced vehicles and their component parts. The Department of Energy estimates that loan guarantees have created or maintained, in total, 39,000 jobs in California, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, Missouri, and Tennessee.

Some have suggested that this program has been slow to spend emergency funding provided in the FY 2009 CR. I say the loan review process is and ought to be strenuous. One company, Tesla, originally applied under a different loan program in 2006 and received an ATVM loan in 2010. It required 4 years of due diligence and review to qualify for the loan.

Having read many of the press releases that went out when there was another DOE program that ran into difficulties, I didn't note anybody there saying we shouldn't take time for due diligence. Due diligence is required.

By the way, the company in question, Tesla, employed about 400 workers before receiving the loan. Today, they have 1,400 employees in the fields of engineering research and development, design, manufacturing, assembly, maintenance, service, sales, and support.

The ATVM program has an additional 18 loan applications in progress that are projected to create 50,000 to 60,000 more jobs, in total, in California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, and Ohio. One pending application would support investments at 11 plants in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio. The company employs over 56,000 workers, and they are adding nearly 9,000 new workers since 2009. Some of the jobs will be at risk by using this offset.

This is not the time to put American manufacturing jobs at risk. If you want to make it in America, you can't take away this funding.

□ 1610

If there is one thing we've learned on the economic forefront, it's that we need a growth policy, we don't need a cut policy. Cut and grow just ain't so.

I would point out that we need to get people back to work. And the way you do that is programs like this that are going to hire people instead of fire people. We have been doing a lot of firing, and it hasn't worked. When are we going to wake up? When is the majority party going to realize that we have to do something to create growth and stimulate the economy and put people back to work? The only way we're going to get the deficit down is to bring unemployment down.

This is an employment program. It should be supported. We should defeat the continuing resolution and come up with—either take this out or come up with another offset that doesn't hurt job creation in our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The gentleman mentioned in his statement that we had not used offsets to fund disaster relief; I beg to differ. In 2001, emergency supplemental, offset; 2002, emergency supplemental, offset; 2004, disaster relief for wildfire and others, offset. And in 2005, offset for relief for the tsunami. In 2006, relief for Katrina, offset. In 2008, disaster relief and recovery, $20 billion in offsets. I could go on. There are many times where we have used the offsets to pay for supplementals. In fact, over the last 10 years, 15 of the 30 emergency spending bills and supplementals were offset, for a total of $60 billion over the last 10 years.

Now, on this offset that has been mentioned, over $4 billion sits idle in that account and has so for 3 years now as the administration has been slow to obligate that money. The $1.5 billion rescission in subsidies we propose will not have a significant impact on the program. This is the same rescission, Madam Speaker, that we used in the 2012 Homeland Security appropriations bill that passed this House with bipartisan support in June. Exactly the same. And yet the Senate didn't act and that billion dollars was not available for disaster relief.

States with applications in the queue in this program, like Indiana, Louisiana, Ohio, Michigan, Florida, Missouri, California and many others, will still receive their due diligence just like before and could receive awards as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, the fact that we are even debating the substance of this continuing resolution is a telling statement about the priorities of the current House majority.

FEMA's disaster relief fund, after all, is operating on fumes. Since late August, the agency has deferred funding for all long-term rebuilding projects in order to have enough resources to meet the most pressing emergency needs. This means that critical rebuilding efforts in over 40 States—Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, Iowa, North Dakota, Tennessee, Missouri, Alabama, my own State of North Carolina and others—are on hold. Thousands of people who would currently be earning a good paycheck by working on rebuilding efforts are not, and communities that are still recovering from past disasters are being told to move to the back of the line to make way for those affected by the more recent disasters.

Madam Speaker, this Congress has a responsibility to make good on our promise to these communities by ensuring that FEMA has enough resources to respond to all major disasters. Regardless of where and when they occurred, we must not pit one State or one region against the other.

The administration has made clear what it will take: a $500 million supplemental appropriation for the remainder of this fiscal year, and an increase of $4.6 billion above its initial request for fiscal year 2012. This CR includes $1 billion in supplemental fiscal 2011 funding, and a $2.65 billion downpayment toward fiscal 2012. But I'm not satisfied with either the amount or with the price of inclusion.

Since 2002, Congress has appropriated $95 billion in supplemental funding for the disaster relief fund and additional disaster funding for the Corps of Engineers. Those are the two accounts we are talking about here, and that has all been designated as an emergency and none of it offset.

Now, at a time when communities up and down the eastern seaboard are still reeling from the aftermath of Hurricane Irene, at a time when millions of Americans are still struggling to find a good job, House Republicans are telling us that this time around, FEMA won't get any more disaster relief funding for the current year unless we take money from another Federal agency. This is a

radical departure from the way in which both parties have treated emergency disaster relief over the past decade, and it will undermine our economic recovery.

The Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program which our Republican colleagues propose to cannibalize, that program stands to add tens of thousands of good paying jobs in an industry that will be critical to our future economic competitiveness. This is a bad precedent, and it's bad policy.

It's no wonder the American people are fed up with Congress. Once again the majority is putting partisan ideology ahead of the dire needs of the American people by telling our communities they won't get relief until we wage yet another budget battle here in Congress.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this approach and instead support the disaster relief measure approved by the Senate which would fully fund FEMA's needs without requiring yet another fight over spending offsets.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), chair of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the full Appropriations Committee for yielding, and, Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this must-pass resolution.

Not only does this CR provide the necessary funds and authority to keep the government open, it also provides an immediate and a substantial infusion of vital funding to both FEMA's disaster relief efforts and the Corps of Engineers' flood control and coastal emergency account, and it does all of this in a fiscally responsible way. This resolution before us today complies with the recently enacted Budget Control Act and provides the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate ample time to do our work on the FY 2012 budget.

For the hard-hit communities all across the country, including my home State of Alabama, which was hit hard back in April, and those devastated by fires, floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes over the past 12 months, this CR will sustain FEMA's disaster relief and recovery efforts and help the Corps with additional funding for emergency flood control projects.

As I mentioned, my home State of Alabama was hit hard back on April 27, so if anyone is interested in sustaining FEMA's disaster relief, it would be me. And I do believe this bill does the job, and just that.

The duration of this CR will provide the time to review and scrutinize FEMA's preliminary damage estimates for Hurricane Irene, estimates that are based on historical projections rather than actual data and claims that are still in the process of being collected. This oversight will enable the Appropriations Committee the time to properly and responsibly address the administration's full supplemental request, a request that was submitted to Congress only about 2 weeks ago. And while Congress has an undeniable obligation to thoroughly address our Nation's disaster relief needs, we can no longer afford to simply throw money at calamities and then ask the hard questions later on. We have to get our funding priorities right the first time, and that is exactly what both Chairman ROGERS and I have repeatedly said when it comes to appropriations for homeland security.

Madam Speaker, this CR is the right tool for the right time, and I urge my colleagues to support this vital resolution and responsibly address our Nation's most pressing needs.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

□ 1620

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. The gentleman is the chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee which funds FEMA.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Exactly.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Now, you passed a bill back in June that provided $1 billion for FEMA for disaster relief; is that right?

Mr. ADERHOLT. We passed that.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. What happened to that bill?

Mr. ADERHOLT. It passed the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I mean, after it passed the House.

Mr. ADERHOLT. And it passed the House and was sent to the Senate.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. And what happened then?

Mr. ADERHOLT. And that's where it's sitting.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Nothing has taken place in the Senate since June?

Mr. ADERHOLT. Absolutely.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. And your bill would have provided $1 billion today for disaster relief, and the other body hasn't acted?

Mr. ADERHOLT. We did that, as you say, back well before June. It passed the House in June, and it sits over there even today.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. No wonder they're operating on fumes.

I'm talking about FEMA.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I rise to oppose the taking of the $1.5 billion from the advanced technology vehicle manufacturing account to offset a portion of the Army Corps disaster needs estimated to be $2.256 billion instead of declaring this matter an emergency.

I do think as a matter of policy this institution and the Congress as a whole needs to have the intestinal fortitude to understand that we have natural disasters every year, and we need to set aside moneys to fund those and not to take money out of investment accounts that create jobs in the United States of America.

We have two problems that we're discussing today. One is a natural problem. We have had tornadoes, we have had floods, we have had hurricanes, we had an earthquake, and we have had wildfires. So what is new?

The fact is in every year save two since 1997, the Congress has recognized the need for emergency funds to respond to the impacts of natural disasters on our Nation's water resources infrastructure. Since 2001, the Congress has provided more than $24 billion in emergency funds to the Army Corps of Engineers for this very purpose. And according to the Corps of Engineers, we have spent $5.12 billion on an emergency basis in Afghanistan and Iraq on economic infrastructures.

Now, some suggest all of this has to be offset because we have a fiscal crisis. I would point out that those emergency declarations for water emergencies in 1998 occurred and the budget of the United States was balanced. There was an emergency declaration as far as those water projects in 1999, and we had a balanced budget. There was not an emergency declaration in 2000, and we balanced a budget. In 2001 we had an emergency declaration for water disasters, and we balanced the budget. That's not an argument not to meet the human crisis that people are facing in this country.

I certainly think that my colleague from Washington covered the account as far as vehicle manufacturing very well and the investment it represents and the jobs maintained and created that are represented again in this account.

And certainly Chairman ROGERS makes a point, and rightfully so, that many of these dollars have now been allocated to specific loan programs and others, eight specifically, will be resolved by the end of this year. Again, this offset would not impact those, and the chairman is absolutely correct. However, I do point out to my colleagues that the remaining 10 projects are in the stage of due diligence, the same words that my colleague from Washington used, to compete for the remainder of the $1.5 billion with approximately 10,000 jobs at stake.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Isn't it true that the industrial States are the ones that are getting most of this money because that's where the automobile industry has over the years been located?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. The gentleman is correct. But I would broaden that to suggest the United States of America is getting that money, and people who want to make things in the United

States of America and manufacture things in the United States of America are getting that money.

Mr. DICKS. Isn't it true we already know this program works, this program received $7.5 billion, and $3.5 billion of it has been obligated and is out there as loans? I think it tripled under the loan guarantee program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DICKS. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

And so we are seeing that this program actually works. I mean, if there was some question that it was something that hasn't worked, but it is creating jobs and it will create jobs in the future. And there is a whole bunch of people in there making applications from many of these States that you and I just talked about.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Right. We have 10 pending, and I would not be on the floor if I did not believe we've maintained and created jobs and we have potentially 10,000 more jobs than we can create with the $1.5 billion that is pending; and I would point out, again, I would broaden your observation to the entire United States of America.

I mentioned two problems we face. The second is manufacturing in the United States of America. In 1977, we had over 18 million Americans engaged in manufacturing. Last year, we had over 11 million. The real hourly wage for what an American worker is paid for 1 hour's worth of their physical labor, whatever they may do in this country, is 53 cents less in 2010 than it was in 1977. That's not the country I want to leave the children of this world, and I'm convinced it's because of the loss of those manufacturing jobs.

If it's good enough to declare an emergency and build a children's hospital in Basra, Iraq, we ought not to take money out of an investment account that creates jobs in the auto industry to help people in Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

If it is good enough to declare an emergency to have generators installed in Kandahar, Afghanistan, by the Army Corps of Engineers, we ought not to take money away from job-creating programs to help people in Springfield, Massachusetts. If it's good enough to build a hydroelectric dam in Afghanistan on an emergency basis, we ought to declare an emergency to help people in Smithville, Mississippi.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I think I have made my point. I think the gentleman has, and I think this is the wrong policy. Again, institutionally we need to come to grips with natural disasters, set those moneys aside; but in the alternative and in the intermediate term, we need to recognize them for what they are and not rob the future of this Nation economically to do so.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of Appropriations, the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill to fund the continuing operations of the Federal Government until November 18. I appreciate the leadership of Chairman ROGERS in addressing the responsibilities of this Congress.

Passing this stopgap measure will give Congress time to complete the fiscal year 2012 appropriations process. In spite of our late start, the Appropriations Committee was still able to move 11 of the 12 appropriations bills this year. However, the committee still needs time to collaborate with the Senate.

The continuing resolution funds vital government programs and services and allows essential bills to be paid. It reduces spending to the levels agreed to by the Congress and the administration in the Budget Control Act that was signed into law in August. And it avoids controversial policy riders in order to ensure swift passage.

There are many reasons Members should support this bill. Perhaps one of the most important is what this bill does for our military. Without a CR, our servicemembers and their families don't get paid. They would have to continue to do their work protecting the country, but they would have to do it while worrying about whether they would be able to pay their bills or mortgage.

Our brave men and women in uniform already faced that possibility earlier this year. They deserve better. They need to know that the United States Congress stands behind them. This bill addresses disaster relief, and it funds it in a responsible way.

□ 1630

I urge my colleagues to support this bill so it can be enacted as soon as possible and the Appropriations Committee can complete its work without any further delay. This is a responsible action for us to take to go forward. The American people expect the Congress to do our jobs. The Appropriations Committee must complete its work.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. I thank my distinguished chairman and the ranking member for this conversation.

Madam Speaker, Congress has found the money over the years for disaster relief for all other parts of the country time and time again, whether it was forest fires in the West, droughts in the Southwest, flooding in the Midwest, tornados in the South. Now the Republican majority in the House of Representatives says that when the Northeast suffers devastating flooding as a result of Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee, you won't get enough to cover all of your damages and we're going to have to cut other investments in programs that create manufacturing jobs in America. That's simply outrageous.

I saw firsthand the devastation that occurred in my district in northeastern New Jersey. Thousands of my constituents lost their possessions, were forced to evacuate from their homes or were without power for days, and critical infrastructure was damaged. Recovery efforts are beyond the means of the State and local governments. Our neighbors, our local communities, our local businesses need Federal help to rebuild and they need it now in full, just like every other part of the country in all the years past.

This is not a partisan matter in the Northeast. My Republican Governor, Governor Chris Christie from New Jersey, said our people are suffering now and they need Federal support now, and he was right.

It is time to meet the disaster needs of American citizens in New Jersey, in northeastern United States of America, to do so now and in full. And the Republican majority should get rid of the bill it has now—which I'm going to vote against—and give full relief to the American people from New Jersey. We've been paying the tab for others for a long time. We need the help now.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 9½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Kentucky has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a very hardworking member of our committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to urge support of H.R. 2608, the Continuing Resolution Act of 2012.

Frankly, I had hoped not to be here in this particular capacity. I had hoped by this point this year we would have been able to restore complete regular order and move our appropriations bills through in a normal fashion. And, frankly, thanks to the leadership of Chairman ROGERS and the cooperation of Chairman DICKS, we've made a lot of progress in doing just that, and hopefully next year we'll be able to complete that progress and build upon what's been accomplished this year. However, there is a genuine need for this continuing resolution at this particular time for a number of reasons.

First, with all due respect, our friends on the other side of the aisle didn't write a budget this year, and that took up quite a bit of time earlier this year getting ready for 2011. Second, we all know we had a prolonged debate over the debt ceiling. That took

up a lot of time. And finally, with all due respect to our friends on the other side of the Rotunda, the Senate operates at a rather leisurely pace these days when it comes to budgeting and appropriating—and, frankly, has for several years. That needs to change.

Some people in this Chamber will oppose this bill because it ''doesn't have enough money for disaster relief.'' The reality is it does. And we can add to that, once the continuing resolution is completed and the appropriations process moves forward, as necessary with due diligence.

Frankly, a lot of this talk about not having enough relief is simply a ruse to spend more money in other areas without being responsible and offsetting expenses from existing revenue. Some on my side of the aisle will oppose this legislation because it spends too much. And, frankly, I have a good deal of sympathy with that. We all would like to lower spending while taking care of legitimate disaster relief.

But this agreement is one that operates under a total spending level. It's been worked out and it's a compromise, and it's one that we ought to honor, honestly, on both sides of the aisle. And my friends who oppose it because it spends too much will only end up triggering additional spending if this legislation doesn't pass. It's a responsible bill.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COLE. In closing, Madam Speaker, it's a responsible piece of legislation. We ought to act on it.

Frankly, it shouldn't be a partisan football. We can take care of people that need relief fully and expeditiously, we can exercise our responsibilities in appropriate oversight fashion, and we can continue to work toward deficit reduction in the long term if we pass this continuing resolution.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the ranking Democratic member of the Natural Resources Committee, Congressman ED MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman from Washington State.

We're having 100-year floods every year. We're having tornados rip through Joplin. We have floods in Vermont, in New Jersey, New York. We have hurricanes all across the country. We have 48 States who have had emergency declarations so far this year. The planet is warming; the weather is worsening.

What is the response of the Republicans? They have to find the money—they say all of a sudden—for disaster relief for people who are suffering, for people who are desperate, for people whose lives have been altered permanently.

They say we have to cut something. Now, do they say we're going to cut the nuclear weapons program because America doesn't need any more nuclear weapons? No. Are we going to cut the breaks that we give to oil and coal? No, we're not going to touch those things. Where are we going? What does the Republican Party do? What does the Tea Party want? I ask what the Tea Party wants.

The Tea Party wants to cut the Clean Car Factory Fund. Now, what is that? Well, that's the fund that we have that's going to invent the automobiles and the trucks that go 60, 70, 80, 90 miles per gallon without having to use oil. Now, why is that important? Two reasons: One, it's the oil that's being burnt that creates the greenhouse gases that are warming up the planet, causing all of these weather conditions that are leading to these disaster relief programs that have to have more money in them as each year goes by; and, two, it is so that we can tell the OPEC ministers, We don't need your oil any more than we need your sand.

So what are they doing here today? They're taking the one program that is central to the health and well-being of our country and to our national security—so that we alter our relationship with OPEC—and they are slashing it. They are slashing the one program that reinvents the vehicles that we drive. They are slashing the one program that gives young people in our country some hope that we are going to invent our way out of this problem.

You don't have to be Dick Tracy to figure out what's going on here. The oil industry, the coal industry, all of the polluting industries are saying kill the program that makes sure that the vehicles we get in 20 years get 75 or 100 miles per gallon without using one gallon of oil.

Vote ''no'' on this terrible bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chair of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

I just want to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this continuing resolution.

This body has been doing a lot of things to try to get the economy moving again, to try to put people back to work, create jobs. One of the ways we can do that is to change this culture of spending into a culture of saving. Quit crowding out the private sector so that the private sector can come in and do the job creation that we know they can do.

□ 1640

We've taken some giant steps on stopping all the spending that's gone on here. Last year we did some good things. Eventually we funded the government at less than last year's level, and this year we hoped that we would come in and do the individual Appropriations subcommittees. In the House we passed six of those through the full House. Unfortunately, the Senate only passed one, and so we find ourselves now in a situation where we have to pass a continuing resolution.

But, again, all the subcommittees that came before this full House funded their subcommittees at less than last year's level. We now have a continuing resolution that has funding that's less than last year. It's been agreed to by the House, agreed to by the Senate, and agreed to by the President.

And we can argue about the process. We can argue about whether it should be a little more or a little bit less. But we'll give ourselves until November 18 to finalize all the work that needs to be done. And so I think it's appropriate that we pass this, move forward, and continue to try to get a handle on the spending to help get our economy moving again.

Mr. DICKS. May I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chair of the Labor-HHS Subcommittee, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG).

Mr. REHBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, there is no phrase that better embodies the fact that something here in Washington is broken than ''government shutdown.'' Yesterday we heard those words for the second time in a year, and that tells us the old ways of doing things simply don't work anymore. It's time for a new direction.

Every month we're faced with new unemployment numbers, new market losses, and new deficit figures. We can never forget that behind those numbers are people. Unemployment isn't just a number; it's people who worry about how they will fill their gas tanks or put food on their table.

Market losses aren't just lines on a graph; it's the retirement savings of seniors across the country who struggle to afford medicine they need. And deficit isn't just borrowed money; it's the future being stolen from our children and our grandchildren.

As subcommittee chairman of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations, I support this continuing resolution. Not only does it prevent a government shutdown, it gives us time to finish working on the remaining appropriations bills in an open and transparent way.

I look forward to my subcommittee introducing and debating their work. Let me tell you a little bit about it. As we've been crafting this bill, I've worked closely with you, Members of this body, and listened to folks from Montana and throughout the country. We want it to be a balanced plan that fundamentally improves how the government spends its money, the hard-working money of taxpayers.

We want to make government more accountable and efficient, saving as much as possible on top of the savings from earlier this year. In addition to eliminating inefficient programs, we'll improve the remaining government by defunding enforcement of unnecessary and overreaching regulations. These regulations cost jobs and hamper economic recovery.

By spending strategically, we can maintain critical funding for things like education and biomedical research. To be successful in tomorrow's economy, our children need to be prepared for the skilled jobs that are going unfilled today. We also need to invest in basic research so the U.S. can continue to be a leader in biomedical advancements. Our subcommittee wants to do that.

Our legislation will keep the promise we made to rein in government spending and government growth. It's the next step, not the final one. We still have a long way to go, but by finding ways to do more with less, we are changing the direction in Washington. That's what the American people want, and I'm confident that by passing this continuing resolution it will give us the time to do it in the open and do it right.

With that, I hope you'll vote for this continuing resolution.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding to me, and I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2608, the Continuing Appropriations Act of 2012. I oppose playing political games with FEMA disaster funding while American citizens are recovering from recent natural disasters that have wiped out homes, businesses, and lives.

In an unprecedented move, the Republican majority requires an offset for FEMA funding. FEMA must be fully funded so that my constituents can continue recovering from the devastation of Hurricane Irene. By requiring this offset, we're playing politics with the lives of those who need our assistance most.

Let me tell my Republican colleagues that if you want an offset, let's get rid of the Bush tax cuts for the rich. That's an offset that you won't want to get rid of.

This bill presents a false choice: that we need to cut off one hand to save the other. The bill slashes funds from a program that would reinvigorate the manufacturing sector and decrease our reliance on foreign oil to fund FEMA. We can do both, and we need not buy in to this ridiculous logic. In times of disaster, we must always take care of our citizens and our country first, period.

Try telling my constituents who are struggling in the aftermath of a hurricane, sorry, you'll have to wait till we find an offset. Sorry, we really don't care about your problems. We have other pressing things to do.

Reasonable Democrats and Republicans maintained the practice of helping constituents in the past. Why this policy has changed is beyond me.

Madam Speaker, disasters are not associated with one political party, and helping our citizens should be a top priority of both.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the CR, and urge the majority to bring a bill to the floor that fully funds FEMA and doesn't harm job creation and does the right thing.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Does the gentleman realize that back in June, in this body we passed, with bipartisan support, the Homeland Security bill, which contained $1 billion for FEMA, sent it to the Senate, and it's been laying there for the last 3 months? Did the gentleman know that?

Mr. ENGEL. I do know that. Unfortunately, it's been difficult passing things in the Senate because, quite frankly, the minority filibusters everything to death, and getting the 60 votes is very, very difficult.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very hardworking chair of the Interior subcommittee on appropriations, the gentleman whose subcommittee held more hearings than any other, I think 22 different hearings—we had 150 committee-wide, but he won the award for the most hearings—the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, many Members of Congress, myself included, recognize that if we want to get our economy going again we need to take steps to get our fiscal house back in order and provide certainty to the marketplace so small business and job creators can begin hiring again.

Until we finish the regular appropriations process for the coming year, we won't be able to implement the necessary spending reductions and policy reforms needed to get our economy moving again.

While the House has come close to passing all of the appropriation bills out of committee and many of the bills on the floor, the Senate has passed only one bill so far. This CR gives us time to complete that work, while cutting current spending. To me, that seems like a much more reasonable solution than threatening another government shutdown, which will only hurt the economy.

Congress has one responsibility each year, and that is to pass the 12 appropriations bills by the beginning of the year. That job has been made harder this year by the fact that the previous majority did not complete their work by the end of 2010.

But I've got to tell you, in all honesty, this debate has almost been bizarre to me today. People have asked me whether we need to offset emergency spending, and I said emergency spending does not have to be offset. But if you can find the offsets to do so, why not do so? And that's what we've tried to do in this bill.

This debate seems to me almost devoid of the fact that we are $1.5 trillion in debt this year. The gentlelady from Texas, in the debate on the rule, said, we're nickel and diming those that are suffering from disaster, and that we shouldn't be nickel and diming.

I don't know, but in Idaho, $1.5 trillion, or the $1 billion that we're offsetting here, is not nickels and dimes.

The gentleman from New Jersey said people need relief now in New Jersey. They are going to get relief when we pass this bill.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) said, we are cannibalizing the program that we are taking the money out of. In full committee, this amendment was offered on the Homeland Security bill. This amendment was offered. There was no objection to it. It passed on a voice vote. And now we are cannibalizing the program?

We need to pass this so that we can get on and finish our appropriations bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 5¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 5 minutes remaining.

□ 1650

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, my good friend, Mr. HOYER, from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this bill.

Now, all of us are for a continuing resolution which keeps the government in business. In the past, on both sides of the aisle, we have talked about clean CRs, clean CRs in the short term—this going to November 18—to keep government running. I was hopeful that we would have such a CR this time so we would not continue to give to the American public the feeling that we can't come to agreement.

I was not in the Appropriations Committee. The gentleman, my good friend from Idaho, said this was an amendment that was not opposed in committee. I don't know whether Mr. PRICE would agree with that. I don't know what the facts on that were. But let me say this:

This is a pay-for that is extraordinarily controversial on our side of the aisle, extraordinarily controversial because the message we got from America as we were home, and as we get today, is we need to create jobs. We need to grow the economy. We perceive on this side of the aisle as having selected a pay-for, which, by the way, pay-for for FEMA disaster aid, as I understand it from staff, has never happened before. No precedent for doing this.

Let me give you an example that we all ought to all understand.

Your water heater goes out at 2 a.m. in the morning. Your family is going to get up the next day and they need to take a shower and they need to get ready, and you need a water heater right away. So what do you do? You go out and buy the water heater. What do you do? You charge it. Because it's an emergency, you've got to get it online.

We have a lot of people who have suffered an emergency assault by hurricane, by tornado, by fire, by earthquake, and they need help now. And historically, we have given help now and have not gotten into a debate about what priority do we undermine in that process. We respond to the true emergency.

Now, we've had a lot of emergencies, and Mr. ROGERS and I have been here a long time, that were not really emergencies. We claimed they were emergencies so we didn't have to pay for them under our rules.

But there is no one, I think, in this body or in this country who doesn't believe that Irene caused a legitimate emergency—not feigned, not used for the purposes of justifying where we may go. The longstanding precedent in both Chambers has been to respond to disasters immediately by getting victims the help they need.

Just as a family can't budget in advance for a car breaking down or the water heater or something as I mentioned, we have provided in the agreement that we just made just a few weeks ago for headroom for exactly these kinds of emergencies—$11 billion. However, we did not provide that for 2011. But, again, 2011 is when the emergency occurred and when the money is needed now.

The Senate just passed a disaster relief bill that adheres to this precedent, and it passed with significant bipartisan support. Unfortunately, Republicans here insist on breaking with this commonsense precedent and with their colleagues in the Senate and demand that responding to an emergency be offset by cutting elsewhere.

Now, again, let me precisely say, on emergency, FEMA funding directed at disaster relief.

Now, the problem we have is that the target for paying for this is what we perceive to be a job creator. So as a result, I would ask that we reject this bill.

We have some time left to do another CR that we ought to agree on in a bipartisan way, a clean CR, short-term, so that, yes, we can, as the gentleman from Idaho said, get on with our business.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to a very hardworking member of our committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER).

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky yielding time.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I rise in support of the continuing resolution that is before us today. This CR continues government operations at an amount agreed to by the Congress and the White House in the Budget Control Act just a few weeks ago, as was noted by the distinguished Democrat whip.

But make no mistake, the American people spoke loudly last November and the message was clear: We need to spend less. And both the House Budget Committee and the House Appropriations Committee have been at the vanguard of meeting that challenge.

But the other message that many of us receive when we go back home to our districts from our constituents is they want this institution to function. They want their elected officials on both sides to put aside the partisan differences and to work to create an environment that fosters job creation and economic growth and that reduces spending and puts our Nation back on a path towards fiscal solvency.

Naturally, I find it disappointing to now learn that some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are opposing this bill for purely political reasons after signalling their support just last week.

And to my friends in our own conference who believe we should make deeper cuts in this CR, I would say we agree. The House has voted to reduce spending further on multiple occasions, and this Appropriations Committee has reported many bills to do so as well.

Sadly, in this hyperpartisan political environment with the Republican majority in the House, a Democrat majority in the Senate, and a Democrat White House, the will of the House alone cannot rule the day simply because we wish to do so.

This is a reasonable bill which pays for the disaster funding it contains, and it holds the funding level at an agreed-upon amount and allows the committee the opportunity to do its work in the remaining days of this year before fiscal year 2012 kicks in.

I urge my colleagues to support this passage.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to a new member of our committee who's doing a great job, from the State of Arkansas, STEVE WOMACK.

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for yielding and appreciate this time.

If I heard it once when I was back in my district, I heard it dozens of times, and that was the frustration of my constituents concerning our inability to get our business done, to get it done on time without the panic and anxiety associated with threatened shutdowns of government.

This vote today is an opportunity for us to do just that—fund government consistently with the amounts agreed to in the Budget Control Act, giving the necessary time to complete 2012 appropriations and save America from the threat of another government shutdown.

Now, as was articulated by the distinguished chairman a moment ago, I'm a freshman, and I realize I'm still learning the ropes of this Chamber and how things get done, but let's just go back in context.

This funds government at levels consistent with the Budget Control Act passed in this very room a few weeks ago. It addresses disaster funding and does so in a very responsible way. It is not unprecedented nor is it unique to find offsets. And this offset is exactly what this House passed in the Homeland Security appropriations bill.

So what has changed? I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that the political strategies have changed, and the emotions and the hardships of the people affected by these disasters are really nothing more than a political prop in this entire discussion designed to make us look hard-hearted or insensitive. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Just a moment ago, the distinguished Democratic whip from Maryland talked about the water heater going out in the middle of the night. You just simply go charge one. What happens when you go to charge it and your credit is denied? You've maxed out on your credit card. As my friend MIKE SIMPSON said a moment ago, we're broke. We're a trillion and a half dollars in deficit.

Our plan, this CR, provides the necessary funding, does it responsibly and consistently with already agreed-upon numbers. I urge its passage.

□ 1700

Mr. DICKS. I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished Democratic leader from California, whose State has suffered a number of major disasters over the years, so she is well versed on this subject, Ms. PELOSI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I congratulate him on his tremendous leadership as the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

When he was speaking today, I was thinking back to when I was a relatively new Member of Congress—not even here 2 years—when we had the Loma Prieta earthquake in the San Francisco Bay Area. It was shocking to us. Of course, it was a complete surprise—a terrible natural disaster. The Bay Bridge was out of commission and cracked. The homes were on fire for days and days and days—a true natural disaster.

When I came to the floor when this issue was brought up by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Honorable Jamie Whitten of Mississippi, he came to the floor; and with his words of comfort and assurance to the people who were affected by this natural disaster, his comments made all the difference in the world. In listening to him, no one had any doubt

that the Federal Government was going to honor its commitment to the American people: that when in time of natural disaster, we will be there. We have a compact with the American people.

How different the conversation is today when we're talking about saying, when in a time of natural disaster—and by the way, there have been many more natural disasters than in the San Francisco Bay Area, the Loma Prieta, which stretched for long distances in northern California. Today, we've had hurricanes, earthquakes, tornadoes, floods, forest fires still raging out of control in some parts of the country—Texas, until recently, in that situation. I hope that it's under control now or that the rain we all prayed for there is coming.

And what do we do? We come to the floor and say, Now we're going to institute a new policy that says: in time of natural disaster, we're going to have to find some place to pay for it. Now, what's next? Where are we going next to pay for it?

The distinguished chairman has said, well, we've paid for emergencies before and, indeed, we have. I'm talking about something of a much different caliber. I'm talking about a natural disaster. I'm talking about the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund. With all of the disasters that are happening at once, we don't know when the next one will come; but what is frightening also is we don't know where this majority wants to go to pay for it.

I have serious objection to the pay-for in this legislation. I have a bigger objection that we would have to pay for a disaster. We never paid for the tax cuts for the rich. They never were paid for. We never paid for the wars in Afghanistan or Iraq. They were never paid for. But, all of a sudden, we have to pay to try to make whole these people who have been affected, who have lost everything. I've visited there. I wish you would. Maybe you have. But it's not that the joblessness story is finished. It's not that as we go to a new disaster, we're finished with the old one. It's just compounded.

Someone mentioned earlier in the election—people talked about this—that the American people, whether in election or out of election, want jobs; and exactly what this bill does is cut jobs. Instead of creating jobs, which is the number one priority of the American people, this Republican bill will cost good-paying jobs. It's amazing because the bill that we're debating here will cost at least 10 good-paying American manufacturing jobs—Make It in America—and perhaps tens of thousands more by cutting the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program.

I'm not even going to speak too much about it because our colleagues already have. They've talked about how this takes us to the next place in innovation and competitiveness for our country, the next place in technology for cars that will reduce emissions, which will help to stop some of these natural disasters. These loans are proven to be effective. They have already created 42,000 jobs, putting America to work making cleaner, more efficient American cars. We shouldn't have to choose between creating jobs and caring for those struggling in the aftermath of disasters like Hurricane Irene and the earthquake that preceded it and the floods that continue.

One of the speakers, a gentleman whom I respect, said this is a political move. Well, if there is anything that is not political in our country, it is a natural disaster. Do you want to talk politics when somebody is suffering a natural disaster? There is no place for that. At some place, we walk on a ground that is more hallowed than the normal terrain on which we debate, and that terrain is the terrain of the disaster that has affected the American people. If you looked in their eyes, you would feel so helpless that you could not make them whole. You may not be able to provide them the personal effects of their families. I've seen it so many times.

Will they economically be made whole? Will their homes be restored in a way that makes it the home it was before that they loved, that created a sense of community, one home after another? So we're at a very, very sad place for all of these people. We don't know who is next.

What makes me suspicious about what the majority has put into this—and I want you to know this—is we haven't paid for natural disaster assistance before. They're using this advanced technology vehicle manufacturing. They're taking $1 billion of it to pay for the disaster. There is a half a billion dollars left, and they're rescinding it in this bill. They're eliminating it. So this isn't about paying for the disaster. This is about destroying an initiative that is job-creating, that is innovative, that keeps America number one, that creates good-paying jobs in our country.

It's really hard to understand what the motivation is for that, but one thing is clear—they are using the disaster to eliminate that initiative, and that's just not right. But even if they had the best offset in the world, I still think it is wrong for them to go down a path that says, This time, for your disaster, we're using this technology program. What's next? With all of the disasters that we have, where do we have the room to say, On those days, at that specific time, this is how we'll pay for it?

Let's, instead, do something that gives hope to people, that creates an economic boomlet in these places that have been affected and not a discouragement that they are being treated differently than anybody else has been in time of natural disasters.

I heard the distinguished chairman use the term ''emergency.'' It's a different story. It's a different story. It is with great sadness that we try to meet the needs of people at this difficult time. It's in great sadness that we even have to have a debate about it. I urge our Republican colleagues to withdraw this bill. Come back clean. Let us vote together to address the natural disaster that has afflicted our country, recognizing that we don't know what's around the corner.

As one of my colleagues said, We said we're going to pay for everything.

We don't know what God has in store for us for the next disaster. We hope and pray that, whatever it is, we have the strength to meet the needs of our people in a way that has nothing to do with politics but everything to do with America.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote against this, reluctantly, because I would love for us to join together but not in its present form.

□ 1710

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this is a simple bill. This is a simple continuation of spending until November 18.

I would not want it on my record that I voted against helping the postal workers keep their routes until November 18. We take care of that problem in this bill. I wouldn't want to vote ''no'' on that if I could help it.

I wouldn't want to vote ''no'' to refuse to continue the government and all that the government does. I wouldn't want it on my record that I voted against helping people who are flooded, the subject of wildfires, earthquakes and all other sorts of calamities. A vote of ''no'' on this bill says no other help for those people.

Now, the gentlewoman who just preceded me, the former Speaker of the House, says that we should not use offsets to pay for at least a portion of these disaster funds. In fact, while the gentlewoman was Speaker of this House, we did just that.

We voted to offset the funding for Hurricane Katrina in 2006 and 2007. We voted for offsets for disaster relief in 2008, 2009; and, lastly, in 2010 we voted to offset $10 billion for what was called the Pelosi edu-jobs stimulus bill. The gentlewoman voted for that offset.

So I urge you to vote for this bill. We will have plenty of time during the negotiations with the Senate during the next 6 weeks to take into account the additional bills we are going to get for flooding and other disaster relief, and we will take care of the problem between now and then.

Vote ''yes'' on the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, today's Continuing Resolution would fund federal government operations through November 18, 2011 at 98.5% of FY 2011 funding levels, reflecting the 1.5% across-the-board cut required to bring spending in line with the $1.043 trillion discretionary cap for FY 2012 in the recently enacted Budget Control Act of 2011.

Additionally, H.R. 2608 provides $3.65 billion in disaster relief funding, which is $1.8 billion below President Obama's request and

$3.25 billion less than the Senate allocation supported by ten Republican Senators. Of the $3.65 billion for disaster relief in today's legislation, $1 billion is made available in FY 2011 and the remaining $2.65 billion is designated as FY 2012 money. However, in a sharp break with precedent under previous administrations from both parties, the $1 billion in FY 2011 in emergency disaster relief is offset by a $1.5 billion cut in the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be holding emergency disaster relief hostage to political infighting in Washington, DC. And with unemployment still hovering above 9%, we certainly shouldn't be undermining a proven job creator like the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program that will help next generation vehicles get built in the United States rather than overseas.

Instead, we should put politics aside, pass a clean CR and get disaster relief where it is needed without undercutting innovation and job creation in an economy that needs more of both.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I rise today to provide explanation and clarification of the intended budget effects from the anomaly related to the U.S. Postal Service that is contained in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2608, the Continuing Resolution (CR) for Fiscal Year 2012.

The amendment would postpone from September 30, 2011 until November 18, 2011 the payment due from the Postal Service, which is off-budget, to an on-budget account managed by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM).

The Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act of 2006 requires the Postal Service to make a $5.5 billion payment to OPM by September 30, 2011 to pre-fund retiree health benefits. However, the Postal Service does not currently have adequate funds to make this payment. To address this issue, the CR includes a provision that will delay the payment to provide time for the Postal Service to work with Congress and the administration to develop a long-term solution.

If only the on-budget effects were counted, this delay would score as an increase in spending in 2011, but then produce savings in 2012, resulting in additional room for spending under the caps on discretionary spending established in the Budget Control Act of 2011. To prevent this unintended consequence, the House Budget Committee scored this anomaly on a unified basis, so that both the on-budget and off-budget effects were counted together. As the result, the 2011 cost and the 2012 savings offset each other and produce a score of zero in the CR. This decision has precedent. A similar provision was included in the FY 2010 short-term CR (P.L. 111–68) where the House scored that provision on a unified basis pursuant to section 426(b) of the 2010 budget resolution.

The off-budget status of the U.S. Postal Service creates significant complications for budget enforcement when the agency seeks timing shifts or bailouts from the U.S. Treasury due to financial distress. The House Budget Committee will continue to monitor this anomaly throughout the budget and appropriations process to ensure that it does not result in additional discretionary spending in FY 2012.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise to voice my strong opposition to HR. 2608, the short-term continuing appropriations measure on the floor today to fund government operations through November 18, 2011.

Hundreds of American communities have been devastated this year by hurricanes, droughts, floods, wildfires and tornadoes. Dozens of Governors—both Republicans and Democrats—have requested federal assistance from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to meet the needs of their states' residents. These federal funds are used by state and local response teams to house displaced families, provide crisis counseling to disaster victims, remove debris, and repair or replace critical bridges, roads and utilities.

With more than three months remaining, 2011 has already seen more billion dollar disasters than any year on record. Early cost estimates of this year's weather-related disasters are well above $20 billion. As a result, FEMA can no longer afford to help all those who need assistance. The Associated Press reported that FEMA's disaster funding is now so low that planned repairs to bridges, roads and schools in tornado-ravaged Joplin, Missouri have been stopped and the funds redirected to help the victims of Hurricane Irene.

Caring for Americans devastated by natural disasters has always been a basic American value. Unfortunately, House Republicans are turning disaster relief into a partisan political battle by under-funding these urgent needs and demanding that emergency funds be offset with cuts to a critical job-creating initiative.

The House legislation under debate today includes $3.65 billion in emergency aid—$1.8 billion less than what the Obama administration told Congress is needed. Even worse, H.R. 2608 cuts $1 billion from the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program (ATVM). This public-private partnership helps U.S. auto makers and parts suppliers build next generation vehicles with technologies made in America, rather than imported from China and other foreign countries. The ATVM is a major success. It has already saved or created 41,000 American jobs and will save or create at least 35,000 additional jobs anticipated by the end of this year. The cuts demanded by House Republicans to this program threaten to destroy thousands of American jobs and undermine the global competitiveness of U.S. auto makers.

During the past decade, House Republicans voted time and time again for so-called emergency funding for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan without offsetting the costs. The hundreds of billions of dollars in deficit spending Republicans supported on these wars helped create the crippling debt our country now faces. And now, my House Republican colleagues are pretending to take a stand against deficits by threatening to shut down the U.S. government and deny assistance to American families who have had their lives destroyed by natural disaster.

I call on reasonable Republicans in the House to join with Democrats to reject this hypocritical and callous bill, and instead commit the necessary funding to rescue America's devastated communities.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2608, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for FY 2012.

This legislation implements a 1.5%, nearly across the board reduction to current spending levels and pays for it by cutting the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program (ATVM). This program is essential to keeping our auto manufacturing industry competitive.

I support the cuts to the Overseas Contingency Operations fund, which is used to fund our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as other counterterrorism operations. But the rhetoric on cuts to war spending does not match the reality and cost of our policies abroad.

Last week, The New York Times highlighted the legal battle currently occurring in the White House over the use of lethal force, of targeted killings against militants abroad by ''drone strikes, cruise missiles or commando raids.'' We talk about ending the wars while planning to expand the use of lethal force—or committing acts of war—in other countries with little to no oversight from Congress. We impose faux deadlines to end the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and attach cost-savings estimates to them, while at the time same, continuing to push the deadline for withdrawal back. According to the Congressional Research Service, the cost of keeping U.S. troops in Afghanistan is $694,000 per soldier per year.

The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have cost the United States trillions of dollars and have played a major role in our economic insecurity. The war in Iraq was the first time in American history that the government cut taxes as it went to war, resulting in a war completely funded by borrowing. Soaring oil prices, the ballooning federal debt and the global economic crisis are all intimately linked to our policies of endless war. These are policies we are continuing today.

Any serious debate on scaling back spending must include not only cuts to defense spending, but also to the wars the U.S. is currently waging or attempting to expand in other countries such as Somalia, Yemen and Pakistan through our drone campaigns. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to debate H.R. 2608, ''The Small Business Program Extension and Reform Act of 2011,'' which provides for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 at the expense of job creating efforts.

Now . . . Now is not the time to trample on the needs of small business owners. Now is not the time to delay assistance to those who need support from FEMA. Now is not the time for a partisan position that will only cause more Americans to suffer while they have to wait on Congress to find balance. Now is the time for balance and reason.

Small businesses have long been the bedrock of our nation's economy. Even with the advent of modern-day multi-national corporations most of our day-to-day purchases take place at ''mom and pop'' small businesses.

This piece of legislation holds small businesses hostage in order to make a demand that has never been made by Republicans before. This demand changes their practice during previous administrations. In the past my colleagues declared disaster funding as emergency spending and did not require offsetting emergency spending.

This bill would offset the $1 billion in FY11 disaster relief funding using a program that is a proven job-creator, a program for small businesses. The very small businesses that are currently in need of access to loans and other

lines of credit in order to build their businesses and create jobs. The very small businesses that are the life blood of our economy. These businesses, the ''mom and pop'' shops across our nation are being held hostage by my colleagues across the aisle at the expense of jobs.

The future success of their businesses are being held hostage in order to demand offsets of funds that have not requires such an offset in the past. These funds would aid victims of natural disasters. To propose such a measure at a time when our economy is so fragile and when so many are struggling to survive is unfathomable. I support the bipartisan Senate language.

At a time when our nation needs every single job we can create. Before us is a job killing measure. We need job creation to help families survive on smaller and smaller pay checks. Before us is legislation that places a halt on this growth. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the first time in our nation's history has added to this piece of legislation a requirement that disaster aid be offset. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) needs the $6.9 billion in funding which has been approved in the Senate last week without requiring offset. These cuts cost Americans tens of thousands of jobs. Under the previous administration Republicans supported disaster relief without requiring an offset, on eight separate occasions but today they want to require cuts that will result in job loss.

As the Representative for Houston, which suffered severe damage in 2008 as a result of Hurricane Ike, I understand the importance of clean up and rebuilding in the wake of natural disaster. Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) addresses the challenges our communities face when we are confronted with a catastrophic event or a domestic terrorist attack. It is important for people to understand that our capacity to deal with hurricanes directly reflects our ability to respond to a terrorist attack in Texas or New York, an earthquake in California, or a nationwide pandemic flu outbreak.

The devastating hurricanes that struck Texas in past years because the response to those events demonstrated the need for significant improvement. During Hurricane Katrina, there were insufficient quantities of generators forced hospitals to evacuate patients. Local governments waited days for commodities like ice, water, MREs, and blue tarps. Evacuees from Texas arrived in Shreveport and Bastrop shelters that were grossly unfit for occupancy, and 2,500 people were forced to use the same shower facility.

We must prepare our first responders with the best information and training to quickly analyze and share information to understand alerts and warning systems, evacuation planning, mission assignments to other agencies, contingency contracting, pre-staged resources, Regional Hurricane Plans and exercises, communications support, citizen preparedness, disaster housing, and long-term recovery planning. In order to accomplish this we must fund FEMA, not at the expense of small business but because Americans come together at times of crisis. This should be what it has always been—emergency funding.

Emergency preparedness is not the exclusive responsibility of the federal government or individual agencies within it. State and local officials, nonprofit organizations, private sector businesses, and individual citizens must all contribute to the mission in order for our nation to succeed at protecting life and property from disasters. Recovery and mitigation are critical to protecting communities from future threats, and our ability to respond will suffer if we do not focus attention and resources on those missions.

On any given day the City of Houston faces a widespread and ever-changing array of threats, such as: terrorism, organized crime, natural disasters and industrial accidents. Cities and towns across the nation face these and other threats. Indeed, every day, ensuring the security of the homeland requires the interaction of multiple Federal departments and agencies, as well as operational collaboration across Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector. This collaboration and cooperation undergirds our security posture at our borders and ports, our preparedness in our communities, and our ability to effectively react to crises. Consider the devastation that was brought by the tornadoes in Alabama and the Southern United States, the flooding that has impacted the entire Mississippi river region, from Montana to Tennessee, and tornado that claimed more than 100 lives in Joplin, Missouri, have shown us that there are disasters we cannot predict, and forces of nature for which we cannot plan.

This legislation is a job killer, it is an affront to growing small businesses and will destroy thousands of jobs. I have been firmly committed to supporting small businesses and this legislation as written will fail to help create the jobs we need at this time. We should not prevent the growth of small business in order to address the unrealistic demands related to disaster relief funding.

Moreover, 99 percent of all independent companies and businesses in the United States are considered small businesses. They are the engine of our economy, creating two-thirds of the new jobs over the last 15 years. America's 27 million small businesses continue to face a lack of credit and tight lending standards, with the number of small businesses loans down nearly 5 million since the financial crisis in 2008.

According to the U.S. Small Business Administration, these small businesses account for 52 percent of all U.S. workers. These small businesses also provide a continuing source of vitality for the American economy. Small businesses in the U.S. produced three-fourths of the economy's new jobs between 1990 and 1995, and represent an entry point into the economy for new groups. Women, for instance, participate heavily in small businesses.

The number of female-owned businesses climbed by 89 percent, to an estimated 8.1 million, between 1987 and 1997, and women-owned sole proprietorships were expected to reach 35 percent of all such ventures by the year 2000. Small firms also tend to hire a greater number of older workers and people who prefer to work part-time.

One strength that small businesses are known for is their ability to respond quickly to changing economic conditions. They often know their customers personally and are especially suited to meet local needs. There are tons of stories of start-up companies catching national attention and growing into large corporations. Just a few examples of these types of start-up businesses making big include the computer software company Microsoft; the package delivery service Federal Express; sports clothing manufacturer Nike; the computer networking firm America OnLine; and ice cream maker Ben & Jerry's.

We must always ensure that we place a high level of priority on small businesses. It is also important that we work towards ensuring that small businesses receive all the tools and resources necessary for their continued growth and development.

American small businesses are the heart beat of our nation. I believe that small businesses represent more than the American dream—they represent the American economy. Small businesses account for 95 percent of all employers, create half of our gross domestic product, and provide three out of four new jobs in this country.

Small business growth means economic growth for the nation. But to keep this segment of our economy thriving, entrepreneurs need access to loans. Through loans small business owners can expand their businesses, hire more workers and provide more goods and services. The Small Business Administration (SBA), a federal organization that aids small businesses with loan and development programs, is a key provider of support to small businesses. The SBA's main loan program accounts for 30 percent of all long-term small business borrowing in America.

I have worked hard to help small business owners to fully realize their potential. That is why I support entrepreneurial development programs, including the Small Business Development Center and Women's Business Center programs. These initiatives provide counseling in a variety of critical areas, including business plan development, finance, and marketing.

We must consider what impact changes in this appropriations bill will have on small businesses.

There are 5.8 million minority owned businesses in the United States, representing a significant aspect of our economy. In 2007, minority owned businesses employed nearly 6 million Americans and generated $1 trillion dollars in economic output.

Women owned businesses have increased 20% since 2002, and currently total close to 8 million. These organizations make up more than half of all businesses in health care and social assistance.

My home city of Houston, Texas is home to more than 60,000 women owned businesses, and more than 60,000 African American owned businesses.

According to a 2009 report published by the Economic Policy Institute, ''Starting in 2004, the Small Business Administration (SBA) set goals for small business participation in federal contracts. It encouraged agencies to award contracts to companies owned by women, veterans, and minorities or those located in economically challenged areas and gave them benchmarks to work toward. The targets are specific: 23% of contracts to small business, 5% to women-owned small businesses, and 3% to disabled veteran-owned and HUBZone small businesses.''

Women and minority owned businesses generate billions of dollars and employ millions of people. They are certainly qualified to receive these contracts. A mandatory DOD outreach program would make women and minority owned businesses aware of all of the contract opportunities available to them.

Facts: Small business are important because they:

(1) Represent 99.7 percent of all employer firms,

(2) Employ just over half of all private sector employees,

(3) Pay 44 percent of total U.S. private payroll,

(4) Generated 64 percent of net new jobs over the past 15 years,

(5) Create more than half of the nonfarm private gross domestic product (GDP),

(6) Hire 40 percent of high tech workers (such as scientists, engineers, and computer programmers),

(7) Are 52 percent home-based and 2 percent franchises,

(8) Made up 97.3 percent of all identified exporters and produced 30.2 percent of the known export value in FY 2007,

(9) Produce 13 times more patents per employee than large patenting firms and twice as likely as large firm patents to be among the one percent most cited.

Republicans appear to be on a mission to cut programs that help families and will buttress small businesses at a time when there are Americans faced with the perils which arise during cleaning up after a natural disaster. Now is not the time to force those Americans to wait on a partisan battle, to pick a fight that has not been fought in eight previous authorizations of funds for disaster relief. There needs to be a balance when determining which programs to cut and when. A balance to finding the funds that will address national disasters. A balanced approach to measures that will aid small business and to restore our economy.

I support small business and job creation. I will not support small business growth being held hostage to the unrealistic demands made by my Republican Colleagues. American families need legislation that are job growers rather than measures that are jobs killers.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 405, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. 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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the motion will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2883.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 230, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 719]

YEAS—195

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Buchanan
Buerkle
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lance
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
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 (NY)
Upton
Walden
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—230

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Campbell
Canseco
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
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
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Flake
Fleming
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kucinich
Lamborn
Landry
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Baca
Bachmann
Blackburn
Giffords
Paul
Payne
Reichert
Sutton

□ 1744

Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia, RUSH, BURTON of Indiana, ROHRABACHER, TURNER of Ohio, MILLER of Florida, DUNCAN of Tennessee, BUCSHON and FINCHER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. STEARNS, GARY G. MILLER of California and Mrs. BLACK changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, I was absent from today's vote. If I had been here, I would have voted "no" on H.R. 2608, the Continuing Appropriations Act of 2012.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2883) to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend the child and family services program through fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 25, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 720]

YEAS—395

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

NAYS—25

Amash
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Chaffetz
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Flake
Foxx
Garrett
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Jordan
Labrador
Lamborn
Lummis
McClintock
Mulvaney
Poe (TX)
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Stutzman
Walsh (IL)

NOT VOTING—13

Baca
Bachmann
Blumenauer
Giffords
Gohmert
Grijalva
Loebsack
Paul
Payne
Reichert
Sutton
Tonko
Turner (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1751

Ms. FOXX changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. ROONEY changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 720 I was unavoidably detained. I conducted a previously scheduled telephone town hall with constituents of the 21st Congressional District of New York. The telephone town hall addressed flooding concerns associated with recent disasters that impacted the district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Mr. TURNER of New York. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 720 I was detained. Had I been present I would have voted ''yea.''

PALESTINIAN STATEHOOD U.N. VOTE

(Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, the Jewish State of Israel is essential to America's national security. The Jewish State of Israel guards the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, and helps us with the oil and other activities in the Persian Gulf near Iran. Our relationship is mutually dependent, and so extremely important to both countries' vital national security.

But what's happening this week at the U.N., the Palestinians are going to the U.N. to avoid negotiating a peace agreement with Israel. The Palestinians want the U.N. to do what they won't do, negotiate a peace agreement.

Yet the Palestinians are made up of Hamas and Fatah. Hamas is a terrorist group with the blood of innocent Americans on their hands. Hamas' charter says they will never recognize Israel's right to exist.

Fatah is coming to the U.N. through their President Abbas, even though President Obama and the Congress have said, Go negotiate peace with Israel. Why would the Palestinians do that to the United States' vital national security interests and America's best friend in the region, the Jewish State of Israel? Because they are refusing to make an agreement to live in peace with the Jewish State.

The Congress has spoken. We will withdraw aid from the Palestinians, and the Palestinian people will suffer. The Palestinian leadership must withdraw from the U.N. and go to the negotiating table without pre-conditions with the Jewish State of Israel.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN BELARUS

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, it's been more than 9 months since the December 19 brutal and bloody crackdown on the opposition in Belarus. Human rights of ordinary Belarusan citizens continue to be denied. Nine political prisoners still exist. Nikolay Statkevich, Andrey Sannikaw, Dmitri Uss, Dmitri Bandarenka, Dmitri Dashkevich, Eduard Lobov, Pavel Severinetz, Ales Belyatsky and Mikalai Autukovich remain in prison, and President Lukashenka is using them to bargain for economic assistance with the international community.

Anatoly Lyabedska, leader of the United Civic Party, described the conditions in the KGB pre-trial detention facility as being cruel and inhumane, and the authorities' actions against opposition activities as being brutal.

For the first time in 17 years, people in Belarus are looking for a real alternative and asking for democratic

change. It is now time to invest in democracy in Belarus. The existing window for the opposition might be temporary. People in Belarus need our support, and we have to be with them until the end of this existing brutal regime.

NEWS FOR THE PALESTINIAN LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, as we speak now, in my hometown of New York, United Nations leaders from all over the world are coming in. The major issue is the Palestinian claim they're going to go to the United Nations to have a declared state of their own.

I have news for the Palestinian leadership. The only way they can have a state of their own is to sit down face-to-face with Israel in face-to-face negotiations and hammer out an agreement, an agreement which is the two-state solution, an Israeli Jewish state and a Palestinian Arab state.

The Palestinians cannot try to impose any kind of solution that doesn't work. If two adversaries want to hash out a disagreement to come to an agreement, then they need face-to-face negotiation. This has happened in the past. Each time Israel has accepted it, and the Palestinians have said no.

The United Nations should not discredit itself even more and continue to be the usual kangaroo court against Israel. I'm glad that the United States and the President are standing up and saying that we will veto a resolution if it comes before the Security Council.

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, what happens at the United Nations this week will have a profound and lasting effect on the prospects for peace in the Middle East. If the Palestinian Authority succeeds in obtaining U.N. recognition for a Palestinian state, it will only delay genuine efforts at a negotiated settlement.

Israel has, for many years, cooperated in good faith with Palestinian and international efforts to mediate peace and work toward a two-state solution. It has made many concessions, some of which were not always in Israel's best interest. The Palestinians, unsatisfied with these efforts at the negotiating table, are seeking an end-run around Israel in an attempt to gain statehood by means of the United Nations.

Watching this spectacle unfold, I was reminded of the time I spent in Namibia in the late eighties and early nineties, where the U.N. General Assembly had arbitrarily designated one of the political parties the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. That had the effect of delaying the negotiating process that ultimately led to Namibia's independence. The same designation was awarded several decades ago to the PLO, and it had a similar effect.

The U.S. Government should use all the tools at its disposal, fiscal and otherwise, to ensure that that same outcome is avoided here.

CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend each American who celebrated Constitution Day, which was last Saturday, September 17.

Over the past few decades, many Americans have expressed disgust with our out-of-control reach of government and erosion of the very freedoms that we claim to protect.

The powers of Congress are clearly laid out in article I, which is the most expansive article of the Constitution for a reason. Our Founding Fathers fully intended for power to rest with the people, in a legislative body.

I'm proud to say that during this Congress, the House has taken significant steps to restate its constitutional authority and has given an earnest attempt to returning to a constitutional government.

One example is the TRAIN Act on the floor this week, legislation intended to rein in the executive branch's gross regulatory overreach. From the debt limit debate to each spending bill considered on the floor, this process has been about more than just our need for fiscal reform. It's about the timeless principles of freedom, justice, and opportunity that have provided America with 224 years of prosperity and the future promise of our Nation, if we continue to hold these principles dear.

□ 1800

NOT YOUR GRANDFATHER'S MILITARY

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

Mr. PALAZZO. This morning I had the honor and privilege to spend 2 hours with 86 World War II veterans from Mississippi. These exceptional men and women inspired generations of Americans such as me to serve their country.

Sadly, though, when I returned to my office after honoring these American heroes, I saw many of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle congratulating themselves on the ill-conceived, lame brain, lame duck session repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Despite the questionable reports, surveys, and certifications, which I believe were flawed from the beginning, I have no doubt that we have taken a wrong turn.

The 111th Congress obviously failed the American people on so many levels. Repeal of DADT is just another glaring example of their failures. Social experiments like this repeal have no place in our military, and I for one apologize to those who have served and those who are currently serving.

God help us all.

ISRAEL AND PALESTINE

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Several years ago, my wife and I, accompanied by a number of other Members and their spouses, were privileged to be in the State of Israel at the time the Israeli Government made a very difficult decision to turn over Gaza to the Palestinian Authority.

It was a very controversial decision. The question was: Would this gesture of goodwill be reciprocated by the other side? Unfortunately, of course, it was not. As in other gestures by the Israeli Government, the response has been: Give us more and we will not commit to the existence of Israel, but you have to commit to the existence of a Palestinian state.

Let there be no mistake. It is a bipartisan support on the floor of the House for the State of Israel at this time of great need for them when they face all sorts of problems in the United Nations and elsewhere.

Let us be clear. We will not be divided on this. Republicans, Democrats, conservatives, and liberals here in the House of Representatives and the United States Senate support Israel in their effort to remain free and to not be forced into positions that are totally unfair.

A CELEBRATION OF HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say that Democrats in Congress continue to work tirelessly to improve the lives of America's Latino families. During the 111th Congress, we passed historic legislation that made college more accessible and affordable and broadened the scope of health care for very many families.

When Democrats controlled the Congress, we increased the maximum Pell Grant, in a bipartisan vote, from $4,050 to the current $5,550, an increase of 37 percent. While I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Ed, I proudly stood next to President Obama when he signed the historic Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 into law. This new law increased college aid for the 39 percent of Hispanic

college students who receive Pell Grants each year. In contrast, the proposed Republican budget will cut college aid for nearly 10 million students, slashing the maximum Pell Grant award by more than $2,500.

Today, I stand here with my colleagues in celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month to say that we must pass the DREAM Act.

We cannot turn our backs on these hard working, talented students who call America their home. Brought here as children and through no fault of their own, DREAM Act students deserve a chance to go to college and become U.S. citizens.

I am proud of my heritage. I am proud of my ancestors who came to this country from Mexico over one hundred years ago. I am proud of the contributions made by America's growing Latino community.

Today, I urge my colleagues in Congress to join us in celebrating Hispanic Heritage Month. Let us honor our great Nation. Let us all work harder to make the American Dream a reality for all.

ISRAEL

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEUTCH. I appreciate the opportunity to be here following those series of speeches delivered that lead perfectly into the discussion that we're here to have.

This is a crucial moment for the State of Israel, for the United States, for the relationship that binds us together. This is an important moment for those who believe in democracy and for those who believe in peace. We will all be watching what transpires at the United Nations in the coming days as the Palestinians continue to move forward with an ill-fated attempt to create a state that can only be created by negotiation.

I appreciate the opportunity to engage in a discussion with some of my colleagues, and I would like to start by recognizing my neighbor and my friend, the gentlelady from Florida, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you very much for putting together this important Special Order hour to give us an opportunity to come together in support of our ally and friend, the State of Israel.

I rise today in praise of President Obama's enduring, unequivocal support for our ally Israel and a vision for a peaceful world.

This morning at the United Nations, President Obama shared with an international audience his commitment to Israel's security in the midst of a challenging region and complex times. The administration approached this year's U.N. General Assembly standing strong with our ally in many respects. From once again boycotting the anti-Semitic activities surrounding the Durban Conference, to pledging to veto any Palestinian unilateral declaration of independence in the Security Council, to working all summer with our partners and allies against the unending efforts to criticize and delegitimize Israel at the U.N., President Obama has been a stalwart ally of Israel in this international forum. I'm so pleased that he continued in that vein this morning with his address to the General Assembly.

In his historic speech to this global audience, President Obama once again demonstrated his stalwart support for our friend and ally Israel. Importantly, President Obama used this opportunity at the United Nations to unambiguously state his support for direct, bilateral negotiations as the only way to solve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and create a Palestinian state.

As the President said, ''a genuine peace can only be realized between the Israelis and the Palestinians themselves. There is no shortcut to the end of a conflict that has endured for decades. Peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations. It is the Israelis and the Palestinians, not us, who must reach agreement on the issues that divide them: on borders and on security, on refugees and Jerusalem.''

President Obama made it resoundingly clear that unilateral action will never create a state and that we must continue to support a process between two peoples that recognize both security concerns and national aspirations. And that clarity has not gone unnoticed.

Prime Minister Netanyahu, speaking after the President's speech today, said that our President is wearing a ''badge of honor'' for his commitment to direct, bilateral negotiations as the only way to a Palestinian state.

As he has done so many times in the past, President Obama again put forth our country's unshakable commitment to Israel's safety and security as a central tenet to peace. The President reaffirmed our enduring friendship to our ally Israel noting the very real security concerns of being surrounded by hostile neighbors. He made clear to the world that he understands the very real threat Israelis face in constant rockets and suicide bombs and children coming of age knowing that, throughout the region, other children are taught to hate them. Only when Israel feels its security concerns are met will future generations of Israelis and Palestinians live side by side in pride and in peace.

With the international community assembled, President Obama stressed the difficult but vital efforts we must all make in our quest for peace, not only for Israelis and Palestinians, but also across the Middle East and all around the world.

He spoke of the accomplishments of revolutions that have brought burgeoning democracies to the Middle East and North Africa over the past year and the frustrated aspirations of many in the region where democracy is yet to come.

In praising the new free Libya and urging the international communities to join us in sanctioning Iran and Syria, the President affirmed his commitment to supporting those who wish to cast off tyranny. And in a world free from the terror of Osama bin Laden, President Obama emphasized our continued quest to end the religious, gender, and sexual persecution that prevents all people from achieving their true potential.

I am so proud of President Obama's unwavering support for Israel and his overall vision for peace that he laid out at the United Nations this morning.

Hopefully, hearing the strong message from the United States, the Palestinians will once again return to the negotiating table with Israel and work out a just and lasting solution between the two parties. In the meantime, we can stand tall with the exemplary efforts by this pro-Israel President as we continue to engage diplomatically over the coming weeks to ensure that bilateral negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians will resume.

Thank you, Mr. DEUTCH, for your unwavering support for our ally.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you very much. The same to you.

I would note the President also spoke today at some length about the need to recognize Israel's security interests. The fact that Israel is a country that is surrounded by enemies, that has faced rocket attacks, barrages, at times on a regular basis, that it is imperative that all of our allies around the world who understand the security threats that Israel faces, that they understand that it is in Israel's interest to take the action necessary to defend herself even as they move toward the negotiations with the Palestinians. That's something that every nation would understand.

I appreciate your bringing that up today.

□ 1810

It is my pleasure and my honor to yield time to the impressive and wonderful former chair and now the impressive and wonderful ranking member of the State, Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, Representative LOWEY from Westchester.

Mrs. LOWEY. I want to thank my good friend Mr. DEUTCH. You are a principled, strong supporter of the Israel-United States alliance for organizing this conversation at this very, very critical time, and I thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Palestinian Authority's counterproductive and dangerous gambit to declare statehood unilaterally through the United Nations.

As we all know, a genuine and lasting peace between the Israelis and Palestinians can only be achieved through a negotiated settlement between the parties, themselves. A lasting peace cannot be imposed on Israel and the Palestinians by an outside country, like the United States, or an organization, like the United Nations. That is why it is so disturbing that the Palestinian Authority has chosen to discontinue direct negotiations with Israel and instead to pursue a unilateral declaration of statehood through the United Nations. This action will indisputably set back the prospects of a settlement between the parties and call into question the commitment of Palestinian leaders to genuine and lasting peace.

The Palestinian Authority receives more than $500 million in economic and security assistance from the United States each year because it is in our interest and that of Israel's to support the ability of the P.A. to provide security and basic services, but that assistance is predicated on the willingness of the Palestinian Authority to negotiate directly with Israel toward its own state. President Abbas has been warned repeatedly, and I remain firm, that this counterproductive action by the P.A. crosses a line and should lead to a reevaluation of this assistance.

Despite the provocative decision of the Palestinian Authority to abandon negotiations and to pursue instead a unilateral declaration of statehood, I remain optimistic that the administration, working in concert with the Quartet, can facilitate the conditions for a resumption of good-faith negotiations.

I commend President Obama and Secretary Clinton for standing firm in support of a negotiated settlement and for reaffirming the unbreakable bond between Israel and the United States. I support the administration's tireless work to prevent a unilateral declaration of statehood from coming to a vote before the United Nations and to defeat this gambit if a vote does occur.

As President Obama stated today before the United Nations, peace is hard, but we also know that it is very much worth the effort. I encourage President Abbas to make the hard choice to return to negotiations with Israel. It is the only way to achieve the lasting and genuine peace that both Israelis and Palestinians seek.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you, Congresswoman LOWEY.

There are few in this body who understand as well as you the importance of weighing the decisions to allocate United States' foreign aid and where that money goes. You have been such a vocal and passionate supporter of aid to Israel in order to give Israel the ability to defend herself. I think you spoke eloquently about the questions that will be raised if the P.A. continues to move forward on this gambit at the United Nations, calling into question their commitment to negotiation and ultimately raising the reevaluation of aid to the Palestinians.

I thank you very much for sharing that with us.

Mrs. LOWEY. I know how hard the administration is working. Every minute of the day has been spent trying to ward off what we think will be a real disaster. So, as an optimist—and I think it's on Friday that Abu Mazen is scheduled to speak—I hope that he is wise and thinks of that decision and gets back to the negotiating table.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the gentlelady from New York.

It is now my honor to yield such time as she may consume to a colleague and friend who has often been described as the great pro-Israel Member of the United States House of Representatives, the Representative from Nevada, SHELLEY BERKLEY.

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman from Florida very much for putting this Special Order together in order to discuss an issue that is very important and that is certainly front and center on the international scene today as it has been for the last several weeks. I also thank you, Mr. DEUTCH, for your extraordinarily steadfast support for the State of Israel and for the strong American-Israeli relationship that we work on and attempt to foster every day.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support our closest friend and ally, the State of Israel, and to support the peace process between Israel and the Palestinians. We must oppose Abu Mazen's misguided and dangerous effort to bypass negotiations with Israel and go to the U.N. with a unilateral resolution in order to create a Palestinian state. The ramifications of that are extraordinary. They could destabilize the entire Middle East, put Israel on the defensive at the International Criminal Court, and create a failed terrorist state right next-door to the State of Israel—controlled by the Iranians, I might add.

The Palestinians have claimed that they're going to the U.N. because they have no partner to negotiate with, but it is the Palestinians, not the Israelis, who refuse to negotiate. They demand—and they demand it time and again—that Israel cease all settlement growth in the West Bank before they would be willing to sit down and negotiate for peace and a Palestinian state with the Israelis.

I think it's time that we talk and remember the exact history—and it's not such ancient history either. Even a full settlement freeze is not enough for Abu Mazen. In the summer of 2009—if we can remember back to that time—the Netanyahu government, at great political risk, agreed to freeze all settlement growth for 10 months. Did Abu Mazen and the Palestinians sit down at the negotiating table with the Israelis? There were 10 months of a moratorium—certainly enough time to negotiate a peace agreement that would bring lasting peace to the Palestinian people and a Jewish State of Israel. Did he do that? No, he did not. He waited over 9 months to begin negotiating with Israel and only sat down at the table with weeks left on the Israeli moratorium. Then what did they do? The Palestinians demanded that the Israelis extend the moratorium. They did nothing for nine of the 10 months. Then they wanted to expand the moratorium.

This is not the behavior of a true negotiating partner. What type of negotiating partner invites Hamas, a terrorist organization, to join them and become part of the Palestinian Authority? Certainly not a peace partner that wishes to bring peace and a Palestinian state to the Middle East.

The Israelis, by contrast, have shown their commitment to negotiations and have repeatedly called on the Palestinians to join them at the negotiating table. When Prime Minister Bibi Netanyahu addressed the United States Congress in a joint session on May 24, he reiterated his willingness to make painful compromises in order to reach peace with the Palestinians, but the Palestinians have turned their backs on the negotiations or on any form of compromise and have gone to the notoriously anti-Israel body, the United Nations, where they believe they will receive more sympathy and, ultimately, success.

I appreciate the Obama administration's strong statements that they will veto any Palestinian statehood effort at the Security Council, but I am deeply concerned that the Palestinians will receive overwhelming approval at the General Assembly.

Today, the Palestinian Authority has tentatively agreed to merely introduce their resolution for a unilateral declaration of statehood in the Security Council and then ask that no action be taken until they negotiate with the Israelis. This concerns me greatly. What type of way is this to negotiate? Put a gun to Israel's head, and every time the Palestinians don't like the way the negotiations are going, the Palestinians can threaten that they're going back to the United Nations? I don't think this demonstrates a true interest in sitting down and negotiating for a Palestinian state.

□ 1820

Let me tell you, as I conclude, what I think we can do; and we should do it immediately.

Congress must act. We must send a clear signal to the Palestinians that we will not continue to support them with our foreign aid dollars if they choose to act unilaterally and avoid negotiations.

I will not continue to throw taxpayer money away at the Palestinians when they are refusing to negotiate in good faith for a Palestinian state.

I have introduced H.R. 1592, which would cut off funding to the Palestinian Authority if they unilaterally declare a state outside of negotiations. I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this timely legislation. We must send a clear message to the Palestinians that their efforts to circumvent negotiations are unacceptable and the only way to statehood, the only way, is at the negotiating table.

Mr. DEUTCH, I thank you so much for allowing me to share my thoughts with you at this most delicate time in world peace.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you very much, Representative BERKLEY.

If there is going to be peace, you are absolutely right: that is peace that will come through negotiations. And I am not sure what type of negotiating tactic it is to, on the one hand, say that there is a commitment to negotiating, but at the same time to run to the United Nations to unilaterally declare a state in a way that only seeks to delegitimize your so-called peace partner.

Israel is committed to peace. We've seen that time and time again. Prime Minister Netanyahu is set, ready to negotiate. It is time that the P.A. moves forward with negotiations. I appreciate your insight and your commentary.

I would tell that you that as you spoke about Hamas, the P.A. made a decision also to move into a partnership with that terrorist organization, a terrorist organization that still holds Gilad Shalit captive and refuses to let the world see him, meet with him. He should be released.

This is a message that was given to Hamas, to the P.A. directly, in a meeting that I was privileged to participate in on a bipartisan trip to Israel some months back. I was pleased to be on that trip with our friend from California, Representative CARDOZA.

I am pleased to yield the gentleman as much time as he desires.

Mr. CARDOZA. Thank you, Representative DEUTCH. You are not just a friend but a great colleague.

Before she leaves the Chamber, I just want to associate myself with Congresswoman BERKLEY's remarks. The gentlewoman from Nevada has been a stalwart for the State of Israel. She is absolutely and unequivocally correct on this issue, and I will gladly cosponsor your bill.

Ms. BERKLEY. Thank you.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. DEUTCH, thank you for putting together this Special Order this evening. As you all know, the Palestinian Authority has stated that it will submit, or it's intending to submit, to the U.N. Secretary General Ban ki-Moon a resolution requesting recognition of Palestinian statehood.

As President Obama said today in his speech before the U.N. General Assembly, the bonds between the United States and Israel are unbreakable, as our commitment is to the security of Israel.

And as I and my colleagues in Congress expressed earlier this year, when there was an overwhelmingly passed House Resolution 268, the only path to a lasting peace is through direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians that leads to a two-state solution.

Lasting peace will not come by playing destabilizing and damaging political games at the United Nations. A unilateral approach to Palestinian statehood will surely fail at the United Nations. It will fail, and in failing it will harm the bilateral negotiation process that is the only way to bring about a lasting peace.

A lasting peace cannot be achieved while a contingent within the Palestinian Government does not recognize Israel's right to exist. A lasting peace cannot be achieved while rockets are being fired into Israel, threatening her children and her people.

I was there with Mr. DEUTCH just days after an anti-tank rocket was shot into a yellow school bus. I ask every American watching tonight and those around the world to think what they would do if the State of Mexico fired on a school bus in El Paso and the response that we as a country would pursue.

A lasting peace cannot be achieved while the same group firing those rockets into Israel is actively trying to define Israel's borders so that those rockets would then strike major populated areas.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a lasting peace cannot be achieved when one party fundamentally refuses to negotiate the terms of peace.

I call upon President Abbas to do what's right for both the Palestinian people, the Israeli people, and the world and to not put political gamesmanship ahead of a lasting peace. I call upon him to return to a negotiating table and to give up this spurious, dangerous, and damaging game.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend from California.

There are a lot of opportunities that we as Members have to participate in the process and to see the impact of the decisions that we make.

The opportunity that we had to spend some time in the community that had just been attacked with that rocket fire reminds us of what we are doing here this evening, what President Obama did at the United Nations earlier today, and what our allies throughout the world hopefully will do in standing up to support the one great democratic nation in the Middle East, why that is so vitally important.

Mr. CARDOZA. You are absolutely correct, Mr. DEUTCH, and the visions of those scared mothers talking to us in their community by the bus stop, a shelter that has to be reinforced by concrete so that they can somewhat protect their children on the way to school, is the reason why we must act for a lasting peace, if no other than that.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you for being here, Mr. CARDOZA.

It is my pleasure and honor to yield as much time as he may choose to utilize to my good friend from New York, Representative JOE CROWLEY.

Mr. CROWLEY. I want to thank my dear friend and colleague from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about one of the most important issues in our world, and that is peace in the Middle East.

For far too many years, many parts of the United Nations have been hijacked by states opposed to the ongoing existence of the State of Israel. Some states simply refuse or are not willing to acknowledge that Israel is a country surrounded by many who seek her destruction. They seem to believe that if the Israelis simply conceded, simply gave up, that peace would come to the region.

That view doesn't only show a lack of understanding; it is simply wrong. The truth is no country in the world would ever take action that undermines its ability to defend itself and neither should the State of Israel.

Day in and day out, the people of Israel face the threat of terrorism. From the moment that they wake up in the morning to when they go to sleep at night, Israeli citizens wonder if they or their families will be the target of attacks.

Dozens of suicide bombings and attacks have been carried out over the past 10 years, and there is no doubt that each and every day Hamas is planning and preparing for even more attacks.

Madam Speaker, we need peace in the Middle East, but these are not the conditions for peace. How can anyone make peace when enemies are seeking their destruction? And now we see this move at the United Nations to secure unilateral declaration of statehood. Instead of finally achieving the peace that is so desperately needed, so desperately wanted, this looks like a step to try to back Israel into a corner.

Let me assure you, this is not the path to positive change. It is a grave error by Abu Mazen to demand recognition of statehood at this time. The fact is, the day after any vote, the situation on the ground in the Middle East will not have changed.

□ 1830

All the same issues will remain in place. The difference will be the trust. Trust will forever be eroded, and for good reason. That's not the only difference, however. There is another issue that I believe we need to have more discussion about.

I believe that what the Palestinian Authority is doing calls into question our funding for their work. The United States supported the Authority as a way to support peace efforts, but this statehood drive undermines those very efforts. American dollars are meant to support efforts by the Palestinian Authority to secure peace and to diminish violence, but this is not a blank check.

We cannot support those who seek confrontation instead of reconciliation.

I believe it is time for a very, very serious review of our policy, the United States Congress and the United States' policy in its funding, not only for the Palestinian Authority but for any nation that seeks to undermine the State of Israel within the U.N., not just the Palestinian Authority but any nation that would vote to undermine the existence of the State of Israel.

I want to thank Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. HOYER and all of my colleagues for putting this effort together tonight. I and my colleagues will continue to stand firmly with the people of Israel.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank you, Mr. CROWLEY.

The most important point to make right now in listening to you and listening to Mr. CARDOZA and listening to the gentleman from California who spoke earlier from the other side, this is not a partisan issue. This is not a religious issue. This is a question of whether we stand together in support of democratic ideals, in support of the safety and security of our ally. That's what is at stake here, and I thank you for coming to so eloquently and passionately speak to that issue.

Mr. CROWLEY. Let me just make one point. There is partisanship. There are those who would use this opportunity to divide. Not here in the United States, not Republicans and Democrats, but around the world. This is a world forum we're talking about in the U.N., and what I want our allies to know and our friends to know is that we're watching—those who will stand with the State of Israel and those who will not.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the gentleman. Efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel at the United Nations must be opposed at every capital in this world. I thank you very much.

It is my pleasure to recognize my friend and colleague, a passionate supporter of the State of Israel who hails from a community in Illinois with an equally passionate zeal for the safety and security of the State of Israel, Representative SCHAKOWSKY.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I want to thank you so much, Mr. DEUTCH, for organizing tonight's Special Order.

Today, President Barack Obama clearly restated the U.S. commitment to negotiated peace and protection of human rights. In his remarks to the General Assembly of the United Nations, the President emphasized the importance not just of peace but of human dignity and economic opportunity.

In particular, President Obama again demonstrated that he is a true and steadfast friend of Israel and reiterated that ''America's commitment to Israel's security is unshakeable, and our friendship with Israel is deep and enduring.''

Like the President, I am a strong supporter of a two-state solution. I look forward to a future in which a Palestinian state exists in peace alongside the Jewish State of Israel. But as the President emphasized at the U.N. today, a genuine, true, and lasting peace can only be reached through negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians themselves.

I strongly support the President's diplomatic leadership and efforts to convince the Palestinians and their international allies to abandon efforts to use the U.N. to bypass negotiations with Israel, and I join him in urging them to return to the talks with the Israelis. While we acknowledge that the conflict will not be resolved easily and that it will require difficult sacrifices from both parties, it is only through direct peace negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians themselves that a lasting solution can be found. There can be no substitute for such negotiations. As the President stated today in New York, ''Peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations.''

In his speech today, the President recognized the legitimate desires of the Palestinian people for a state with recognized borders and opportunities for economic growth. I share his commitment to working toward that goal. But, as he also emphasized, any peace agreement must acknowledge and address the ongoing security threats faced daily by Israel and the Israeli people and be based on a recognition that Israel is the historic homeland of the Jewish people.

Instead of appealing to the U.N., the parties simply need to return to the table. A lasting peace cannot and will not be imposed by any external party. It must be reached by the Israelis and the Palestinians themselves, with regional and international support, including that of the United States of America. The Palestinians should abandon this effort at the United Nations. Our allies should stand with the State of Israel and a real peace negotiation. That means the Palestinians have to return to the bargaining table.

I thank you, Mr. DEUTCH.

Mr. DEUTCH. And I thank you, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY. Your talk about the President's statement today is important. Equally important is what the administration has been doing leading up to that speech today, in the way that the U.N. Ambassador has continued to press our allies, in the way that this administration has been clear throughout that if this movement goes forward, if the Palestinians continue to go to the Security Council, that the United States will veto that resolution because it is not a way to achieve peace. I appreciate your sharing those thoughts and raising those issues with us.

It is a great privilege for me now to turn over the floor and yield to my friend, who is one of the fiercest defenders of the U.S.-Israel relationship, one of the most outspoken Members of this body when it comes to standing up for the safety and security of the State of Israel and someone who has steadfastly remained engaged in this issue, even traveling to New York, before coming back to Washington, to speak directly to those who will be making decisions at the United Nations, a good friend and a great colleague, ELIOT ENGEL.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, and before I talk about these issues, let me first compliment the gentleman from Florida. He hasn't been in Congress very long, but he certainly made his mark very strongly, particularly on the U.S.-Israel relationship. He has been a stalwart supporter and a very articulate spokesperson for the U.S.-Israel relationship. I know that Mr. DEUTCH has been very, very effective, and it is an honor to do this Special Order with him this evening.

Madam Speaker, I agree with everything that every one of my colleagues said. Let me first say, because we are Democrats having this Special Order, there has been a lot of fighting in Congress, but one thing we don't fight about, Democrats and Republicans, we agree that the U.S.-Israel relationship must remain strong. If there is one thing that unites this Congress and unites Democrats and Republicans, it's strong support for the U.S.-Israel relationship.

Many of my colleagues have made very, very good points, many of which I want to reiterate, but I think the most important thing to reiterate is this: If there is a dispute anywhere around the world, the only way you can resolve that dispute is getting the two adversaries face to face in direct negotiations to hammer out all of the areas of disagreement and hopefully come to a peace agreement.

That happened in Ireland, in Northern Ireland, a place that we never thought would get peace but did, because both sides made the commitment that they preferred peace over war and over misery that had gone on for far too long. So they sat down face to face, with a little prodding from other countries, including the United States, and were able to hash out an agreement. That, I'm convinced, is the way that the Middle East difficulties will come to fruition, only by face-to-face negotiations.

□ 1840

The Palestinians, in my estimation, have attempted to throw so many preconditions at Israel before they will even sit down and negotiate that it has made it impossible for Israel to be able to sit down and talk with them. Boundaries like 1967 boundaries or settlements or expansion of neighborhoods, all these are final status issues. These are not issues where one side says to the other side, you have to unilaterally agree with our position before we will even sit down and negotiate with you. That makes no sense whatsoever. So face-to-face negotiations are the only way that we can have peace.

I would argue that going to the United Nations by the Palestinians actually sets back the cause of peace because if the United Nations were to declare a Palestinian state, say on the basis of the 1967 lines, which is what the Palestinians want, well, that is a guarantee that there can never be peace with an agreement like that. First of all, if the United Nations were to agree to that, no Palestinian leader in the future could ever accept anything less. And the Israelis can never accept, and will never accept, a return to the 1967 borders, which were indefensible. Israel fought wars because those 1967 borders were not defensible. And so these preconditions, and this going to the United Nations, actually sets back the cause of peace.

Now I just think a little bit of history is important because it's so easy to go on college campuses or to try to delegitimize Israel and the United Nations or to have statements that aren't really true. The fact of the matter is that Israel has always been prepared to make painful concessions for peace. I was in this Congress during 2000–2001 when President Clinton helped negotiate what we thought was a peace, the Oslo Accords, and what we thought was a peace between Israel and the Palestinians. I remember in 1993 on the White House lawn with Yasser Arafat and Yitzhak Rabin shaking hands. I remember being there with my 8-month pregnant wife in 95-degree weather, and we all had such high hopes.

But what has happened? Abba Eban used to say the Palestinians never miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity. And there have been many opportunities for peace. In 2000–2001, Israel agreed to a peace. Arafat, who was the Palestinian leader, said no. And what did Arafat turn down at that time? He turned down a Palestinian state, part of Jerusalem, 97 percent of the West Bank and billions and billions of dollars of aid. Israel said yes. He said no. I think it's important to put that in perspective.

Then the Palestinians talk about the right of return. They want to flood Israel with Palestinian refugees—not refugees that left in 1948, when Israel was founded—but their descendants. And that's a pipe dream because that could never happen. It would undermine the essence of a Jewish State of Israel.

So if there is going to be peace in the Middle East, we need to go back to what the partition of Palestine in 1948, the original resolution, said in the U.N. It said Palestine is to be partitioned into an Arab state and a Jewish state. And here we are, some 63 years later, and the Palestinians and most of the Arab world won't even recognize Israel as a Jewish state. That's where the problem lies, not with Israel. And the attempt to go to the United Nations and sort of do an end game around Israel will not work.

Finally, and then I'd be happy to discuss this further with my colleague from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), let me just say this, and we have heard some rumblings about it with some of our colleagues here. This Congress will not continue to fund the Palestinian Authority. It's not going to be a blank check. If the Palestinian Authority doesn't want peace and doesn't show that it wants peace, we are not going to continue to fund them.

I introduced a resolution in the Foreign Affairs Committee which came before the State Department markup which passed unanimously on a roll call vote withholding money, ending money to the Palestinian Authority if they come to the United Nations for a vote. It passed unanimously—every Democrat, every Republican. And so this Congress is not going to be a fool. Either the Palestinians want peace or they don't. But they cannot have it both ways. They cannot say they want peace and refuse to sit down and talk to Israel face to face at a negotiating table.

So, Mr. DEUTCH, I want to thank you for doing this. I think it is very, very important that all people of good will, Democrats and Republicans, stand together in support of Israel. I think the President's speech today at the United Nations was a very good speech where he talked about the bond is unbreakable between the United States and Israel.

And we have to make sure that the Palestinians live up to their commitment. Israel is willing to live up to its commitments. Israel wants to live in peace. We're now waiting to see what the Palestinian and the Arab states want to do.

Finally, let me say this. There are two factions in the Palestinians: One is Fatah, which is Abbas' faction, and one is Hamas. Hamas controls Gaza. Hamas is a terrorist group. Hamas doesn't recognize Israel's right to exist. Hamas certainly doesn't recognize the right of a Jewish state to exist. How can we expect our ally Israel to sit, negotiate, and make peace with an entity that denies its very right to exist and an entity whose whole reason for being is to destroy the Jewish state?

We wouldn't ask that of ourselves. We shouldn't ask that of Israel.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ENGEL, if the Palestinians were serious about peace, they would abandon their unity with Hamas. They would abandon this plan to move forward at the United Nations, and they would return to the negotiating table. But this doesn't seem to be the case, as we've discussed here tonight. They seem intent on, in fact, making a mockery of the United Nations by using it as a platform to delegitimize Israel. But we will stand up to that effort. We'll stand up against it. The fact is from the vile ''Zionism is Racism'' resolution of the 1970s to the biased and misleading Goldstone Report, the United States has, time and time again, stood up against such delegitimization efforts, loudly voicing our opposition and declaring that we won't tolerate such bogus and malicious accusations. And we'll stand up again for Israel this week in New York, but not just today and Friday.

I would like to take a moment to talk about what is going to be happening tomorrow. When Mahmoud Ahmadinejad brings his campaign of hatred to the United Nations General Assembly, as he stands just miles from Ground Zero a mere 3 weeks after the 10th anniversary of the September 11 attacks and blasphemously declares that the U.S. Government orchestrated the attacks to reverse the declining American economy, as he did last year, we will stand up for those brave men and women who lost their lives that day and every day since fighting for freedom. And when he stands at the U.N. and celebrates the 10th anniversary of the Durban hatefest that was an anti-Semitic rant against Israel, we will stand up for the freedom and democracy that Israel represents, the freedom and democracy that Ahmadinejad so brutally represses in his own country. That's going to be our role just tomorrow. And I know that you will look forward to standing in strong opposition to those statements from one who wishes to see Israel wiped off the map, one who could probably be tried for incitement to genocide for his statements, you will stand with me, as you always have, in opposition to the rhetoric, the hateful rhetoric, that we will be forced to listen to tomorrow.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. DEUTCH for pointing that out because, unfortunately, I said before that the U.N. had been a kangaroo court against Israel time and time again. Israel cannot get a fair shake in the United Nations. I do hope that we are able to block the votes in the Security Council where the United States, the Obama administration, has said that the President will do a veto of any kind of resolution, and I hope that it won't even come to that because I hope that they do not get the requisite number of votes to even pass it.

And then the Palestinians might then go to the General Assembly. They say they are going to do that. And while the General Assembly cannot admit a Palestinian state, it can upgrade their status, which would allow them to run around and harass Israeli leaders in the different international courts.

I just think the U.N. better be careful. It sits in my hometown of New York, and we have always been proud that the U.N. is in New York. But I think the U.N. is on the verge of discrediting itself very, very badly.

□ 1850

There was resolution 242, which talked about land for peace in the Middle East. I would say that the Palestinians, by trying to get recognition unilaterally in the U.N., they are repudiating the land for peace. They're certainly repudiating the Oslo Accords,

which said that both states have to sit down, the Palestinians and the Israelis have to sit down and hammer out an agreement. As I mentioned before, it even repudiates the very basis of the initial partition of Palestine in 1947 and '48 into a Jewish state and an Arab state.

And we talk about the Palestinian refugees. They have been used as pawns by the Palestinian leadership—and frankly by all the other Arab states in the world. And we ought to mention this because it's very, very important. Jewish refugees from North Africa and all over the world, from Europe, from all over the world, came to Israel and were integrated into Israeli society through the years. The Palestinian refugees could have and should have been integrated in the various Arab countries, but the Arab leaders decided to leave them in these horrendous conditions in these camps, to use the Palestinian refugees as pawns in the Palestinian camps.

It wasn't done by the Israelis. It was done by the Palestinians themselves and by the Arab nations themselves to use them as political pawns. So I think we should look at the people who are really suffering here and say why they're suffering. They're suffering because they've had a leadership that has failed them for more than 60 years.

So I'm very proud of the United States of America. I'm proud of our country for standing up for freedom. I'm proud of our country for standing with Israel. I'm proud that the President said the bond between Israel is unbreakable. We have to understand that this is not a fight between two groups that are sort of equal in being concerned about democracy. Israel shares our values. Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East. What's important to Israel is important to the United States. That's why we have to stand with Israel because if we don't do it, nobody else will. We've shown time and time and time again that the international community, particularly the United Nations, is biased against Israel; and unless the United States stands squarely with Israel, Israel will never get a fair shake.

So I am proud that we are doing that now at the United Nations. I am proud that we have taken a stand. I am proud of this Congress, on a bipartisan basis, for taking a pro-Israel stand. The United States—and I would say this to the people of Israel—will always stand with our friends and allies, Israel, who care for the basic human rights and concerns and democracy and democratic values that we care about as well.

So as we see this unfolding, I would just say to the Palestinians, if you really want your state, if you really want a two-state solution—which I believe you are entitled to—then sit down with Israel face to face across the negotiating table, no preconditions, and talk peace. The Israelis are ready to do it. We're still waiting for the Palestinians.

Thank you, Mr. DEUTCH.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank you very much, Mr. ENGEL, for your passionate words.

I think it's important, as we wrap this up, to think about why it is and to remind our colleagues and the American people why it is that we are so committed to this bond with Israel, and we do it because the bond with Israel runs deeper than our interests in Middle East affairs. It runs deeper than mutual security interests. Our bond is born out of the values that our two nations share, the values of freedom, of respect, of human rights. We as Americans share those values with the people of Israel. They are universal values, American values. They span religious and political parties. They bring people together from all walks of life. They are the things that some of Israel's neighbors are losing their lives fighting for, the values that Israel holds dear as a great democracy in the Middle East and in the world.

Israel faces one of its greatest challenges, a worldwide campaign to unilaterally declare a Palestinian state. The United States must continue to remind the world why it is that we stand in solidarity with Israel.

I urge our allies around the world to stand with us now in urging the Palestinians to abandon this misguided and dangerous quest. If Mr. Abbas seeks a state where the Palestinian people can truly prosper, a peaceful state, then he will look to Israel as a partner. He will understand why negotiations provide the only path to peace; and he will take his seat at the negotiating table.

To our whip, STENY HOYER, who helped us arrange this hour, and to my colleagues who participated, and to everyone who has tuned in even for a moment, I want to say thank you, thank you for giving us the opportunity to stand up at this most difficult and crucial moment in the history of the U.S.-Israel relationship and remind our allies from around the world—and every nation from around the world—just how strong and unbreakable the bond between our two nations is.

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

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, Palestinian Authority President Abbas has announced that this Friday he will formally seek statehood recognition at the United Nations.

While there are obstacles to achieving a lasting and peaceful two-state solution, the PA's attempt to seek recognition at the UN demonstrates that they are not truly interested in achieving peace.

Such a unilateral approach, will not lead to peace. This action violates the letter and spirit of the Oslo accords and deals a significant blow to future negotiations.

Recognizing a Palestinian state would also give legitimacy to Hamas given that the terrorist group currently is in control of the Gaza Strip—an area the PA claims for its state.

By granting recognition of a state, the international community will reward Hamas for its terrorist actions, rather than condemn them.

Furthermore, this reckless action at the UN could lead to widespread violence on the ground.

The only way to achieve a two-state solution is through direct negotiations leading to a peace treaty fully accepted by both governments and by both peoples.

A vote on a unilateral UN resolution will likely set prospects for peace in the region back years.

The United States needs to stand strong with Israel, and I am pleased that President Obama has called the Palestinian efforts at the UN a ''mistake'' and has stated that the United States will veto this resolution should it be brought before the Security Council.

We need a unified voice from the United States and our allies showing that this action is not the way to achieve a peace and that if such action is taken, there will be consequences.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to join with so many Members of the House to express our profound concern, and strenuous opposition, to the impending request by the President of the Palestinian Authority, Mahmoud Abbas, to seek a unilateral declaration of statehood at the United Nations later this week.

The Palestinian leadership says it wants peace with Israel, but their actions and words contradict their assertions. It is not at all clear President Abbas is even capable of making peace with Israel. He refused to enter direct negotiations last year even when Israel agreed to a settlement freeze. He refuses to accept a simple statement that he accepts Israel as a Jewish state. And, as a prelude to his bid for statehood from the United Nations, he wrote in the New York Times last May: ''Palestine's admission to the United Nations would pave the way for the internationalization of the conflict as a legal matter, not only a political one.'' Recognition of statehood by the United Nations, in other words, is simply another front in the conflict—and not a settlement of the conflict.

Any move towards statehood for Palestine in the United Nations is gravely flawed.

First, a unilateral declaration of statehood, by the Palestinians themselves or through the United Nations, constitutes a unilateral repudiation of the peace process. A Palestinian state can only emerge at the conclusion of a peace treaty with Israel. As President Obama told the assembled leaders of the world today at the United Nations: ''There is no short cut to the end of a conflict that has endured for decades. Peace is hard work. Peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations.''

Second, a unilateral declaration by the Palestinians will not bring a State of Palestine into existence. Without agreed borders, there is no agreed state. Without an agreed state, there is no lawfully constituted government of the state of Palestine.

Third, such action at the United Nations may well provoke violence in the West Bank and Gaza and possibly across the region. Excessive expectations among the Palestinians have been induced by the public campaign of the Palestinian Authority to seek statehood through the U.N. Reality cannot and will not meet those expectations—leading to immense frustration for Palestinians in the West Bank and elsewhere. In the past, this has led to successive uprisings targeting Israel. Such violence has been vicious and inhumane, with

immense loss of life—and it serves no purpose. It brings neither peace nor statehood any closer. But the threat of violence overhangs the Palestinian maneuvers at the U.N.

Fourth, unilateral action at the United Nations will be a major setback of incalculable duration to any meaningful resolution of the issues if there is to be a just and lasting peace with Israel, and the establishment of a Palestinian state. If the Palestinians seek to act on their own, what is there to negotiate with Israel? Where is the dialogue? What can possibly be the prospects for a meeting of the minds and a resolution of the issues of borders, security, Jerusalem, and refugees? A unilateral declaration of statehood is not a substitute for the peace process; it is a repudiation of the peace process. And that means the end to the peace process.

Fifth, a recognition of Palestine by the United Nations will lead to great legal vulnerability to Israel and its government's leaders by giving Palestine standing in several international institutions, such as the International Court of Justice. No settlement of any issues or grievances between the parties can be advanced by legal harassment of Israel in international organizations.

For all these reasons, I believe it is imperative that the United Nations reject any unilateral bid for statehood for Palestine.

The member states of the United Nations must understand that a vote against a resolution in the General Assembly is not a vote against a Palestinian State—it is a vote to get the parties into direct negotiations so that a Palestinian State can truly and successfully and legitimately arise.

As President Obama said today: "We will only succeed in that effort if we can encourage the parties to sit down together, to listen to each other, and to understand each other's hopes and fears. That is the project to which America is committed, and that is what the United Nations should be focused on in the weeks and months to come."

Last week, I was pleased to join with dozens of Members of the House in correspondence directed to several dozen foreign heads of state, in which we urged that their governments reject a unilateral declaration of statehood for Palestine by the United Nations.

I commend our correspondence to all our colleagues. We will continue our efforts at the United Nations and redouble our commitment to the re-commencement of direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians leading to a peace agreement between them.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
September 15, 2011.

We write on a matter of great urgency, on the eve of the United Nations General Assembly meeting. It is our understanding that the leadership of the Palestinian Authority will pursue a resolution at the United Nations—in either or both the Security Council and the General Assembly—to grant the Palestinians the equivalent of statehood and/or prejudge final issues, including borders and the status of Jerusalem. One of the major goals of this effort is for the Palestinians to better position themselves to petition the International Criminal Court, very possibly bogging down the court for the foreseeable future.

It is our strong belief that such unilateral action would have devastating consequences for the peace process and the Palestinians themselves. Accordingly, we urge you in the strongest terms not to support this effort.

We believe that the only way to achieve a two-state solution is through direct negotiations leading to a peace treaty fully accepted by both governments and by both peoples. A just and lasting peace cannot and must not be imposed on the parties. If the Palestinians pursue such a unilateral approach, it violates the letter and spirit of the Oslo Accords and will deal a significant blow to future negotiations. Given the expectations gap among the Palestinian public, such action could lead to widespread violence on the ground, jeopardizing the West Bank's impressive economic and security gains over recent years. There is also a substantial risk of more broadly inflaming the region and increasing violence at a time of already great instability. Finally, the United States will reconsider its assistance program for the Palestinian Authority and other aspects of U.S.-Palestinian relations if they choose to pursue such a unilateral effort.

We are confident that your government shares the United States' commitment to a comprehensive resolution of the conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians. That outcome can only be achieved through direct negotiations. A vote on a unilateral UN resolution will likely set prospects for peace back years.

Our bilateral relationship is based on certain fundamental values. We urge you to vote those values, and to stand with the United States in not supporting unilateral action at the UN that would impede the peace we all seek.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Democratic Whip Steny H. Hoyer; Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi; Rep. Gary Ackerman; Rep. Joe Baca; Rep. Shelley Berkley; Rep. Howard Berman; Rep. Madeleine Bordallo; Rep. Leonard Boswell; Rep. Dennis Cardoza; Rep. Russ Carnahan; Rep. David Cicilline; Rep. Emanuel Cleaver; Rep. Gerry Connolly; Rep. Jim Costa; Rep. Jerry Costello; Rep. Mark Critz; Rep. Joseph Crowley; Rep. Susan Davis; Rep. Rosa DeLauro; Rep. Ted Deutch.

Rep. Eliot Engel; Rep. Charlie Gonzalez; Rep. Gene Green; Rep. Janice Hahn; Rep. Brian Higgins; Rep. Kathy Hochul; Rep. Tim Holden; Rep. Steve Israel; Rep. William Keating; Rep. Larry Kissell; Rep. James Langevin; Rep. John Larson; Rep. Sander Levin; Rep. Dan Lipinski; Rep. Nita Lowey; Rep. Carolyn Maloney; Rep. James McGovern; Rep. Gregory Meeks; Rep. Michael Michaud; Rep. Chris Murphy.

Rep. Jerrold Nadler; Rep. Eleanor Holmes Norton; Rep. Bill Owens; Rep. Gary Peters; Rep. Steven Rothman; Rep. C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger; Rep. John Sarbanes; Rep. Janice Schakowsky; Rep. Adam Schiff; Rep. Allyson Schwartz; Rep. David Scott; Rep. Brad Sherman; Rep. Heath Shuler; Rep. Albio Sires; Rep. Betty Sutton; Rep. Edolphus Towns; Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz; Rep. Henry Waxman.

MEDICARE AND OBAMACARE

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank our majority leader for giving me the opportunity to take this time this evening to talk about two of the most important issues on the minds of every American, but especially on the minds of our seniors, and those two issues are, number one, Medicare, and, number two, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Now, if you go to the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, Madam Speaker, and you say, what do you think about the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that was passed on March 23, 2010—1½ years ago—in this body, they would say I don't know what you're talking about. What is PPACA, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act? And then if you said to the folks in the 11th of Georgia, well, ObamaCare, they would say yes, of course, now I know what you're talking about. So tonight I will use the term ''ObamaCare''—not in a pejorative way, but it's the term that's most recognizable to the American people.

Of course even today, 1½ years after passage of ObamaCare, fully 60 percent of people across this country are opposed to it. They were opposed to it at its inception; and yet when President Obama was inaugurated and became our 44th President, just within weeks there was this push to have something that I would call national health insurance or government-controlled health insurance for this great country of ours.

Many times, Madam Speaker, the dialogue was, well, we have been wanting this government-controlled health insurance, national health insurance, Medicare-for-all government insurance from cradle to grave for years, way back in probably the days of Theodore Roosevelt. We have been wanting this and trying to get this passed, and now is our opportunity. Now finally we have the opportunity to bring this to the American people.

Well, who was it, Madam Speaker, that wanted it all these years? And why, if they wanted it so badly for 50, 60, 70 years, why was it never passed? Indeed, why was it not passed the last time before this passage in March of 2010? Why did it fail back in 1993–94, during the administration of President Clinton, when we referred to it as HillaryCare? Everybody remembers that very well. Well, it's because the American people don't want this. They didn't want it then, didn't want it in 1993–94, absolutely didn't want it in March of 2010. And yet this President and that majority—at the time, the Democrats controlled this House of Representatives. They controlled the Senate. They had the White House.

□ 1900

All their ducks were in a row. Everything was aligned. And they literally spent a year and a half, Madam Speaker, a year and a half forcing that legislation, literally, down the throats of the American people, even when folks of all ages, but especially seniors, were saying, you know, We don't really want this.

Part of that reason, especially in regard to our seniors, Madam Speaker, is the fact that they were worried, and still are worried, about their Medicare program. Medicare, of course, was an amendment to the Social Security Act that was passed back in 1965. I had just completed my freshman year of medical school, and I remember it very well. Medicare, of course, is a great program for our seniors. I would hate to think what our situations would be, those over 65 and those with disabilities, if it were not for the Medicare program.

But, Madam Speaker, the Medicare program is far from secure. I'm sad to say that tonight, but it's the truth, and I think the American people, and again, especially our seniors who are currently on Medicare, or those that are getting close to age 65, I think they know that our attention in this Congress and from this administration should be on preserving, strengthening the Medicare program for our seniors and not spending a year and a half, from January 2009, literally, until March of 2010, with almost nothing on the agenda but instituting, passing this new entitlement program called PPACA, Patient Protection Affordable Care Act, or, indeed, ObamaCare, that really has nothing to do with seniors, has very little to do with those who are poor in this country, through no fault of their own, and thank goodness, again, created in 1965, their health care system called Medicaid.

So, no, what we have done with ObamaCare, Madam Speaker and my colleagues, is just simply create a whole new entitlement program. I will make a little analogy and say that if, in the middle of a thunderstorm, you have a leaking roof on your house, you don't go out and add another room or a deck on the back of the house. You get up on that roof and you stop the leaking.

It's a matter of priorities, Madam Speaker. It's a situation that is beyond my comprehension that the Democratic majority and President Obama would spend all that time and effort trying to add a new room, put a deck on the back of the house when the roof was badly leaking. And the analogy is, of course, that roof is the Medicare program.

There's so many things that we need to do and we need to have the courage to do. I am very proud of my party, the current majority in this House of Representatives, when we passed our budget for fiscal year 2012, sometimes referred to as the Ryan budget. PAUL RYAN, Madam Speaker, as you know, is our colleague that is the chairman of the Budget Committee. But it is a Republican budget, and it has the courage of conviction, the commitment to our senior citizens to say to them, We are going to fix the Medicare program and we're going to guarantee that it will be there for your children and your grandchildren and your great-grandchildren, and that the benefit program that you currently have and, indeed, even people who are not yet eligible for Medicare but they're 55 years old, 10 years away, we would enact no changes whatsoever to their Medicare benefits.

Medicare as you know it will be preserved and protected for those 47 million people who are currently on the Medicare program; maybe 7 million of those are younger individuals who are permanently disabled. Forty-seven million people currently on Medicare. When you add those who, today, men and women in this country who are 55 years of age or older but not yet 65, in 10 years, Madam Speaker, that will be another 20 to 25 million people on the Medicare program with absolutely no changes. You're talking about 65 or 70 million people 10 years from now who will be on Medicare, traditional Medicare as we know it, for the rest of their natural lives, and I hope every one of them, including myself, lives to be 93 years old like my mom is today and enjoying the benefits and the security of Medicare.

Again, we diverted our attention away from a program that our seniors can't live without but that's in danger of becoming insolvent. And that's not Congressman PHIL GINGREY, Dr. GINGREY, the chairman of the GOP House Doctors Caucus speaking, although I do represent, Madam Speaker, that group here tonight as the designee for the Republican majority in this hour of time that is allotted to me. No, this is the trustees of Medicare and the Congressional Budget Office and the actuary of CMS, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, who every year they look at the sustainability of the program. And what they have told us, Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, in both bodies, we know very clearly that the best case scenario if we do nothing is that Medicare will be insolvent. We're talking now about the Hospital Trust Fund. It will be insolvent by the year 2024. Maybe it's worse than that, maybe by the year 2020.

For us to ignore that, just using the expression, Madam Speaker, whistling past the graveyard, pretending something doesn't exist that's as obvious as the nose on your face, kicking the can down the road thinking, well, gee, you know, all I really care about is getting reelected and let somebody else deal with the problems, unconscionable on our part.

And to suggest that this new program to cover those in the country, I don't know how many, 20 million people maybe, that are not poor enough for the Medicaid program and not old enough or disabled enough for the Medicare program, let's create yet another entitlement program. If money grew on trees, that might not be a bad philosophy, but it doesn't. It doesn't. If it did, we wouldn't be in debt $14.9 trillion, soon to be $15.5 trillion. We just can't do everything, and we have to set our priorities and focus on what is the right thing, what is the most important thing.

I say to my colleagues tonight, Madam Speaker, during this time, that that most important thing is to strengthen, to preserve, to save our Medicare program for our current seniors and for our children and our grandchildren.

□ 1910

There's so many things in ObamaCare, this new program, this new entitlement program, to make sure that everybody has health insurance whether they really want to or not.

There are so many things in this bill, which doesn't really fully go into effect until 2014, but yet the taxes that are burdening our citizens are already being applied, whether it's an addition to the payroll tax, taxing for the first time income that's not earned, income that's interest, income that's dividends, income that's rental income. If mom and pop happen to rent out a room in their basement, and they have income over a certain amount, the President says they're rich. Again, I used this word a few minutes ago, it's just unconscionable.

When ObamaCare was created, one of the largest pay-fors in that program, Madam Speaker, was cuts to Medicare, something like $550 billion taken out of the Medicare program—not to strengthen Medicare, not to pay for catastrophic coverage for our seniors, not to strengthen the prescription drug plan, part D, not to close the doughnut hole. No. That money was taken out of the program to pay for this new entitlement that most of us know as ObamaCare, or the Patient Protection and Unaffordable Care Act. In my opinion they should have called it that. That's what's hurting this country very badly right now.

There are many things in ObamaCare that a lot of folks are not really aware of. They don't fully appreciate what is there because as Speaker PELOSI said, you're not going to know until you read it. She suggested that once you read it, you might like it. That certainly has not turned out to be the truth.

Madam Speaker, I want to take an opportunity to go through a few slides. Here are some of the promises that were made as the ObamaCare law was developed.

''ObamaCare will reduce the deficit,'' Senator TOM HARKIN of Iowa says of the Affordable Care Act, ''This historic legislation will reduce the deficit by $143 billion over the next 10 years.''

The next bullet point, colleagues, I know you can't see the small writing so I will read it to you: ObamaCare will create jobs and improve the United States economy. The White House claims that ObamaCare, and this is also a quote from Tim Geithner, the Treasury Secretary, ''helps businesses and the overall economy by eliminating hidden costs that currently contribute to higher health care premiums charged to businesses and the government.'' Tim Geithner, Secretary of the

Treasury, said that in a White House blog on January 19 of this year.

Another quote from the President himself: The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act ''will save a typical family up to $2,500 on premiums yearly.'' President Obama said that, of course, back in 2009. He also said, ''If you like your health plan, you can keep your health plan.''

During the health reform debate, President Obama promised Americans that there is nothing in the new law that would force Americans to change plans or their doctor. Colleagues, do you remember that? Sure you do. Of course you do.

Then the last bullet point on this slide, Madam Speaker: ObamaCare will not ration health care.

Now, this is in reference to the provision that was added in the Senate creating something called the acronym IPAB, Independent Payment Advisory Board, kind of like MedPAC is an advisory board under current Medicare.

But this creates this new board, and Secretary Sebelius said this on June 23, just a couple months ago, ''IPAB is expressly prohibited from making recommendations that ration care, raise premiums, reduce benefits, or change eligibility for Medicare.'' That's a quote from Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius.

Here, Madam Speaker, are the realities. Those were the promises. Here are the realities.

Colleagues, please pay attention to this next poster because this is so important.

ObamaCare will not reduce the deficit. According to a report by the House Budget Committee, there will be a $700 billion increase in the deficit in the first 10 years of ObamaCare.

The second bullet point: ObamaCare will not create jobs nor will it improve our economy. According to testimony by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the American labor force will be reduced by 800,000 jobs due to ObamaCare provisions that will effectively increase marginal tax rates, which will also discourage work. That was the testimony of Doug Elmendorf, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office. He was put in that position by Speaker PELOSI. And that was at a House Budget Committee hearing in February of this year, some 6 months after the passage of ObamaCare.

The third bullet: ObamaCare will not lower health care costs for families by $2,500 a year. The President was wrong about that. Due to ObamaCare, families buying insurance on their own can expect a $2,100 increase in premiums. And that's from a letter from CBO to former Senator Evan Bayh, a Democrat from Indiana, and that was in November of 2009, some 5 months after passage of ObamaCare. I'm sorry. That was actually 6 months before. This is when the bill was being developed and debated in the Senate.

If you like your health plan, you cannot keep your health plan. According to the United States Census Bureau, the 2010 census shows that employer-provided insurance fell by 1.5 million to 55.3 percent from 56.1 percent in 2009. And it is continuing to fall. It would not surprise me if within the next 6 to 8 years, Madam Speaker, that a hundred million workers in this country will lose their employer-provided health insurance because the mandates of ObamaCare make it impossible to meet this requirement.

It's not just a matter of being forced to provide the health care for their employees; it is the type of health insurance coverage dictated by the Federal Government. That's why, my colleagues, 60 percent of this country remains totally opposed to this.

Finally on this poster, ObamaCare will ration health care. Don Berwick is the new director of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS. He had to be appointed by the President during a recess because he could not pass advise and consent and approval by the United States Senate.

□ 1920

They didn't have the votes. They didn't have all the Democratic votes, I feel quite confident.

So the President used a little trick of the trade and put him in this position during a congressional recess. This is a gentleman who was quoted and who wrote about and talked about other national health insurance programs. In regard to rationing, here is what the Director of Medicare said, ''The decision is not whether or not we will ration care. The decision is whether we will ration with our eyes open.'' Don Berwick in Biotechnology Health Care, June 2009.

Madam Speaker, as we talk about these two programs—Medicare on the one hand, ObamaCare on the other—I just think it's so important for us to understand what kind of costs we're talking about. This new entitlement program, it's not paid for. They tried to say that it was paid for, and raised $1 trillion by slashing and burning Medicare of $550 billion and by raising taxes for the other $500 billion, and said in the final analysis that this is paid for and that it saves money. Nothing could be further from the truth.

This program is not paid for. It does not save money, and it is probably costing we the taxpayers $2.7 trillion. How can we afford to do that, to add that new room or to build that new deck when there are obligations that we have made to our seniors and our obligations that we have made—our promises, our commitment—to those who, through no fault of their own, are unemployed, who have little income or maybe no income? That hand up, of course, is the Medicaid program. It is just patently unconscionable for we as Members of this great Congress to ignore that.

As our supercommittee now is debating what needs to be cut in our overall spending of $3.7 trillion every year—and 30 percent of that is borrowed—that's how you get to a debt of $15 trillion. If you borrow $1 trillion here and $1 trillion there for 3 or 4 years in a row and if you create a new entitlement program that costs another $2.7 trillion, you can get to $15 trillion worth of debt pretty darned quickly.

So, to this bipartisan commission which has been set up to recommend additional cuts so that the President can have his request granted to increase the debt ceiling another $1.5 trillion so that he gets through the next election and so that this issue doesn't have to be addressed again, and as this bipartisan, bicameral commission of 12 Members debates where to find the offsetting cuts of $1.5 trillion, Madam Speaker, I would say, Hey, men and women. You're all very bright. You were selected by your respective parties and your respective leadership because of the respect all the Members have for you and for your work and experience in regard to dealing with these things.

You've got the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, one of the more senior members of the Financial Services Committee—and I'm referring to the Republicans on the committee. You have the ranking member of the Budget Committee on the Democratic side, and you have one of the highest leadership Members from South Carolina. You have good Democrats and good Republicans in this body and in the other body.

I know they're struggling. I know they're struggling. I know the President just sent them a document, a 29-page document, asking for another $2 trillion worth of cuts. Hey, repeal ObamaCare, and you'll get $2.7 trillion of reduction in the debt. It is so simple, and it's what the American people want. It's what the American people want.

Majority Leader REID, pass the House-passed budget for fiscal year 2012. I know the Senate hasn't passed a budget in 900 days—I understand that—but just don't keep down that path. It's like trying to tax your way out of debt. The President seems to think that that's the way to create jobs. You just tax the so-called ''rich,'' who actually are people who have an adjusted gross income of $200,000 a year. These are the job creators. These are the small business men and women who, by the way, pay their taxes as individuals.

Colleagues, you know that, and you know that this is a lot about politics and that it's a lot about the next election; but we just need to take a deep breath and think about what the people back home are telling us. Think about the struggles that they're going through, those 15 million without jobs—and 45 percent of them have been without jobs for more than 6 months. When you add the underemployed or the people who have just given up, you're probably talking about not 14, 15 million; you're probably talking about 25 million people.

I see it. I see it, colleagues, in town hall meetings, and I know you do, too—both Republicans and Democrats. People ask questions. They shake their fingers at you. They're just not going to take some little smoke and mirrors answer to these tough questions. They're fed up with that, and I don't blame them. That's why our approval rating is so poor in the Congress. We as individuals like to think ''they love me in my district.'' You'd better hope so, but maybe not. Maybe not. Maybe every one of us is at risk of joining the ranks of the unemployed.

If we don't do the right thing, Madam Speaker, we deserve it. We deserve to be fired.

I stand here tonight, hopefully not in a partisan way. I think my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle would agree that my rhetoric is not over the top—maybe occasionally. Let's try to be honest with each other and work together and get things done and realize, when you've crammed a law like PPACA, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, down the throats of the American people when 60 percent or more say they don't want it, your first priority should be to create jobs and that your second priority and your third priority should be to create jobs and put America back to work and not spend a year and a half trying to pass something just because Democrats for 75 years have wanted this program of government control over health care. I think it was so wrong-headed. It's even worse than the previous year when we spent the whole year trying to please Al Gore and pass this scheme of cap-and-tax—or cap-and-trade—in regard to carbon dioxide. In the process, it would literally have cost every family in this country $1,500 a year in increased utility bills.

□ 1930

That's what the Democratic majority did when they took over in January of 2007. For a year and a half, I can remember distinctly, Madam Speaker, I was on the Science Committee and the very first hearing we had, we had one witness. That was the new Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, promoting cap-and-trade or cap-and-tax.

And the next hearing we had, we had one witness. That was Al Gore, former Vice President, again, pushing for something that was a job killer, maybe not a job killer for him, maybe not a job killer for certain sectors, special interests in this country, but for John Q. Public, Joe the Plumber, an absolute killer to jobs and has done nothing but increase unemployment despite spending $850 billion on a stimulus bill that, if it created any jobs, they were government jobs.

Then, in the default position, the Democratic majority says, oh, well, you know, if it hadn't been for this bill that we've passed, all this spending, a lot of jobs would have been lost. Well, that's easy to say, but how do you count that? How do you verify that? Trust but verify.

Again, Madam Speaker, I am not going to take all of the designated hour this evening, but I am proud to have had the opportunity tonight to talk about these issues, yes, on behalf of the GOP House Doctors Caucus, as a member, health care providers, nurses, doctors, dentists, psychologists, people that have been there, that walk the walk in regard to what's best for our country and best for our citizens and, yes, best for our patients, not just seniors. I talked a lot about Medicare tonight and this PPACA, ObamaCare, but we need to let the marketplace work.

Mr. President, we don't want, we didn't want, we never will want a U.K.-type system. We don't want national health insurance. We don't want bureaucrats coming between our health care providers and their patients.

If we don't repeal ObamaCare, we are going to destroy medicine as we know it, not just Medicare and Medicaid as we know it, but health care as we know it. Colleagues, that's one-sixth of our economy today, and it will be growing each and every year.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1958

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 7 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–214) on the resolution (H. Res. 409) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. SUTTON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 2 p.m. on account of attending a funeral in district.

Mr. BACA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 22, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3166. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Make Inoperative Exemptions; Vehicle Modifications To Accommodate People With Disabilities, Head Restraints [Docket No.: NHTSA-2011-0108] (RIN: 2127-AK22) received August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3167. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Car Assessment Program (NCAP); Safety Labeling [Docket No.: NHTSA-2010-0025] (RIN: 2127-AK51) received August 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3168. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Electric-Powered Vehicles; Electrolyte Spillage and Electrical Shock Protection [Docket No.: NHTSA-2011-0107] (RIN: 2127-AK80) received August 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3169. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Air Brake Systems [Docket No.: NHTSA-2009-0175] (RIN: 2127-AK84) received August 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3170. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Courtesy Notice of Liquidation [USCBP-2010-0008] (RIN: 1515-AD67) (formerly RIN: 1505-AC21) received August 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3171. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — United States Income Tax Treaties That Meet the Requirements of Section 1(h)(11)(C)(i)(II) [Notice 2011-64] received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3172. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 2011 Marginal Production Rates [Notice 2011-58] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3173. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 2011 Section 43 Inflation Adjustment [Notice 2011-57] received August 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3174. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2011-67] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3175. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Creditability of UK Remittance Basis Charge (Rev. Rul. 2011-19) received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3176. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Definition of Solid Waste Disposal Facilities for Tax-Exempt Bond Purposes [TD 9546] (RIN: 1545-BD04) received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3177. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — State and Local Bonds: Volume Cap and Timing of Issuing Bonds [Notice 2011-63] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3178. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct liability (Rev. Proc. 2011-41) received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3179. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — September 2011 (Rev. Rul. 2011-20) received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3180. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Elections Regarding Start-up Expenditures, Corporation Organizational Expenditures, and Partnership Organizational Expenses [TD 9542] (RIN: 1545-BE77) received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3181. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Annuity and Life Insurance Contracts with a Long-Term Care Insurance Feature [Notice 2011-68] received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3182. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Branded Prescription Drug Fee [TD 9544] (RIN: 1545-BK34) received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3183. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue procedure under section 263(a) regarding the capitalization or deduction of electric utility transmission and distribution costs (Rev. Proc. 2011-43) received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3184. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Group Health Plans and Health Insurance Issuers Relating to Coverage of Preventive Services under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act [TD 9541] (RIN: 1545-BJ60) received August 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3185. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Method for Making Election to Apply Carryover Basis Treatment under Section 1022 to the Estates of Decedents who Died in 2010 and Rules Applicable to Inter Vivos and Testamentary Generation-Skipping Transfers in 2010 [Notice 2011-66] received August 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3186. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Use of Actuarial Tables in Valuing Annuities, Interests for Life or Terms of Years, and Remainder or Reversionary Interests [TD 9540] (RIN: 1545-BH67) received August 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 409. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 112–214). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (by request):

H.R. 12. 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; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, House Administration, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, Rules, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. STARK (for himself, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 2981. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the 1-year deadline for application for asylum in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. LONG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WOLF, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 2982. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include human trafficking as a part 1 violent crime for purposes of the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 2983. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and gas leasing, to deposit use revenues from such activity into the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. MICHAUD (for himself and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 2984. A bill to designate certain Federal lands within the Cross Island National Wildlife Refuge and the Petit Manan National Wildlife Refuge, part of the Maine Coastal Islands National Wildlife Refuge Complex, in Lincoln County, Hancock County, and Washington County, Maine, as wilderness; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AKIN (for himself and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 2985. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 2986. A bill to expand the Officer Next Door and Teacher Next Door initiatives of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to include fire fighters and rescue personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 2987. A bill to amend the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 to further enhance the promotion of exports of United States goods and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 2988. A bill to amend the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 to enhance awareness of export promotion activities with respect to clean energy and environmental products and services of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TIBERI, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 2989. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2990. A bill to create a full employment economy as a matter of national economic defense; to provide for public investment in capital infrastructure; to provide for reducing the cost of public investment; to retire public debt; to stabilize the Social Security retirement system; to restore the authority of Congress to create and regulate money, modernize and provide stability for the monetary system of the United States; and for other public purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2991. A bill to disapprove of a certain sentencing guideline amendment submitted by the United States Sentencing Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. FORBES, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 2992. 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; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 2993. A bill to direct the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers to revise certain authorized purposes described in the Missouri River Mainstem Reservoir System Master Water Control Manual; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 2994. A bill to promote marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. KEATING:

H.R. 2995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for hiring post 9-11 veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KISSELL (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2996. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the period of time in which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs presumes the service-connection of certain disabilities of veterans who served in the Persian Gulf War, Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, or Operation New Dawn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2997. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Responsive Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (''Superfund'') to provide that manure is not considered a hazardous substance or pollutant or contaminant under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 2998. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to prohibit the delegation by the United States of inspection, certification, and related services to a foreign classification society that provides comparable services to Iran, North Korea, North Sudan, or Syria and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 2999. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Duwamish Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. FLEMING):

H.R. 3000. A bill to provide for incentives to encourage health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Rules, House Administration, Appropriations, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Budget, 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. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 3001. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Raoul Wallenberg, in recognition of his achievements and heroic actions during the Holocaust; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3002. A bill to make local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2012 available for use by the District at the beginning of the fiscal year at the rate of operations provided under the local budget act for such fiscal year if the regular District of Columbia appropriation bill for such fiscal year does not become law prior to the beginning of such fiscal year; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BACA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. STARK, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. PITTS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. YODER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOLD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCHOCK, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 3003. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Balazs ''Ernie'' Bodai in recognition of his many outstanding contributions to the Nation, including a tireless commitment to breast cancer research; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 3004. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 260 California Drive in Yountville, California, as the ''Private First Class Alejandro R. Ruiz Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 3005. A bill to make supplemental appropriations for disaster relief for fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. WELCH (for himself and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 3006. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prevent excessive speculation in commodity markets and excessive speculative position limits on energy contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 3007. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish and carry out a direct lending program for small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

140. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 28 questioning the assumptions made and the accuracy of the analysis used in making the decision to relocate the F-15C/D mission out of Great Falls to Fresno, California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

141. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 10 urging the Congress to enact legislation that assists the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund in establishing a voluntary system for full insurance for public funds accounts; to the Committee on Financial Services.

142. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 13 supporting the filling of the overwhelming need for reinvestment in the profession of social work in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

143. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 12 urging the Congress and the President to call a White House Conference on Children and Youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

144. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 10 requesting Congress to consider adopting legislation prohibiting the EPA from utilizing existing federal laws to regulate greenhouse gas emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

145. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 12 urging the Department of the Interior to consider the negative impact that oil and gas leasing and permitting policies that may have on Montana's economy; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

146. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 urging the Congress and the President to focus adequate federal resources on funding to complete environmental review processes for federal land use decisions with improved timelines; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

147. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 1 supporting the transfer of management of the grey wolf to the state of Montana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

148. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 4 opposing the presidential designation of any new national monument in Montana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

149. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 1 urging the Congress to pass legislation to ease the visa application process for Chinese visitors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

150. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 11 memorializing the Congress to restore funding for the Regional Counterdrug Training Academy located in Meridian, Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

151. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 6 urging the Congress to require the Veterans Health Administration to pay the transportation costs when a veteran who sought emergency care at a facility not operated by the VHA is transported to a VHA facility; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

152. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 170

memorializing the Congress to take such actions as are necessary to ensure that no reductions are made to benefits for Social Security recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

153. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 25 urging the Congress to pass legislation that will reauthorize and extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

154. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 10 supporting school-based health center program; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and the Workforce.

155. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 20 urging the Congress to enact legislation that requires the Federal Aviation Administration to develop an expedited approval process for application for aerial testing in rural counties; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Science, Space, and Technology.

156. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 12 requesting that the Congress and the President enact the federal Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers Act of 2011; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 12.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce clause and provisions to provide for the general welfare.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4, Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 2982.

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 Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 2983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Spending Clause: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

Interstate Commerce Clause: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

Power Respecting Property Belonging to the United States: Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. AKIN:

H.R. 2985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 2986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 2987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 2988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2989.

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.

By Mr. KUCINICH:

H.R. 2990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is Article I, Section 8, which enumerates the power of Congress to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures. The bill will re-assert the sole grant of constitutional authority to Congress to create money.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 2992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, Congress shall have the power to Regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Graves 050 seeks to remove an impediment to commerce, among other things.

By Mr. INSLEE:

H.R. 2994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 2995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 2996.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 2997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 2998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by the United States Constitution under Article I, Section 8, Congress shall have the power To . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States and To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 (To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes)

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 3000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the commerce clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Clause 3 of Section 8, Article I of the Constitution.

The bill repeals the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which exceeds the authority vested in Congress by the Constitution.

Finally, the bill removes government intrusion into the doctor-patient relationship, which is protected by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 3001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3002.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 3003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 clause l (relating to the general welfare of the United States) and clause 5 (relating to the coinage of money).

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 3004.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 3005.

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.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3006.

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 Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 3007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 23: Mr. PAUL and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 25: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 49: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 104: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 157: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 303: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 306: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 396: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 420: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 482: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 593: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 615: Mr. SCHILLING.
H.R. 632: Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 650: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 674: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 702: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 719: Mr. COBLE and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 750: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CANSECO, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 795: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 812: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 831: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 886: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 923: Mr. RIVERA and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 997: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 998: Ms. HOCHUL.
H.R. 1063: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1164: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1167: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 1172: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1182: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 1259: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1267: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1340: Mr. KLINE and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1366: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1381: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1418: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, and Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1509: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 1550: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1558: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1585: Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 1639: Mr. ROKITA, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1653: Mr. LANCE and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1681: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1697: Mr. CANSECO and Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 1738: Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1754: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1755: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 1821: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1826: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1834: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1847: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1848: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1862: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1876: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1881: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1905: Mr. GUINTA, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BERG, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1909: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1912: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1951: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1965: Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1980: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1983: Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2000: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 2032: Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2059: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 2088: Mr. KIND and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 2097: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 2106: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2140: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2233: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2247: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 2250: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2299: Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2306: Mr. FARR and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2337: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 2369: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. CHU, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOLD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RIVERA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 2381: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 2425: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2429: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 2433: Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2447: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2457: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2459: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2471: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2502: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2508: Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FARR, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2513: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2514: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2530: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2541: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 2559: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2671: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2674: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 2681: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2689: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2695: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2696: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2731: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2750: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2752: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2757: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2763: Mr. STARK, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2766: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2772: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 2786: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2815: Mr. ROSKAM and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2823: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2827: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2829: Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. TURNER of New York, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2830: Mr. CARTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2833: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 2848: Mr. JONES and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2855: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2859: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2864: Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. JONES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2897: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HURT, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 2898: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KELLY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GUINTA, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 2926: Mr. FLORES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 2938: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2941: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 2966: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2973: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.J. Res. 47: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.J. Res. 73: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.J. Res. 78: Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. OLVER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H. Res. 60: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Res. 111: Mr. MICHAUD.
H. Res. 295: Mrs. LOWEY.
H. Res. 306: Mr. GARRETT.

H. Res. 333: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BACA, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H. Res. 336: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. REYES, and Mr. KING of New York.

H. Res. 367: Mr. MARINO.

H. Res. 394: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H. Res. 407: Mr. KING of New York.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

21. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Liberty County Development Authority, Georgia, relative to Resolution supporting the relocation of the 3rd Heavy Brigade Combat Team/3rd Infantry Division from Fort Benning, Georgia to Fort Stewart, Georgia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

22. Also, a petition of Wayne County Commission, Michigan, relative to Resolution No. 2011-350 opposing altering the direction of Michigan into becoming a right-to-work state; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

23. Also, a petition of the Niagara County Legislature, New York, relative to Resolution IL-043-11 opposing the Cross-State Pollution Rule; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

24. Also, a petition of Wayne County Commission, Michigan, relative to Resolution No. 2011-376 supporting an integrated network of high-speed trains and expanded Amtrak service as a key to economic development; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2011 No. 141

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.

Eternal Lord God, whose mercies never fail, we come into Your presence with thanksgiving and praise. We are thankful that Your mercy is everlasting and Your truth endures to all generations. We praise You that we are Your people and the sheep of Your pasture.

Today, enable the Members of this body to experience Your presence and to receive Your wisdom. May they receive these blessings, aware of Your counsel that, ''to whom much is given, much is required.'' Bless us and all the people of the world today and every day.

We pray in Your great 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 legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 21, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable 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 ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will be in morning business for 1 hour with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2832, the GSP bill and the vehicle for trade adjustment assistance.

At approximately 12:30 p.m. there will be two rollcall votes in relation to the Hatch amendment regarding the effective date of trade adjustment assistance and the McCain amendment regarding a 2-year extension of that program.

Additional rollcall votes are expected during today's session.

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, the time equally divided, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each. The majority will control the first half and the Republicans will control the second half.

The Senator from Illinois.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this morning we learned that the Republican leaders of the House of Representatives and the Senate have done something which may be unprecedented. We are searching for some example in the past when this has occurred, but we have learned today that the Republican leaders of both the House and the Senate have sent a letter to Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke ahead of the central bank's 2-day meeting that begins today. That letter to Chairman Bernanke from the Republican congressional leaders instructs him as to what they should try to achieve during their 2-day meeting.

A former Commissioner of the Federal Reserve said this is outrageous; that an independent agency such as the Federal Reserve, which is operated with independence of political impact and political pressure over the years, would now be receiving direct political communications from the Republican leaders.

What is the message from the Republican leaders to the Federal Reserve? The message is, don't lower interest rates. I don't know if Senator MCCONNELL, Senator KYL, Speaker BOEHNER, or Congressman CANTOR have been home lately. But if they have been home and met with local businesses, small businesses, they will have learned very quickly that it is very difficult for them to borrow money to sustain and expand their businesses and to hire more people.

As we have a monetary policy which allows expansion of these businesses and expansion of jobs across America, we have an opportunity to try to put this recession behind us. So what is the message of the Republican leaders to

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

the Federal Reserve Board? The message is clear and simple: Do nothing. Stand by the sidelines and watch this economy languish.

It is the same message the Republican leaders are sending the President of the United States. He came to us almost 2 weeks ago and said: We have to move together to make this economy stronger. We have to find a way, working together, to create jobs. The President said: Let's give to working families across America a tax cut, a payroll tax cut. The average family in my State of Illinois will receive about $1,500 a year. This will help those families who are working but struggling from paycheck to paycheck.

The Republican response to them: No. They have said to the President they will not accept a payroll tax cut for the working families and middle-income families across America.

The President said: Let's give to businesses across America some help. Let's reduce the payroll tax. In fact, let's create a tax incentive for these businesses to hire unemployed workers.

We know there are plenty of people out there who need work. Some businesses, with an enticement through the Tax Code, may be able to finally hire that extra worker and reduce the unemployment rolls.

The Republican answer, again, is no. Time and again, when either the Federal Reserve Board or the President or, in fact, any economist suggests that we need to move forward as a nation to deal with the recession, the answer from the Republican side of the aisle is no.

Now, with this letter to the Federal Reserve, the Republican congressional leaders are telling the Federal Reserve, we believe for the first time in history, that they should not provide a vehicle for expansion by lowering interest rates in this economy.

That, to me, is wrongheaded. When I think of the businesses looking to borrow money, when I think of those homeowners who need to refinance their homes, interest rates are critical to the expansion of this economy. Time and again, the Republican approach to this economy has been simply stated in just a few words: Do nothing and protect the millionaires.

When the President steps forward and asks the wealthiest among us to pay something more in terms of their own taxes, which is only fair, the Republicans cry foul, class warfare, and all the words they have used to defend their position defending millionaires across America. Most people across American understand we are going to need to have shared sacrifice to emerge from this recession. A lot of families are making that sacrifice today. Working families and middle-income families have been falling behind for a long time. We want to help them with a payroll tax cut and by creating some life in this economy that creates new jobs.

Unfortunately, we have no help coming from the Republican side of the aisle. The President believes, as we do, that putting workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America is the best way to see us through this recession. He believes there are pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs. He wants to restructure the unemployment compensation program using some innovative techniques that have been popular in the past with Republicans but now are being rejected because the President offers them—an idea that has been suggested of allowing some unemployed workers to come back to work and still draw unemployment so they can have valuable work experience and perhaps find a long-term permanent position.

Tax relief for workers and families across America—cutting payroll taxes in half for 160 million workers—is going to be a break they need. Many of these workers and working families are struggling with high gasoline prices. Does $125 a month mean that much to a Senator or Congressman? Maybe not. But if you are living paycheck to paycheck and you just saw gasoline go over $4 a gallon, $125 is absolutely essential so you can make it back and forth to work and do what is necessary for your family. The President's payroll tax cut will help these working families, and Republicans oppose it.

This plan also has deficit reduction. The President understands, as we all do, that the deficit America now faces in our long-term debt needs to be faced squarely. He believes—and I share that belief—we should spend the next year building the economy but make it clear that over the long term we are going to take the actions necessary to reduce our deficit substantially over a 10-year period of time by more than $4 trillion. That is what the President announced when he made his statement on Monday.

He also realizes that while cutting the deficit and reducing America's debt, we have to keep our promise, the promise to Americans who receive Social Security. Twenty-six percent of Social Security recipients have no other source of income. If we talk about cutting those benefits or privatizing Social Security, as many Republicans do, we are putting at risk, literally, the lifeblood of 26 percent of Social Security recipients.

For 70 percent of Social Security recipients, Social Security represents more than half of their income. So they listen carefully as the President says we are going to protect the basic benefits under Social Security. The same holds true for Medicare. Medicare is a program that has been dramatically successful. Don't take my word for it, don't take any politicians' word for it, look at the life expectancy for senior citizens since we passed Medicare in the 1960s. Senior citizens can live independently, with more confidence, and live longer because of Medicare.

We know we have to make changes in this program, but let's do it in the spirit of preserving the basic benefit structure of Medicare. That is essential, and the President has made that clear too. Those on the Republican side who support the Congressman PAUL RYAN budget, which would basically hand out vouchers to seniors and say good luck in the insurance marketplace, ignore the reality that as people age they sometimes face medical challenges that others don't have, and they need the benefit and protection of Medicare in years to come.

The President is committed to that. The Democrats are committed to that. It should be a bipartisan commitment.

The same is true when it comes to Medicaid. This is a program across America that is essential in New York and Illinois. Thirty-six percent of all the children in the State of Illinois rely on Medicaid for health insurance. More than half of the babies born in my State are paid for by the Medicaid Program, and 20 percent of Medicaid recipients in Illinois consume 60 percent of the money spent. Most of them are elderly people who are very poor, living on Medicare, relying on Medicaid to stay in a convalescent setting or a nursing home setting.

So Medicaid has to be protected as well. That is a challenge the President and those of us on the Democratic side accept.

The bottom line is, we can move this economy forward in a coordinated, bipartisan effort; use the President's payroll tax cuts, the business tax cuts that are fully paid for; make certain we are dedicated to rebuilding America's basic infrastructure; and make certain, as well, that we take care of our own: the veterans returning from war, 10 percent of whom are out of work today. That is an embarrassment, and it is one that should come to an end immediately. We should work on a bipartisan basis to encourage their being hired.

There is something else that worries me as we come to the end of this week and face a recess for both the House and Senate. The Republican leader, Congressman ERIC CANTOR of Virginia, has suggested we may be facing another government shutdown threat. It is just incredible that the Republican leader would bring that up as one of the options as we go into this week before recess.

We don't need this. We have faced two previous threats this year from the tea party-dominated Republican House of Representatives. They threatened to close down the government when we passed the continuing resolution. They threatened again to close down the economy when we faced the debt ceiling.

At this moment, this perilous moment in America's economic history, we should not face a government shutdown again, and the Republican leaders in the House should not be suggesting that as an alternative. We need to work together.

The bottom line issue is disaster aid. I think the Senator from New York

knows, as I do—in Illinois we have faced these natural disasters; 48 States have this year. Hurricane Irene, I know, did tremendous damage in the State of New York. Earlier this year in the spring the flooding on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers did tremendous damage in my State of Illinois. We cannot predict when these natural disasters will come, and we certainly cannot predict how much they will cost. Now the Republicans in the House are insisting that we have to pay for every dollar of disaster aid.

What are their pay-fors? Take a look at it. It is a program we created to encourage the creation of manufacturing jobs in the United States, making fuel-efficient vehicles. The Republicans say eliminate it, eliminate a program focused on putting Americans back to work in good-paying jobs, building the vehicles of the future so we can be competitive not only at home but overseas? The Republicans say that is something government should not do.

It is a consistent pattern, whether it is their message to the Federal Reserve to do nothing when it comes to lowering interest rates, whether it is their message to the President to do nothing when it comes to payroll taxes to help middle-income families and business tax credits to put people back to work or when it comes to paying for disasters when they suggest eliminating a program that will create manufacturing jobs in the United States. Time and again, the philosophy of the Republicans comes through: Stand by; do nothing.

We saw it as well when it came to making certain that General Motors and Chrysler survived the crises of the last several years. The Republican position was: Do nothing.

There are many employees whose jobs are at stake when we talk about the automobile industry—all across America. We often think of some of the big names now that we see every day in the news. There are about 3,000 employees of an operation known as Facebook. There are around 30,000 employees of a company known as Google. There are 200,000 direct employees of General Motors, not to mention the millions who are suppliers and vendors of their products. To me, that is an indication of the shortsightedness of the Republican approach. Ignoring the reality of an automobile industry that needed a helping hand meant, if the Republicans had their way, GM and Chrysler may not exist today. Thank goodness they did not have their way. The President stepped in, made the changes necessary, encouraged the management of these companies to restructure in light of the new economic realities, and the companies survived.

In my home State of Illinois, in Belvidere, we are proud to have a Chrysler facility. I talked to the CEO of Chrysler. He believes—and I certainly concur—this facility has a bright future because the government helped Chrysler through an economic crisis, and now they are restructuring to build for the future. That is the kind of forward-looking view of the economy that we need.

When the Republicans instruct the Federal Reserve Board to do nothing to help the economy, say to the President: Do nothing to help the economy, and then threaten a government shutdown over paying for disaster relief across America, that is shortsighted. It is not consistent with the economic growth we need in this country to make certain we are moving forward.

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 Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SUPPORTING ISRAEL

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Earlier this week, I met with leaders in the Ohio Jewish community about events that could happen as the United Nations General Assembly convenes in the Presiding Officer's city, New York. One of the leaders and a dear friend of mine and a dear friend of Israel's told me these are tough times for Israel, some of the toughest ever. She took a deep breath, gathered her thoughts, and said, ''Until your neighbors accept you, it will always be a tough time.''

Israel is accustomed to living in a tough neighborhood, but in recent months that has grown tougher. Confrontation with Israel is a new centerpiece of Turkish foreign policy. Leaders in Egypt question Egypt's commitment to its peace treaty with Israel. Hezbollah has consolidated its political hold on the Lebanese Government. Iran is probably consistently the largest threat to peace in the Middle East as they defiantly continue their unmistakable march to nuclear capability.

In the coming days, the next step in an escalation against Israel will take place should the Palestinians seek recognition as a state from the United Nations. Instead of negotiating directly with Israel, as the Palestinians have often committed to do as far back as the Oslo agreement, they are about to seek to exclude Israel from any role in deciding issues that are critical to achieving a permanent peace. That must not occur. This action could set back the peace process for decades to come. The Obama administration is assiduously attempting to stop this dangerous move.

Today, as it has done in the past, Congress must stand firm with Israel. It must oppose any Palestinian action at the U.N. which would circumvent its commitment to negotiate. Our support for Israel must be united. We must speak with one voice—Democrat and Republican, House and Senate, Congress and the administration. The administration has said it will veto a Security Council resolution that would recognize a Palestinian state, and it must do that.

The U.N. rules for admission require that any applicant before the U.N. be ''peace loving'' and ''willing and able to carry out the obligations of the U.N. charter.'' The U.N. charter calls for ''faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person.'' It calls on members to ''practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors.'' The PA is not there yet.

U.N. membership and statehood itself is not a gift. It is not a right. It is earned. There is a responsible path for the Palestinians. Direct negotiations with Israel are the only way to produce a Palestinian state and the only way to achieve a lasting peace, just as direct negotiations produced peace between Israel and Egypt and Israel and Jordan.

Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu has called for direct talks to begin immediately, as have President Obama and so many of our colleagues. Why should the Palestinians be rewarded by the U.N. for refusing to negotiate with Israel?

If the Palestinians have elected to pursue confrontation over negotiation with Israel, we must rethink our efforts to support the Palestinians and the Palestinian Authority. Today, the Senate foreign operations subcommittee, of which I am a member, will be marking up the international affairs appropriations bill, which happens to be the same day the PA is considering making its plea at the United Nations. The bill is strong on holding the PA accountable should it attempt such a misguided maneuver. We cannot reward unilateral acts. We cannot reward bad behavior borne of a clear rejection of the only proven path to peace.

Many of my colleagues and I understand that a great number of Palestinians want what we all want in this country—in New York and Ohio and across our country—and what people want in Israel: a better life for their children, a life of peace and prosperity between and among peoples.

I am confident the administration will veto any Security Council recognition of a Palestinian state, but there are other options and possibilities before the U.N., such as seeking recognition from the General Assembly as a nonmember state. While it is a different name and comes by different procedures, it doesn't solve the Palestinians' fundamental problems of avoiding the tough negotiations and the internal consensus-building that are essential for peacemaking to succeed. That is why U.S. leadership is so important at this critical time. That is why we must all speak with one voice and stand firm in an unbreakable bond

with our ally Israel. Until we hold those who seek to destroy Israel accountable, it will always be a tough time for our closest ally.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). The Republican leader is recognized.

CHANGING COURSE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, there has been a lot of debate in the past week about the latest proposals coming out of the White House, about whether the President's latest stimulus bill or the tax hikes he is proposing will help or hurt the economy. But based on what we are hearing from the White House this week, it is hard to see the point in having any debate at all.

I am referring, of course, to a comment by the White House Communications Director who told the New York Times on Monday that the President had entered what he referred to as a new phase—a new phase. He said the President may have worked with Republicans to avert a government shutdown last spring and to raise the debt ceiling this summer, but ''that phase is behind us.'' In other words, the White House isn't interested in actually accomplishing anything anymore. It is more interested in making a point than making a difference.

So here is my question: How do you explain to the 14 million Americans looking for a job right now that you are more interested in motivating campaign supporters than in motivating businesses to hire?

For the past week, the President has been running around the country trying to set a record for the number of times he can say pass this bill ''right away'' in a 5-minute stump speech. Meanwhile, his communications director is telling people the President doesn't expect the bill to pass. And the Democratic majority leader in the Senate is treating it like a legislative afterthought. My friend the majority leader said yesterday he might take up this supposedly ''urgent'' bill next month after he has had a chance to deal with a Chinese currency bill and a few others. As for the other Democrats in Congress, well, they are not exactly rushing to get it in the queue either.

This so-called jobs bill seems to be about as popular as Solyndra, and I am just talking about among Democrats. Yet the President is out there acting as though somebody is actually putting up a fight. So this whole thing is a charade, and I think the American people deserve better. I think they deserve a President who realizes that governing involves working with a situation as it is, not as you would like it to be. President Obama may think the best way to distract people from the challenges we face is to stand near a bridge in a swing State and pit one group of Americans against another and hope his critics look bad if they don't go along with him, but I don't think he is fooling anybody. I don't think all the campaign stops in the world are going to convince most Americans that the real cause of our problems lies anywhere other than with the policies that are coming out of Washington these days or that the single greatest obstacle to job creation in America today is policies that punish the risk takers and the entrepreneurs and that stifle investment and private enterprise, rather than rewarding it.

When it comes right down to it, I think most Americans care more about results than about rhetoric. Let's be honest. The results of this President's economic policies speak for themselves. After 2½ years of government spending, here is what we have: record deficits, chronic unemployment, median incomes going down, poverty rates going up, and the first ever credit downgrade. This isn't exactly a record to be proud of. So I can understand the President wanting to change the topic. It might make him feel better. It might energize his strongest supporters. But here is something it won't do: It won't create jobs.

Look, if we can solve our jobs crisis and revive the economy by passing the hat at Warren Buffett's annual shareholders meeting, we would have done it by now, but we can't. Why? Because that is not a real solution. It is a campaign slogan.

The President said the other day the tax hikes he is proposing aren't class warfare. He said they are math. Well, we can do math too, so let's do the math. According to the IRS, if you doubled—doubled—the tax burden on everybody in America who earned more than $1 million in 2009, you would cover the cost of about 3 months of deficit spending around here. If you doubled the tax burden on everybody in America who earned more than $1 million in 2009, you would cover the cost of about 3 months of the deficit we are running around here. If you confiscated every dime of taxable income from those the President refers to as millionaires and billionaires—take it all—you wouldn't even cover a single year of deficit spending in Washington right now. Spending more money in Washington won't solve our spending problem, it will enable it.

How about the stimulus? One of the programs is the stimulus was supposed to create 65,000 jobs. So far, it has created 3,500 at nearly $11 million per job—$11 million per job. Solyndra was supposed to create thousands of permanent jobs. Two years later, more than 1,000 Solyndra employees are out of work altogether, and the American taxpayer is on the hook for more than $½ billion in loans to the company.

But here is the most important calculation: Not a single new job will come about as a result of the tax hikes the President proposed this week—not one new job. As the National Federation of Independent Business puts it:

> New tax increases on America's biggest job creators are the last thing this economy needs to get back on track.

What else do we need to know?

Republicans are ready to work with the President on turning this economy around. We know what would work, and after the past 2½ years, we have certainly seen what won't work. So my suggestion to the President is the same now as it has been for months. Put aside the political playbook and work with us on policies that will actually solve the problems Americans care about the most. Let's work together on policies that are aimed at motivating job creators, not your political base. It is time to change course.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. 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. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

THE AUTHORIZATION PROCESS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a fundamental problem of this body: the fact that Congress as an institution—and the Senate in particular—rarely engages in the process of authorizing prior to appropriating money for our government. As a result, a handful of senior appropriators and their unelected staffs dictate the spending of hundreds of billions of dollars, often in a manner that directly contravenes the will of those committees that still authorize spending. It is time this process be stopped.

The solution is simple. We should not authorize on appropriations bills, and any funding proposed for unauthorized projects should be subject to the scrutiny and approval of the authorizing committees and reflect the will of their members.

We are all to blame for this problem. The fact is that routine passage of authorizing legislation simply doesn't occur as it should. Far too often, even routine passage of appropriations legislation has devolved into passage of a

single omnibus bill. This also must stop.

A case in point is the appropriations bill to fund the Department of Defense that was reported out of the Appropriations Committee last week. That legislation should reflect the will of the Defense authorization bill but runs directly contrary to it in many areas. At a time when we face a $14.7 trillion national debt that is mortgaging the future of our children and grandchildren, the Senate Appropriations Committee is proposing a Defense spending bill that uses a budget gimmick totaling over $10 billion to mislead the American people about the savings the committee claims to achieve.

While the Department of Defense is struggling to find more than $400 billion in cuts directed by the President, the Appropriations Committee is still conducting business as usual by rewarding special interests and funding pet projects that have little or nothing to do with our national defense. In the bill reported out last week that purports to cut over $26 billion from the President's request by changes to 580 different programs, somehow the Appropriations Committee still found money for over $2.3 billion in additional spending not requested by the Department of Defense and for items that are far from real defense requirements.

I have here a list of the roughly 580 items changed by the Appropriations Committee which are differences from the bill adopted unanimously by the Senate Armed Services Committee in June in the Department of Defense authorization bill. This list is 45 pages long and represents $20 billion in changes.

For example, it is incredible to me the Appropriations Committee put a priority on spending $33 million in operation and maintenance funds. That money is used to maintain the readiness and combat capability of our troops. The $33 million is going to purchase schoolbuses, to build a mental health substance abuse facility on Guam, and a repository for cultural artifacts. I am not making that up: $33 million for a repository—oh, phase one of a repository for cultural artifacts, funding for a mental health substance abuse facility, and the purchase of schoolbuses. All of this money, and $40 million more next year to complete these facilities, is, at least in theory, supposedly, to help promote Guam's cooperation as part of the plan to move 8,700 marines and 9,000 family members from their current bases on Okinawa to Guam.

I know the marines will enjoy being on Guam. I am not sure it is absolutely necessary for them to have a repository for cultural artifacts. But the plan to move the marines, which will require spending between $18 billion and $23 billion on Guam to build up its capabilities as a permanent base, is so much in doubt that both the Armed Services Committee and the Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee have stopped funding Guam military construction projects until the Department of Defense provides a master plan and considers alternatives that may provide the needed marine forward presence at much less expense.

In fact, we simply cannot afford to carry out the plans as they were originally envisioned. In the face of all the doubt about the scope and timing of the eventual buildup, the Appropriations Committee put a premium on buying schoolbuses, an artifact repository, and a mental health clinic in Guam. That is not anybody's idea of defense priorities in the fiscal environment we face.

In some cases, the Appropriations Committee was well aware that the Armed Services Committee had, on a unanimous vote, reported out a bill that denied funding for a program, but the appropriators funded the full amount anyway. This is the case with the Army's Medium Extended Air Defense System, or MEADS. The Armed Services Committee cut the entire budget request of $406 million for this program because Army leaders have told the Senate they do not intend to ever buy or deploy the system and because repeated technical reviews have determined that MEADS is behind schedule, over cost, and a high risk of technical failure. The Appropriations Committee ignored the Armed Services Committee's decision not to authorize further funding for MEADS and instead appropriated the full amount of $406 million—even in the face of the fact of the need to cut defense spending by eliminating troubled programs that are not effectively providing increased combat capability for the troops.

Additionally, hundreds of millions of dollars in the fiscal year 2012 Defense appropriations bill have been allocated to things that were never requested by the Pentagon, never authorized by the Senate Armed Services Committee, and which are simply not core defense priorities.

Example: There is $354 million added for medical research not requested by the Pentagon, including $120 million for breast cancer research, $10 million for ovarian cancer research, $64 million for prostate cancer research, and $50 million for other medical research for a laundry list of medical conditions. I am not questioning the merits of medical research, but they do not have anything to do with defending this Nation. They should be taken out of the appropriations of the Health and Human Services Subcommittee, not out of defense.

Again, I am not questioning the merits of medical research and the important role the Federal Government can play. I am saying it is time for it to stop being taken out of national defense.

The Appropriations Committee adds even more unrequested funding for programs such as $60 million for environmental conservation for ranges; $106 million for alternate energy research, whatever that means; $45 million for high-performance computing modernization—all of these, and a long list of them, may be good programs; they are not authorized; and the job of the Senate Armed Services Committee is to scrutinize these programs and select those that are in most need of funding—$5 million for the National Guard Youth Challenge Program; $4.5 million for the Civil Air Patrol.

Programs have some merit, but we have to look at these with an eye to the fact that we have been tasked to cut $400 billion that the President has already ordered the Pentagon to undertake.

Despite the Appropriations Committee's desire to find $26 billion in defense savings, they found money to add $240 million in unrequested funding—the Pentagon and the President did not ask for them—for a number of congressional special interest areas, such as advanced materials research, $10 million; Industrial Base Innovation Fund—whatever that is—$30 million; Defense Rapid Innovation Fund, $200 million.

In the procurement account, the Appropriations Committee added $675 million for items that were not requested by the Pentagon or authorized by the Armed Services Committee, including $120 million for advance procurement of 12 Air Force C–130Js, $47.4 million for improved radars for Air National Guard F–15s, $140 million for program increases to classified programs—the list goes on and on.

Although the appropriators were looking for $26 billion in savings, they chose not to follow the Armed Services Committee in making cuts to some programs even when the justification for taking savings was clear. These examples include $150 million for the Army Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System; $495 million for Navy F/A–18E/F Hornets, which the Armed Services Committee pointed out were funded in the full-year Defense appropriations bill for the year 2011; $205 million for the Fleet Satellite Communications follow-on program, for which the Government Accountability Office and the Armed Services Committee noted that the funding for the requested booster was too early.

In order to give the appearance of real savings to the taxpayer, the Appropriations Committee, again, incredibly, shifted over $10 billion in funding from the nonwar base defense funding budget to the ''off-budget/emergency spending.'' For the benefit of the record, the Overseas Contingency Operations Fund does not count as part of the budget, but it is for overseas contingencies, i.e., the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

So what did the Appropriations Committee do? They took money that is supposed to be for the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, and they transferred over $3.2 billion to the account for

overseas contingency operations, $550 million for predator drones, $228 million for counterfire radars, $192 million for Fire Scout unmanned aerial systems, $784 million for unmanned aerial systems.

In the operations and maintenance accounts, the Appropriations Committee transferred over $6.2 billion for items that were requested in the base budget to the ''off-budget'' overseas contingency operations funding, including $3 billion for Army depot maintenance, $495 million for Navy depot maintenance—it goes on and on.

In the miliary personnel accounts, another $529 million was transferred from the defense budget, where it was requested, to the overseas contingency operations budget so it would count as ''defense savings.''

This is pure budget gimmickry. It is about time we got serious about cutting spending. Using budget gimmicks to shift over $10 billion from the base defense budget to the emergency account we have set aside for support of overseas contingency operations is not saving the taxpayers a dime. Cutting $10 billion from the President's request for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, shifting over $10 billion in nonwar expenses, and then claiming in a press release—they had the gall in a press release—that the President's request for the warfighting accounts is fully supported is not only a gimmick, it is dishonest with the American people. It is a disservice to the men and women of the military who depend on that funding for critical warfighting equipment and support.

I have talked to many of our senior commanders in Iraq and members of the Iraqi Government during repeated trips to Iraq this year. All of them have recommended that the United States maintain at least 10,000 soldiers beyond December 31, 2011. There is no money in the warfighting accounts for, if we have, additional troops. So because of the administration's delay in any decision for any additional troops, understandably, that is not funded in these bills, which is required, obviously, by October 1, the end of the fiscal year.

What will also put our troops, our national security, and our Nation at grave risk is the specter of even more drastic defense cuts should the recommendations of the joint select committee fail to gather enough congressional support.

Secretary of Defense Panetta warned last week that the failure of lawmakers to agree on debt ceiling talks, which would trigger up to $600 billion in additional Pentagon budget cuts, could add 1 percentage point to the Nation's jobless rate. He also called the impact of cuts of that magnitude ''devastating'' to our Armed Forces.

The citizens of my State—and nearly every other State in the Nation—have been struggling through record unemployment rates and unprecedented fiscal pressures. Now, more than ever, they need strong leadership to make tough decisions to restore fiscal discipline and responsibility in Federal spending. I am committed to using every power available to me to ensure the Defense bill for 2012 provides spending for only the most critical national security requirements, as proposed by the President and defense leadership. In this regard, the Defense appropriations bill that has been reported from the Appropriations Committee is sadly lacking.

There is plenty of blame to go around. I do not fault just the appropriators. We have all failed to do our jobs. The answer to this problem is to fix it. We must stop authorizing on appropriations legislation without the agreement of the authorizing committee. The appropriations bills should reflect the will of the authorizing committees. I intend to work with my colleagues to remedy this problem so the will and wisdom of all Senators—not just a select few—is represented when we pass appropriations legislation.

A solution to this problem is long overdue, and I intend to fight to see that it is solved.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXTENDING THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2832, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2832) to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Casey) amendment No. 633, to extend and modify trade adjustment assistance.

Hatch amendment No. 641 (to amendment No. 633), to make the effective date of the amendments expanding the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program contingent on the enactment of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act, and the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 625 TO AMENDMENT NO. 633

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 625. I ask unanimous consent that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 625 to amendment No. 633.

Mr. McCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To extend trade adjustment assistance as in effect before the enactment of the Trade and Globalization Adjustment Assistance of 2009)

Strike title II and insert the following:

TITLE II—TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

Title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.) (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act and without regard to any substitution made by section 1893(b) of the Trade and Globalization Adjustment Assistance Act of 2009 (19 U.S.C. 2271 note prec.)) is amended—

(1) in section 245, by striking ''2007'' and inserting ''2014'';

(2) in section 246(b)(1), by striking ''the date that is 5 years'' and all that follows through ''State'' and inserting ''December 31, 2014'';

(3) in section 256(b), by striking ''each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, and $4,000,000 for the 3-month period beginning October 1, 2007'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2012 through 2014, and $4,000,000 for the 3-month period beginning October 1, 2014'';

(4) in section 285, by striking ''2007'' each place it appears and inserting ''2014''; and

(5) in section 298(a)—

(A) by striking ''2003 through 2007'' and inserting ''2012 through 2014''; and

(B) by striking ''October 1, 2007'' and inserting ''October 1, 2014''.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the amendment would authorize the continuation of trade adjustment assistance or TAA for 2 additional years at the level of funding the program maintained prior to the 2009 stimulus package addition. Prior to the stimulus, passed by this body in 2009, the TAA Program cost taxpayers about $1 billion per year.

The passage of the stimulus package, which was advertised to be a temporary injection into the economy—a temporary injection—the stimulus was increased and expanded to the program at a cost of about $2 billion in 2010; according to the Department of Labor estimates, $2.4 billion in 2011, if the stimulus expansions were allowed to remain in place.

I would remind my colleagues that with the stimulus package, these were a one-time deal, and once the money was spent, then those programs lapsed. Apparently not so with the TAA Program. We do not yet have a cost score for the Reid substitute before us, but estimates indicate the TAA agreement may lock in at least 65 percent of the 2009 stimulus expansions for the next several years.

That is approximately, in my calculation, at least a $600 million additional cost per year to the taxpayers for maintaining 65 percent of the stimulus level of TAA. Architects of the agreement will say these provisions sunset at the end of 2014. But we all know sunsets can be fiction. So we are talking about 2012, 2013, and 2014. That is about, roughly, a minimum of $1.2 billion of additional spending on the dubious—at least in my mind dubious—benefits of the TAA Program.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have long insisted that the price of passing trade agreements in Congress is passing TAA and other programs similar to it, domestic spending legislation geared to assist U.S. workers who have been adversely affected by foreign trade.

For this reason, in 2002, Congress passed the TAA legislation that provided short-term temporary support for worker retraining and other assistance. Many Republicans, including myself, were skeptical about whether this program and others like it achieved their goals. But we went along for the sake of our national interests and expanding free trade.

In 2009, without any action taken on our three pending trade agreements, the stimulus package dramatically increased the TAA Program as part of the stimulus bill and increased spending on this program annually by approximately $1 billion. In essence, a program that was designed to assist workers who had been adversely affected by free trade was transformed into a domestic spending program for reasons that had nothing at all to do with expanding free trade.

What is worse, after repeatedly claiming it supports the free-trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and Korea, the White House earlier this year announced that the cost of its support was reauthorization of the new TAA with funding set not at the original 2002 level but the 2009 stimulus level.

So we had a program that had been expanded from its original cost under the dubious guise of a temporary economic stimulus, and then we were told this temporary funding increase, which was designed to expire along with the stimulus, should, in effect, be turned into a permanent domestic spending program.

After much discussion and debate, there now appears to be a proposal to reauthorize TAA and fund it somewhere between the prestimulus and poststimulus levels. This proposal is contained in the substitute amendment offered by the majority leader. Some would say this is a good deal and Republicans should accept it. Others say trade adjustment assistance is ineffective and unproven and Congress should kill it altogether.

I am very dubious about the benefits of TAA. But I understand also what is doable around here and what is not. So I am offering this amendment as a matter of principle. As I have said many times on the floor of this body, I am not opposed to TAA nor do I seek to kill it. I read the same media reports as my colleagues, which suggest that the White House is holding hostage the trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama until Congress passes TAA.

Many of us do not like this. Many of us think this is contrary to our national and economic interests. But it is a fact. So I recognize, as in the past, that Congress should reauthorize TAA. The question is, How much of the taxpayers' money should we spend to do it?

That is why I am offering this amendment. I believe Congress should reauthorize it because we are being compelled to do so, but I also believe we should reauthorize this program at its prestimulus funding levels.

Let me explain why. The following are the temporary expansions to TAA that were included in the stimulus, which cost about $2 billion in 2010, and, according to the Department of Labor, was estimated to cost approximately $2.4 billion in 2011 if the 2009 stimulus expansions had stayed in place.

The stimulus expanded TAA to cover workers whose employers shifted production to any foreign country, not just those—as under prior law—whose jobs were outsourced to countries with which the United States has a free-trade agreement.

It expanded TAA coverage to the service sector and government employees who lose their jobs because of trade.

It increased the tax credit available to cover private health insurance premiums from 65 percent to 80. It increased the appropriations cap for training from $220 million to $575 million, a 160-percent increase over the previous cap.

It created the Community TAA Program, which authorizes $230 million for trade-affected communities to assist in strategic planning grants up to $5 million, sector partnership grants up to $3 million over a 3-year period, and community college and career training grants up to $1 million.

It gave $17.5 million to States for employment and case management. It lengthened the amount of time workers could receive trade readjustment allowance assistance by 26 weeks.

Finally, it revived the TAA for farmers and the wage insurance program, estimated by CBO to total about $100 million for 2 years.

So we had a program that had been expanded from its original intent, with benefits going to government employees, service sector employees, TAA benefits going to communities, TAA benefits going to farms, TAA benefits going to firms, under the dubious guise of a temporary economic stimulus.

This is what the White House and the other side in Congress were telling us had to be reauthorized in order to pass the free-trade agreements. My amendment also addresses the claim made by some that the agreement in the majority leader's substitute amendment not only reduces TAA from stimulus levels but also much lower in several years.

However, according to a recent Heritage Foundation analysis, this may not be accurate. This is important, so let me read this analysis at length. This is from the Heritage Foundation report:

> Instead of cutting TAA back to pre-stimulus levels, the proposal restores and solidifies the most alarming aspects of the stimulus expansion at a yet unknown cost.
>
> It keeps the 2009 stimulus expansion for service sector workers. TAA was originally intended to provide income maintenance and job training to workers from the manufacturing sector. The stimulus bill expanded eligibility to include workers from the service and public sectors. This expansion expired in February, but the proposal restores TAA eligibility for service sector workers.
>
> It restores stimulus expansion of benefits for job losses unrelated to FTAs. The proposal retains the stimulus expansion of providing TAA benefits to any workers who lost their jobs to overseas production, not just TAA-certified jobs that were lost to FTAs.
>
> It reinstates the stimulus's 161 percent increase in TAA for workers' job training spending. The proposal cements the stimulus spending expansion of TAA for workers' job training at $575 million per year from $220 million—an increase of $355 million per year.
>
> It continues the stimulus's creation of a new and duplicative job training program.
>
> The proposal keeps the TAA Community College and Career Training Program, which has appropriations authorizations of $500 billion per year from fiscal years 2011 through 2014. This new job-training program is just one of the 47 employment and training programs operated across nine agencies by the federal government.

Let me repeat that. This is another proposal that spends $500 million for job training, even though we already have 47 employment and training programs operated across 9 agencies by the Federal Government.

> It partially reinstates the stimulus increase in Health Coverage Tax Credit. . . .
>
> It solidifies the wage subsidies for older workers as a permanent program. The prestimulus Alternative TAA was a temporary five-year demonstration program that paid 50 percent of the difference between new and old wages of displaced older workers. It subsidized the wages of older workers earning less than $50,000 per year for up to $10,000 over two years. After changing the program's name to Reemployment TAA, the stimulus expansion increased the wage subsidy to $12,000 over two years for displaced older workers earning less than $55,000 and made the program permanent. While the proposal reduces the wage subsidies to pre-stimulus levels, it also cements into law the permanency of the wage subsidy program.
>
> It retains the stimulus expansion of the union VEBA handout. Despite having nothing to do with international trade, the stimulus expansion of TAA extended the HCTC to Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Associations (VEBA). A bankruptcy court can allocate a portion of an out-of-business employer's assets to a VEBA, which assumes responsibly for retirees' health coverage. This expansion primarily benefits unions. Under the proposal, the federal government would cover 72.5 percent of the cost of retiree health benefits at bankrupt companies. This coverage occurs regardless of whether the bankruptcies are related to free trade.

Let's look at an example of excess created in the ''temporary'' stimulus expansion of the TAA Program that taxpayers are still on the hook for. According to a February 2011 study by Senator COBURN, entitled ''Help Wanted: How Federal Job Training Programs are Failing Workers'':

Taxpayers may have a case of indigestion when they learn, nearly two years after the stimulus was enacted, their money is paying lobstermen, shrimpers and blueberry farmers $12,000 each to attend job training sessions on jobs they are already trained to do.

The stimulus reauthorized the Trade Adjustment Assistance for Farmers program administered by the USDA, a program that provides subsidies to producers of raw agricultural commodities and fishermen so they can adjust to import competition. Under the stimulus, TAA benefits were enhanced to focus more on employment re-training.

While the Reid substitute includes a compromise to ''pare back'' some of the expansions in the ''temporary'' stimulus spending legislation of 2009, it still expands TAA benefits and eligibility beyond the prestimulus levels—by approximately, by my calculations, at least $600 million a year.

I acknowledge that expanding trade temporarily puts some of our workers at a disadvantage. I remember being roundly criticized during the 2008 Presidential campaign when I had the audacity to tell Michigan workers the truth—that many of the jobs that had left their State for cheaper labor markets overseas were never coming back. So I understand that trade can create difficulties for some American workers. I am not opposed, in principle, to supporting those workers temporarily so they can develop new skills and find new jobs. That said, let's look closer at how the Federal Government has been going about programs such as this.

Earlier this year, the GAO released a study entitled ''Multiple Training and Employment Programs: Providing Information on Collocating Services and Consolidating Administrative Structures Could Promote Efficiencies.'' Here is what the GAO reported on Federal employment and retraining programs, including the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program:

Based on our survey of agency officials, we determined that only 5 of the 47 programs have had impact studies that assess whether the program is responsible for improved employment outcomes. The five impact studies generally found that the effects of participation were not consistent across programs, with only some demonstrating positive impacts that tended to be small, inconclusive, or restricted to short-term impacts.

So not only are many of these worker employment and training programs duplicative, the GAO has found very little empirical evidence to support whether these programs are even accomplishing their intended goals—and what empirical evidence they have they found is, I repeat, '' . . . small inconclusive, or restricted to short term impacts.'' TAA is among these programs.

This is bad enough, but what is worse, we have not even been told how much this expansion of TAA will cost the taxpayers. We are told the legislation includes ''offsets,'' but we know they are not real. Offsets allegedly include: rates for merchandise processing fees, changes to the ''time for remitting certain merchandise processing fees,'' unemployment compensation program integrity provisions to create a ''mandatory penalty assessment on fraud claims, prohibition on non-charging due to employer fault, reporting of rehired employees to the directory of new hires.'' That is supposed to come up with hundreds of millions of dollars.

I cannot say what most of these mean, but I can say they are not real.

Even while extending the TAA prestimulus program, we need to analyze whether the TAA Program is doing what it was intended to do. The following are some of the questions and concerns we must consider:

Does the TAA Program provide overly generous benefits to a narrow population?

According to analysis from the Heritage Foundation, based on statistics from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in the third quarter of fiscal year 2009, only 1 percent of mass layoffs were a result of import competition of overseas relocation.

Is there evidence that TAA benefits and training help increase participants' earnings?

An analysis by Professor Kara M. Reynolds of American University found ''little evidence that it (TAA) helps displaced workers find new, well-paying employment opportunities.'' In fact, TAA participants experienced a wage loss of 10 percent.

The same study found that in fiscal year 2007, the Federal Government appropriated $855.1 million to TAA Programs. Of this amount, funding for training programs accounted for only 25 percent.

In 2007, the Office of Management and Budget rated the TAA Program as ''ineffective.'' The OMB found that the TAA Program failed to use tax dollars effectively because, among other reasons, the program has failed to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of achieving its goals.

Let me close by reminding my colleagues how we got to our current predicament. It is mid-September of 2011, 2½ years since President Obama took office, and we still have not received these important trade agreements that were finalized half a decade ago—all because of the White House's insistence on making a ''temporary'' stimulus program—the dubious extension of TAA—into a permanent domestic spending program.

This is how George Will summed it up, writing in the Washington Post on June 8, 2011. The piece is as appropriate now as it was then:

President Obama is sacrificing economic growth and job creation in order to placate organized labor. And as the crisis of the welfare state deepens, he is trying to enlarge the entitlement system and exacerbate the entitlement mentality. . . .

On May 4, the administration announced that, at last, it was ready to proceed with congressional ratification of the agreements. On May 16, however, it announced they would not send them until Congress expands an entitlement program favored by unions.

Since 1974, Trade Adjustment Assistance has provided 104, and then 156, weeks of myriad financial aid, partly concurrent with the 99 weeks of unemployment compensation to people, including farmers and government workers, and firms, even whole communities, that can more or less plausibly claim to have lost their jobs or been otherwise injured because of foreign competition. Even if the injury is just the loss of unfair advantages conferred, at the expense of other Americans, by government protectionism.

This process should be appalling to the average American who is looking for an improving economy, not special favors to certain special interest groups.

At a time when our national debt has reached unsustainable levels, at a time when Congress and the American people face some truly painful choices about how to cut our Federal budget, at a time when some are even considering enormous and dangerous cuts to our defense spending as a way to get our fiscal house in order, this is no time to throw more money than we did before the stimulus at a Federal program that, as the GAO points out, is duplicative and possibly ineffective.

I am prepared to reluctantly support TAA if it were funded at the prestimulus level, as a recognition of reality that some form of this program is required in order to pass our existing trade agreements. But we should authorize it at prestimulus levels and not one dollar more. That is what this amendment would do. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

At this moment, there is not a sufficient second.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. 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. CASEY. Madam President, I wish to address some of the points raised by our colleague from Arizona—just a couple areas; one is the question of the impact of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, which has been enhanced by way of the Recovery Act of 2009. I will talk about some of the reforms as well and maybe address some of the cost questions.

First, with regard to trade adjustment assistance prior to the 2009 period versus the period after that, I wish to submit for the RECORD—and then I will walk through some of this—this document entitled ''Trade and Globalization Adjustment Assistance

Act (TGAAA) Worker Certification 5/18/2009–6/27/2011.'' This is a Department of Labor document.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE AND GLOBALIZATION ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT (TGAAA) WORKER CERTIFICATIONS 5/18/2009–6/27/2011

State	Estimated total workers certified under new provisions	Estimated total workers certified under all provisions	Estimated percent of workers certified under new provisions
Alabama	4,710	11,277	41.77
Alaska	3	3	100.00
Arizona	4,969	8,540	58.16
Arkansas	807	6,192	13.03
California	20,942	30,619	68.40
Colorado	2,755	3,652	75.44
Connecticut	2,916	4,728	61.68
DC	50	50	100.00
Delaware	13	1,281	1.01
Florida	2,867	6,196	46.27
Georgia	1,887	5,684	33.20
Hawaii	43	43	100.00
Idaho	1,549	2,228	69.52
Illinois	6,997	19,772	35.39
Indiana	3,717	17,047	21.80
Iowa	1,479	4,380	33.77
Kansas	1,065	6,076	17.53
Kentucky	3,519	9,755	36.07
Louisiana	601	2,261	26.58
Maine	914	3,506	26.07
Maryland	1,556	3,118	49.90
Massachusetts	6,821	9,745	69.99
Michigan	14,440	49,642	29.09
Minnesota	4,325	9,166	47.19
Mississippi	392	2,566	15.28
Missouri	2,889	9,328	30.97
Montana	316	658	48.02
Nebraska	1,130	2,121	53.28
Nevada	61	89	68.54
New Hampshire	382	1,471	25.97
New Jersey	4,744	6,329	74.96
New Mexico	1,467	2,412	60.82
New York	9,411	18,795	50.07
North Carolina	9,674	19,569	49.44
North Dakota	905	905	100.00
Ohio	7,706	33,905	22.73
Oklahoma	1,473	1,976	74.54
Oregon	6,045	11,981	50.45
Pennsylvania	9,932	27,401	36.25
Puerto Rico	42	821	5.12
Rhode Island	579	1,401	41.33
South Carolina	4,133	8,358	49.45
South Dakota	350	925	37.84
Tennessee	6,676	17,712	37.69
Texas	11,706	20,441	57.27
Utah	2,233	3,328	67.10
Vermont	344	964	35.68
Virginia	4,256	10,951	38.86
Washington	2,547	7,269	35.04
West Virginia	1,760	3,688	47.72
Wisconsin	5,731	16,864	33.98
Wyoming	0	46	0.00
Total	185,783	447,235	41.54

Mr. CASEY. Let me go through, by way of summary, what this depicts. First of all, it is a document that has three columns; first is the ''Estimated Total Workers Certified Under New Provisions,'' meaning the changes made to TAA as a result of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009; the second column is the ''Estimated Total Workers Certified . . .''—meaning certified under TAA—'' . . . Under All Provisions of TAA''; finally is the ''Estimated Percent of Workers Certified Under New Provisions'' as a result of the changes made. And what it shows is, if you look across the country, the estimated total workers certified under all provisions is 447,235 people. Of that, the increase—in essence because of the 2009 changes—is 185,783. And if you look at the percentage, that is a 41-percent increase.

So the basic point here—after a long explanation—is very simple. Because of the changes made in 2009, we were able to help—the U.S. Government, by way of TAA—41 percent more individuals. That is relevant because it was helping folks to be retrained, helping them to get the skills they needed for a new career, a new job, at the time they needed it—during the worst economic catastrophe in 100 years, other than the Great Depression. So if there were ever a time when we needed to make sure that TAA worked—and it has worked—and, also, if there were ever a time when we wanted to make sure that TAA was strengthened and enhanced, it was during the last couple of years. That is the point, that the 2009 changes were made because we were in the throes, the teeth, the grip of the worst economic downturn in 100 years, other than in the 1930s.

Let me highlight a couple of States. For example, in my home State of Pennsylvania, what all this means, if you look at the total number of workers helped in this time period—again, talking about roughly the 2 years between May of 2009 to June of 2011 in Pennsylvania—there were 27,401 people helped. Workers helped, I should say. Of that, about 36 percent were helped solely because of the Recovery Act changes.

I know a good bit about the workers in our State. They needed that help. They needed the help that was provided as a result of the Recovery Act. So we have good evidence a lot of folks were helped, certified, and then enrolled in programs to give them the skills they needed.

The Presiding Officer is from the State of New York, and she knows how difficult this recession has been on workers in New York. The total number of workers certified in New York in that 2-year time period was 18,795. But half of that number, a little more than 50 percent, were helped as a result of the 2009 changes that were made.

I say that to highlight and emphasize that the 2009 changes allowed more workers to be retrained, to get the skills they needed to go back to work. I think that is what we are all about here. Democrats and Republicans all say they want workers to get back into the workforce. This is one of the ways we do it. It is very practical. In order to get from here to there—from unemployment to employment, and in a lot of cases to a new job or a new career—you need to be trained. That is what TAA does.

I will highlight two or three more States. Chairman BAUCUS, from the great State of Montana, his State was helped as well. Their increase, based upon the 2009 changes, was close to 50

percent. So almost 50 percent more workers in the State of Montana were helped as well to get the skills they needed.

Let me mention as well my colleague Senator BROWN who has worked so hard on this. There were 7,706 more workers in the State of Ohio who were certified to get the skills and training they needed because of these changes.

And, finally, I will mention as well our colleague from Arizona. If we look at the total number of Arizona workers certified, there were 8,540 workers certified in total, but of that 8,540, the increase was some 4,969. So in Arizona, the increase of workers who were helped or certified for new training, there was a 58.16-percent increase. So the increase in Arizona was even higher, and in some States it was even higher than that.

The point here is that 2009 changes weren't just a couple of changes made to enhance the program or expand it for the sake of expanding a program. I think the evidence shows we have certified more workers. These workers have to go through a process to be certified in order for us to provide help by way of the Federal Government and other partners who are helping us retrain workers. I think the evidence is pretty clear that has been a very positive change, giving more workers the skills they needed to compete.

Let me say as well about our colleague from Arizona that I appreciate what he said about TAA, and that he supports it. We may have a disagreement about how to get there. He apparently doesn't want the 2009 changes to be made part of any effort going forward, but I appreciate the fact he has expressed support for TAA. I also appreciate the fact that when Senator BAUCUS, Senator BROWN, I, and others in the latter days of 2010 were trying to get an expansion of TAA, Senator MCCAIN worked with us to try to negotiate something. He was very willing to talk and to work and to come together, and I appreciate that, because we need that bipartisanship, we need that collegiality to move this forward. So even though we have a disagreement about the changes made, I appreciate his willingness to work with us back in December and to continue to work with us.

Let me make one or two more points. One basic point about reform. Folks will criticize programs and say programs aren't sometimes going through the kind of changes we hoped for in reforming them. But we should note for the record that in 2008, the GAO released a study which highlighted a number of issues with trade adjustment assistance. They set forth findings. That is why GAO is important. We shouldn't allow programs to go on for years without some sort of reporting, accountability, performance measures, or whatever you wish to call it.

GAO pointed out problems they believed could be the subject of reform for TAA, and those recommendations were the foundation for some of the changes in the 2009 Recovery Act we are debating here on the floor, and we are debating as a result of Senator MCCAIN's amendment. Here is what they are. I will highlight them quickly. Here is what we are talking about.

The amendment we are considering, or the effort we are working on to expand TAA, does a number of things we should highlight. In addition to making more workers eligible for training, it does a couple of things. First of all, it consolidates administration—that is important to highlight—it consolidates case management, and it consolidates job search and relocation funding under the new dollars for job training. The amendment also eliminates separate funding streams that were in place before, but it also allows States the flexibility to use a portion of the training funds for administration and for case management costs. States must prioritize these funds for training and case management, but administrative costs are capped at 10 percent of the funds and States can also use these funds to pay for 90 percent of the cost of job search and relocation up to $1,250.

Finally, the amendment includes 30 new performance metrics and accountability measures across all TAA programs.

So what is the point? The point is very simple. We had a GAO study in 2008 that recommended changes to TAA. We had a Recovery Act introduced and enacted for a variety of reasons, some of which spoke directly to TAA in 2009. The reforms from the GAO study were incorporated in the 2009 changes. So if we stay with the original non-2009 provisions, we won't have these reforms built in. GAO had pointed out some issues we should address, they were addressed in 2009, and that is another good reason why we should support the amendment that would include those 2009 changes.

Finally, on the question of costs or offsets, the 10-year cost for TAA is now $962 million over 10 years. That is cut way back. In fact, it has been cut by as much as half. We will talk about them more in the record, but there are three offsets. The first, so-called ''merchandise processing fee,'' raises $1.77 billion; the second, on unemployment insurance, accounts for $320 million; and then finally, the Medicare quality improvement organizations raises another $330 million. So there are offsets—three in number—and the total cost is now $962 million over 10 years. I think it is a reasonable price to pay for the substantial training and retraining that TAA provides for our workers who are living the horrific nightmare of job loss and the destruction of their careers, and, frankly, in many cases, the destruction of their family.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. 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. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all time in a quorum call be divided equally.

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

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 641

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise in support of my amendment No. 641. As I explained yesterday, this amendment really is about fundamental fairness.

The President wants TAA and has held hostage three free-trade agreements to get it. Well, most of us want these free-trade agreements and think it is wrong for TAA to move forward while the FTAs languish. My amendment will ensure that all four legislative ships arrive in port at the same time.

It is time for the entire trade agenda to move forward. In August, as he toured the Midwest, the President repeatedly called upon Congress to take the agreements up ''right now'' to help create jobs. This hollow call for action typifies the President's approach to the trade agenda. By calling upon Congress to act, he appears to be embracing the agreements and pushing for their quick approval. But, like so many of the President's trade initiatives, his words do not match his deeds.

In reality, Congress cannot take up these agreements ''right now.'' President Obama is relying upon a trade law called trade promotion authority to protect each of these agreements from being blocked or amended by Congress. In order to take advantage of this statutory authority, it is not Congress but the President who must take the first step and submit each agreement for consideration. If the President does not submit these agreements, Congress cannot act under the trade promotion authority. The President and his team know this. In fact, here is a chart which outlines the TPA process, called ''How a Trade Agreement Moves Through Congress Under Trade Promotion Authority.'' This was taken directly from the Web site of the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. It clearly shows that Congress cannot act

until the President submits the agreements.

But why take responsibility for moving the agreements when it is much easier to blame their continued delay on Congress? The fact is, the President wants all the benefits of trade promotion authority but none of the responsibility.

Once they were called out on the mismatch between their words and their deeds, the administration finally reined in their rhetoric but provided little guidance as to what their actual plans are. In the meantime, Republicans continued to push for consideration of the three pending FTAs. Back in July, a group of Republican Senators signed a letter vowing to help the administration achieve its objective of gaining approval of trade adjustment assistance in exchange for submitting the FTAs. Now, despite a clear path forward, the President remains silent to this day.

As the President continues to delay, our country cedes each of these three free-trade agreement markets to our foreign competitors, and they are taking them over because we are dilly-dallying here instead of doing what is right.

Our economy and our workers are suffering under horrific levels of unemployment. Almost 1 in 10 American workers are out of a job under this administration, and we can't afford to throw away any opportunity to create jobs. Yet this is precisely what the President is doing. The President himself has said these three trade agreements, once put into law, will amount to 250,000 new jobs, and that is not something to sniff at.

While our economy remains troubled and while the rest of the world watches in bewilderment as the United States lets other countries take over our export markets, we hear nothing but silence from the President. A case in point: The European Union's exports to South Korea increased almost 45 percent in the first 20 days since that agreement went into force on July 1. Their share of Korea's import market increased from 9.5 percent to 10.3 percent in just 3 weeks. Meanwhile, the U.S. share of Korea's import market dropped from 10.5 percent to 8.4 percent. Unless we act quickly, these trends are likely to continue.

In an open letter to the President and Congress, over 120 food groups and companies wrote:

> If there is any doubt about the seriousness of the problem for U.S. agricultural exports, one need only consider the damage that has already been done by the delay in implementing the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. Argentina and Brazil have negotiated trade agreements with Colombia that have given them preferential access. As a result, U.S.-produced corn, wheat, and soybeans have been hit hard, with the combined share of Colombia's imports for these products falling to 28 percent from 78 percent since 2008.

That is a big drop, mainly because of the dillydallying on this trade agreement.

On August 15, 2011, an agreement between Canada and Colombia entered into force, which will only make the problem worse for U.S. exporters and our farmers. The fact is that each of these agreements is critically important to our economy. For my home State of Utah and for workers across the country, they mean more opportunity and jobs. It is a slam dunk for the President to create jobs by getting these agreements up here and getting them passed.

The National Association of Manufacturers estimates that U.S. workers lose $8 million in wages and benefits every day these agreements are delayed. I for one stand ready to continue to fight for their consideration and approval. We have come a long way this year, but we are not yet done.

I hope the President will heed my call and submit these agreements to Congress so we can approve them, but history has shown this President will not act unless he is forced to. This amendment I am offering will continue to put pressure on him to act, and act soon, and I encourage my colleagues to support it. The time for dithering and deliberation is over. Let's adopt my amendment and ensure that our work in moving TAA forward leads to the promised result—submission of three pending free-trade agreements by the President and their quick enactment into law.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, it is my understanding there will be two votes at approximately 12:30. One is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah, Senator HATCH, and another by the Senator from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN. I wish to explain, in a few minutes, why I think it is advisable for the Senate to not adopt either of those two amendments. Let me first address the amendment offered by my good friend from Utah, Senator HATCH.

There are a lot of people looking for work. Today, about 14 million Americans are looking for work. More than 6 million have been out of work for at least 6 months. These Americans are looking to put in a good day's work and looking to provide for their families. At the same time, many employers cannot find enough skilled workers to fill the jobs that are open. It is very difficult, because employers need people with specialized skills. This is becoming more and more true with each passing year. We need workers who are good at math. We need workers who are good with their hands, who are trained in high-tech manufacturing. The bottom line is, employers need an educated and skilled workforce. Trade adjustment assistance can help bridge this gap. Trade adjustment assistance can train workers and connect them with employers who are looking to grow their businesses.

Let me mention a fellow who has been a big beneficiary who has been helped by this program. His name is Kris Allen. Kris lost his job at Montana Tunnels in Jefferson City, MT, in 2009. Because of trade adjustment assistance, he was able to go to school at Helena College of Technology. He wanted to be a diesel mechanic. He made the dean's list most of the semesters. In May of 2011 he graduated. In fact, he got his degree on a Friday and started work the very next Monday. His new job at a trade company in Belgrade earns him $18 an hour. Kris has not stopped there. He continues to hone his skills at Montana Resources keeping up to date on the latest technology and machinery.

In this fast-paced globalized economy, human capital is the key to our country's competitiveness and economic vitality. Americans such as Kris know the benefits of a good day's work, and he could not have done this without trade adjustment assistance. That is why I must oppose the Hatch amendment. The amendment would withhold trade adjustment assistance benefits to this bill until a free-trade agreement with South Korea and Colombia and Panama is approved. It would delay Americans such as Kris from getting the help they need to find good-paying jobs, and the amendment would delay businesses such as New Holland Trade Company from hiring employees and growing their company.

The Senate is here this week to consider the GSP trade adjustment assistance bill. It is my hope the Senate will pass it in short order and will send the bill to the House, which is expected to pass it shortly.

We have an agreement, and that is an agreement between the leadership of both the House and Senate, an agreement on how the Congress will consider trade adjustment assistance and also how to consider free-trade agreements. There is no need to legislate this process. In fact, doing so could substantially delay the process and disrupt disagreements, not just disrupt trade adjustment assistance but disrupt passage of free-trade agreements.

I might add that there is a difference between the legislative process with respect to trade adjustment assistance and free-trade agreements. Trade adjustment assistance is legislation. It goes through the usual legislative process. It can be delayed. There is no requirement that it be voted on.

That is not true with free-trade agreements. Once the President sends up a free-trade agreement, it enjoys a certain fast-tack process under which there must be a vote in both bodies after a certain period of time. It is not imperative between the legislative process in one and the special fast-

track process for the other. It is why the agreement was reached encouraging trust on both sides for the trade adjustment assistance amendment to be passed by both bodies first before the President can send up the free-trade agreements. He has indicated he will do so.

I have very strong assurance from the White House that is the case. In fact, that is the agreement with the leadership, that if the trade adjustment assistance passes, then the free-trade agreement will come up and be voted on and passed in the House and then voted on and passed in the Senate.

The best way to support our trade agenda and the best way to support free-trade agreements is to not accept the amendment as offered by my good friend from Utah so we can get both passed very quickly.

AMENDMENT NO. 625

Virtually, the same is true with respect to the amendment offered by Senator MCCAIN. I oppose Senator MCCAIN's amendment. He wants to go back and undo some of the progress that was made in trade adjustment assistance. Let's start with the 2002 trade adjustment assistance law. That made important changes in trade adjustment assistance. In fact, I helped write that law.

In 2002 trade adjustment assistance covered manufacturing workers, and it covered workers whose jobs shifted to countries with which we had a free-trade agreement. So it covered workers who were in manufacturing who lost their jobs, and then it covered workers whose jobs were shifted to countries with which we had a free-trade agreement. Other aspects of American employment, such as services, did not cover the jobs that shifted to countries with which we did not have a free-trade agreement.

That 2002 law not only covered manufacturing workers and workers whose jobs shifted to countries with which we had a free-trade agreement, it also doubled training funds. Doubled it. Training is so critical. It also provided a new tax credit to help Americans better afford health insurance for themselves and their families. That is no small item. We all know how hard it is to get health insurance especially for individuals in small firms. We are not talking about big companies. We are talking about individuals who have lost their jobs. We also know how expensive health care is; therefore, there is a great need for health insurance. Again, that 2002 change of the trade adjustment assistance doubled training funds. Training is so important in today's modern society, and it provided a new tax credit to help Americans better afford health insurance.

Our economy has changed since 2002. America's strength in manufacturing expanded to include a robust services sector, which is now 80 percent of our economy. Madam President, 80 percent of our economy today is services. It is all different facets. It is call centers, insurance, and everything you can think of that is characterized as services. America's trade with foreign nations has expanded to countries such as China and India, big countries with which we do not have free-trade agreements. The service sector has expanded just since 2002, and we have trade with other countries with which we do not have free-trade agreements.

I believe trade adjustment assistance should cover workers both in manufacturing and services. It should cover workers whose jobs move to any country, especially China, whether it is an FTA country—free-trade agreement country—or not.

These changes in realities have prompted me and my colleagues to update that program, to update it from what it was in 2002. It was updated in 2009. When they updated it in 2009 the law brought trade adjustment assistance more fully to the 21st century by providing Americans with training for the new economy. Unfortunately, those expanded provisions expired in February. They are gone. That had a big impact. Thousands of workers were denied access because the expiration of the expansion of trade adjustment assistance.

For example, more than 1,000 service sector workers in both Texas and Virginia were denied TAA benefits when the 2009 law expired earlier this year. These workers likely will be eligible under the trade adjustment assistance compromise I negotiated with Chairman CAMP. Chairman DAVID CAMP, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and I and our staffs spent a lot of time getting an agreement on trade adjustment assistance, what the provisions should be, how far the expansion should go, and how it should be paid for. It was an agreement, a bipartisan agreement. There is not much of that around here, but we worked hard and got the job done.

I must say, however, under Senator MCCAIN's amendment, these service workers I mentioned would remain shut out. They would not qualify. I think it is time to bring us into the modern world. It is time to provide equal access to all Americans regardless of whether they work on a factory floor or a call center. It should not matter. If you lose your job on account of trade, you should get trade adjustment assistance benefits regardless of whether the job moves to Mexico, a country with whom we do have a free-trade agreement or if the job moves to a country such as China, a country with whom we do not have a free-trade agreement.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the McCain amendment. I think it is unwise. I might also add that if either of these two amendments pass, guess what. It gets all gummed up over in the House. The House, therefore, cannot take up the clean trade adjustment assistance amendment. We have to go back all over again, amend it again, back and forth.

Do you know what that is going to do? It is going to do two things: That is going to jeopardize passage of then updated trade adjustment assistance. Guess what else it is going to do. It is going to jeopardize passage of free-trade agreements. I think a vast majority of the Members of this body and in the other body, together, want both of these matters passed.

I must say if we had amendments here, despite them being defective on the merits, if amendments are added, it is going to delay the process further. The House will have to amend it again, send it back over here, and it is going to very much delay both the trade adjustment assistance and the free-trade agreements. For those reasons I urge that those amendments not be agreed to.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, nothing of the sort is going to happen. The fact is, we have had nothing but delays by the President. Just a few weeks ago he was accusing us of not passing the free-trade agreements when he knows we cannot even consider them. There have been a lot of games played with us.

I remember last spring in our committee when the Trade Representative said: We have a few more things we have to work out on Panama and Colombia, and we will definitely send these free-trade agreements before the August recess.

We got near the August recess, and they said: Well, we need one other thing. We need trade adjustment assistance.

Now, if they need trade adjustment assistance—and I have no doubt that is going to pass in the Senate if there is a fair process. I do not believe there is any doubt it will pass in the House. The agreement worked out by the distinguished chairman and Chairman CAMP over in the House probably will be voted on. I have to vote against it.

The fact is, all my amendment—it does evidence some distrust in this process. All my amendment does is say: Look, we are not going to allow trade adjustment assistance to go into effect until these three trade agreements are sent by the President and passed. Both bodies can pass the trade adjustment assistance on this bill, and that is fine with me. My amendment says TAA does not go into effect until the President submits these three treaties, and they are passed and become law. Then trade adjustment assistance goes.

That is a very fair way of doing this. It is a way of saying to everybody: Let's get rid of the mistrust. Let's do this in a straight-up way. Let's do it so everybody knows what is going to happen. Trade adjustment assistance will ultimately come into effect, but only after the administration lives up to submitting these trade agreements and they are passed.

Why would we want trade adjustment assistance to pass if these three trade

agreements do not pass? It is just another big cost to the government. Keep in mind the people who are out of work are getting unemployment insurance. Trade adjustment assistance adds payments on top of that to their unemployment insurance. Why would we do that if we are not going to have these three trade agreements become law? It just makes no sense. Mine is a practical amendment.

It says let's get rid of the game playing. We will do this if you do this. Frankly, the President promised to do it, and we are still standing here waiting for the three trade agreements to be sent here. To me, it is hard to imagine why the President is not doing this.

By the way, on the trade adjustment assistance a little less than 7 percent of our nongovernment workers are unionized. Yet one-third of these payments will go to union members. I do not blame my colleagues on the other side for wanting to help anybody who is out of work or anybody who belongs to a trade union. But do we always have to do it in a slanted way that helps one small sector of the workers in this country and not the rest of them? It is a problem. We have unemployment insurance to take care of people who are out of work. We should do that. It is important we do that. Trade adjustment assistance is just adding some more payments on top of that.

There is a real question whether we should do it here because I asked the representatives of the administration in the committee what jobs are going to be lost as a result of these three agreements. They could not come up with one. There will be, according to the administration, 250,000 new jobs that will occur, or at least jobs that will occur and will be sustained by these three trade agreements once they are enacted into law.

Just yesterday my friends on the other side voted down trade promotion authority. I cannot imagine why any President would not want trade promotion authority.

It is mind-boggling to me that this President doesn't want it. It is the only way we are going to be able to get free-trade agreements done. Otherwise, we are going to have to do it through other legislative processes, which is much more arduous, much more difficult, and does not come up with just an up-or-down vote. There is a reason for this process, and that is to be able to do free trade in this country. Yet every time we turn around there is another roadblock thrown up by the other side, as though they don't want free trade. I understand that for some unsubstantiated or ridiculous reason the unions don't like free-trade agreements, even though they are going to, according to the administration, create 250,000 new jobs—or jobs, anyway. Why wouldn't they like those? They have an opportunity to unionize companies that come into existence.

By the way, even under the stilted, one-sided National Labor Relations Board that currently exists that is running away with our responsibilities and legislating from the regulatory bench—even with that board, unions win 60 percent of union elections—contested elections. It is not as though they are being picked on or are not being treated fairly.

By the way, I would be one of the first to make sure they are treated fairly. I am one of the few people in this whole body who earned a union card. I worked in the building and construction trade unions for 10 years. I acknowledge the distinguished Presiding Officer sitting in the chair earned a union card. I am not sure we can call that a union, working with the—just joshing. The entertainment industry unions are not like the AFL–CIO. We are tough as nails. On the other hand, I have to retract that because I have seen some people in the entertainment industry as tough as nails, and the Presiding Officer is one. No question about it. I have great admiration for him. But he ought to be with me on this. He ought to be with me because all we are saying is, look—and the most that would happen is a few days, enough to get the free-trade agreements passed in the House.

So what I am saying is, first of all, let's get the President to do what he has blamed us for not doing; that is, to send these three free-trade agreements with these countries that are so important to us and we are important to them. We are losing business every day because this is being dragged out for so long. Send them so we can vote on them. TAA will pass here, and I believe it will pass over there with the process we have.

All I am saying is it doesn't become effective because we shouldn't be paying for people when we don't have free-trade agreements that are the basis for paying people. All I am saying is they don't come into existence—the TAA doesn't come into existence until after these free-trade agreements are ratified, are voted up or down, and become law—voted up and become law. That is fair. It is an intelligent approach to it. It ends the mystery. It ends what some people think is a convoluted process. It ends what some people think is not a good-faith process. It does it in a way that doesn't hurt anybody, and it just says: Look, let's do it straight up so there is no more arguing or moaning or groaning or accusations that one side is not being fair to the other. Let's just do it this way.

So I am calling on my colleagues on the other side to vote for my amendment. They don't lose a doggone thing. In fact, it will help this process along, and that is one reason I brought it up.

I am personally not sure trade adjustment assistance will pass without my amendment. That is one reason I brought it to the Senate floor—because it is a fair, decent, honorable way of saying, OK, let's get rid of the mysteries. Let's get rid of the arguments. Let's get rid of the partisanship. Let's vote on these three free-trade agreements—or excuse me, the trade adjustment assistance—which is going to add a lot of money to the cost of this government, and let's vote on them. When they are both voted through by the House and the Senate, then let's bring up the three free-trade agreements which should pass readily in both Houses. Once they become law, trade adjustment assistance comes into being.

That is a fair, responsible way of doing this in a way that does away with the mystery, does away with partisanship, does away with Democratism and Republicanism and gets this process down the road.

For the life of me, I can't understand why anybody would argue with this. I am calling on my Democratic friends and saying: Let's be bipartisan about this. Let's send a message to the President that we want those doggone trade agreements up here. He controls that process. I just found it astounding when he came out and said: I wish they would pass the three free-trade agreements when he knows we can't until he sends them.

This agreement is not only fair, it is the right thing to do. It may be the only way we are going to get these three free-trade agreements done. I would like to hear a good argument against them, but there isn't any. With these free-trade agreements, I believe there will be thousands of jobs created. I am not sure there will be 250,000 as the administration claims, but I believe there will be many jobs at a time when we need jobs.

Trade adjustment assistance—there are a lot of sincere people in this body and in the other body who believe it is absolutely essential, even though there was not one shred of evidence as far as I heard that any jobs would be lost as a result of these two free-trade agreements. But I am willing to understand there may be some loss, and therefore—and even if there aren't, to get these three free-trade agreements through, the other side says we have to pass TAA. Fine. Let's pass it through both bodies. Let's make it subject to getting the three free-trade agreements passed into law because it should be subject to that.

There is no reason in the world why we would add more spending from a trade adjustment assistance standpoint unless we have these three free-trade agreements. That is the argument for the trade adjustment assistance that our colleagues on the other side and some on our side are making. I have a feeling this is the way to get this done. It is the smart way to get it done. It is the honorable way to get it done. It is the truthful way to get it done. It is the bipartisan way to get it done.

I think people know I have a reputation for being able to bring both sides together from time to time, and that is what I am trying to do. This is not a political game as far as I am concerned. I do want these three free-trade

agreements because I know it would be great for our country. We are losing business. We have gone down from 74 percent agricultural exports to Colombia to 28 percent. Anybody with brains would say we shouldn't have allowed that to happen, and it wouldn't have had we passed these three free-trade agreements, or at least the Colombia one, last year. But Korea is such a big, even greater trading partner than Colombia—although, when I look at what President Uribe and what President Santos, the current President, have done to straighten out that country and get rid of the terrorists and to bring down the violence against union members and so forth, they deserve our support. They deserve these agreements.

When I look at Korea and what an important partner they are in our trade—and we are losing trade to them now; others are taking it away from us because we haven't passed the Korean agreement—my gosh, it doesn't take any brains to realize we are not acting like friends to Korea.

Then look at Panama. Panama is one of the financial centers of this hemisphere. It is a great nation. It is important to us, above all people. It is dishonorable for us to not pass the Panamanian Free Trade Agreement that they worked out with us and which we had to add labor language in each one of these agreements that wasn't there before because of this administration's fealty to organized labor. Fine.

Why don't we do what has to be done to pass these three free-trade agreements and to get the support for TAA for those who believe that is the right way to go and get rid of any kind of concerns that one side or other would not live up to its share of the battle. My amendment will do that.

I hope it is not just a partisan vote. I hope we have some Democrats who will vote for my amendment. If we do, I think it will push this whole process forward in a way that makes sense.

Mr. President, let me just dwell a few minutes on one of the things I would like to get across. People ask me why I spent years working toward a leadership position on the Senate Finance Committee. It is pretty simple. The Finance Committee has jurisdiction over issues that matter not only to the people of Utah but to everybody: the bloated Tax Code we have, the inheritance taxes, health programs such as Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security, issues that go to the heart of international trade such as customs duties, tariff, and import quotas, and free-trade agreements. I could go on and on. It is a very important committee.

Sixty percent of all spending in this government comes through the Finance Committee. Being the lead Republican on the Finance Committee gives me a unique platform to shape all of these policies in a way that works best for my home State of Utah, and I hope the Nation as a whole.

Today I wish to focus on international trade and why I am so passionate about opening new markets to our goods and services. It gets repeated ad nauseam that 95 percent of our potential customers live outside of the United States, and there is no doubt that trade is vital to America's competitiveness. But trade has immediate and particular importance to jobs and the economy in my home State of Utah as well as every other State.

Last year alone companies in Utah shipped over $13 billion in merchandise exports to international markets—$13 billion—supporting nearly 93,000 jobs in our State. Think about that: $13 billion and close to 100,000 jobs thanks to products Utah companies sold outside the borders of the United States. My State is only one State. I think every State can tell a similar story. That doesn't even include our service providers, who similarly take advantage of opportunities across the globe. Companies in Utah exported to over 190 foreign markets; companies such as Varian Medical Systems, which produces cutting-edge x ray products that assist with various cancer treatments and industrial security screening and which provides over 700 people with good-paying jobs in our State.

By removing barriers to trade, free-trade agreements level the playing field for our companies operating in markets abroad. This has an immediate and observable impact on trade. Following the implementation of every U.S. bilateral or regional free-trade agreement, Utah has increased its exports to partner countries.

Let me give two examples. Utah's exports to Morocco experienced growth of over 2,000 percent after the United States implemented a free-trade agreement with them, and Utah's exports to Singapore increased by over 800 percent after we implemented that FTA.

Listening to some of the pundits, it would be easy to draw the conclusion that exports in free trade are only important to large, multinational companies; but nothing could be further from the truth. In 2008, the most recent year for which we have statistics, 86 percent of Utah's exporting companies were small or midsized companies. For the entrepreneurs who lead these small and midsized companies, international trade is their lifeblood. But exports are only part of the story.

Thanks to low taxes, family-friendly values, and a well-educated, motivated, and internationally savvy workforce, Utah is a place where people want to live and work. And it is not just the greatest skiing in the world, although that certainly is a draw.

When foreign companies look to grow their operations or gain a foothold in the U.S. market, they increasingly look to Utah to site their operations. These companies invest significant amounts of capital to open or expand facilities in our State every year.

Foreign-owned companies employ over 34,000 workers in Utah. That is more than 3 percent of all Utah employees in the private sector. These are well-paying jobs. U.S. subsidiaries of foreign companies pay an average compensation of over $68,000 per year. And let's not forget all of the spending by international visitors to our world-class colleges and universities, ski resorts, and parks.

That is why I have been pushing so hard to get the three FTAs with South Korea, Panama, and Colombia passed and implemented. It is not the only reason, but it is certainly a reason. These agreements have been sitting idle for far too long. They were negotiated during the administration of President Bush. They were wrapped in a bow for President Obama, ready to go the day he took office. His own administration has made some changes in them that these three countries have agreed to. Yet President Obama still has not sent them to Congress for a vote, which is astounding to me. The President himself says these three agreements will create 250,000 new jobs. His failed stimulus, his burdensome overregulation of business, his penchant for taxing and spending to ''redistribute wealth'' all rubbed salt in the wounds of a difficult economy. We are now left with an unemployment rate of 9.1 percent. You would think the President would be eager to do something everyone agrees would actually create real jobs, and not just real jobs, great jobs. But the FTAs with South Korea, Panama, and Colombia remain on his desk.

While the President stands still, the world continues to forge ahead. China continues to pursue policies that boost its growth at our expense. Other countries around the world continue to negotiate trade agreements that exclude the United States, putting Utah exporters at a serious disadvantage, as well as other States. The consequences of this administration's trade paralysis are real.

By way of example, the U.S. share of Colombia's agricultural imports has already fallen from nearly 44 percent in 2007 to 21 percent in 2010. The EU and Canada swooped in to fill this vacuum. Both have now negotiated free-trade agreements with Colombia.

During President Bush's Presidency, we passed trade agreements with 14 countries, providing a significant boost to the U.S. economy. By contrast, President Obama has not submitted a single trade agreement to Congress.

It certainly does not help that the President has refused to spend any political capital to seek trade negotiating authority from Congress. The need for it is obvious: Without it, we cannot pass good agreements to open foreign markets for our exports. That is why every President since FDR has sought this authority. Why doesn't this President? I think it is a lack of experience, personally. He is smart enough to understand this.

Every President but one has sought it. The only one who has not is our current President. But whether he seeks it

or not, I am going to work to see that he gets it. And when he does, you can be sure it will be designed to shape his negotiating objectives so that the resulting agreements embody high standards that best serve the economies of the United States and, in particular, my home State of Utah.

It is vital that future trade agreements—such as the proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement between the United States and six other nations—protect the intellectual property of our innovators and content creators, level the playing field for our companies which are often forced to engage in lopsided competition with state-owned companies and national champions, enable modern day integrated global supply chains, and enhance market access for both goods and services providers.

In the months and weeks ahead, we have the opportunity to shape the economic future of our great Nation and my own great State of Utah. I am going to do my part to ensure that trade plays a central part in that equation.

I hope everybody in this body realizes how important this is and that we should not keep playing these games because we have political opportunism. Then again, that is another reason for my amendment. My amendment says the games will be over. Both sides will vote on TAA. The President will have to submit the agreements. Once the agreements are passed and made into law, TAA comes into existence. And it should not come into existence until after these agreements become law.

What it says to everybody is: Look, the games are over. This is the way to do it. This is the fair way to do it. This is the bipartisan way to do it.

Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could get these free-trade agreements passed? Wouldn't it be a wonderful achievement for all of us here—a bipartisan achievement, with the President getting lots of credit for it? I think it would be a good thing. If we cannot do this, then you can imagine what this place is going to become in the future. My amendment is the way you get there.

I am hoping my colleagues on the other side listen to this. I hope they pay attention. I sure hope they vote for this amendment because if they do not, I question whether we will ever have these free-trade agreements.

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

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

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 641 offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH.

There will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote.

Mr. HATCH. My understanding is both sides are waiving the 2 minutes of debate time.

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

Mr. HATCH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 142 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Blunt	Hatch	Paul
Boozman	Heller	Portman
Brown (MA)	Hoeven	Risch
Burr	Hutchison	Roberts
Chambliss	Inhofe	Rubio
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Corker	Kirk	Toomey
Cornyn	Kyl	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
DeMint	McCain	

NAYS—54

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

NOT VOTING—2

Lugar	Rockefeller

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 44, the nays are 54. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 625 TO AMENDMENT NO. 633

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on amendment No. 625, offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN. There will be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to the vote.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the stimulus passed in 2009 was purported to be temporary. As part of that massive piece of legislation, we made a significant expansion and added at least $600 million a year to the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. This amendment would cut back to the prestimulus number of the TAA.

It is pretty simple. It would save at least $600 million per year on questionable programs of questionable effectiveness. But the point is, the stimulus was supposed to be a temporary increase in spending and not a permanent one. The Reid package makes most of it—at least 65 percent of it—permanent. The least we can do is cut it back to prestimulus levels, which is supported by the National Taxpayers Union. I know that will be very persuasive to my friends on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this country has an extremely high unemployment rate. We all know a lot of people are losing jobs and some are losing jobs on account of trade. The world has changed, even as recently as 2002. In 2002, the law said: OK. If a person loses a job on account of jobs going to a free-trade country, they are eligible for trade adjustment assistance, but it has to be a manufacturing job.

That was changed in 2009 because the country has changed. There are a lot of countries with which we trade that are not FTA partners—China, India. It makes eminent sense, if someone loses a job on account of trade with any country, that person should be eligible for trade adjustment assistance and not just with FTA countries.

Secondly, we expanded that to services. Eighty percent of the workers in our country are in the services sector, not the manufacturing sector. That addition was also provided for in 2009.

For technical reasons also, if this amendment passes, it jeopardizes both TAA as well as FTA because everything has to be renegotiated. So I urge this amendment not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 143 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Alexander	Burr	Corker
Ayotte	Chambliss	Cornyn
Barrasso	Coats	Crapo
Blunt	Coburn	DeMint
Boozman	Cochran	Enzi
Brown (MA)	Collins	Graham

Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hoeven
Hutchison
Inhofe
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson (WI)
Kirk
Kyl
Lee
Lugar
McCain
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rubio
Sessions
Shelby
Thune
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NAYS—53

Akaka
Baucus
Begich
Bennet
Bingaman
Blumenthal
Boxer
Brown (OH)
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Conrad
Coons
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand
Hagan
Harkin
Inouye
Johnson (SD)
Kerry
Klobuchar
Kohl
Landrieu
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lieberman
Manchin
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murray
Nelson (NE)
Nelson (FL)
Pryor
Reed
Reid
Sanders
Schumer
Shaheen
Snowe
Stabenow
Tester
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Warner
Webb
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 46, the nays are 53. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HATCH or his designee be recognized to offer amendment No. 642; that following the Hatch amendment Senator CORNYN be recognized for debate only for up to 15 minutes; then Senator KYL or his designee be recognized to offer amendment No. 645 anytime prior to 5 p.m.; that the time until 5 p.m. be for debate on the Hatch and Kyl amendments and be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Hatch and Kyl amendments, in that order; that there be no amendments, points of order, or motions in order to either amendment prior to the votes other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that each amendment be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; and there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote.

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

The Senator from Utah is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 642 TO AMENDMENT NO. 633

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] proposes an amendment numbered 642 to amendment No. 633.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the eligibility requirements for trade adjustment assistance)

On page 31 of the amendment, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

SEC. 224. MODIFICATION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2272), as amended by section 211(a), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking ''contributed importantly to such workers' separation or threat of separation and to'' and inserting ''was a substantial cause of such workers' separation or threat of separation and of''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''contributed importantly to'' and inserting ''was a substantial cause of'';

(2) in paragraph (3)(B) of subsection (b), as redesignated by section 211(a), by striking ''contributed importantly to'' and inserting ''was a substantial cause of''; and

(3) in subsection (c), as redesignated and amended by section 211(a), by striking paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively.

(b) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—Section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2341) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C), by striking ''contributed importantly to such total or partial separation, or threat thereof, and to'' and inserting ''were a substantial cause of such total or partial separation, or threat thereof, and of''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A);

(ii) by striking ''(B)''; and

(iii) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the left.

(c) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 292(c)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2401a(c)(3)) is amended by striking ''contributed importantly to'' and inserting ''was a substantial cause of''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 291 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2401) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4) through (7) as paragraphs (3) through (6), respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we are talking about trade, how we create markets for what Americans grow or build and sell abroad, which creates jobs here at home. But I wish to talk about a rather specialized area of trade, and that has to do with foreign military sales, and particularly I wish to talk about a topic Senator MENENDEZ and I introduced a bill on last week called the Taiwan Air Power Modernization Act of 2011. This bill requires the U.S. Government to respond to the request of the Government of Taiwan for the sale of at least 66 F–16 C/D fighter aircraft to Taiwan.

That sounds like a mouthful and a big subject, and it is, but let me try to put some meat on the bone and explain why I think this is so important.

Support of the people of Taiwan has been a bipartisan priority for decades. Democrats and Republicans supported the Mutual Defense Treaty with Taiwan, signed by President Eisenhower in 1954. Democrats and Republicans came together and passed the Taiwan Relations Act, which was signed by President Carter in 1979, and which remains the law of the land today. The Taiwan Relations Act states that the United States will provide to Taiwan the defense articles necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain sufficient self-defense capabilities in furtherance of maintaining peace and stability in the western Pacific region.

What does sufficient self-defense capabilities mean? President Reagan, in a memorandum he dictated dated August 17, 1982, laid it out. This is about the time the third communique between Communist China and the United States was formally adopted, because the Chinese wanted to know exactly what this meant. Were arms provided to Taiwan a threat of aggressive weaponry or purely for defensive purposes? According to James Lilley, who was America's top representative in China at the time and who later served as Ambassador to China under George Herbert Walker Bush, that is what this was designed to do, to crystalize what the nature of the weapons sales to the Taiwan Government would be used for. This memorandum from President Reagan in August 17, 1982 laid it out:

. . . it is essential that the quantity and quality of the arms provided Taiwan be conditioned entirely on the threat posed by the People's Republic of China. Both in quantitative and qualitative terms, Taiwan's defense capability relative to that of the PRC will be maintained.

This is strictly for giving Taiwan the ability to defend itself against potential Communist actions by Communist China. It was directly proportional and reciprocal to the threat posed by the People's Republic of China.

But Ronald Reagan was not alone in this interpretation. In fact, both Democrats and Republicans over the years have supported numerous arms sales to the Government of Taiwan, including the current request for 66 F–16 C/D advanced fighter aircraft.

So far this year, 47 Republicans and Democrats have signed a letter—these are Senators—to the administration in support of this sale. In August, 181 Members of the House of Representatives, Republicans and Democrats alike, wrote to the administration endorsing this same sale.

Why is Taiwan asking for these aircraft and why do so many Democrats and Republicans join together in a bipartisan way on this issue when the parties seem to be so polarized by so many other issues? The answer is simple and straightforward: Taiwan's air defense capabilities are nearly obsolete, while China's military capabilities are growing at an alarming rate. This chart demonstrates the problem.

On the right in the red you will see that China has 2,300 operational military combat aircraft, while Taiwan has 490 operational combat aircraft. But air defense is not just a numbers game. Quality of those aircraft matters a lot—just as much as quantity. So what about the quality of Taiwan's existing forces?

According to our own intelligence services, the Defense Intelligence Agency, in an unclassified report last year, said that ''many of Taiwan's fighter aircraft are close to or beyond service life, and many require extensive maintenance support.''

China's capabilities, on the other hand, are clearly newer and clearly growing and clearly focused on intimidating Taiwan and the United States. China's official press agency reported in March that the People's Republic of China will increase its military budget this year by 12 percent, after an increase last year of 7.5 percent. But the Pentagon estimates that China's official military budget of about $90 billion they disclose, is actually far less than the $150 billion they actually spend. In other words, they only disclose part of their expenditures on national security and not the full amount, which is some $150 billion. The question is, who does China intimidate with this growing military power?

Here is what the Pentagon had to say in its 2011 report to Congress, called ''Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China.'' The Defense Department observed that China continued modernizing its military in 2010, with a focus on Taiwan contingencies.

The Pentagon also noted that China's air force will remain primarily focused on ''building the capabilities required to pose a credible military threat to Taiwan and U.S. forces in East Asia.''

Let me repeat that. The Pentagon noted that China's air force will remain primarily focused on ''building the capabilities required to pose a credible military threat to Taiwan and U.S. forces in East Asia.''

Some say the United States should not look at our policy with Taiwan in a vacuum, that we should consider the context of our larger strategic relationship with China. I could not agree more, because the strategic situation with China these days is very troubling. Many of China's neighbors are concerned about its military buildup and territorial ambitions. Last year, China claimed the South China Sea as a ''core interest,'' which unsettled Vietnam, the Philippines, Indonesia, and other nations in the region. China also renewed a long-running dispute with India over the borders of the Arunachal Pradesh region.

China continues to be an enabler of the nuclear ambitions of the regime in North Korea. This summer, Google publicly reported that a Chinese entity has been targeting the personal e-mail accounts of U.S. and South Korean government employees, and Pakistan's defense minister publicly discussed the possibility of China building a naval base at Gwadar, Pakistan, which is already home to a new strategically important port at the mouth of the Gulf of Oman.

China, we know, has also escalated its rhetoric aimed at the United States, and particularly the U.S. Senate. A number of my colleagues visited Beijing last April where they reportedly received a lecture from Chinese officials on fiscal policy. Just last week, more to the point of this topic, China's top official newspaper used a lot of unnecessary and bellicose rhetoric on the subject of the proposed U.S. arms sales to Taiwan. This official newspaper of the Communist Party in China said that those of us on Capitol Hill who support Taiwan are ''madmen.'' They said we were ''playing with fire.'' They said we could pay a ''disastrous price'' if we continued to support our ally Taiwan, as we are obligated to do by the Taiwan Relations Act.

I suggest the United States should not give in to this intimidation and these threats, and that we should instead pass this legislation to send a clear message to China that respects only strength, not weakness; that the real madmen are those who think America will abandon our friends and allies and our principles and our longstanding strategic interest in the stability of East Asia.

Supporting this legislation would also greatly reassure our allies and friends around the world. Many remember what happened when President Clinton deployed two aircraft carrier battle groups during the Taiwan Strait crisis in 1996. That crisis developed when China tried to intimidate Taiwan on the eve of its first free Presidential elections by conducting a series of military exercises that included the firing of missiles a few miles north of Taiwan. President Clinton responded by ordering the largest U.S. military force since the Vietnam war to deploy to the region, including carrier battle groups led by the USS *Nimitz* and the USS *Independence*.

America's show of strength and resolve under President Clinton's leadership did not escalate the crisis, it defused it, and it sent a welcome signal to our friends and allies in the region. According to an article in the current issue of Washington Quarterly, following the crisis, ''the region's confidence in the United States soared.''

'' . . . Japan, Singapore, the Philippines and other nations all bolstered their security ties with the United States.'' The Taiwan Strait crisis was one of the real foreign policy success stories of the Clinton administration. But the authors of this same article conclude that ''forsaking Taiwan [now] would likely have the opposite effect.''

This bill deserves bipartisan support of the majority of Members of the Senate based on our longstanding bipartisan consensus on policy toward Taiwan, the growing gap in military capabilities between the People's Republic of China and the Government of Taiwan, China's aggressive behavior toward its neighbors and toward the United States, and America's credibility with our allies and with free peoples everywhere.

I conclude by pointing out perhaps something that is obvious, but maybe it is not so obvious to everyone. Since we are talking about trade, what we grow and we sell to people abroad creating jobs at home, it is worth mentioning that selling F–16 aircraft to Taiwan creates jobs and exports for the U.S. economy and does not cost 1 penny of taxpayer money. This map demonstrates all the States in which direct and indirect employment from which the export sales of F–16s to Taiwan is projected to be at least 60 person years of employment, which is the equivalent of 10 American workers employed full time for 6 years.

As you can see from this map, 32 States will have that level of job creation or more as a result of the sale of these F–16s, making the sale of the F–16s to Taiwan a coast-to-coast job engine. In fact, according to the Perryman Group, the requested sale of F–16C/Ds to Taiwan ''would generate some $8.7 billion in output; and directly support more than 23,000 jobs.''

As I pointed out earlier, these jobs do not cost the American people one cent. These are private sector jobs paid for with money coming in from overseas because this is an export-driven industry. The only thing the U.S. Government needs to do is get out of the way and let these Americans continue to stay on the job and collect an estimated $768 million in Federal tax revenues. Yes, not only will we be selling these aircraft, creating jobs, we will be generating revenue for the Federal Treasury in the process, generated by this private sector, export-driven economic activity.

I wish to thank the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ, for introducing this legislation with me, and I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have agreed to cosponsor it. I hope more Senators will join us, and I hope we will pass this bill soon. I hope we can help American workers continue building these aircraft to strengthen our friends, the people of Taiwan.

Mr. President, let me just close on this comment: This is standalone legislation I discussed here today, but I will be offering, in due course, an amendment to the pending bill that would mandate this sale. So I would ask my colleagues to please join us in a bipartisan way of showing our support for our friends and allies in Taiwan and generating jobs right here at home.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, my State of Vermont has been hit very hard by Hurricane Irene. Widespread flooding caused a number of deaths, the loss of many homes and businesses, and hundreds of millions—perhaps $1 billion—in damage to property and infrastructure. I have visited many of the most hard-hit towns, and I have been shocked and moved by the extent of the damage I saw. Irene will go down in history as one of the very worst natural disasters ever to hit the State of

Vermont. Let me share a few facts with you about the extent of the damage.

Already, more than 5,200 Vermonters have registered with FEMA. Remember, we are a State of only 630,000 people and approximately 200,000 households, and yet more than 5,200 Vermonters have already registered with FEMA.

More than 700 homes were severely damaged or completely destroyed—700 in a State which has about 200,000 households.

Between 1,500 and 2,000 families have been displaced, their housing uncertain as we approach Vermont's brutally cold winter season. It is beginning to get cold in Vermont.

More than 73,000 homes were left without electricity—one-third of all of the homes in our State. Tens of thousands of Vermonters lost their phone service, and in some areas these services still have not been fully restored.

More than 2,000 roads were badly damaged—2,000 roads—including 135 segments of State highways. More than 300 bridges—300 bridges—were damaged. Hundreds of roads and bridges remain closed, while many others are only open to emergency vehicles today. Some towns still have limited access because the roads and bridges that link them to the outside world were destroyed.

Further, dozens of town libraries, townhalls, and municipal and volunteer fire departments have been damaged or destroyed. Ninety public schools could not open on time. The last one is just now opening for the year.

Hundreds of businesses and more than 360 farms with more than 15,000 acres of farmland have been damaged, tearing at the fabric of our rural economy.

Our Amtrak and freight services were completely suspended, as railbeds literally washed into rivers. One Amtrak line is still down today.

The largest State office complex was completely flooded and is closed until further notice. Mr. President, 1,600 State employees cannot go to work in that building. Important files and computer systems have been ruined, disrupting the ability of the State to deliver critical State functions.

I know that, as in times past, we will pick up the pieces in Vermont and restore our homes and businesses. And I have to tell you that if there is any silver lining out of that disaster, it is the fact that in community after community, people came out, worked together, and participated in cleanup efforts, supported each other. People from the northern part of the State, which was hit less severely, came down to the southern part of the State to help. Strangers helped strangers. It was an extraordinary effort of people coming together. But the simple fact is, if a State such as Vermont has communities that are devastated, a State such as New Jersey has communities that are devastated, we cannot do it alone. The scale of this disaster is too overwhelming for a State of the size of Vermont.

The Federal Government has long played an important role in disaster recovery. That is something we have known for many years and we have seen time after time after time. When our fellow citizens in Louisiana and the gulf coast suffered the devastation of Hurricane Katrina, people in Vermont were there for them, and I can tell you how many people told me we have to do everything we can to protect the people who were devastated by Katrina. When the citizens of Joplin, MO, were hit by deadly tornadoes, people on the west coast were there for them. And, of course, when terrorists attacked the United States on 9/11, we were all there for New York City. That is what being a nation is about.

The name of our country is the United States of America—''united,'' u-n-i-t-e-d—and if that name means anything, it means when disaster strikes one part of the country and communities are devastated, people are hurt, bridges and roads are out, farmers cannot produce the food, we as a nation rally together to support those communities. That is what States impacted by Irene expect from Congress because that is what being a nation is about. Disaster relief, funded on an emergency basis, is what Congress has done for decades, and it is what Congress must do now.

The Senate did the right thing in quickly passing a $6.9 billion disaster relief supplemental appropriations bill, and I wish to thank all of the people active in that, from Senator REID, to Senator LANDRIEU, to Senator LEAHY—all of the people who made that happen. They did a great job.

Does that bill have everything I would like to see in a disaster relief bill for the State of Vermont? No, it does not, quite frankly. But it is a very good bill. It is an urgently needed bill. It is an important step forward in the right direction. I commend, again, all of those Senators who played an active role in moving that bill along, including 10 Senate Republicans.

Disaster aid should not be a partisan issue, but it seems the House Republicans are intent on making it one. The disaster funding the House is likely to pass this week is totally inadequate and will not address the magnitude of the damages inflicted by Hurricane Irene or the backlog in FEMA funding that existed before it.

To my mind, it is an outrage that for the first time in modern American history House Republicans want to have a budget debate over disaster assistance. They threaten to block urgently needed aid unless the cost of that help is offset by cuts in other needed programs. They want to use Hurricane Irene as another excuse for a budget fight. And think about the precedent that sets. What happens if tomorrow there is, God forbid, a disaster in New Mexico or a disaster in Colorado? Does that mean we should be cutting education or environmental protection in order to pay for help to New Mexico or Colorado or California? If there is a major earthquake someplace in this country and communities are devastated, do we cut back on the needs of the children? Do we cut back on Medicare and have that huge debate in order to pay for disaster relief?

Historically, the U.S. Congress has said—and what they said was right—that when disaster strikes, we as a nation come together and we provide the support to those communities which have been hurt to get them back on their feet. That is what we have done in this great country, and I am offended that some of my Republican colleagues in the House suddenly start thinking we need a major budget debate for every disaster that is hitting this country. That is wrong. That is extraordinarily bad public policy. That is, frankly, unpatriotic and not what the United States is about. Yes, of course, we must continue to address our deficit problem but not on the backs of communities in Vermont, New Jersey, North Carolina, or other States that have been devastated by Hurricane Irene. For those States and communities, we must get them emergency help, and we must get it to them as quickly as possible.

Amazingly—I must say this—this talk about budget offsets for disaster relief comes from some of the same people who repeatedly and conveniently ignore their own actions when it suits them. Congress provided $800 billion to bail out Wall Street banks. I did not hear any discussion about offsets when it came to bailing out Wall Street. Congress extended huge tax breaks and loopholes for the wealthiest people in this country, driving up the deficit. I did not hear any call for offsets when we gave tax breaks to billionaires and large corporations. The United States is spending today $10 billion a year on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, including billions to rebuild those countries. I did not hear any call for offsets when it came to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Let me conclude by saying this: This country has its share of problems. We all know that. But if we forsake the essence of what we are as a nation; that is, we stand together when disaster strikes, if we forgo that, if we no longer live up to that ideal, I worry very much about the future of our great Nation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The majority leader is recognized.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last week the Senate passed three important pieces of bipartisan legislation. It was really quite a productive week. We reauthorized the Federal Aviation Administration, which kept 80,000 workers, including safety inspectors, on the job. We passed a highway bill that

keeps 1.8 million people at work building roads and bridges and dams. We reached a bipartisan agreement to rush relief to communities devastated by floods, tornadoes, and wildfires. So I was hopeful, as this week began, that it would be productive. I thought Congress might be able to set aside party politics to accomplish the important work of this Nation. Instead, the tea party has taken over again. The tea party Republicans have once again allowed partisanship to rear its ugly head.

Now House Republicans, obsessed with pleasing a group of radicals—the tea party, they are called—are refusing to give the Federal Emergency Management Agency the funding it needs to reconstruct ravaged communities across this great country, and they are threatening to shut down the government if they do not get what they want.

It is bad enough that we cannot agree that victims of floods and fires should get the help they need without delay.

We cannot even agree on what we have already agreed to. We spent months this spring and summer negotiating a deficit reduction agreement that allowed Congress to appropriate more than $11 billion in disaster aid for next year. After an earthquake, weeks of wildfires, and a hurricane that slammed the eastern seaboard, we are asking to free up $6.9 billion in emergency funds to help Americans in need.

There is a reason we have agreed in the past that disaster funding should be set aside from the regular budget process. There is a reason we agreed, as part of July's deficit reduction agreement, it should be set aside once again. Farmers who have lost their crops to floods, families who have lost their homes to hurricanes should not be used as pawns in a budget-bidding war.

Over the last two decades, almost 90 percent of the money Congress has authorized for disaster relief has been done outside the regular budget process. Why? Because we cannot determine what Mother Nature is going to do. We do the best we can. But who would have ever dreamed Irene would hit when it did, with the devastation it did. Who would have ever dreamed a tornado would level the town of Joplin, MO?

We have done the best we can. I ask my Republican colleagues: Why should today be any different than the past? FEMA is running out of money. That is the bottom line. On Monday, they will be broke. The President declared emergencies in 48 of the 50 States this year. We have had 10 disasters already that have cost more than $1 billion each. It has been 30 years since we have had so many large natural disasters.

As of this morning, FEMA's disaster fund had almost nothing left. It will be broke on Monday. The agency that rushes to help when disaster strikes will be out of money in just a day or two—I repeat, Monday. We are still in the middle of the hurricane season. Turn on the Weather Channel and see why it is so important that we get FEMA the resources it needs to react quickly to whatever Mother Nature sends our way.

FEMA has already halted reconstruction projects in 40 States to free funds to react to immediate needs of communities affected by the most recent disasters. Because of these delays, FEMA will take longer to rebuild bridges in New Hampshire and schools in Missouri and homes in Texas, all because of Republican stubbornness.

I am stunned. We have Senators from States that have been devastated by these disasters—one State, thousands of fires, 2,000 homes burned. Why wouldn't people vote to help people who have had such devastation? All politics.

FEMA has been there for people when crops they have planted and counted on to make a living were drowned by floods. The Federal Government has always been there to help Americans in their hour of greatest need, when their homes where their children were raised, spent holidays, and made memories had burned to the ground or been washed away or blown away.

But because of the delays, FEMA will no longer be able to rebuild the bridges, for example, in the State of New Hampshire. I just heard my friend, the junior Senator from Vermont, talk about Vermont. Vermont has had almost 200 bridges washed away—gone. Texas has had those fires. FEMA has been there when schools studied in and bridges driven on have been rocked by earthquakes or blown away by tornadoes. Never before has Congress tried to nickel and dime the victims of these disasters.

Americans have watched all they had go up in smoke or be washed or blown away. That is what Republicans are doing today. They are shortchanging communities that can least afford the delays of partisan gridlock.

Senate majority leader George Mitchell said: ''Bipartisanship means you work together to work it out.'' American families and communities are relying on us to work together to work it out and holding out hope that we will not disappoint them.

Go back a month. We were struggling, struggling hard, to work out an agreement that in years past has been simple. We were going to just raise the debt limit in this country on bills we had already accumulated. It took 3 months. But we got it done. One of the things we did was we said we will no longer have fights during this next fiscal year on funding the government. We agreed on the numbers.

What the House could not do in good conscience directly they are doing indirectly. They are sending us a short-term continuing resolution to fund the government until the middle part of November. But because they have all these extremists in the Republican majority in the House, they could not do that. They could not do that. They could not send us what they had already agreed upon.

In fact, they put an addition on the bill, a so-called rider on the bill, saying the Senate is only going to be able to raise the debt ceiling if it agrees on their number on emergencies, recognizing that their number will only last a few weeks. Here is what they did also that was so mean-spirited. As I have outlined in detail, we have not paid for these disasters because they are emergencies. They are not in the normal budget process.

But the House took money for more efficient vehicles—they took that money and said: We are going to pay for $1 billion for the year 2011. The year 2011 ends—fiscal year ends—the end of this month, just a few days from now.

Everyone has said, we just need a few million dollars to take care of it until the end of this month. As I have indicated, we have enough money until Monday. But that is all. The end of the month is not Monday. They took $1 billion, when only a little bit was needed, and stripped our ability to create jobs.

I spoke to STENY HOYER in the House. He said they are taking away 52,000 jobs from the American people by doing this. They take $1 billion and pay for this. But just to show further meanness, they take $½ billion and rescind it. It does not go toward the debt. It does not go for anything. They just rescind it.

Then, of course, the year 2012, they put in an amount of money that does not go very far with all these disasters, a few weeks' worth. So we will be back having the same fight again, which is so senseless, so unnecessary. I would hope the House of Representatives—there will be a vote today around 4 or 5 o'clock. I know it will be a close vote. But I hope people in the Senate will understand how important this vote is. We are going to have a vote, as we have indicated, on the continuing resolution to strip out the mean-spirited amendment they have in it, take it out and put in what has already passed here by a substantial majority.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 642

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, earlier, I sent an amendment to the desk. This amendment will constrain the growth of this domestic spending program. My amendment is fairly simple. It tightens the nexus between TAA benefits and actual jobs lost because of trade. It does this by changing the eligibility criteria from one that only requires that trade ''contribute importantly'' to job loss to a more restrictive criteria that the job loss be ''substantially caused'' by trade.

Under the current program, the worker only has to demonstrate that imports from or shifts in production to a foreign country—what many folks would call the ordinary course of business—''contributed importantly'' to their job loss.

So what does ''contributed importantly'' actually mean? The TAA Program holds that the contributed importantly standard is met if trade is a cause, which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause of the job loss.

That does not sound like a tight nexus to me, certainly not a tight nexus to trade to me. Believe me, these fears are not theoretical. Let me give a real-life example. I am sure, by now, everyone is familiar with Solyndra, the now-bankrupt solar firm that was lauded by President Obama as the poster child for his stimulus and green jobs plans.

It turns out, now that Solyndra is in bankruptcy, many of its employees are applying for job-training benefits through TAA. To fully understand this lunacy, let's take a look at recent history.

Here is how Vice President BIDEN described the administration's ill-considered plan to direct over one-half billion taxpayer dollars for loan guarantees for Solyndra:

> The Recovery Act is working and you're going to see it work right on that site. The loan to Solyndra will allow you to build a new manufacturing facility and with it almost immediately generate 3,000 new well-paying construction jobs. And once your facility opens, there will be about 1,000 permanent new jobs here at Solyndra and in the surrounding business community and hundreds more to install your growing output of solar panels throughout the country.

Well, that didn't quite happen. Instead, the firm failed, potentially taking over a half billion taxpayer dollars with it. Those ''permanent new jobs''? Well, not quite. The workers are all unemployed because their ''permanent'' jobs no longer exist.

It gets worse. According to the Wall Street Journal, the stimulus loans themselves were a major cause of Solyndra's bankruptcy. Here is the headline on the chart: ''Loan Was Solyndra's Undoing.''

In selling the half billion dollar loan to Solyndra, Vice President BIDEN made it clear that these were the jobs of the future, saying:

> We are journeying, in a sense, closer and closer to the sun, to a more solar-powered America. And as we do, we're leaving a shadow of a less efficient, more damaging past behind us.

We all know—or should know—what happened to the arrogant Icarus when he flew too close to the Sun.

> Despite the Vice President's exhortations, what happened to Solyndra? Solyndra is set to become an even bigger drain on our taxpayers.

How is that possible? Through the magic of TAA, of course. It turns out that the now-unemployed former Solyndra employees have applied for trade adjustment assistance. The irony here is profound. The administration is now considering whether to grant these Solyndra workers TAA benefits because competition from China ''contributed importantly'' to their job loss. That is ridiculous, frankly.

Here is another Wall Street Journal article, entitled ''Solyndra Was Always Likely to Fail.'' You can see in the photo what a beautiful plant it was—with all of your taxpayer dollars.

In a letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal, the CEO from another solar company—tenKsolar—explained that everyone in the solar business knew Solyndra's business model would not work and their solar technology was too costly.

That didn't stop the White House from giving this company a $535 million taxpayer loan—money that is basically gone now. This was despite the fact that the government's own analysts had predicted months ago that Solyndra would fail in September. Well, it did.

Again, look at the photo of that beautiful building that was built with taxpayer dollars. It is pretty hard to not admire it, to be honest with you.

The fact that TAA benefits are even being considered for Solyndra shows how tenuous the nexus between job loss and trade can be—and workers can still get these expanded benefits, on top of unemployment insurance.

How can Solyndra workers get TAA, when the business collapsed due to a bad business plan and an ill-conceived loan of taxpayer money? That was the cause of Solyndra going under. China imports, under the current TAA program, however, might be construed by ambitious Department of Labor bureaucrats to have ''contributed importantly'' to Solyndra shutting down—despite the fact that the primary cause was the business model and the government's intervention.

This needs to stop. We can do better. If we are going to continue to fund this domestic spending, let's at least make sure its benefits go to those workers whose job loss is actually caused by trade. That is what this amendment will do. It will return the TAA threshold standard to the ''substantial cause'' level. It would require that trade would have to be a ''substantial cause'' of the work dislocation. This standard was included in reforms advocated for by President Reagan that were included in the bipartisan Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981. That deficit reduction act included the largest package of spending cuts in history—at that time. President Reagan had noted the unfairness of treating one class of workers who lose their job due to foreign competition better than their neighbor, who lost his job due to domestic competition, so he tightened the threshold criteria to be eligible for the TAA Program.

By returning to the narrower TAA threshold, this amendment would put reasonable constraints on the program to prevent it from expanding into another out-of-control spending program.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment because I think it makes sense. There is no question it will save taxpayer dollars and make people act more honestly with regard to the use of taxpayer dollars and, in the end, I think it will work better than the current approach that my friends on the other side wish to have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

DISASTER AID

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am here to speak about disaster aid and the acute need we have in my State for assistance to deal with a disaster that occurred earlier this summer in Minot, ND.

These are pictures from the valley in Minot, ND. Minot is constructed on two hills, with a valley in between, with the Souris River flowing through. We have just had the worst flood ever in history, by a long margin. The Corps of Engineers was in yesterday to see me. They calculate that this was a 430-year flood. A flood of this magnitude would only come every 430 years. Certainly, it is beyond anything we have ever seen in recorded history. They say the volume in this flood was three times the previous record; the volume of water was three times the previous record.

These are just a handful of the homes in Minot that were inundated; and 4,000 families lost their homes. These are modest, middle-class families, and the homes averaged $160,000 or $170,000 in value. Yet they are devastated, because all they are eligible for is FEMA assistance.

As the occupant of the chair knows well, FEMA was never designed to be a stand-alone program to recover from disaster. FEMA was designed to work in concert with insurance programs—homeowner's insurance, flood insurance. In this case, with a flood, homeowner's insurance doesn't help you at all. You get nothing on your homeowner's insurance. Then the burden falls to flood insurance. In this entire town of 40,000 people, there were less than 400 flood insurance policies. Some may say, why didn't they have flood insurance?

That is a reasonable question to ask. The answer is very simple: No one thought they needed flood insurance. Flood insurance was not required because they were behind a levee that was supposed to protect against a hundred-year flood event, and actually something more than that. In addition, new dams, since the last major flood, have been built in Canada to prevent such flooding—dams that were, in part, paid for by the United States.

There was no reason for people to believe they needed flood insurance. As a result, very few had it. The bottom line is that the most these people, who have had their homes destroyed, can get—and believe me, these homes are destroyed. Most of the 4,000 families who

lost their homes had 10 feet of water on their homes for weeks. I have been there. I have seen these homes, and I have smelled them. It is horrific. To restore these homes, you have to take them down to the studs and start over again—with $30,000 at the most.

If you are a young couple starting out, and you have a $170,000 home and a $140,000 mortgage, and the house is destroyed, and it costs $140,000 to rebuild, and you have $30,000, you have a big problem. Maybe you are like my cousin and her family, who had just sold their home, and then it was flooded—but it flooded before closing. So guess what. They had gone and bought a new home because they sold their existing home. Then their existing home was flooded and, of course, the person never goes to closing. So now they have two homes, two mortgages. This is a neighborhood of middle-class and lower middle-class families. They are devastated.

The question is, are we going to help? In the past, we have. In Katrina, we not only provided FEMA disaster funding, we also provided CDBG additional emergency funding. That is precisely what we did in the 1997 flood in Grand Forks, ND, a 500-year flood. We provided additional CDBG funding. For that town alone, we provided over $170 million of CDBG emergency funding to help deal with the catastrophic situation there. We have provided much more than that to Katrina victims.

What we are asking here is not unprecedented, and it is not something that hasn't been done before. It is absolutely needed.

This is the headline from the Fargo Forum, the biggest newspaper in our State, about what is happening in Minot, ND: ''11,000 People Forced Out of Their Homes.'' It may not sound like many in a State such as California or New York, but in North Dakota that is one-sixtieth of the entire State's population. That is over a quarter of the population of this city, Minot, ND. ''The Rising Souris Moves Up Evacuation Time.'' Eleven thousand people were forced out of their homes. When they came back, they found an absolutely unmitigated disaster.

This ran in the Minot Daily News this year: ''Projection: Devastation. Minot Residents Evacuate as Historic Rise in Souris River Approaches.''

This shows some of the preparation. The people tried to get out of town and out of these homes before it hit.

Then we have this headline from June 21: ''It's a Sad Day.'' It is a sad day because the crest was increased, in 48 hours, by 10 feet. In other words, the city was protected to a certain level, and then Canada lost control of their major reservoir. Their Premier told our Governor that the floodgates are wide open, there is a wall of water coming your way. Indeed there was. They increased, in a 48-hour period, the projection of how high water levels would be by 10 feet.

There is no way humanly possible to build up defenses by 10 feet in 48 hours. It cannot happen. There is no possible way. With miles and miles of levees, can you imagine trying to build that up 10 feet in just a matter of hours? It was a sad day, Mr. President.

Here is the result—massive flooding, flooding that represented an unusual flood in the sense that usually when you have a flood, the water comes and goes. In this case, the water came and the water stayed.

This is downtown Minot, ND. This is home, by the way, to one of the two Air Force bases that are home to the Nation's B–52s. It is also the home to 150 Minute Men III missiles, which are an important part of the deterrence of the United States.

You can see that this downtown area was devastated by floodwaters. The flood came—and stayed and stayed and stayed and stayed. Here you can see rooftops, in a picture taken by Brett Miller of the North Dakota National Guard while flying over Minot, ND. I have been to the schools that have been flooded, and two of them were absolutely destroyed. They have to be rebuilt. You can't possibly rehab them in any kind of cost-effective way.

In many cases, all you see are roofs here, because a majority of the 4,000 homes that were destroyed had 10 feet of water on them. For weeks and weeks, many of these homes had 6 to 10 feet of water on them. Anybody who knows what water can do when it sits and is there for weeks. When you come back, you have mold everywhere. The only possible way to get it out is to take the house down to its studs.

Mr. President, let me just close on this photo from June 24 of this year. Again, the Minot Daily News headline: ''Swamped.'' Indeed, we were absolutely swamped. Water starts to inundate the valley. ''The Corps Says Souris Flows to Double by Saturday.'' These are the headlines people were coping with in Minot, ND.

This devastation will not be addressed for months to come. People are already moving in to temporary FEMA trailers. Those FEMA trailers—which are welcome because without them people would have no shelter—it should be understood, are going to be tough to live in during a North Dakota winter. The people living in those trailers are going to have a tough time in a North Dakota winter. So we need help.

Yes, we need to replenish the FEMA fund, absolutely. But more than that, we desperately need additional emergency CDBG funding. That is what was used effectively for Katrina, and that was used effectively in the horrible flood that hit Grand Forks, ND, 1997. So we are asking our colleagues to do what we have done for them in disaster after disaster. We stood with them, we joined with them, we supported them, and we are asking that for our people at this time.

Senator HOEVEN and I have an amendment for $1 billion of CDBG funding. We have a markup occurring in the Appropriations Committee this afternoon, and I understand they are going to agree to $400 million. But that is nationwide. The need in North Dakota alone is $235 million, according to our State's Governor. The need for emergency CDBG funding in my State alone is $235 million, and the Appropriations Committee is about to agree to a level of funding nationwide of $400 million.

Mr. President, there is a chasm—a chasm—between the need and the resources available. We are going to have to do better than this, or these 4,000 families in North Dakota who have had their homes destroyed are going to have a pretty miserable Christmas and a pretty miserable new year. We are better than that. We have proven so repeatedly. I hope we are able to prove it again.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. 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. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we charge time during the quorum call equally between the two sides.

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

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair, and again I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. 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. KYL. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I will be speaking to in just a moment.

First, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the Arizona Republic from September 21, by Robert Robb, the subject of which is President Obama's debt-cutting plan fails to tell the whole story, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the amendment I will be talking about has been filed. It is amendment No. 645. But before I describe that amendment—which I believe and hope we will be able to vote on when we have our series of votes later on this afternoon—I want to respond to one thing the leader said in his remarks after lunch.

He was talking about the continuing resolution, which we believe will be coming over from the House of Representatives later on today. That continuing resolution, of course, has funding for the various disasters which

have befallen various parts of our country.

I think the leader has indicated that he is going to be attempting to amend that House product with an increase in that spending. He asked the question rather rhetorically: Why aren't those Senators who have disasters in their States willing to vote for my increased spending amendment? Then he answered his own question, saying it is all politics.

Mr. President, first of all, as you know, we are not supposed to ever question the motives of fellow Senators. I am sure that isn't what the leader had in mind, but I would suggest to the leader it is not politics that causes people to vote against his amendment. If it were politics, they would be voting for his amendment. Those Members who have disasters in their States would say, surely, they want even more money so they can be sure to cover all those disasters. So if it were politics, they would probably be voting yes.

I suggest the reason they are voting no is because of principle. First of all, because there is plenty of money in the House continuing resolution to cover all of the disasters that have already occurred and those that could be anticipated over the course of the next 7 or 8 weeks, which is the period of time covered by the bill; and, secondly, we should never spend more money than necessary. I will stand corrected if I am wrong, but I do not believe the majority leader's amendment has a calculation of why all of the money he proposes is necessary based upon emergencies or disasters that have occurred.

So I just wanted to make sure my colleagues appreciate if and when such a vote occurs, at least for those people with whom I have spoken, they are going to be voting on principle and on the fact there is plenty of money for disasters. There is no reason to put in more money than is needed, especially in our time of a very difficult deficit situation.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Real Clear Politics, Sept. 21, 2011]

OBAMA'S DUPLICITOUS DEBT PROPOSAL

(By Robert Robb)

President Barack Obama's debt reduction plan could be titled, The Audacity of Duplicity.

According to Obama, he is proposing $4 trillion in debt reduction over the next 10 years, with there being $2 in spending cuts for every $1 in tax increases.

Where to begin?

Half of the president's claimed debt reduction comes from policies already in place. Obama says $1 trillion will be saved by winding down the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. In other words, Obama wants credit for reducing debt that was never going to be incurred.

Another $1 trillion is from the agreement that was reached to increase the debt ceiling. But that agreement didn't really reduce the debt by $1 trillion. It simply adopted future spending caps that would have that effect. However, there were no new laws adopted that would actually reduce spending. The caps are unenforceable promises to do something unspecific in the future.

Obama is actually only proposing $2.1 trillion in new stuff. Of that, nearly $1.6 trillion is increased taxes. So, he's actually proposing $3 in tax increases for every $1 in spending cuts.

But that still doesn't tell the real story. The ''spending cuts'' aren't really all spending cuts. They are just things other than tax increases, and there's over $135 billion in fee increases. Those may be warranted, but they aren't spending cuts.

So, Obama actually is proposing over $1.7 trillion in additional federal revenue, making the ratio $4 in increased taxes and fees for every $1 in spending cuts.

But that still doesn't tell the whole story. Obama, of course, is purposing increased stimulus spending now. Net, Obama is only proposing to decrease actual federal spending by about $245 billion over 10 years. So, the real ratio is $7 in increased taxes and fees for every $1 in actual spending cuts.

In short, Obama has proposed a massive tax increase while doing very little to control federal spending.

The bulk of the tax increases, $1.2 trillion, fall on individuals making over $200,000 a year. Supposedly, their tax treatment would only be returned to the levels prevailing during the Clinton prosperity, but that's another bit of duplicity.

Obama proposes that the top two tax rates be returned to Clinton-era levels, but doesn't stop there. He would also limit the deductions they take, which wasn't the case during the Clinton bliss. And his health care bill already socked this group with an increase in payroll taxes of nearly 1 percent on wage income and an investment income tax increase of nearly 4 percent.

In short, Obama is advocating tax rates for those earning more than $200,000 a year much higher than the Clinton-era rates, which Bill Clinton himself described as too high.

This is supposedly so millionaires and billionaires pay their fair share. According to the Tax Policy Center, the top 1 percent of tax filers has 16 percent of the country's income, but pay 24 percent of all federal taxes and 35 percent of federal individual income taxes.

According to Obama mythology, millionaires and billionaires pay lower tax rates than average Jacks and Jills. According to the Tax Policy Center, the top 1 percent pays 18 percent of their income in federal income taxes. The middle quintile pays less than 3 percent. Those below that actually get more money back than they pay in.

Obama seems really worked up over the fact that investment income is taxed at a lower rate than wage income. But that's not really the case. Dividends are taxed at the corporate level before they are distributed to individuals, when they are taxed again. Capital gains are taxed on their nominal value, ignoring the effect of intervening inflation.

If Obama were truly interested in a bipartisan down payment on debt reduction, he could have anchored his proposal in the recommendations of his debt commission. The debt commission, however, recommended about half of what Obama proposes in additional federal revenue and raised in a way that lowers rates across the board, including for millionaires and billionaires.

Obama's interests, however, clearly lie elsewhere.

AMENDMENT NO. 645 TO AMENDMENT NO. 633

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the amendment, as I said, is numbered 645, and I will be discussing the contents of the amendment and why I think it should be addressed. But let me precede that with this point.

I think the bill before us, the TAA bill, actually deserved greater scrutiny than the process allowed. There was an opportunity for some more fundamental changes in the TAA Program than occurred. The only changes are pretty rudimentary, and I don't think anyone can contend they will save substantial amounts of money or represent fundamental reform. The process of putting this all together was by people who supported TAA, not people like me who have a real problem with TAA. So it is probably no surprise the program isn't substantially reformed.

Specifically, on the TAA training, which is part of what I am focusing on, no work was done to reform the training funding to reflect the fact there are already over 40 programs dedicated to worker training. One of our colleagues, Senator COBURN, has done some great work in this area to highlight the problem. Instead, the substitute just increases overall training funding and does very minimal reform.

More broadly, there is little evidence the TAA programs are actually effective. That is what I will speak to with regard to the piece I will be eliminating, hopefully, with the amendment I am proposing. We are going to spend over $1 billion on the so-called enhanced TAA provisions in the substitute and another $7 billion on the baseline program. So $1 billion on the enhanced provisions, $7 billion on the baseline program, and we don't even know whether it actually helps our citizens.

I have filed other amendments that I may or may not bring up, depending upon what our schedule is, but at a minimum I hope the word of the TAA supporters can be relied upon as we move forward. For example, the substitute is intended to terminate baseline TAA after 2014. But due to CBO scorekeeping, CBO estimates that Congress could actually spend another $7.4 billion for the years 2015 to 2021—years after all the TAA is scheduled to be terminated. So I plan to work with the CBO to ensure these savings are actually extracted from the baseline.

This amendment I speak of repeals the TAA for the Firms Program. It would repeal that as of October 1, 2011—in other words, the end of the fiscal year. The amendment would only save about $16 million a year, but I think it serves as a test of one's real commitment to reform. I propose eliminating this small piece of the TAA that President Barack Obama proposed be eliminated in his budget.

The President's budget recommendations for this year specifically recommend termination of the TAA for Firms Program, and I thought—since we have all talked about how our constituents keep telling us they want us to come back and work together to get things done—here is an opportunity where a Democratic President and a Republican Senator have proposed something, and it is an opportunity for colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get together and say, yes, there is at least one program—it is a small one,

$16 million—that ought to be eliminated.

What are the reasons for the President's request this program be dropped? According to his ''Termination, Reductions and Savings''—this was submitted as part of the fiscal year 2012 Federal budget—the first point is the resources would be better spent elsewhere. Here is what the President's budget says:

The administration believes it is more effective to direct EDA's funding towards programs that make investments to promote globally competitive regions, rather than to assist specific firms that have been harmed by trade.

The budget also made the point the centers are too expensive and they are poorly selected. Here is what the President's budget said:

The non-profit Trade Adjustment Centers that administer the program are chosen noncompetitively and have high overhead rates.

So the first point is the President's budget says: Let's get rid of this program. It is not run well, and it is not centered properly on where we should be centered. The second reason for elimination of this proposal is the EDA's own budget request to Congress for fiscal year 2012 clearly shows other programs are more effective and less costly than this program—TAA for Firms—and I will quote them directly:

The Economic Adjustment Assistance program, which is the most flexible tool in EDA's toolbox and provides a wide range of technical, planning, and public works and infrastructure assistance and can get money out more quickly and with far lower overhead costs, meaning more help for the communities that need it.

The third reason I propose eliminating this small program is the TAA for Firms Program doesn't require any kind of significant trade impact for eligibility. In fact, according to the program's own Web site that outlines frequently asked questions, here is what it says:

Question: Are only firms seriously affected by imports able to participate? Answer: No. We work with a variety of manufacturers and, for some, imports represent only a minor challenge. Regardless of the degree of impact, a firm may be eligible if it experienced sales and employment declines at least partially due to imports over the last two years.

So that is the third problem. The fourth problem: Obviously, there are always bound to be some success stories, but the program's 2010 annual report raises serious questions about its effectiveness. For example, this annual report—by the way, it was required by the stimulus bill—highlights that only 56 percent of firms in 2010 actually completed the program. That means a whopping 44 percent quit for various reasons.

The annual report also shows that firms that started the program in 2008 had little marketed success. After 1 year, firms that completed the program had average employment decrease by 10 percent and an average productivity increase of 11 percent, which is only slightly better than the Bureau of Labor Statistics' national average for the manufacturing industry of a decrease in employment of 13 percent and an increase in productivity of 4 percent. After 2 years, program graduates' average employment dropped by 16 percent and average productivity increased by 3 percent, while the national average for manufacturing firms saw employment drop only 12 percent and average productivity increase by 6 percent. In other words, after 2 years, firms not in the program were doing better than firms in the program despite all the money we are spending on it.

The fifth reason. While it is just authorization language here, repeal does save money. The TAA for firms centers will close and their employees will be reassigned.

We have to reduce the cost and reach of government if we are going to prevent fiscal collapse, and that is the primary reason I am focused on this program. It is not a huge amount of money. Under the substitute, the program would be continued at 2002 levels or, in other words, about $16 million a year. But that is money we don't have to spend, as the President's own budget said, because this program doesn't work well and in effect, as I am saying, wastes taxpayer money.

So if we can't eliminate a program such as this—a program the administration wants to terminate, one EDA says could be done better with other programs, that doesn't require any great connection or impact by trade imports, that has a questionable track record with high failure rates and outcomes at least no better than firms that don't participate—then I am greatly discouraged about the Senate's ability to effect any kind of actual reform.

I urge my colleagues' attention to this. I know some will say we can't make any amendment to this whatsoever or it won't be accepted by the House. You ask my House colleagues whether they would support this amendment. My guess is they would say they would be happy to support this amendment. I hope we will be able to vote for it this afternoon and that my colleagues will support amendment No. 645.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be made pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] proposes an amendment numbered 645 to amendment No. 633.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor and join my colleagues who were here just a few minutes ago talking about the importance of robust funding and immediate funding for disaster relief in our country.

Leader REID came to the floor to explain the importance of this issue, followed by the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. CONRAD, who has helped lead portions of his State back literally from the brink of destruction several times. So when a Member like Senator CONRAD speaks, we really should listen. He has been through—excuse me—hell and back in parts of his State, and he really does understand what is at stake, and some Members who think they know about disasters and have not really quite experienced them in their State would be well advised to listen to his plea to get this done right now.

I wish to address three specific statements that have been made on the floor of the Senate by my friends on the other side of the aisle that are, with all due respect, patently false.

Leader MCCONNELL came to the floor either last night or this morning—because it was reported in the Washington Post—and said we don't have to worry because Congress always does what is appropriate when it comes to disasters.

I don't even know where to begin to say how false that statement is. And I know the leader didn't mean to mislead anyone; he just made a comment: We don't have to worry about this; we always do the right thing. I was there for Katrina and Rita. This Congress did not always do the right thing. There are still things Congress should have done in the aftermath of Katrina and Rita that have not yet been done, and there is a whole list of things that were done by this Congress but 2 years too late or 3 years too late. So let me be very clear with people following this debate. Congress does not always do the right thing when it comes to disasters, and we are about ready to make another mistake, and it is so unnecessary and so unfortunate.

No. 2, there is a disagreement going on about whether this is politics or principle. And I know our side has said and we believe there has to be politics involved because there is no other reason to explain why the House Republican leadership continues to throw a wrench into this when it is completely unnecessary. What is the principle they are fighting for, if it is a principle? The only principle I can think of is the principle of, when things are going smoothly, blow it up, because that is what they are doing.

What do I mean by that? Let me take a minute to explain. As the Republican House leadership knows full well, the Senate and the House have already agreed—we agreed 30 days ago. Before Hurricane Irene, before Tropical Storm Lee, before these storms ever happened, the Republican and Democratic leadership agreed, in the big fight we had over the whole meltdown—not of the government but of the shutdown, almost, of the economy—we remember that, Mr. President, don't we, that big fight we had—in that negotiation, the leadership of both Houses, Republicans

and Democrats, already agreed—in anticipation that we would be running short of FEMA money because we have been running short of FEMA money now for 8 months, in anticipation of that, they said in that agreement: We are going to carve out an $11 billion approximate pot of money or cap adjustment so that when we come to ask for disaster aid, we won't have to fight again.

Why do we like to fight so much? I mean, I can fight, I do fight, but I choose not to. What is the principle the House Republicans are fighting for? It must be ''when things are going smoothly, let's blow it up.'' That is why I am so frustrated. It is an unnecessary fight to be having. Again, we have already made provision for $11 billion. So the leader puts in $6.9 billion—well within the range of this $11 billion allowance—and lo and behold the House leadership says: Absolutely not. We are not doing that. We are not even going to consider the $6.9 billion. What we are going to do is just continue last year's level of funding, which was inadequate then. That is why we have run out of it.

So they are going to take the inadequate level we had last year before all these storms happened and extend it for 6 weeks and claim victory and then come back after the fact and require, for one of the first times—not the first time in history but one of the few times in history—to then grab back and say: To finish the disaster money for 2011, you have to go gut a program that is very important to some Members—more important to some than others but an important program.

The House is insisting that we gut $1.5 billion of a program that is creating jobs in Michigan and other parts of the country. So why are we destroying jobs when we don't have to? Again, it must be the principle of, when things are going smoothly, when things are working, when the leadership has actually agreed, the House Republican leadership will just throw a wrench and really mess things up.

Thank goodness there are 10 Republican Senators in this Chamber who don't follow that principle of throwing a wrench when things are going smoothly. They follow the principle of common sense and compassion and being forward-leaning when it comes to helping Americans who need our help. Senator BLUNT, Senator RUBIO, Senator SNOWE, Senator COLLINS, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator BROWN from Massachusetts, Senator HELLER from Nevada, Senator HOEVEN from North Dakota, Senator TOOMEY from Pennsylvania, and Senator VITTER from Louisiana—many of them have experienced disasters in their States in the past and remember those terrible days or they are experiencing them now, and they said: We don't follow the ''throw the wrench in the gears'' principle. We are going to follow the ''let's get it done'' principle. Let's get the work done. Let's move forward. Let's stop fighting. Let's provide immediate and robust funding to help our communities.

So they voted across party lines. I have done that before. I have been elected now three times. I mean, you can sometimes cross party lines to do the right thing, find middle ground. So they did. They found middle ground, and we came up with the $6.9 billion package.

Now, let me say, to answer specifically the Senator from Arizona, for whom I have a lot of respect, we did not pull this sum out of the air. This $6.9 billion, which is much more robust than the $2.6 billion the House wants to provide, is a much more accurate estimate based on actual numbers given to the Appropriations Committee, which is the committee of authority here, by the agencies that are in charge of the disasters, from Agriculture, from the Corps of Engineers. So our number, the 6.9 that is being ridiculed as just being pulled out of the air—no, contraire—it was given to us by the agencies. The number that came from absolutely nowhere, that has no bearing on any sense of reality today, is the number the House pulled up, which is last year's number, which was the estimate before the storms even hit. So if you want to argue which number is more accurate, please put your money on our number because you will lose this bet.

Our number is based on actual estimates that have already been made of disasters that have already occurred. In fact, it doesn't even—our number—because we don't have the estimates in, we don't even have the estimates yet for Tropical Storm Lee or for Irene. It was too early. It takes a while for these numbers. So when I say the 6.9 is much better than the 2.6 and more accurate, that is true. Is it the real, actual number that might take us through next year? Even I can't say that and I am the chairman of the committee. I have more information than anybody in here on this. But I can tell you one thing: It is much better than 2.65, it is much more accurate, and at least it is based on realistic estimates.

So when people on my side say: We don't even understand what the Republicans in the House are fighting about, it is the truth. They picked a fight they didn't need to pick. They are arguing over something that was already decided. They are rejecting their own government estimates of what these disasters cost because of what? On principle? What is the principle? The only thing I can think of—and I have said it five times, and I am going to say it six—it must be the principle of, let's throw a wrench when things are working well, and I think the American people are tired of it. It is exhausting.

So we now have projects—I would like to show the projects that are stopped. We have a list that is literally too thick to put into the RECORD, and I am not going to ask for it to be put in the RECORD because somebody will have to stay here for days and type it in, and I am not going to ask the clerks to do that. But I am going to hold it up so people can see. These are pages and pages of projects that are stopped right now.

I want to say directly to the House Member from Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, who is the chairman, my counterpart, there are pages of projects here in Alabama, in his own district, that are stopped, and he is not helping by supporting last year's numbers for this year's disasters. I hope he will rethink and start arguing not for his party but for his State. Sometimes we have to put our parties aside and fight hard for our districts and our State. I have done that before. I think it is the right way to do it.

These are pages and pages of projects that have been stopped. They are finished. They are not finished forever, we hope, but they are stopped—roads, libraries, bridges. Talk about jobs, most of these are done by small businesses, as we know. There is not any government agency that swoops in to do these projects in small towns. They are local contractors that get contracts with FEMA or the Corps of Engineers for the work. They are issuing pink slips for these projects right now. One would think that would motivate people. If compassion doesn't motivate them, if the morality of the situation doesn't motivate them, maybe thousands of jobs would motivate them. It seems none of those are working. I am running out of enticements.

All these projects have been stopped. Will the $2.6 billion the House is offering start these projects again? Yes, it will—their offer they put on the table, that they are pushing us to accept, against which we are fighting hard. We do not want to accept it, but we will not shut the government down over this. We are pushing back as hard as we can without shutting the government down because over there they keep holding the economy hostage, then holding the government hostage. But I am saying, yes, these projects will get started again. They will go for 6 weeks, and then we will be back where we are right now, which is no place.

When we have a chance to fix a problem, there is already an agreement it should be fixed, already the leadership has agreed how to fix it, and there is an allocation of the money set aside—we still cannot do it? Why? Because we want to come back in 6 weeks and have this fight again? How much time is wasted.

Do you know what Tom Ridge said about this—a Republican, the first guy who ran Homeland Security, the first Secretary? He said:

> Never in the history of the country have we worried about the budget around emergency appropriations for natural disasters and, frankly, in my view, we should not be worried about it now . . . we are all in this as a country. And when Mother Nature devastates a community we may need emergency appropriations and we ought to just deal with it and then deal with the fiscal issues later on.

That is a former Secretary of the department that was in charge of this.

Governor Christie, I spoke with him yesterday on the phone. He said last week:

> You want to figure out budget cuts, that's fine . . . you expect the citizens of my State to wait? They are not going to wait, and I am going to fight to make sure they don't do it. Our people are suffering now and they need support now. We need the support now here in New Jersey. This is not a Republican or Democratic issue.

That is from Gov. Chris Christie, a very popular Republican, I might say.

Then Gov. Bob McDowell, from Virginia, another Republican:

> My concern is that we help people in need. For the FEMA money, that's going to flow, it's up to them how they get it. I don't think it's the time to get into that (deficit) debate.

Why are we fighting over this? Why does the House Republican leadership think last year's number that was inadequate last year is good enough for this year when, as my staff just reminded me, we have had 10 disasters, each one over $1 billion this last year? This is Mother Nature. This wasn't caused by some conspiracy of the Democratic Party; this is just what happened. Why do they want people to have to worry whether help will be there when we can so easily fix this? On what principle are they standing? It cannot be fiscal responsibility; it is already provided for in the budget.

If this is conservatism, I don't think America likes that. I don't think they will accept that. It is not their vision of conservatism, it is their vision of foolishness.

I also think, as PATRICK LEAHY, Senator from Vermont, has said many times, many people are starting to think, why is it some people in Congress rush out to fund programs in Afghanistan and Iraq and never wanted to debate when we went to war how we were going to pay for that. We literally did it in 30 days. Nobody even questioned how we were going to pay for it—literally. I was here. Maybe a few people raised the issue this is going to be expensive, but nobody on the other side did—to go to war, twice. Yet after a hurricane, a tornado, we now have to have a knock-down, drag-out, full-fledged debate on how we are going to pay for every single penny before we can give a green light to these Governors and mayors and county commissioners. I think it is outrageous, it is unnecessary, and it is so terribly unfair.

I don't know what is going to happen because we sent a bill over to the House that has $6.9 billion. It, as I said, may not be enough, but it is much better than $2.65 from last year that was not sufficient then. We sent a bill over. It is a stand-alone bill. The House, if they do not think the number—if they think the number is too high, take it down a little bit or tell us they do not think this item is worth funding—say something. We could negotiate on that number. It is not written in the scripture, but it is the best estimate we had of what we actually need right now.

No, they will not even look at the bill. They just send us $2.6 billion on a continuing resolution. So, basically, Senate, take our old, tired, inadequate number and we are going to go home and then you can shut the Government down if you don't like it. What kind of way is that to treat disaster victims? It is no way at all.

Senator HAGAN just told me—she got out of a meeting today—some of her people are living literally in tents. I know, when I went down to Cameron Parish, some of my people were sleeping in the open air, on concrete. I know what these scenes are. They roll in my head. Unfortunately, I have lots of memories about people sleeping on the street, 500 people sleeping under an overpass waiting for the Federal Government or the State or local government to set up a trailer or rental unit.

Again, if we did not have the provision for this already decided, if this was not the way we had operated in the past, I could understand it, but everything moves us: the agreement that has already been raised, the precedent of history, the accurate estimates of disaster. Yet the Republicans want to fight about it. I think it is a bad fight for them to have, let me just say. It is a shame. But we are going to do our best to get immediate and full funding, and if we cannot, we will be back in 6 weeks talking about it again, which is very unfortunate because we cannot rebuild Tuscaloosa, AL, and Joplin, MO, and parts of North Dakota, Minot, ND, and small towns in Alaska and Alabama 6 weeks at a time. We cannot do it. When we have the money, we have the provision, we have history and precedent on our side and the need is so great for the Republican leadership to throw a wrench just because they like to keep things stirred up, it is a shame.

That is where we are. We are going to do our best. This is what Republican leaders say. This is what the pictures look like on the ground. When it is not on CNN every night, people don't think it is truly happening, but the fact is the fires are burning, there is rubble in town that looks like this, the water may have receded from this particular farm, but the damage is still there. The water I am sure has receded from this scene, but this family is still wandering around their lot looking for spoons and forks and things that might remind them of what they once had, and Republicans have decided, for whatever reason, to throw a wrench in this whole thing and make a big fight, when it is absolutely not necessary.

We are going to keep working and see what we can do to bring relief to a lot of this misery.

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

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

CONSTITUTION DAY AND JUSTICE ANTONIN SCALIA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, September 17 was an anniversary with double significance for our country. On September 17, 1787, delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia held their final meeting and signed the Constitution they had crafted. And on September 17, 1986, this body voted unanimously to confirm Justice Antonin Scalia's appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States. Today, 25 years later, he is the senior member of the Court.

These two events are profoundly related because Justice Scalia is literally helping us rediscover the real Constitution. His approach to doing the work of judges is helping us to rediscover the Constitution that America's Founders gave us—the Constitution that is powerful and solid; the Constitution that belongs to the people, protects our rights, limits government, and makes liberty possible.

Antonin Scalia was born in Trenton, NJ, on March 11, 1936. After graduating first in his high school class, valedictorian from Georgetown University, and magna cum laude from Harvard Law School, he embarked on a legal career that would include stints in private practice, government service, the legal academy, and, finally, the judiciary.

President Reagan nominated then-Professor Scalia to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit in July 1982. He appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee on August 4, 1982—another date with constitutional significance. The hearing began just minutes after the Senate voted 69 to 31 to approve a balanced budget constitutional amendment, the only time this body has done so, at least so far. I was an original cosponsor of that amendment. I mention that because Justice Scalia's approach to the Constitution means that the people, and the people alone, have authority to change it through the amendment process outlined in the Constitution. The Senate's vote on that balanced budget amendment was part of that process.

Professor Scalia told the Judiciary Committee that, if he were appointed to the bench, his days of being able to comment on the wisdom of laws enacted by Congress would be ''bygone days.'' The sense that judges are doing something fundamentally different than private citizens, fundamentally different than legislators, defines his judicial philosophy.

The same theme dominated his confirmation hearing 4 years later, when President Reagan nominated Judge Scalia to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. As that hearing opened, I quoted from the Chicago Tribune that the nominee was determined ''to read the law as it has been

enacted by the people's representatives rather than to impose his own preference upon it.''

When Justice Scalia took the oath of judicial office, President Reagan said that the judiciary must be independent and strong but confined within the boundaries of a written constitution.

Public officials must swear to uphold and defend this written Constitution. It declares itself to be the supreme law of the land. More than 90 percent of Americans say it is very important to them. But what exactly is it and what are judges supposed to do with it? The answer to that question defines Justice Scalia's career and its lasting impact on all of us.

The Constitution is a document, the oldest written charter of government in the history of the world. Professor Steven Calabresi, who teaches at Northwestern University Law School and once clerked for Justice Scalia, writes that when Americans think of liberty, they think of documents, especially of the Constitution.

Three statements at the turn of the 19th century tell us what we need to know. First, the Supreme Court, in 1795, literally asked the same question: What is the Constitution? Here is their answer:

> The Constitution is fixed and certain; it contains the permanent will of the people, and is the supreme law of the land; it is paramount to the power of the legislature, and can be revoked or altered only by the authority that made it.

Second, President George Washington echoed this theme a year later in his Farewell Address. He said:

> The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all.

Third, the Supreme Court, in its 1803 decision Marbury v. Madison, wrote that through the Constitution, the people established certain limits for the Federal Government.

> [A]nd that those limits may not be mistaken or forgotten, the Constitution is written.

There you have it. The Constitution is the means by which the people express their will and set limits on the government. The people alone have authority to change the Constitution and, until they do, it is fixed and certain. One obvious way to alter the Constitution is to change its words. But a more subtle, and even more effective, way to alter the Constitution is to change its meaning. Words themselves are just the form, but the meaning of those words is the substance. The real Constitution is its words and their meaning together. Whoever controls the meaning of the Constitution controls the Constitution itself. When we say that only the people may alter the Constitution, that simply must mean that only the people can change the words or their meaning. For the Constitution to be what it is supposed to be, both its words and their meaning must remain fixed and certain until the people choose to change them.

Justice Scalia delivered the 1997 Wriston Lecture at the Manhattan Institute. Its title was simply ''On Interpreting the Constitution.'' He described his topic as ''what in the world we think we're doing when we interpret the Constitution of the United States.'' This is why it is so important to clarify what the Constitution is in the first place, so we know what judges are supposed to do with it.

Justice Scalia believes the only proper way to interpret the Constitution is to find the meaning it already has, the meaning given to the Constitution by the people who alone had authority to establish it. Justice Scalia calls this approach originalism.

In his Wriston Lecture, he said that the Constitution ''means what it meant when it was written.'' No one is more candid than Justice Scalia that this approach is not easy, but no one is more certain than Justice Scalia that this approach alone is legitimate. This approach alone preserves both the people's control of the Constitution and the Constitution's control of judges.

In 2005, Justice Scalia delivered a speech at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars titled ''Constitutional Interpretation the Old Fashioned Way.'' He described originalism as beginning with the text and giving it the meaning that it bore when it was adopted by the people. With all due respect to Justice Scalia, he did not invent this approach, but he is helping us to return to those principles.

In his service on the Court, in his speeches and writings, Justice Scalia is helping us rediscover what America's Founders told us to do from the start. I have to emphasize that Justice Scalia has for 25 years implemented the very same approach that he described in his hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Vice President BIDEN was the ranking member at the time, and his very first question was about original meaning as a means of interpreting the Constitution. Justice Scalia explained later in the hearing that the starting point is ''the text of the document and what it meant to the society that adopted it. . . . I am clear on the fact that the original meaning is the starting point and the beginning of wisdom.''

This body knew Justice Scalia would take this approach when we unanimously confirmed him, and he has stayed true to his word throughout his judicial career. In addition to instructing us about the principles we should once again follow, Justice Scalia has been sounding the alarm about failing to do so. He condemns as ''power judging'' the modern trend of judges substituting their own constitutional meaning for that of the people. This amends the Constitution as surely as changing its very words.

Judges continually find creative ways to mask their power judging. They think of deeply impeded social or cultural values, evolving standards of decency, and what the Constitution should mean in our time.

One of Justice Scalia's former colleagues even said that the Constitution is ''a sparkling vision of the supremacy of the human dignity of every individual.'' All of these evolving standards and sparkling visions are different ways of saying the same thing: that judges have taken control of the Constitution by controlling what it means.

Justice Scalia will have none of it. In a 1996 dissent, he rejected this for what it really is; namely, the Court's Constitution-making process. He wrote:

> The court must be living in another world. Day by day, case by case, it is designing a Constitution for a country I do not recognize.

One of the many things I like about Justice Scalia is that he applies his principles across the board. He has often pointed out that judges amend the Constitution by changing its meaning in ways that liberals like, but also in ways that conservatives like. All of it, he says, is wrong.

Judges have no authority to design a new constitution no matter what it looks like. Sometimes I wonder how anyone could think otherwise. How could anyone believe that unelected judges may take the Constitution that opens with the words, ''We the People,'' and turn it into something else? Why would anyone tolerate judges who change the very Constitution that judges are supposed to follow?

Justice Scalia believes no one should, and he challenges us to live up to the principles that define our system of government and that make our liberty possible. The real Constitution is solid and fixed. It was established and can be changed only by the people. That Constitution, the real Constitution, is strong enough to limit government and protect liberty.

But that Constitution is being replaced by a very different one. Since about the 1930s, the real Constitution controlled by the people has been replaced in some measure by a fake constitution controlled by judges. The Constitution is weak, pliable, and shifting, according to them. It morphs and modifies. It shivers and it shakes.

This Constitution is a figment of the judicial imagination, and it is written in disappearing ink. Thomas Jefferson warned that if judges control what the Constitution means, it would become ''a mere thing of wax in the hands of the judiciary which they may twist and shape into any form they please.''

Doing so, Jefferson said, would make the Constitution nothing but a blank paper. This is not just an academic exercise. If you think the latest judicial mood swing is strong enough to limit government, think again. If you think that a lump of wax or a piece of blank paper is firm enough to protect your liberty, think again.

A constitution that can be changed by nothing more than a judge's imagination is no constitution at all. This struggle over what the Constitution is affects not only what judges do with it but also how judges are chosen in the first place. If judges can change the Constitution by changing its meaning, then the judicial selection process will inevitably focus on the Constitution a judicial nominee is likely to create. It will inevitably focus on the form into which a judicial nominee can be expected to shape and twist the Constitution.

Speaking at the State University of New York School of Law in 2002, Justice Scalia warned that if the Constitution's meaning is determined by judges rather than the people, the selection of those judges becomes ''a very political hot potato. Every time you need to appoint a new Supreme Court Justice, you are going to have a mini-plebiscite on what the Constitution means.''

In a 2007 speech at the Jesse Helms Center, Justice Scalia similarly compared the judicial confirmation process to a miniconstitutional convention. If judges may write a new constitution through their rulings, he said, the process will be about finding a nominee who will ''write the Constitution that you want.''

Justice Scalia is also affecting how we do things in the legislative branch. The more that judges are willing to do our work for us, the less of it we are likely to do ourselves. On the other hand, if judges insist that we legislators say what we mean and mean what we say, then we are likely to draft laws differently. The law that we enact, after all, is the text of our statutes and not the speeches, reports, comments, thoughts, or other things that consume the legislative process.

Knowing that judges who have to interpret and apply our statutes will look only at the law is an incentive for us to make sure if it is to be the law, it must be in the statute. That approach is more transparent, more accountable, and more reliable. We have Justice Scalia to thank for pushing us in that direction.

Justice Scalia seems to be the Justice liberals love to hate. If this were a Harry Potter movie, liberals would put Justice Scalia on a wanted poster as ''Undesirable No. 1.'' Yet they just cannot seem to look away. The principles upon which he stands are so compelling and his way of winning them so powerful that whether you love him or hate him you simply must deal with him.

Those who think judges may just make it up as they go along have a hard time figuring out Justice Scalia because he does not follow their game plan. Only a few months into his first term on the Supreme Court, the Washington Post reported that though Justice Scalia was expected to be a hard-changing conservative, he was voting with liberal Justice William Brennan almost two-thirds of the time.

Several weeks later another Post headline read: ''Newest Reagan Appointee Joins Liberals,'' and the percentage of agreement with Justice Brennan seemed to be going up.

Conservative George Will's column at the end of the 1986–1987 Supreme Court term bore the title, ''Good Grief, Scalia!''

Not to worry, though, because a Post headline just 1 year later read: ''Scalia May Be Successor as Conservatives' Chief Advocate.'' The real way to know Justice Scalia, you see, is to know his principles. They are principles drawn directly from America's founding from the nature of limited government under a written constitution. No one works harder to articulate and apply those principles day in and day out than Justice Scalia.

Research in the last several years has demonstrated that he is the funniest Justice in oral argument and the most cited in law reviews and journals. His lectures around the country are consistently standing room only. His interview on the University of California's ''Legally Speaking'' television program has been viewed at least six times as often as any other guest.

No doubt some of this popularity, this buzz, comes from his engaging personality, his wit, and his sense of humor. People enjoy being with a person like him. But it also comes from the substance, the sheer magnitude of the message he delivers in that unique way. People like a witty, engaging person. But they also respect powerful principles and a message that weighs more than a passing intellectual fad.

I have so far spoken today about Justice Scalia, the jurist; I cannot close this tribute, however, without a few comments about Antonin Scalia, the man. The hearing on his Supreme Court nomination 25 years ago took place in the Judiciary Committee's regular hearing room, which is much smaller than where we hold such hearings today. His hearing lasted just 2 days, including testimony by witnesses.

I can still remember that Justice Scalia's family occupied more than one row in the audience. As Justice Scalia introduced them, including all nine of his children, he said, ''I think we have a full committee.''

Media cameras went crazy every time his youngest daughter Meg would lean her head on her mother's shoulder. Meg was just 6 years old then. But as I remember, she held up very well as we lawyers talked about all sorts of jurisprudential minutiae.

That sight impressed on me Justice Scalia's deep love for family and the sacrifice that family makes when someone like him is so devoted to public service. He is also a man of deep faith and love for our country and the values on which it was founded.

Five years ago, I marked Justice Scalia's 20th anniversary in a speech on the Senate floor. At that time I put into the RECORD letters from some of his former law clerks. I want to do the same today.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD after my remarks letters from some of the following former law clerks.

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

(See exhibit 1).

Mr. HATCH. Edward Whelan, who clerked during the October 1991 term and later served as my counsel when I was ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, and is now president of the Ethics in Public Policy Center; Paul Clement, who clerked during the October 1993 term and later served as Solicitor General of the United States, and he is now a partner in the Bancroft law firm; Mark Phillip, who also clerked during the October 1993 term and later served as a U.S. district judge, and is now a partner at Kirkland & Ellis in Chicago; Brian Fitzpatrick, who clerked during the October 2001 term and is now an associate professor at Vanderbilt Law School; and Brian Killian, who clerked during the October 2007 term, and is now an associate at the Bingham McCutchen law firm in Washington.

In closing, all Americans owe Justice Antonin Scalia a deep debt of gratitude. Every day he serves on the Supreme Court Justice Scalia gives a gift to all of us. He is reintroducing us to the principles and to the document that make our liberties possible. He invites us, in the words of the Kellogg's Corn Flakes commercial, to try it again for the first time.

I return to the scene of his first judicial confirmation hearing in 1982. The constitutional amendment process was underway that day, but it was rightly happening on the Senate floor rather than in the confirmation of a Federal judge. Keeping clear the principle that only the people have authority to change the Constitution will give us, as Justice Scalia often puts it, an enduring rather than an evolving constitution. We must step up and govern ourselves rather than look to judges to do it for us.

I hope we see this opportunity for what it is, following Justice Scalia's lead, grasping again the principles of liberty and resolving never to let them go.

Finally, I have been around here a long time. I have had a role with regard to every current member of the U.S. Supreme Court and a number of those who have gone on. I have to say that one of the most respected men in this country is Justice Scalia. I count him as a friend. I count him as a mentor. I count him as a teacher and professor. I count him as one of the all-time greatest Supreme Court Justices, a man who, without question, is as good a person as you can find.

He is a terrific human being. His life has been a life of service to his fellow men and women. His wife is a terrific person, and as far as I know the kids are all great too.

We have been fortunate that he has been willing to serve as he has. We are

a greatly strengthened country because of Justice Scalia. There are a number of Justices in the history of this country we have to look up to. He is one of them. I think we should revere all of them, but he is one of the greatest. I suspect that he will be quoted, he will be written about, he will be talked about for a long time because of the genuine intellect of the man, the tremendous personality he has, the brilliant mind that we see on display every time he writes an opinion or gives a speech or lectures to us or gives a talk.

This is one of the truly great people in our country today. I do not care whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, a liberal or a conservative or somewhere else, this is a man we ought to all respect with every fiber of our beings, and his family as well.

EXHIBIT 1

ETHICS AND
PUBLIC POLICY CENTER,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2011.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: Thank you for commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Senate's unanimous confirmation of Antonin Scalia to the Supreme Court in 1986—fittingly, on Constitution Day. As someone who has had the special privilege of working both for you and for Justice Scalia, I am particularly grateful to you for inviting me to take part in this celebration.

Over the past twenty-five years, no one has done more than Justice Scalia to promote fidelity to our Constitution. As the most prominent proponent of the interpretive methodology of ''original meaning,'' Justice Scalia has forcefully argued that genuine fidelity to the Constitution requires that its provisions—including, of course, its amendments—be interpreted in accordance with the meaning they bore at the time they were adopted. His intellectual triumph over advocates of the so-called ''living Constitution'' approach—under which judges are free to look to their own values or sense of empathy in determining what the Constitution means—has been so devastating that his opponents have largely abandoned the term ''living Constitution'' and some have even tried to rebrand their positions as originalist.

Justice Scalia's clear ideas are made all the more potent by his distinctive writing, which combines a sparkling prose and a logical rigor in a manner that is especially accessible and appealing.

Time has a way of vindicating Justice Scalia's judgments. Virtually everyone, for example, now recognizes the soundness of Justice Scalia's brilliant solo dissent in *Morrison* v. *Olson*, the 1988 case in which the Supreme Court ruled that the independent-counsel statute did not violate the Constitution's separation of powers. Precisely because Justice Scalia's jurisprudence reflects the genius of the Framers and an abiding faith in, and fidelity to, American constitutional principles, there is ample reason to expect that his wisdom on other hotly contested issues of the era will ultimately prevail.

I am personally grateful to Justice Scalia for the opportunity to serve as his law clerk for a year, for all that I learned about the law and about legal reasoning from working with him, and for his friendship and support during my ensuing career. But, like all Americans, I am also deeply indebted to him for his years of tremendous service on the Court. May he enjoy many, many more!

Sincerely,

M. EDWARD WHELAN III.

BANCROFT,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2011.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: Thank you for taking the Senate Floor to mark the 25th anniversary of the beginning of Justice Antonin Scalia's distinguished tenure on the Supreme Court of the United States. Thank you also for inviting me to send you a letter offering a few thoughts of my own on this important anniversary.

I have had the privilege both of serving as a law clerk to Justice Scalia and of arguing over 50 cases before him. I count both experiences as high professional honors. What is perhaps most remarkable about the opportunity to clerk for the Justice is how much of the interaction with the Justice is oral. To be sure, the opportunity to watch the Justice work through drafts of an opinion is a remarkable experience. But his writing style is inimitable, and the clerks are relegated to the sidelines. The most valuable aspect of the clerkship is the opportunity to discuss the Court's cases with the Justice. Before every sitting, he had a session with his law clerks that resembled nothing so much as an oral argument. With 25 years of service, the Justice has now had roughly 100 law clerks. As a reflection of the Justice's own remarkable career, his law clerks have gone on to distinguish themselves in academia, executive branch service, and the judiciary. The key to their success, I believe, is that once you have mixed it up with the Justice in an argument in Chambers, very few subsequent professional experiences have the capacity to intimidate.

Perhaps the only experience that can hold a candle to those in-Chambers debates is to argue a case before the Justice and his colleagues. Justice Scalia clearly changed the dynamic of Supreme Court oral arguments. One only needs to listen to the audio recording of arguments before Justice Scalia joined the bench to appreciate his impact. Advocates used to hold forth at length with only occasional questions from the Justices. The Justice arrived and began asking questions in rapid-fire succession. His colleagues did not want the newest Justice to steal the show and began asking more frequent questions, and as subsequent Justices joined the Court, they too joined the fray. I do not believe it is an accident that the Solicitor General's office only formalized its practice of holding moot courts after Justice Scalia joined the Court.

Justice Scalia's impact on the Court has extended well beyond oral argument. He has had a profound impact on the way the Supreme Court, and all Judges, decide cases. The impact is most obvious in the area of statutory construction. He has fundamentally changed the way the Supreme Court approaches the interpretation of congressional statutes. Coming from a former law clerk, this could be dismissed as being less than objective. But I have a much better source for this observation: Justice John Paul Stevens. A few years ago, the Supreme Court held argument in *Arlington Central School District* v. *Murphy*, a case involving the question whether expert fees were recoverable under a statute that allowed for the recovery of attorneys' fees and costs. There was a pretty good textual argument—which the Court ultimately adopted—that expert fees were neither attorneys' fees nor costs. There was also a pretty good argument based on the conference report that the conferees thought that expert fees would be recoverable. At oral argument, Justice Stevens suggested that the latter view should carry the day because ''the rule that you cannot look at legislative history didn't really get any emphasis until after 1987'' and the statute at issue was enacted earlier. To be clear, 1987 was not the date of some watershed Supreme Court opinion about legislative history; it was Justice Scalia's first full year on the Court.

It would be a mistake to think that Justice Scalia's influence is limited to statutory as opposed to constitutional interpretation, just as it would be a mistake to pigeonhole his views as conservative or pro-Government. Perhaps no opinion better illustrates both points than his opinion for the Court in *Crawford* v. *Washington*. That decision worked a fundamental reconsideration of the Court's Confrontation Clause jurisprudence. With a classic Scaliaesque focus on text, rather than purpose, the Court rejected prior Supreme Court's decisions which considered the underlying purpose of the Confrontation Clause—reliable evidence—in favor of what the text actually guarantees: an absolute right to confront witnesses. As he wrote for the Court, the Sixth Amendment ''commands not that evidence be reliable, but that reliability be assessed in a particular manner: by testing in the crucible of cross-examination.'' In the years that have followed *Crawford*, few areas of the Court's constitutional jurisprudence have been more dynamic and no criminal defendant has had a better champion in a Confrontation Clause case than Justice Scalia.

Justice Scalia's impact has extended beyond the Court in one more important way. An entire generation of law students has now learned the law by reading Justice Scalia's opinions. Even Justice Scalia's critics acknowledge the power of his prose. I have had numerous law students—left, right and center—confide that whenever there is a case with a Scalia opinion, even a dissent or concurrence, they always read the Scalia opinion first. And who can blame them? Who would want to read about a three-pronged doctrinal test, when instead you can read about 60,000 naked Hoosiers or even just nine people selected at random from the Kansas City phone book. And Justice Scalia's colorful prose can have serious consequences—I am not sure the Court's *Lemon* test has ever fully recovered from being compared to a B-movie ghoul.

Finally, the most commendable thing about your decision to mark this anniversary is that it does not require us to wait for the end of Justice Scalia's service to celebrate his tenure. I can assure you that from an advocate's perspective, Justice Scalia appears to be a vibrant young man up on that bench. At the same time we mark his twenty-five years of service, we can look forward to his continuing service to his country and his Court.

Most sincerely,

PAUL D. CLEMENT.

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
AND AFFILIATED PARTNERSHIPS,
Chicago, IL, September 15, 2011.

Sen. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: Thank you very much for honoring Justice Scalia on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his confirmation to the United States Supreme Court. It is an honor to contribute a letter to your effort.

I suspect that many of Justice Scalia's colleagues in the federal judiciary, his former colleagues from the legal academy, and many of my colleagues in the Scalia law clerk family will write about the Justice's

vast intellect and his profound contributions to the law. Their comments will certainly be on the mark. Justice Scalia is one of the smartest people one will ever encounter. And he has indelibly influenced many areas of the law. He not only has written landmark opinions concerning numerous areas of constitutional and statutory law, he has, even more broadly, focused debate about the proper methods of interpreting the Constitution and federal statutes. He also has made key contributions to the debate about the proper role of the federal judiciary within our system of government. Not everyone agrees with his views, of course, but I suspect most everyone would agree that he has been, and remains, one of the most important voices in these key discussions.

If I may, however, I am going to leave the accounting of Justice Scalia's jurisprudential contributions to others far more scholarly and intelligent than me. Instead, let me please briefly address an aspect of Justice Scalia that sometimes receives less public attention—namely, just how nice and decent a person he is on a human level.

It is commonly said within the Scalia law clerk family that the Justice was the nicest boss any of us has ever had. He is, first and foremost, a teacher at heart, and he routinely would take time, despite his workload and responsibilities, to help us become better thinkers and lawyers. He also treated us with the utmost professionalism and respect, and with concern for our personal lives as well as our professional ones. That concern has remained in the years since we clerked for him—as he has shared our joys, with the birth of our children, and our sorrows, with the deaths of loved ones.

Justice Scalia's generosity with his time and attention is not limited to his law clerks. I recall one time, in the early summer when I was clerking, when Justice Scalia had been working particularly hard for quite a stretch of time. Notwithstanding those demands, he agreed to meet with a group of school children who were touring the Court—as I recall, somewhat unexpectedly within his schedule. Despite the sixteen hour days he had been putting in for some weeks, he engaged the kids at length, and fielded their many questions, for well over an hour. There were no historians to record his deeds, nor camera crews, but he did it just because he is a generous and decent person. He entertained the kids (he is quick to laugh, and quick to joke as well) but he also made them think about important issues, and he took the time necessary to do that, notwithstanding the long hours he had been putting in for many weeks.

Justice Scalia will be ranked among the most important jurists in American history because of his vast professional contributions. He also is a model of a dedicated public servant, who works earnestly to discharge his duties to the American people, that can be emulated by judges throughout the nation. But he also is an exceedingly kind and decent person. Being a nice person is not everything, but it is quite important indeed, and in that regard, he is also a gem.

In closing, let me please add one final thought. Any recognition of Justice Scalia's twenty-five years of service on the Supreme Court would be incomplete without a recognition of his wife, Mrs. Maureen Scalia. Serving on the Supreme Court is certainly a huge honor, but serving in that role imposes substantial demands on any person and those around them. I am quite confident, because I have heard Justice Scalia say it many times, that he could not have served on the Supreme Court without the support of his lovely wife over his many years in the federal judiciary. She too is owed recognition and thanks.

Thank you again for your efforts to recognize the twenty-fifth anniversary of Justice Scalia's confirmation to the Supreme Court. And thanks for your continuing service to the Nation as well.

Sincerely,

MARK FILIP.

VANDERBILT LAW SCHOOL,
Nashville, TN, September 9, 2011.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: This month marks the 25th anniversary of the United States Senate's confirmation of Justice Antonin Scalia to the Supreme Court of the United States. On September 17, 1986, the Senate confirmed Justice Scalia by a vote of 98–0, and, on September 25, he received his commission.

I hope that the Senate will find an appropriate moment sometime in the coming weeks to honor Justice Scalia for this important milestone in his service to the American people. I realize that some members of the Senate are more fond of Justice Scalia's jurisprudence than are others, but, no matter where one stands on that question, I think it has to be acknowledged that Justice Scalia has been one of the most influential legal thinkers in modern American history—indeed, perhaps in all of American history.

In an age where much judicial decision-making is ad hoc, Justice Scalia distinguishes himself by following coherent judicial philosophies known as ''textualism'' and ''originalism.'' Although these philosophies may have predated Justice Scalia in some form, I think it is fair to say that he brought them to life, and, in doing so, forever changed the way lawyers, judges, and public officials talk and think about the law.

This is not mere conjecture; it can be demonstrated empirically. Several years ago, a student note was published in the Harvard Law Review called Looking it Up: Dictionaries and Statutory Interpretation, 107 HARV. L. REV. 1437 (1994). The author examined how often the Supreme Court cited dictionaries in its opinions. The author found that citations dramatically increased after Justice Scalia brought his textualist approach to statutory interpretation to the Court in 1986. And it was not only Justice Scalia who was citing the dictionary: all of the Justices were doing it. In short, whether or not one agrees with Justice Scalia's philosophies, nearly everyone acknowledges their power and nearly everyone understands they must be grappled with.

Consider as well how often Justice Scalia appears as the subject of law review articles. I asked a research assistant to tally how often his name appeared in the title of a law review article compared to the 17 other Justices who have been his colleagues. Although it turns out that this is more difficult to do than it sounds—Justices with common last names generate many false positives—after eliminating the most common false positives, my research assistant reported what I had long suspected: law professors write many more law review articles about JusticeScalia than about any of his colleagues (including, strikingly, Thurgood Marshall, the first African American on the Court, and Sandra Day O'Connor, the first woman). My research assistant found 220 articles about Justice Scalia, well ahead of the 150 or so for his closest competitors (and many of the articles found for his closest competitors were false positives not easily eliminated). In short, love him or hate him, nearly everyone feels the need to reckon with him.

Justice Scalia's influence is a result not only of the strength of his ideas, but also of his rhetorical skills. Few judges have ever turned phrases as colorfully as he does. I witnessed firsthand the pleasure he takes from writing, and it is an investment that has served him well. The reason he was the thinker that brought textualism and originalism to life may very well have been because he was the writer that could not go unread.

Justice Scalia's long public service and his extraordinary influence on the law deserve recognition and respect. The Supreme Court is a much richer place today than it would have been had the Senate not elevated Justice Scalia there 25 years ago. It would be a nice gesture of bipartisanship to take a few minutes this month to remember him.

Sincerely,

BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
Associate Professor of Law, Vanderbilt University; Law Clerk to Justice Scalia, 2001–2002.

SEPTEMBER 17, 2011.

Senator ORRIN G. HATCH,
U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH, as one of Justice Antonin Scalia's former clerks, I'm delighted that you are commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Senate's September 17, 1986 vote to confirm him as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In hindsight, it is a wonderful coincidence that Justice Scalia was confirmed on the 199th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution. (The bicentennial would have been even more fitting, but we're all grateful the Senate didn't wait a year for it.) Over the last 25 years, his name has become a synonym for ''originalism,'' the view that the Constitution of the United States has only one, unchanging, original meaning—the meaning that prevailed when it was adopted. He has authored some of the most significant originalist opinions the Supreme Court has ever issued, including opinions on the accused's Sixth Amendment right to confront the witnesses against him (Crawford v. Washington) and on our Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms (District of Columbia v. Heller).

Justice Scalia believes that judges must be originalists because the United States is a nation ruled by law, not by judges. The whole point of writing out a constitution (indeed, of writing out any law), he observes, is to prevent rules from being changed. As he has famously quipped, the rule of law is a law of rules.

For Justice Scalia, these words aren't just rhetoric. They are principles he strives to follow in all his judicial tasks, even the most insignificant ones. My favorite example of this illustrates the depth of his commitment to rules.

In the Supreme Court, a party can ask the justice assigned to his or her circuit to postpone a filing deadline. Applications for an extension of time are not exciting work, particularly compared to everything else going on at the Court. As a result, they aren't paid much attention. As a further result, the vast majority of the applications are granted—except, it turns out, in Justice Scalia's circuit. Whereas the other justices tend to deny only a handful of extension applications each year (less than 20%), Justice Scalia grants only that many. Why does he take a solitary stand over insignificant procedural motions?

Barely three months on the job, Justice Scalia gave his answer. He had received one

of his first extension applications. The attorney generically claimed that the case presented ''important questions under the Constitution of the United States which were determined adversely to the petitioner by the court below'' and that the attorney, therefore, needed ''additional time to research and prepare the [petition for a] Writ of Certiorari.'' This was the legal equivalent of a form letter, mailed in with the expectation that it was a technical formality, as if five minutes of copying a prior application plus the price of postage were all that someone needed to get an extra 60 days to file a petition.

To the attorney's surprise, Justice Scalia denied the request and wrote a short explanation for his decision, making an example of the seemingly routine case (Kleem v. INS). The Supreme Court's rules say that a party must demonstrate ''good cause'' for an extension, and they admonish that extension requests are ''not favored.'' If needing more time to prepare the best possible petition was ''good cause,'' everyone could honestly claim good cause. Then, the Court's pronouncement that extension requests are ''not favored'' would serve only to deter inexperienced attorneys who, not being part of the savvy club, didn't know that the rules don't really mean what they say.

Of course, the easy decision always is to grant an application. But what is easy isn't always right, and what is right isn't always easy. We expect judges to do what is right, no matter how hard it is. Justice Scalia fulfills our expectations in all he does.

Twenty five years ago, what was right was also easy: the Senate should be proud that it unanimously consented to give Justice Scalia a lifetime appointment to the highest court in the land. His commitment to the rule of law is unflagging, as strong today as it was the day he was confirmed.

Respectfully yours,

BRYAN M. KILLIAN,

Law Clerk to Justice Scalia (2007–2008).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, my hope is that we are moving into the homestretch, in terms of being able to pass the trade adjustment assistance legislation.

I strongly support efforts to promote more exports. The President has set a laudable goal of increasing exports. We know that in the export sector, there is an opportunity to make things here, to grow things here, to add value to them here, and then ship them around the world. To promote these export markets and generate the economic growth our country wants, we have to make sure our workers have the latest, most updated skills to make sure they can get those jobs and exports and get American products around the world.

As I indicated yesterday, there is no doubt that the American brand is a hit around the world. Ninety percent of the consumers are outside the United States, and they want our products. My hope is, as I have indicated, that we are moving toward being able to pass this legislation, the trade adjustment assistance, to increase our exports. Because some pretty astonishing comments have been made with respect to the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, I wish to take a few minutes this afternoon and make sure we can get some facts out to combat some of the rhetoric.

For example, one comment I have heard repeatedly is that the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is a sop to organized labor. The argument is that the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is just a giveaway to labor unions and that they are the people who want the program; that it is something that is part of the labor priority list. I can tell the occupant of the chair—and I am sure she hears the same thing I do at home—that folks who are members of labor unions don't come up to us and say what they want in the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. They say: Senator, I want to have a good-paying job. I want a job where I can support my family and where I have a living wage. That is what I am concerned about right now.

What I am concerned about is China, for example, with their low-interest loans. In some areas, such as solar manufacturing, which I have written the Obama administration about, they are undercutting our solar manufacturers because they are basically giving out free money now. That is what workers come up to Senators and say: Senator, I want a good job, one I can make sure that when I go to bed at night, I will know when I wake in the morning, I will be able to support my family. Labor union folks don't walk up and say: This is what I want from the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program.

The fact is, it has been documented by Mathematic Policy Research that less than half the participants in the TAA were members of a union. Let me repeat that. Less than half of those who participated in trade adjustment assistance were members of a union. In fact, this is a program that is available to all American workers who qualify. When we are talking about applying, in effect, a trade adjustment assistance petition can be filed by any of the following groups: a group of three or more workers, an employer, a labor union, a State workforce official, a one-stop operator or partner or any other person who is designated a duly authorized representative.

This is, to me, the bottom line. In 2009, more than 9 out of 10 petitions for trade adjustment assistance relief were filed by nonunion firms or groups. I will repeat that because we have heard so frequently this is somehow a giveaway to labor or a sop to the labor unions. In 2009, more than 9 out of 10 TAA petitions were filed by nonunion firms or groups. More than two-thirds of the eligible population for the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program were not members of a union.

I hope that, at this point in the debate, we can make it clear, we can make it understandable that TAA is not a program only available to labor unions. That is not true. The Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is not only available to labor unions. TAA is for all Americans. As this debate continues and, as I indicated, hopefully moves into the homestretch, I hope Senators remember that in 2009 more than 9 out of 10 TAA petitions were filed by nonunion firms or groups.

The second area I wish to touch on, in terms of trying to rebut some of these criticisms about the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, is the argument that there is no need to extend eligibility to those in the service sector. In 2009, Congress expanded the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program so service workers who are displaced by trade would be eligible for assistance. There has been criticism of this expansion, and I wish to make sure, again, that Senators and those listening to this debate actually get some of the key facts.

It is important to remember that 82 percent of employment between 2006 and 2010 was in the service sector. To argue that workers in computer programming, finance, accounting, and insurance do not face foreign competition is simply to put our heads in the sand.

A forthcoming paper by Bradford Jensen finds that Americans employed in businesses and professional services face more international competition than workers in the manufacturing sector. Again, when Senators hear this argument that there is no case for extending trade adjustment assistance eligibility to service workers, I hope they will think through the implications of the international competition our workers face in this sector because those in computer programming, in finance, in accounting, and in insurance are important workers in the American economy. They have played a big role particularly in the export sector. I think to arbitrarily say they should not be eligible for the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, given what many of them are facing in terms of international competition, isn't right.

The third argument I would like to take on directly is the argument that, in some way, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is almost a duplicative program. Again, the facts show this argument doesn't stand. A Mathematic Policy Research report from last year makes clear that workers who lose their job due to increased imports—surging imports is the way we ought to appropriately characterize it—those folks who are, therefore, eligible for the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program because of surging imports tend to be older, often have less education, and have higher prelayoff earnings compared to other unemployed Americans.

That is why the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is different than the unemployment insurance program. It is tailored to meet the distinct needs of a critical portion of the labor force. The workers are older, and often they have less education. The transition, as the occupant of the chair knows, can be gut-wrenching because a lot of these individuals, before their layoffs, were

making good wages. Now they are wondering how they are going to be able to get the skills and how they are going to be able to pick up the knowledge to tap the latest opportunities that are available in American business that is looking to export.

This is a program that doesn't duplicate any other. It is a program that is designed to serve a unique population. I am sure we are going to continue through the rest of the discussion about trade adjustment assistance and see a lot of back and forth between Senators with respect to the merits of the program.

I continue to believe we ought to start, as we analyze it, by remembering this has always been a bipartisan program, No. 1; No. 2, TAA petitions have been approved by Labor Departments in both Democratic and Republican administrations. This has roots in the bipartisan effort to support expanded trade. One study after another shows that expanded trade—particularly tapping export markets—can generate hundreds of thousands of jobs. But there is no question that, as we try to make sure we don't lose a single job in America—even short term—some workers can end up needing some help during a transition from one job to another, and if they have been harmed by surging imports, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is there for them. That is why we ought to reauthorize it.

I think we also ought to recognize it is knitted together with the effort to pass the free-trade agreements because the free-trade agreements are about more exports. To have all the workers we need for the potential export markets, we have to make sure workers who have been laid off have a chance to upgrade their skills.

We will come back to this topic, I am certain, but I hope, in the last few minutes, I have been able to at least offer some concrete, documented facts that make clear that the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is not a sop to organized labor, since, in 2009, the vast majority of those granted relief had nothing to do with a labor union; second, that we have made the case for why service workers, facing aggressive international competition, ought to be eligible for the TAA; third, I hope we have been able to lay out how this program doesn't duplicate any others because this is a unique group who disproportionately uses the program, who is older, often with less education, and the transition can be particularly gut-wrenching because very often they have higher prelayoff earnings compared to other unemployed Americans.

I think we understand the biggest challenge for this Senate is creating more good-paying jobs. In my State, about one out of six jobs depends on international trade. The trade jobs tend to pay better than do the nontrade jobs. That is why I considered it such an honor when Chairman BAUCUS asked me to chair the Finance Committee's Subcommittee on International Trade. I saw this as an opportunity to grow the Oregon economy and to grow good-paying family wage jobs. Oregon has a very good record in terms of manufacturing. We face a whole host of dramatic challenges right now. For example, I am particularly concerned about where our country is headed in terms of manufacturing in the renewable energy sector. The Chinese are engaged in very aggressive and questionable practices with respect to the Chinese Development Bank. In effect, they are giving free money to companies that can manufacture and undercut the American market. I have asked the Obama administration to investigate this. If they do not, I am certainly going to be looking legislatively at pursuing trade remedies.

Much of what we are faced with in terms of the renewable energy sector, particularly generating jobs in manufacturing in that sector, deals with making sure we have a rules-based trading system. We enjoy the fact that China is a trading partner. Our State gets a significant amount of jobs from exporting goods to China. But the Chinese, like everybody else, have to comply with the rules, and there is a substantial amount of evidence that the rules aren't being complied with as they relate to manufacturing in the solar sector.

That is why I am using my position as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness to get on top of that. We have already lost some solar manufacturers and we shouldn't sit idly by and lose more. That is the kind of challenge we ought to be working on together on a bipartisan basis; not coming to the floor of the Senate and blocking a piece of legislation that gives our workers an opportunity to get ahead—to get ahead in the private sector, to get ahead in the export market, and to be in a position to get the good-paying jobs that are going to be available in the years ahead if we pass legislation to remove trade barriers.

The reality is that in virtually all of these areas, our tariffs are low, which means that around the world countries get to send their products to us and get almost totally free access to our market. Yet, around the world, when we try to ship our products to them, we face very substantial tariffs. That is what we are trying to change here on the floor of the Senate—to level the playing field. Because if we level the playing field, our workers get more out of it than do the workers of other countries. And that, to me, ought to be particularly appealing to Senators now when our folks are hurting and when there is so much pain in communities across this country.

When I am home, I am consistently seeing workers who are walking an economic tightrope—balancing their food bills against their fuel bills and their fuel bills against their medical costs. They go to bed at night wondering if they are going to have a good-paying job in the morning, given what is being reported every day in the newspapers in terms of layoffs and the kinds of challenges our companies are facing in these tough global markets. That is why legislation to promote exports makes sense. It is an opportunity to provide a new measure of economic security to hard-working American families—to tap those export markets. We have to make sure our workers, all of our workers, can get the skills and those kinds of opportunities so they can qualify for those export markets.

This legislation—passing trade adjustment assistance—is a key component of our ability to generate more jobs in the private sector through exports. I certainly hope we are in the homestretch of being able to pass this legislation and then to move on to the agreements, move on to the opportunity to generate more exports, because that means more work—good-paying work—for our people.

Madam President, with that, I yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I also believe profoundly that increasing our exports, improving our trading opportunities for businesses in this country can do a lot to get Americans back to work. It employs a lot of people across this country today, and it is important we get these trade agreements done. I couldn't agree more with what my colleague from Oregon had to say about that in terms of its impact on the economy.

What is unfortunate, in my view, is the fact we have had to wait so long to get where we are. We have had trade agreements now that have been teed up, literally signed back in December of 2006 for Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, in 2007, and it strikes me that at the least we have lost a tremendous amount of opportunity and a tremendous amount of market share as a result of the delay.

I would have hoped yesterday we would have passed trade promotion authority, because that allows us at least to be at the table to negotiate trade agreements in the future. We have been basically locked out of that since trade promotion authority lapsed back in 2007. This is a global economy, and the world is passing us by. Every single day we are not engaged, that we are not out there negotiating trade agreements with countries around the world somebody else is, and every single day we are losing opportunities for American business to export and to grow our economy and to create jobs here at home.

What I want to speak to today is an amendment I filed earlier this afternoon that deals with what I believe is a very important topic, and that is the high cost of delay when it comes to the pending free-trade agreements. Much attention has been paid in this debate to the pros and cons of trade adjustment assistance, and that is certainly

a debate we ought to have. But we should not overlook the fact there has been a real cost to America's economy and American business associated with the President's strategy to link passage of the free-trade agreements to the renewal of an expanded Trade Adjustment Assistance Program—very unfortunate, especially considering what even the White House acknowledges, which is that passing the trade agreements is one of the best things we can do in the short term to create jobs.

According to the Business Roundtable, the passage of the trade agreements will support 250,000 American jobs. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce estimates this figure could be as high as 380,000 U.S. jobs. You would think passage of these trade agreements, which were signed in 2006 and 2007, would have been a priority, and an early priority, for the Obama administration. Yet here we are, more than 2½ years into this administration, and the President still has not made a commitment to sending us the trade agreements so we can consider them.

I hope what we are doing today puts in place a process whereby that will happen. But as of right now, we have yet to see those trade agreements, notwithstanding the President's assertions he is committed to growing trade and to getting these trade agreements passed. That can't happen until they are submitted to the Congress for ratification. I am hopeful the trade bill before us now will allow us to get to a full and fair debate on the trade adjustment assistance and, in so doing, we will finally get to where we have removed what I hope is the last obstacle blocking passage of the three free-trade agreements.

My amendment is very simple. Under the current trade promotion authority procedures, the International Trade Commission must prepare a report that is submitted to Congress no later than 90 days after a trade agreement is signed. However, there is currently no requirement the ITC conduct a study to assess the negative impact on U.S. businesses when we delay implementation of an agreement, as we have with Korea, Colombia, and Panama. My amendment would simply require that the International Trade Commission assess the negative impact to U.S. businesses if a trade agreement is signed but has not been considered by Congress within 2 years.

The ITC study would focus on lost U.S. exports, how the delay has impacted U.S. trade objectives, as set forth under TPA, as well as how the delay impacts the protection of U.S. intellectual property overseas. The study would also estimate the impact on U.S. employment if the trade agreement in question continues to languish. And, finally, the ITC would be required to update this study in every year subsequent that the trade agreement is not considered by Congress or if it is not entered into force.

My amendment follows a basic principle: If the President believes a trade agreement is in America's national and economic interest, he needs to submit it to Congress. The three pending trade agreements, which hopefully will be considered soon, are a good case in point. Consider that U.S. companies have paid more than $5 billion in tariffs to Colombia and Panama since the trade agreements with these nations were signed more than 4 years ago. That is $5 billion American companies have had to put out in the form of tariffs to these countries because these trade agreements—which were signed more than 4 years ago—haven't entered into force.

More importantly, U.S. businesses have lost countless business opportunities in Korea, Colombia, and Panama. Without trade agreements to ensure similar treatment for our exporters, American businesses will continue to face high tariff and nontariff barriers abroad. Consider just one example: the market for agricultural products in Korea, which is the world's 13th largest economy. Korea's tariffs on imported agricultural goods average 54 percent compared to an average 9-percent tariff on these imports into the United States. Passage of the Korea Free Trade Agreement will level this playing field. Yet the administration continues to delay sending these agreements to Congress.

At a time of near record unemployment and slow economic growth, this delay is unacceptable. This ongoing delay is having a real impact on American businesses and it will only get worse. The Colombian market for agricultural products is another good example of the high cost of delay. In 2010, for the first time in the history of U.S.-Colombia trade, the United States lost to Argentina its position as Colombia's No. 1 agricultural supplier.

Consider the story of the three main crops we grow in South Dakota—soybeans, corn, and wheat. The combined market share in Colombia for these three U.S. agricultural exports has decreased from 78 percent in 2008 to 28 percent in 2010—a decline of 50 percentage points.

We are living in a global economy. America cannot afford to stand still and to stay on the sidelines when it comes to trade. In 1960, exports accounted for only 3.6 percent of our entire GDP. Today, exports account for 12.5 percent of our GDP. Exports of U.S. goods and services support over 10 million American jobs. It is long past time for us to get back in the game by passing the three pending trade agreements and then to work aggressively to make sure our administration is in a position, with trade promotion authority, to negotiate new agreements that will open new market opportunities for American business. America's manufacturers, America's farmers, and America's service providers cannot afford to wait any longer.

What this amendment does, very simply, is require us to weigh and to evaluate and analyze the impact of delay when it comes to implementing these free-trade agreements. We have seen in these examples of Colombia and Panama and South Korea with great clarity the economic impact—the loss of market share—that has occurred to many of our exporters as a result of this delay. It is important we know, that American business know, that the American people know what we are losing when we delay these agreements, as has happened here with these three particular agreements.

It is a straightforward amendment, and I offer it to raise what I think is an important issue, which is that when we get signed agreements, we need to take action on those. They need to be submitted, to be ratified and enacted by the Congress, or we are going to continue to lose out on critically important opportunities for American exporters.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, before he leaves, I simply want to say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who is the ranking Republican on our subcommittee, that I very much enjoy working with him. I have listened carefully to his remarks, and it seems to me what we ought to be addressing in the Senate is our country's opportunities. This is about opportunities. Trade agreements present an opportunity for more exports, something—as the Senator from South Dakota touched on—that is particularly promising for areas such as agriculture. I know in South Dakota and Oregon these are huge opportunities. America is about exports, and free-trade agreements are about opportunities to export.

The Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is about opportunities for our workers to update their skills. In a sense, American business is only as competitive as its workers. That is why, in my view, we have always had this tradition—a bipartisan tradition which I have tried to highlight this afternoon—of making sure we look at every possible opportunity to advance trade.

Before the Senator came to the floor, I think I talked about—and he and I have talked about this—the fact that our tariffs have historically been low compared to the rest of the world; they have big tariffs. We have trade agreements that level the playing field, and our side gets more out of it than everybody else. It has been part of the bipartisan approach to trade. It seems to me we have the chance—and I hope we are heading into the home stretch, because I think the Senator from South Dakota has correctly noted it is certainly time to get this done—to get this to the President's desk; that we can resolve this by saying this is an opportunity to see Congress—the Senate—at its best.

Because we can be in the opportunities business, trade agreements generating opportunities for exports that are

clear winners for the American economy when we have unemployment, economic insecurity, surging imports from Japan.

We need opportunities for our businesses to export, but we also need opportunities for our workers, and I hope that as we move into the home stretch of this discussion, we can see that trade adjustment assistance is an opportunity for our workers to update their skills. As they update their skills, that is going to make American businesses—particularly our exporters—more competitive because they will have workers who can take the jobs.

I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from South Dakota. He and I have worked very closely on a whole host of issues, in fact some that I think are going to be a big part of the future debate. The Senator from South Dakota and I want to make sure those who manufacture digital goods in our country and offer digital services get treated fairly in international markets. This is also a promising opportunity: digital goods—software, for example—digital services such as cloud computing. Under the legislation the Senator from South Dakota and I have offered, we can break down some of the barriers to those kinds of products. I am looking forward to working with him on that and a number of other issues.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I just want to say I thank the Senator from Oregon. He and I have worked together on a number of issues, not the least of which is some of these trade issues, and I look forward to continuing that collaboration. I do believe the Senator from Oregon is someone who really understands the value of opening export opportunities for American businesses and has worked and advocated on their behalf in his time in the Senate.

I think the Senator would also understand the frustration some of us have expressed, and perhaps is felt even by him and others, that these things have languished for so long. I understand the issue of trade adjustment assistance is very important to him and many other Members on his side of the aisle, as well as some on our side, but it strikes me at least that we could have been at this a lot sooner and not have relinquished and given up so many of the lost market opportunities I mentioned in my remarks. It certainly impacts an agricultural State such as mine and many other Members who represent agricultural areas of this country.

If you look at the loss of market share that has occurred in just these last few years since we have sort of been locked out and other countries have moved in to fill that vacuum, it is very frustrating to many of us to have witnessed that. That is why this amendment sort of gets at the idea that we need to know what the economic impacts are when these trade agreements don't get dealt with. One way or the other, these agreements need to get dealt with, and here we are, almost 5 years later with regard to Colombia and over 4 years later with regard to Panama and South Korea. That is way too long for us to be out of the game, so to speak, and it has cost us mightly. So I hope we can get these done.

He is right, we have a process in place that I hope will enable us to finally accomplish this. But we ought to make sure that doesn't happen again in the future.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. 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.

Mr. HATCH. As I understand it, we are prepared to vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 642

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Under the previous order, the question occurs on amendment No. 642 offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH, with 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote.

The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise in support of my amendment No. 642. It is fairly simple. It tightens the nexus between TAA benefits and actual jobs lost because of trade by requiring a stricter standard to receive TAA benefits. The expanded TAA benefit offered by my friends across the aisle continues the "contributed importantly" standard that says if trade is a cause which is important, but not necessarily more important than any other cause of the job loss, TAA benefits can be provided. That is not a tight nexus.

As a result, many workers are eligible for TAA benefits even if their job loss was not caused by trade. My amendment requires that trade would have to be a "substantial cause" of job loss for TAA benefits to be available. This standard was established by President Reagan when he constrained spending on TAA.

By returning to the stricter TAA standard, this amendment puts reasonable constraints on the program to stop it from expanding into another out-of-control spending program.

I ask my colleagues to help the American taxpayers and constrain TAA spending by supporting this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Hatch amendment. In a time of surging Chinese imports, high unemployment, and widespread economic pain, the Hatch amendment would make it harder for workers, companies, and farmers to obtain trade adjustment assistance in order to be able to compete in the global economy. Specifically, the Hatch amendment would take Congress back to a standard for qualifying for TAA benefits that was a demonstrated failure in the early 1980s.

Chairman BAUCUS and Chairman CAMP have put together a reasonable TAA agreement. It is bipartisan. That bipartisan agreement ought to be preserved, which is why the amendment by the Senator from Utah should be rejected.

I strongly urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO).

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

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 144 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Alexander	Hatch	Moran
Ayotte	Heller	Murkowski
Blunt	Hoeven	Paul
Boozman	Hutchison	Risch
Burr	Inhofe	Roberts
Chambliss	Isakson	Rubio
Coats	Johanns	Sessions
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cochran	Kirk	Thune
Corker	Kyl	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Wicker
DeMint	McCain	
Grassley	McConnell	

NAYS—57

Akaka	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Harkin	Portman
Bingaman	Inouye	Pryor
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Boxer	Kerry	Reid
Brown (MA)	Klobuchar	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Kohl	Schumer
Cantwell	Landrieu	Shaheen
Cardin	Lautenberg	Snowe
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Collins	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Conrad	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Coons	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Webb
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Barrasso	Enzi	Rockefeller

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 40, the nays are 57.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 645

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on amendment No. 645, offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, with 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, this amendment is very simple. It eliminates one small piece of the TAA Program called TAA for Firms.

Now, why would I do this? Strictly for bipartisan reasons, to demonstrate my agreement with President Obama, who also supports the repeal of this particular piece of the TAA. In his budget submission of this year, it specifically recommended the elimination of this program. It is only $16 million a year, but it is inefficient. As the President's budget pointed out, it does not achieve its objectives as well as other programs do.

Measured against other programs, the firms that are supposedly helped actually fail at a bigger rate than other firms that are not in the program. As a result, I decided I would support one of the elements of the President's budget: to eliminate this TAA for Firms Program.

Friends, if we are serious about any kind of reform for TAA, surely we can agree upon a clearly bipartisan proposal of the President of the United States, which is supported by Republicans in the Senate. I ask for your support for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Kyl amendment. It is an antismall business amendment. There is a lot of talk around here about government getting out of the way of job creators, but let's be clear. Firms using TAA are those job creators. They are small businesses such as RBB Systems in Wooster, OH, CB Manufacturing in West Carrollton, and auto and truck suppliers in Bolivar.

In my State alone, 96 percent of companies assisted with TAA for Firms—this program that Senator KYL wants to eliminate—96 percent of those companies that were in business in 2006 are still in business.

When a job creator goes out of business because of an unfair trade deal, we know what happens. Workers lose their jobs, communities lose revenues, funds for schools are cut, funds for public services.

TAA is a lifeline not just for workers, but this program for firms, TAA for Firms, is a lifeline for small businesses and community schools and all of that which matters to our tax base and our communities.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Kyl amendment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO).

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

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 145 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Alexander	Heller	Moran
Ayotte	Hoeven	Murkowski
Blunt	Hutchison	Paul
Boozman	Inhofe	Portman
Burr	Isakson	Risch
Chambliss	Johanns	Roberts
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Coburn	Kirk	Sessions
Cochran	Kyl	Shelby
Corker	Lee	Thune
Cornyn	Lieberman	Toomey
Crapo	Lugar	Vitter
DeMint	McCain	Wicker
Grassley	McCaskill	
Hatch	McConnell	

NAYS—54

Akaka	Franken	Murray
Baucus	Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Hagan	Pryor
Bingaman	Harkin	Reed
Blumenthal	Inouye	Reid
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Brown (MA)	Kerry	Schumer
Brown (OH)	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kohl	Snowe
Cardin	Landrieu	Stabenow
Carper	Lautenberg	Tester
Casey	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Collins	Levin	Udall (NM)
Conrad	Manchin	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Webb
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Barrasso	Enzi	Rockefeller

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 43, the nays are 54. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader—I need about 2 minutes for the chairman and I to have a colloquy.

Mr. REID. OK. I spoke to the Republican leader a few minutes ago, and we think we are on a path to complete this most important piece of legislation in the morning. This is an agreement we had—that we would try to finish this—and we will expeditiously work toward other matters relating to trade as soon as we can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wanted to inform the majority leader, I was going to have a brief colloquy with the chairman who, I think, will be back in a few minutes.

In the meantime, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. 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. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a brief colloquy with the distinguished chairman.

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

MOLDOVA

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the original Jackson-Vanik amendment was offered to the Trade Act of 1974, and it was led in this body by the great Democratic Senator of Washington, Henry ''Scoop'' Jackson. That amendment prohibited the United States from entering into Permanent Normal Trade Relations with any country that placed restrictions on the freedom of emigration and other human rights of its people. This law was later expanded to cover countries with non-market economies. The major impact of the Jackson-Vanik restriction was that it prevented the United States from granting ''most-favored nation'' trading status to the Soviet Union, which at the time was placing awful restrictions on the ability of its Jewish citizens to emigrate and flee the persecution they experienced behind the Iron Curtain.

Jackson-Vanik applied to Moldova when it was part of the Soviet Union, and it remained in place following Moldova's independence 20 years ago. This made sense at the time, because the country continued to be ruled by communist governments, which ensured an unfortunate continuity with Moldova's Soviet past at a time when the country's neighbors were reaping the benefits of liberation.

But Mr. President, the situation in Moldova is now fundamentally changed. In August 2009, a coalition of democratic and reformist parties managed to win power in what international organizations deemed a free and fair election. For the first time in two decades, Moldova had a noncommunist government, and with it, the potential for real reform. The goal of this coalition is reflected in the name that they have given themselves: the Alliance for European Integration. Their platform is to deepen Moldova's democratic institutions, pursue free market reforms, fight corruption, and work on integrating Moldova into Euro-Atlantic institutions. This is a new generation of leaders, and they represent the great hopes of their citizens.

I visited Moldova in June. I met at length with their Prime Minister and other senior leaders, and I can tell you firsthand this government is committed to leading Moldova toward a future of political and economic freedom.

Yes, major challenges remain to the realization of this vision, but for the first time in Moldova's history as an independent nation, its current government is on the right track. They are pursuing the right goals and policies. Their intentions are good and admirable.

In the face of continued opposition from elements in Moldova that want to drag the country back to its troubled past, the current government is trying to move the country forward. They are taking on the hard challenges. When I asked how we in the United States could best support their efforts, all they asked of me—all they asked of us in Congress—is one thing: It is not additional foreign assistance. It is not more of our taxpayers' dollars, although that assistance is important too. It is the repeal of Jackson-Vanik, so Moldovans can develop their own country, grow their own economy, and deepen their own free market reforms through normal trading relations with the United States. Nothing we could do would provide greater moral and material support for Moldova's reformers.

I wish to thank Senator BAUCUS for his continued support of the people and the country of Moldova. I understand that any amendment to the legislation that is pending would be harmful to the progress of the trade agreements, and I appreciate that fact and hope the chairman can perhaps—hopefully before the end of the year—take up the repeal of Jackson-Vanik as it applies to the country of Moldova, a country that is very much in need of it.

I want to read a statement made by Vice President BIDEN during his visit to Moldova this year.

He said:

> We will work with the Congress and with your government to lift the Jackson-Vanik amendment and establish permanent trade relations. We believe that will be good for Moldova and for the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the National Council on Soviet Jewry concerning Moldova.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY,
Washington, DC, September 29, 2010.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Committee on Finance U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of NCSJ, I want to state our support for the graduation of the Republicof Moldova from the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Moldova has satisfied the requirements of the two areas central to the Amendment's intent: Jews are free to emigrate, in accordance with the Helsinki Final Act and established principles of international law; those who choose to remain in Moldova can practice Judaism and participate in Jewish culture and language without reservation.

Jewish community life has flourished since the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Synagogues, community centers and schools serve the community without government interference.

While incidents of popular anti-Semitism and intolerance still take place in Moldova, NCSJ has been working with the Moldovan government through a variety of avenues, including the OSCE, to address these issues. In January, when Prime Minister Filat met with the American Jewish community and testified before the U.S. Helsinki Commission, he committed to reforming Moldova's law on preventing and combating discrimination.

Moldova has been admitted to the WTO but still falls under the strictures of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. We hope that you will find an appropriate legislative vehicle to graduate Moldova from Jackson-Vanik.

If you or your staff have any questions, please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

MARK B. LEVIN,
Executive Director.

Mr. MCCAIN. I again thank the chairman for his consideration and for his continued support for the people of Moldova.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I very much thank my friend for bringing this up. Moldova is a country which joined the World Trade Organization in 2001, and for various reasons—basically, it is Jackson-Vanik or the relic of Jackson-Vanik—Moldova has not been granted PNTR. But Moldova has made huge, successful strides in its government, in its political and economic reforms. I am very impressed with Moldova. It is a friend to the United States.

Although we cannot deal with that issue on this bill, I want to make it very clear to my friend from Arizona that we will take up legislation this year to ensure that Moldova is granted PNTR status and becomes a full member in the world community. I make that pledge to my friend from Arizona to get that done this year.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the chairman. I know he has an incredibly heavy schedule, with the legislation before us today and other matters before the committee, but I also know he knows—and I want to assure him—when the people of Moldova hear of his commitment, this will be a happy day in Moldova. I thank the chairman.

Mr. BAUCUS. And I thank the Senator for standing for the people of Moldova.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the Senate is in consideration of trade policy this week with an extension of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. TAA is the main way we help American workers cope with the negative effects of our globalized economy. It is a crucial program in both good times and bad, and it must be renewed.

TAA helps workers who have lost jobs through no fault of their own, but rather because of increased competition from imports or because of offshoring. TAA provides workers with critical income support, job training, job search and relocation assistance, and assistance with health insurance premiums. TAA relieves some of the hardship these workers face—helping them get back on their feet and back into jobs.

Trade adjustment assistance is designed to help these workers with unique needs. Workers who qualify for TAA are mostly older workers—more than half are over age 45—and they often have a hard time getting back into the workforce. Unfortunately, we have all heard many sad stories about workers in their fifties or sixties spending years looking for new work. Many have been at their jobs for decades. They often do not have education beyond high school. For these workers especially, the job training and other services offered by TAA are a way for workers to gain new skills and enter into new and growing industries or occupations.

We have watched the middle class struggle over the last several decades. We see that incomes are stagnating, health insurance and other costs are skyrocketing, good jobs are disappearing. There are many reasons for this, but unfair trade agreements and the failure to enforce our trade laws are certainly among them. When cheaper imports come in to the U.S., American workers making competing goods or providing competing services can lose their jobs as their companies lose business. We have watched manufacturing companies and manufacturing jobs disappear, and now jobs in the service sector are being offshored as well.

So there is no question that TAA must continue. The thousands of workers who have been laid off as a result of trade are depending on us, as will the thousands more who could lose jobs in the future.

We also have to restore improvements to the program that were included in the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, but which expired earlier this year. These improvements updated TAA to respond better to our changed economy. The provisions made sure that more resources were available for workers to go back to school and get training in a new field. They also extended TAA to workers in the service sector—in addition to manufacturing workers already covered. They also ensured that the program was available to workers whose jobs have been shipped to any country, like China or India, even where the US does not have a free trade agreement.

This expansion has been very successful. More than 4 out of 10 workers—nearly 200,000—who qualified for TAA from the passage of the Recovery Act until those provisions expired earlier this year, qualified because of the Recovery Act provisions. In my State of Iowa, a third of the 4,100 workers that qualified in that time period did so under the new provisions. Some of the workers who have participated in the TAA program had worked at companies that are well known in my State: 1,100 workers from Electrolux alone were certified eligible for TAA.

My State of Iowa has suffered many layoffs as jobs have been shipped

abroad, especially in the manufacturing sector. I have received many letters from Iowans who have been able to take advantage of TAA. One person who was laid off from her factory job went back to school to become a licensed practical nurse, and she hoped to go on to become a registered nurse. Another Iowan wrote of how important the health care tax credit has been to her and her husband, who was one of 300 people laid off from his company. Another Iowan wrote about how her job was being shipped to China; she was thinking of using TAA services to go back to college.

A related program, the TAA Community College and Career Training Grants Program will be extremely beneficial to workers through the community college system in Iowa and other states. I am thankful that this program will soon move ahead, and I understand that grant recipients will be announced next week.

This grant program will provide to community colleges in every State funds they desperately need to build capacity and meet training demands for 21st century jobs. The funds will total $500 million a year for 4 years, a huge and necessary injection of funds into the community college system. The grants will enable local leaders from the education, workforce, economic development, and business communities to work together to develop and expand programs as they help workers succeed in acquiring the skills, degrees, and credentials needed for high-wage, high-skill employment while also meeting the needs of employers for skilled workers. Community colleges and their partners can use the funds to develop innovative programs or replicate evidence-based strategies.

The advanced manufacturing and health care sectors are among the largest and fastest-growing sectors in the Iowa economy, and recent projections indicate that employers in these sectors will continue to need workers with advanced skills to fill vacancies. TAA training grants support the training of these workers. Iowa Central Community College, for example, has developed an entrepreneurism and business development program to respond to regional needs. Iowa Lakes Community College has started a wind turbine program—one of the first of its kind in the country—that prepares workers for ''green-collar'' jobs and ensures that graduates have the skills that area employers need.

I am very hopeful that we will reauthorize TAA this week. When we pass this legislation, we will ensure that a wider range of workers can continue to access TAA benefits and services, and that resources are available so that workers are prepared for high-skill jobs with family-sustaining wages. We owe American workers nothing less.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following morning business, tomorrow, September 22, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 2832; that the only remaining amendments in order to the Casey-Brown-Baucus amendment and the bill be the following: Rubio amendment No. 651, Thune amendment No. 650, and Cornyn amendment No. 634; that there be up to 5 hours of debate on the Rubio, Thune, and Cornyn amendments equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with Senator CORNYN controlling 1 hour of the Republican time and with Senators RUBIO and THUNE each controlling 30 minutes of the Republican time; that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate proceed to votes in relation to the Rubio, Thune, Cornyn, and Casey amendments, in that order; that there be no amendments, points of order, or motions in order to the amendments prior to the votes other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that each amendment be subject to a 60-affirmative vote threshold; and that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote; that upon the disposition of the amendments, the bill, as amended, if amended, be read a third time; that there be up to 10 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to a vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended; that the bill be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; finally, there be no points of order or motions in order to the bill prior to the vote on passage of the bill other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

REMEMBERING KARA KENNEDY AND ELEANOR MONDALE POLING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, by sad coincidence, America lost two women this past weekend women we had watched grow from little girls into accomplished women. Kara Kennedy and Eleanor Mondale Poling were both members of this Senate family.

Kara was the daughter of Senator Edward Kennedy and his wife Joan. Eleanor was the daughter of former Senator and former Vice President Walter Mondale and his wife Joan. Both women fought brave, against-the-odds battles against cancer in recent years.

Ted and Joan Kennedy named their first-born Kara, a name that means ''dear little one'' in the old Irish language—and that is what she always was to her parents. Like the rest of her famous family, Kara was committed to helping those less fortunate than herself. After graduating from Tufts University, she worked as a filmmaker and was active in a number of causes.

In 2002, she was diagnosed with lung cancer. Her doctors gave her 1 year to live. But Kara and her family refused to give up. She underwent surgery, chemotherapy and radiation treatment. Her father accompanied her to her chemotherapy treatments.

It seemed that Kara had beaten cancer. But Friday night, she collapsed after her usual workout at the gym. Her brother, former Congressman Patrick Kennedy, said that cancer surgery and years of grueling chemotherapy and radiation treatment had taken a devastating toll on his sister's strength and her heart simply gave out.

In addition to her mother Joan and stepmother Vickie, Kara leaves behind three brothers and a sister, a multitude of cousins and nieces and nephews, and her two beloved children, Max, 14, and Grace, who turned 17 yesterday.

Eleanor Mondale Poling was just 4 years old when her father was appointed to fill the Senate seat vacated by Hubert Humphrey, who had just become Vice President of the United States. Like Kara Kennedy, she grew up in this Senate and in the public eye. She was 17 when her father became Vice President of the United States.

As a young woman, Eleanor Mondale made her own career in broadcasting, beginning with a job as a radio D.J. in Chicago. She would go on to work for a number of TV organizations. In 2005, Eleanor Mondale married Chan Poling. The couple lived on a farm in Prior Lake, MN, surrounded by animals, which Eleanor loved.

That same year, 2005, Eleanor was diagnosed with an aggressive form of brain cancer. The next 6 years would bring multiple surgeries, chemotherapy and radiation, and at least twice apparent remissions. But the cancer came back in 2009. Eleanor Mondale Poling died at home on her farm early Saturday.

In addition to her parents, Eleanor leaves her two brothers, Ted Mondale, a former Minnesota State senator, and William Mondale, the former assistant attorney general of Minnesota.

REMEMBERING HARRY ''BUS'' YOURELL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend and a great Illinois public servant—Harry ''Bus'' Yourell, who passed away September 19, 2011, at the age of 92. Bus

grew up on Chicago's South Side and was married to his wife Millie for 66 years.

Bus served nine terms in the Illinois House, was Cook County recorder of deeds in the 1980s, and served 18 years as a commissioner of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. In fact, Bus ran in 40 elections over the years, without ever losing one. But his public service goes much deeper than that.

Bus enlisted in the Marines on the day Pearl Harbor was attacked and served 4 years in the South Pacific, fighting in Guadalcanal, Bougainville, Guam, and Iwo Jima. He was awarded the Bronze Star and three Purple Hearts.

Bus loved public service, but he enjoyed travelling and meeting people just as much. He enjoyed life. Bus hitchhiked through Vietnam, rode 250 miles on top of a box car in Ecuador, took a trip up the Amazon River in a dugout canoe in his seventies, and in his eighties bungee jumped in New Zealand.

He was a one of a kind person and a tremendous asset to the Chicago community. I extend condolences to his wife Millie, his three children and many grandchildren and great-grandchildren, as well as the many friends and admirers who will miss him.

BUDGETARY ADJUSTMENTS

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I previously filed committee allocations and budgetary aggregates pursuant to section 106 of the Budget Control Act of 2011. Today, I am adjusting some of those levels, specifically the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2012 and the budgetary aggregates for fiscal year 2012.

Section 101 of the Budget Control Act allows for various adjustments to the statutory limits on discretionary spending, while section 106(d) allows the chairman of the Budget Committee to make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. The Committee on Appropriations reported three bills last week that are eligible for adjustments under the Budget Control Act. Consequently, I am making adjustments to the 2012 allocation to the Committee on Appropriations and to the 2012 aggregates for spending by a total of $117.885 billion in budget authority and $59.677 billion in outlays. Those adjustments reflect the sum of $302 million in budget authority and $136 million in outlays for funding designated for disaster relief and $117.583 billion in budget authority and $59.541 billion in outlays for funding designated as being for overseas contingency operations.

I ask unanimous consent that the following tables detailing the changes to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations and the budgetary aggregates be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—PURSUANT TO SECTION 106(b)(1)(C) OF THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011 AND SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

[In millions of dollars]

	2011	2012
Current Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,070,885	2,853,989
Outlays	3,161,974	2,982,421
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority	0	117,885
Outlays	0	59,677
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,070,885	2,971,874
Outlays	3,161,974	3,042,098

FURTHER REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 106 OF THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011 AND SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

[In millions of dollars]

	Current allocation limit	Adjustment	Revised allocation/limit
Fiscal Year 2011:			
General Purpose Discretionary Budget Authority	1,211,141	0	1,211,141
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	1,391,055	0	1,391,055
Fiscal Year 2012:			
Security Discretionary Budget Authority	688,458	117,583	806,041
Nonsecurity Discretionary Budget Authority	360,311	302	360,613
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	1,263,157	59,677	1,322,834

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2012 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 106 OF THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

[In billions of dollars]

	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Overseas Contingency Operations	Total
Commerce, Justice, Science:				
Budget Authority	0.135	0.000	0.000	0.135
Outlays	0.007	0.000	0.000	0.007
Defense:				
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	117.583	117.583
Outlays	0.000	0.000	59.541	59.541
Financial Services and General Government:				
Budget Authority	0.167	0.000	0.000	0.167
Outlays	0.129	0.000	0.000	0.129
Total:				
Budget Authority	0.302	0.000	117.583	117.885
Outlays	0.136	0.000	59.541	59.677
Memorandum 1—Breakdown of Above Adjustments by Category:				
Security Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	117.583	117.583
Nonsecurity Budget Authority	0.302	0.000	0.000	0.302
General Purpose Outlays	0.136	0.000	59.541	59.677
Memorandum 2—Cumulative Adjustments (Includes Previously Filed Adjustments):				
Budget Authority	5.813	0.000	117.841	123.654
Outlays	1.094	−0.007	59.747	60.834

TRIBUTE TO SYDNEY LEA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier this month, Vermont's Governor Peter Shumlin appointed Sydney Lea to serve as Vermont's new Poet Laureate. This honor has been bestowed to Vermonters whose poetry manifests a high degree of excellence since Governor Kunin reestablished the position of Poet Laureate in 1988. Sydney Lea is certainly deserving of this honor.

A resident of Newbury, VT, Sydney has written a number of poetry collections including Young of the Year, Ghost Pain, Pursuit of a Wound, and The Floating Candles to name a few. His pieces have been published in the New York Times, the New Yorker, the New Republic, Sports Illustrated, and many others. In 2000, his poem, Pursuit of a Wound, was a finalist for the Pulitzer Prize for poetry. In 1998, he was a cowinner of the Poets' Prize, one of the nation's highest honors for a single collection of poems.

Sydney has taught at Dartmouth, Wesleyan, and Middlebury College as well as the University of Vermont and Yale University. He has also spent time teaching at the Franklin College in Switzerland and the National Hungarian University in Budapest. His dedication to and love for the written word has inspired hundreds of students in Vermont and around the globe. As a Central Vermont Adult Basic Education board member, he continues to see education as a lifelong process. Sydney's stories attract a wide array of audiences and come alive for Vermonters of all generations. His personal dedication to land conservation

has given him an unique ability to describe our beautiful New England landscape.

I am proud of Sydney Lea and applaud his accomplishments as a distinguished Vermonter and poet. When I called to congratulate him he was characteristically modest, but we are so proud of him, and I join all Vermonters in congratulating him on this appointment.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, September marks the start of a month-long celebration of the Hispanic community's contributions to America's exceptionalism and the strength of the common values that unite our Nation.

We celebrate a community whose accomplishments and stories remind us that the American Dream is as alive today as it has ever been.

During this same time, our Nation faces an unemployment rate of 9.1 percent, and the Hispanic community struggles with a rate over 11 percent. Now more than ever, we must fight for pro-growth policies that will allow my generation to continue the great tradition of leaving our children a stronger and more prosperous America than the one we inherited from our parents.

Hispanic Heritage Month is a time to celebrate the American dream. We celebrate people like my parents, who came from Cuba, worked hard and opened doors for their children that were closed to them. We celebrate a community where the number of young adults enrolling in college has grown by 349,000 in the last year. We salute the many Hispanic men and women fighting for our freedom in our armed forces. We also remember how lucky we are to live in a country where success is not limited by the circumstances of one's birth.

I am proud to be an American of Cuban descent, and today I would like to celebrate the many Hispanic Americans whose talents, accomplishments, and cultures have strengthened America.

CONGRESS CAN LEARN FROM TOM EVANS' DAY

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following op-ed from the Wilmington News Journal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Delaware News Journal, Aug. 19, 2011]

CONGRESS CAN LEARN FROM TOM EVANS' DAY

(By Darry Carmin)

The wild, turbulent, white-knuckle political ride of the summer of 2011 appears to have caught Americans with their seatbelts unfastened. Many of us seem to have been totally unprepared for the economic uncertainty, largely precipitated by Washington political gridlock and the inability of Congress to get the nation's financial house in order.

As a result, there are a lot of angry people out here. And, as to be expected, our rage is directed at those perceived as the perpetrators of the mess in which we find ourselves, i.e., Congress and the White House.

A recent Washington Post survey indicates that 80 percent of Americans are dissatisfied with how the political system functions, up from 60 percent in November 2009. There appears to be plenty of blame to spread around: 28 percent of those surveyed cited President Obama as making things worse, while 35 percent pointed finger at congressional Republicans.

What this suggests is that, regardless of how disgusted they are about the $14 trillion debt or how outraged they are at the intransigence of the tea party, most Americans crave government that can address the nation's problems and achieve some sort of solution, no matter how imperfect.

Not too long ago, things were different in Washington. I was privileged to have had a front row seat in a Congress that did get things done. From 1977–1983, I worked on the personal staff of Delaware Congressman Tom Evans. Tom quickly became something of a master at bringing together members with widely divergent politics to accomplish something important to the nation. I was amazed to see liberals join with conservative forerunners of the tea party to support legislation I suspected they would never have supported without Tom serving as a catalyst.

Among several of Tom's key legislative victories were passage of the first Chrysler loan guarantee assistance bill in 1979 and the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, co-authored with Sen. John Chaffee.

The Chrysler bill appeared dead on arrival with House Republicans in 1979. But Evans, essentially acting as the Republican floor manager of the measure, persuaded enough conservatives and moderates to go along with President Jimmy Carter's administration and pass the legislation.

The legislation proved to be highly successful. The automaker continued operations, paid off the loans that had been guaranteed by U.S. taxpayers, and repaid $350 million to the U.S. Treasury, rewarding taxpayers for the risk that was taken.

Another direct benefit for Delawareans was that the Newark assembly plant remained open for 28 years.

The Coastal Barrier Resources Act stopped federal subsidies and assistance for the development of fragile coastal barrier areas. The act was initially opposed by both Democratic and Republican members of Congress, reflecting the opposition of major land developers. But again, Tom persuaded enough House members to vote for the measure, which, since its passage, has been estimated to save U.S. taxpayers several billions while preserving priceless natural resources.

Recently, I asked Tom what made the Congresses in which he served so much different than the Congress of today that took Americans to the precipice of national default.

He mentioned three factors:

A willingness of individual members to put the needs of the nation above their own personal ideologies.

The ability of those members to respect different philosophies, leading to productive dialogue.

A firmly held belief that Congress was elected to address the nation's problems with action rather than intransigence.

The first phase of the debt ceiling debate is now over and the nation's attention is shifting towards the 12-member supercommittee charged with the enormous task of finding $1.5 trillion in debt reduction.

I hope this panel's deliberations will be substantially different than what we saw in Congress last month, when it frequently appeared that a parliamentary brawl was about to break out on the U.S. House floor.

It would be great to see the dialogue between the six Republicans and six Democrats guided by the kind of principles that I've mentioned.

Not only would a respectful and productive dialogue between the parties do much to quell the nation's and financial markets' fears about the ability of the political system to see us through this current crisis, there's another more paradoxical outcome that might well result.

What I learned from my time with Tom Evans is that by treating your colleagues with respect, grace, and dignity, you often achieve much greater results than with the ideologically pure, winner-take-all approach that pervades so much of Congress today. There is much to be learned from the recent past.

ANGELS IN ADOPTION

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, as a member of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute, I have the honor and privilege each year to recognize a West Virginia family for efforts to promote adoption. This is an exceptional program that highlights how policies and programs can change a child's life. In 1997, I worked on the bipartisan Adoption and Safe Families Act which sought to increase adoptions and improve foster care. Much work remains, but real progress has been made in encouraging adoptions.

While policy can help, the real angels are the families who open their hearts and homes to vulnerable children. There are many wonderful stories but in 2011 I have nominated Nick and Jorun Picciano as Angels in Adoption.

These caring parents already have teenage children, and they have incredibly hectic, fulfilling lives as paramedics. But they noticed that some of the children they met on the job were victims of abuse or neglect. As paramedics, they sadly saw a parent who was more interested in returning to a party than taking care of her burned child. According to their story, this was a turning point for them. They sought information about foster parenting, and they worked to find a program that would accommodate their challenging schedules.

Nick and Jorun were approved and welcomed a toddler into their home in 2009. They honestly admitted it had been a long time since they had cared for such a young child, and he already had challenging problems of nightmares, being separated from his siblings, and recovering from contact with his biological parents. This 3-year-old had already been placed in four different homes. But kindness, patience and love make a huge difference.

In 2011, after his parents decided to voluntarily relinquish their parental rights, the Picciano family was able to adopt their son, Joshua Nicholas Picciano. Joshua joins his older siblings, Jacob Hively who is 16, Michaela Hively who is 14, Jacynda Hively who is 13, and Lucia Picciano who is 13. And

this extraordinary family continues to welcome vulnerable children including two foster girls, ages 7 and 9, into their hearts and home. This is a special family, and they deserve our admiration.

I believe their willingness to see the tragedy of abuse and neglect in their challenging work as paramedics and their decision to make a personal difference by opening their own home and family to vulnerable children is a remarkable, inspiring story that has earned them the distinction of Angels in Adoption.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION ACT

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss my strong support for the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act that the Finance Committee approved yesterday. This is an important bipartisan and bicameral bill that deserves to pass and become law. I am proud to be a cosponsor and I congratulate Chairman BAUCUS and Ranking Member HATCH for their leadership on the important issue of adoption and prevention services for vulnerable children.

Over the years, I have been proud of the Finance Committee's bipartisan work to encourage adoption and improve child welfare services for our most vulnerable children, those who are at risk of abuse and neglect in their own homes. It is inspiring to know that, even now, members can come together to work on such critical issues. Bipartisan bills like this one may not attract headlines, but the policies and programs can change the lives of children and families.

This package continues previous investments in children and families, and it makes improvements on what lessons have been learned over the past 5 years. I am proud that the legislation continues to invest in the court improvement program that is making such a difference in West Virginia, and the country. Our judges are an essential partnership in the child welfare system because they decide when a child can return home safely or if adoption is the better permanency plan for a child. It is a difficult decision to make. Judges deserve specialized training in child development and trauma to help in their decision because this is not always provided at law school, but it is a critical factor in such cases. I am proud of our State training on trauma. The bill also continues the competitive grant program to combat substance abuse and to evaluate the grants so we make wise investments in the future. The bill invests in caseworker visits because such visits are the basics of good practice and essential for child safety and care.

As a former Governor, I support providing waiver authority for states to continue to try innovative programs. Under previous waivers, it became clear that kinship care was a good option for many children in the foster care system. I hope that our States will be creative in using this new opportunity to provide guidance for additional child welfare reform that is truly needed.

RECOGNIZING OHIO'S GLENN RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the men and women of NASA Glenn Research Center in my home State of Ohio for their achievements in the design, build, and test of the new space environmental test capability for the Space Power Facility at Plum Brook Station. These new capabilities will advance the human exploration of space, ensure the safety of our astronauts, drive scientific advances and technology development, and enrich the lives of all people and inspire our next generation of explorers throughout the United States and the world.

Seventy years ago, during World War II, the United States sought sites for ordnance facilities to help defeat totalitarianism. In quiet Erie County, OH, between major highways and acres of farmland, the Army Corps of Engineers created Plum Brook, a facility that would first be home to a munitions factory, and for the last 50 years, Plum Brook Station has continued to serve our Nation as a one-of-a kind facility that has ensured the success of our Nation's space program.

Throughout its history, Plum Brook remained vital to our Nation's security and our Nation's exploration of space. The National Advisory Council for Aeronautics, NACA, the predecessor to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, built a facility to test the nuclear power sources for airplanes and spacecraft that would be designed at Lewis Field—later to be NASA Glenn Research Center—in Cleveland, OH.

When President John F. Kennedy announced that the United States would push the boundaries of science and innovation to explore the heavens, Plum Brook Station became a world-class test site for the new spacecraft. A thermal vacuum chamber, called the Space Power Facility, was built to simulate the harsh space environment. At 100 feet wide and 122 feet high, it remains the largest thermal vacuum chamber in the world.

In 2007, as NASA began to develop a new path for human space exploration, the men and women of NASA Glenn at Lewis Field and Plum Brook Station rose to the challenge to develop a test capability that would push the boundaries of spacecraft testing. The new spacecraft will continue the United States' legacy of carrying American pioneers beyond Earth's orbit, but will experience launch and space environments that never before have been experienced. The Space Environmental Test Facility will allow NASA to test its new spacecraft to these new extremes—ensuring the safety of our Nation's astronauts and the success of our space exploration mission.

To keep our crews safe, the test capabilities of Plum Brook Station were expanded beyond that of the largest thermal vacuum chamber in the world. These include: a state-of-the-art sine-vibration table that has the largest capacity for payload size and weight in the world, the largest electromagnetic reverberant chamber in the world, and the most powerful acoustic facility in the world capable of simulating launch environments for developmental spacecraft. This facility is now the crown jewel of NASA's test capabilities.

I have had the privilege to meet many of the scientists, engineers, and technicians who made this achievement possible. They are dedicated and compassionate, and guided by the scientific patriotism that displays a Nation's pursuit in understanding the world in which we all live.

These pioneers of NASA Glenn will continue to push the boundaries of spaceflight—fueling technology advancements and inspiring our children to follow in the footsteps of great Ohioans like Neil Armstrong and John Glenn. The scientists and engineers of NASA Glenn will ensure the success of the next generation of pioneers.

Our Nation is defined by the spirit of discovery, the pioneers who pushed westward on land, navigated the oceans, and are now sending humankind into what was once a mere vision seen only through Galileo's eye. We are a nation of pioneers. And we all have a responsibility to safeguard that defining American spirit and to inspire a new generation of American explorers.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING ERNEST HOUSE, SR.

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, today I honor the life and memory of a prominent tribal leader and dedicated public servant in my home State of Colorado. The Honorable Ernest House Sr. served more than 30 years in tribal leadership, including four terms as tribal chairman of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe in southwest Colorado. He was first elected to the Ute Mountain Ute Tribal Council in 1979 and elected chairman in 1982. Throughout his long tenure as a tribal council member and chairman, he actively and effectively worked for the betterment of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe.

Mr. House Sr. was an unassuming, yet forceful leader on many issues important to the people of his tribe, including natural resources development, law enforcement and support for tribal business enterprises. His leadership on water issues helped to complete the critical Dolores and Animas-La Plata water projects in southwest Colorado that benefited not only his tribe, but also the entire region. He was a strong

advocate for keeping the Ute Mountain Tribal Park in pristine and undeveloped condition.

As the grandson of Chief Jack House, the last traditional chief of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Ernest House Sr. was raised from a young age to be a leader of his tribe. And he proved himself equal to the task. In his years of leadership, he was widely respected for his ability to bring people together and get results for his tribe and the greater Four Corners community. Ernest House Sr. worked his entire life to move his tribe forward while still maintaining its traditional tribal identity and heritage. He urged young Native people to be proud of their tribal heritage.

Mr. House Sr. also served his country in the Army National Guard, the Signal Corps, and the Special Forces.

I ask you to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Mr. Ernest House Sr., a visionary leader who was dedicated to serving his tribe, his community, Indian country, the State of Colorado, and our country. My thoughts and prayers are with his family and the entire Ute Mountain Ute Tribe at this time of loss.●

LITTLE ROCK 2011 RODEO TEAMS

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the 314th Airlift Wing Air Mobility RODEO 2011 members who were awarded for excellence in their field at the Air Mobility Command RODEO 2011 at McChord Air Field.

In addition to winning the Moore Trophy for Best Air Mobility Wing, the team was recognized as the Best Airdrop Wing and maintainers and flyers also earned top honors for their maintenance skills, earning the Maintenance Skills Competition Award—C–130 maintenance and the Maintenance Skills Competition Award—overall winner. The C–130E team snagged the Best Overall Maintenance Team award, Best Team Overall—Maintenance and Operations—Best Overall Aircrew Team.

This outstanding crew, led by COL Mark Czelusta, excelled during the international air rodeo competition which draws the ''Best of the Best'' from air forces around the world. More than 40 teams and 2,500 people from the U.S. Air Force, Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard, and selected foreign countries participated in this competition.

The group put in hours of hard work and deservedly earned these awards. In true Arkansas spirit of teamwork COL Czelusta acknowledges this couldnt have been done without the help of the 19th Airlift Wing and the community.

The 19th Airlift Wing also took home accolades. Members of the team were recognized as the Best C–130 Airdrop Aircrew.

What is even more amazing is that these crews accomplished this after having a major destruction to the Little Rock Air Force base in late April when a tornado damaged three C–130 planes and blew roofs off and damaged buildings in the base's flight line area.

I am proud to represent the 314th Airlift Wing Air Mobility RODEO 2011 team and the 19th Airlift Wing for all of their accomplishments. We are grateful for their service and thank them for their dedication to success and the sacrifice they make to protect our freedoms.●

TRIBUTE TO KEITH OLSEN

● Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, today I recognize Keith Olsen for the dedicated leadership he has provided for Nebraska agriculture.

Through his involvement in various State and national organizations, Keith has brought a renewed focus on supporting youth in agriculture. He has taken an active role in ensuring that the views of farmers and ranchers are communicated to policymakers in both Lincoln and Washington, DC.

Keith has been integral in the development of a vision for the University of Nebraska, the State's land-grant university. And, he has taken a leadership role in educating the public about modern agriculture practices.

Internationally, Keith has represented Nebraska farmers on trade missions around the world. He has promoted our food and agriculture exports in a number of countries, including Japan, Russia, Turkey, and Brazil.

Keith Olsen was born in Imperial, NE and was raised on the family farm near Venango. In high school, Keith was involved in FFA, and his children have been involved in 4–H and FFA. He served as a 4–H leader for 30 years. He graduated from Grant High School and the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, where he majored in agricultural economics.

After college, Keith returned to Perkins County to farm with his father. He married his wife Doris in 1969, and, at the age of 24, Keith and Doris took over the family farm. The Olsens have three sons—Craig, Jeff and Curtis. They are also the proud grandparents of seven. Now in its fourth generation, the Olsen farm is a no-till, dryland operation raising certified seed wheat, wheat, dry peas, and corn.

Keith has served on the Nebraska Farm Bureau Board of Directors since 1992 and was elected to the American Farm Bureau Federation Board of Directors in 2004. He was elected as first vice president of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Board in 1997 and has served as president since 2002.

Keith has been widely recognized for his support of agriculture, including youth and young farmers and ranchers. He received the 2010 Agricultural Youth Institute Award of Merit, the 2011 Nebraska FFA Honorary State FFA degree, and in 2004, he was elected to the Nebraska Hall of Agriculture Achievement.

As great of an ambassador as Keith has been for Nebraska agriculture, he is an even better man. His principled approach coupled with his kindness and compassion for others has earned him the respect of many—including me. I congratulate Keith on completing a very successful tenure as Nebraska Farm Bureau president and wish him and his family the very best.●

TRIBUTE TO RICH WILSON

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, just a few days ago I received a special gift from a consummate mariner, Rich Wilson of Marblehead, MA, the skipper of the *Great American III*. The gift was a U.S. Yacht Ensign, the red, white and blue flag used to identify American licensed yachts since 1848. What made this particular Ensign so special is that Rich flew it aboard the *Great American III* on December 10, 2008, in the solo, nonstop, around-the-world sailing race known as the Vendee Globe.

Rich flew the Ensign on his 31st day at sea from France, just as he was entering the Indian Ocean bound for Cape Horn. Ninety days later, Rich and the 60-foot *Great American III* completed their 28,000-mile global trek from France to France, ninth among the 11 finishers of a race that began with 30 boats. Rich was the only American entry, the oldest skipper in the fleet at 58 years of age, and only the second American ever to finish the Vendee Globe in its six quadrennial runnings.

The Vendee Globe is widely regarded as the Mount Everest of the seas. But, in fact, it is even a greater challenge than climbing Mount Everest. Consider the fact that while 3,000 people have climbed Mount Everest, Rich was only the 46th person ever to sail alone around the world nonstop. Consider, too, the fact that some 500 astronauts have flown in space, and that further underscores just how rare and special Rich's accomplishment in the Vendee Globe truly is.

The Vendee Globe is like no other event on this earth. It is a grueling contest largely unsullied by hype and commerce, a competition of men and women against each other but mostly against the ceaselessly moving sea, sometimes playful, sometimes terrifying, an immense power inspiring admiration, caution and, above all, respect.

But in the hands of Rich Wilson, the Vendee Globe also became a learning experience for students and newspaper readers throughout the world. As with his earlier long-distance ocean voyages, Rich shared his Vendee Globe experience through the online company he founded, www.sitesalive.com, a nonprofit that has produced 75 live, interactive, full-semester programs linking K–12 classrooms to adventures and expeditions worldwide. During the 2008–2009 Vendee Globe, sitesalive.com shared Rich's 15-part weekly series, written at sea from the *Great American*, with 250,000 students and 7 million readers.

Rich's goal was to excite students and engage students by connecting

them to a live ocean expedition. As Rich explains it the reasoning behind sitesalive.com: ''Excite a kid with dolphins, flying fish, and gales at sea, or with snakes, bugs, and bats in the rainforest, and they will pay attention, not knowing what will happen next. Then the science, geography, and math flow freely.''

Anyone who enjoyed high seas adventure novels like Moby-Dick and Treasure Island or anyone who marveled at National Geographic expeditions or the adventures of Jacques Cousteau on the *Calypso* can understand how Rich is making the world come alive for students. And anyone who has sailed, even within sight of the shore, or who has run a marathon or has hiked a mountain range can appreciate the skill, conditioning, and discipline it took for Rich to complete Vendee Globe.

I thank Rich for the Ensign, the memento from his great adventure, and I congratulate him, not only for completing his great voyage but also for sharing it online with millions of people around the world. And as he considers whether to enter the Vendee Globe again in 2012, I urge him to once again climb aboard the *Great American III* and set sail.●

RECOGNIZING PRESENTATION COLLEGE

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Presentation College in Aberdeen, SD, as it celebrates its 60th anniversary on September 23 and 24.

Presentation College is an independent Catholic educational institution that has been sponsored by the Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary since 1951. The school, which is located on a scenic 100-acre campus in northern Aberdeen, originally started with female-only nursing and health sciences programs. In 1968, the institution became co-educational. Presentation College encourages its students to develop an understanding of life at all stages. The Christian environment of the school focuses on the principles and teachings of the church, while welcoming students from all faiths.

This small but proud school is also a division III member of NCAA athletics, and 2011 is an exciting year for the school as it marks the inaugural season for the first football team in the school's history. In both its athletic programs as well as with the general student population, Presentation College places a strong emphasis on developing their students into capable, active leaders who have the ability to affect positive change throughout the world.

Presentation College has experienced a number of changes over the years. From its inception as a nursing school to the community force it has become today, the school has built an impressive reputation over the last 60 years. As it celebrates this landmark event, I commend Presentation College on its commitment to improving the community of Aberdeen, providing academic excellence to students across the country, and standing as a pillar for the State of South Dakota.●

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO COMMIT, THREATEN TO COMMIT, OR SUPPORT TERRORISM THAT WAS ESTABLISHED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13224 ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2001—PM 23

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice, stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2011.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism, and maintain in force the comprehensive sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 21, 2011*.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:07 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1852. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

H.R. 2005. An act to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006.

H.R. 2189. An act to encourage States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding the deaths of individuals in the custody of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2646. An act to authorize certain Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility projects and leases, to extend certain expiring provisions of law, and to modify certain authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2944. An act to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2189. An act to encourage States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding the deaths of individuals in the custody of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1852. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

H.R. 2005. An act to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006.

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–3314. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Chlorantraniliprole; Pesticide Tolerances; Correction'' (FRL No. 8888–3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3315. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fluazifop-P-butyl; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 8889–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3316. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Biomass Crop Assistance Program; Corrections'' (RIN0560–AI13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3317. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military

Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 11–086, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3318. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 11–062, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3319. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Vern M. Findley II, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3320. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Duncan J. McNabb, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3321. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a proposed change to the Fiscal Year 2011 National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation (NGREA) procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3322. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a proposed change to the Fiscal Year 2011 National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation (NGREA) procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3323. A communication from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on Implementation of Army Directive on Army National Cemeteries Program''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3324. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Video Description: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010'' (MB Docket No. 11–43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3325. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schools and Libraries Universal Services Support Mechanism'' ((RIN3060–AF85) (CC Docket No. 02–6)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3326. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Certain External Power Supplies'' (RIN1904–AB57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3327. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Refrigerators, Refrigerator-Freezers, and Freezers'' (RIN1904–AB79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3328. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia; 2002 Base Year Emission Inventory, Reasonable Further Progress Plan, Contingency Measures, Reasonably Available Control Measures, and Transportation Conformity Budgets for the Washington, DC 1997 8-Hour Moderate Ozone Nonattainment Area'' (FRL No. 9466–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3329. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; North Carolina: Clean Smokestacks Act'' (FRL No. 9471–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3330. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Requirements for Preconstruction Review, Prevention of Significant Deterioration'' (FRL No. 9466–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3331. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interim Final Determination to Stay and Defer Sanctions, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District'' (FRL No. 9471–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3332. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, and Placer County Air Pollution Control District'' (FRL No. 9468–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3333. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases: Changes to Provisions for Electronics Manufacturing (Subpart I) to Provide Flexibility'' (FRL No. 9469–3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3334. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases: Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Revisions to Best Available Monitoring Method Provisions'' (FRL No. 9469–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3335. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Redesignation of the Indianapolis Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard for Fine Particulate Matter'' (FRL No. 9469–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON SEPTEMBER 20, 2011

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INOUYE, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ''Revised Allocation to Subcommittee of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2012'' (Rept. No. 112–81).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KERRY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1280. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, the development of sexual assault protocol and guidelines, the establishment of victims advocates, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 112–82).

By Mrs. MURRAY, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1596. An original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 112–83).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Ashton B. Carter, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Air Force nomination of Col. Timothy J. Leahy, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Capt. Rebecca J. McCormick-Boyle, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Raquel C. Bono, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Jan-Marc Jouas, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Patricia D. Horoho, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Douglas J. Venlet, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) David C. Johnson, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Donald E. Gaddis, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Barry L. Bruner and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Robert L. Thomas, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 9, 2011.

Navy nomination of Capt. Mark R. Whitney, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Cindy L. Jaynes, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Judith A. Fedder, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Michael T. Flynn, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Scott M. Hanson, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Clyde D. Moore II, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Cecil E. D. Haney, to be Admiral.

Army nomination of Col. Robert F. Thomas, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Allyson R. Solomon, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Gary W. Keefe, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Colonel Frederik G. Hartwig and ending with Colonel Kenneth W. Wisian, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 2, 2011.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brigadier General Joseph G. Balskus and ending with Brigadier General Catherine S. Lutz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 6, 2011.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. James L. Terry, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. William T. Grisoli, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Margaret W. Boor, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Raphael G. Peart, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Terry M. Haston, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Michael S. Rogers, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Frank C. Pandolfe, to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nominations beginning with Colonel Randall R. Ball and ending with Colonel Dean L. Winslow, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2011. (minus 1 nominee: Colonel Edward E. Metzgar)

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Raymond V. Mason, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Terry A. Wolff, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with David B. Barker and ending with Angela M. Yuhas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Air Force nominations beginning with Mark W. Duff and ending with Bryan A. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 6, 2011.

Air Force nominations beginning with Chad J. Carda and ending with Barry J. Van Sickle, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 6, 2011.

Air Force nomination of Christopher J. Oleksa, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Arthur L. Bouck, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Tamala L. Gulley, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Michael H. Heuer, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Larry W. Dotson and ending with Damian K. Waddell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 2, 2011.

Army nomination of Jack M. Markusfeld, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Stephen R. Taylor, to be Major.

Army nomination of Hal D. Baird, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of James E. Orr, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Steven A. Chambers and ending with James P. Waldron, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Susan M. Camoroda and ending with Gerson S. Valles, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2011.

Army nomination of Hyun S. Sim, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Olga Betancourt, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael C. Freidl, to be Major.

Army nomination of Natacha L. Miller, to be Major.

Army nomination of Benjamin D. Owen, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Heidi J. Cox and ending with Mark A. Rich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Colin A. Bitterfield and ending with Andreas W. Wooten, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Richard J. Allinger and ending with Margaret A. Youngblood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Brian R. Benjamin and ending with Mark D. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Terese B. Acocella and ending with Gary L. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Michael D. Alperin and ending with David S. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Clayton T. Abe and ending with Terrence A. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with George V. Hankewycz and ending with Henry K. Thomas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with John F. Bowley and ending with Maureen E. Weber, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Army nomination of Kelly A. Cricks, to be Major.

Army nomination of Damian G. McCabe, to be Major.

Army nomination of John R. Pendergrass, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Robert D. Black and ending with Trudy A. Salerno, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with James A. Christensen and ending with Kathleen A. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Matthew J. Conde and ending with Victor M. Palomares, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Lee A. Adams and ending with Mark A. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Kathie S. Clark and ending with Nancy L. Mclaughlin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Lynn R. Gaylord and ending with Vicki L. Nolin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Nathan W. Black and ending with Troy G. Danderson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2011.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Paul M. Aboud and ending with Richard M. Zjawin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 3, 2011.

Marine Corps nomination of John L. Hyatt, Jr., to be Major.

Navy nomination of Paul E. Schoenbucher, Jr., to be Captain.

Navy nomination of John N. Desverreaux, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of David D. Dinkins, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Kevin J. Oliver, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael Fortunato and ending with Matthew T. Wellock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Joseph H. Adams II and ending with Jeremy S. Yarbrough, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Damon M. Armstrong and ending with Marisol C. Ziemba, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with James P. Alderete II and ending with Seth T. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Saad M. Alaziz and ending with Michael A. Zundel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael W. Bloomrose and ending with Christopher P. Toscano, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Hector Acevedo and ending with Jay Zulueta, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Javier Araujo and ending with Raymond C. Yau, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Thomas T. Cook and ending with Leroy C. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Adnan S. Ahsan and ending with Rebecca L. Waldram, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Fabio O. Austria, Jr. and ending with Donna L. Smoak, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 14, 2011.

By Mrs. BOXER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Kenneth J. Kopocis, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

S. 1586. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish a Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 1587. A bill to enable States to opt out of the Medicaid expansion-related provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WEBB (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. COBURN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1588. A bill to protect the right of individuals to bear arms at water resources development projects administered by the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 1589. A bill to extend the authorization for the Coastal Heritage Trail in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 1590. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to develop a new classification system for small business size determinations and to promulgate rules to eliminate the nonmanufacturer exception to small business size determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 1591. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Raoul Wallenberg, in recognition of his achievements and heroic actions during the Holocaust; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1592. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to expand eligibility for Farm Service Agency loans; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1593. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require State electronic benefit transfer contracts to treat wireless program retail food stores in the same manner as wired program retail food stores; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1594. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a conservation program under which the Secretary shall make payments to assist owners and operators of muck land to conserve and improve the soil, water, and wildlife resources of the land; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COATS, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1595. A bill to prohibit funding for the United Nations in the event the United Nations grants Palestine a change in status from a permanent observer entity before a comprehensive peace agreement has been reached with Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1596. An original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 1597. A bill to provide assistance for the modernization, renovation, and repair of elementary school and secondary school buildings in public school districts and community colleges across the United States in order to support the achievement of improved educational outcomes in those schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 1598. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prevent excessive speculation in commodity markets and excessive speculative position limits on energy contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 58

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 58, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for patient protection by establishing safe nurse staffing levels at certain Medicare providers, and for other purposes.

S. 89

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 89, a bill to repeal the imposition of withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities.

S. 102

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 102, a bill to provide an optional fast-track procedure the President may use when submitting rescission requests, and for other purposes.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 164, a bill to repeal the imposition of withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities.

S. 672

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 672, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 798

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 798, a bill to provide an amnesty period during which veterans and their family members can register certain firearms in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record, and for other purposes.

S. 996

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 996, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the new markets tax credit through 2016, and for other purposes.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) were added as cosponsors of S. 1025, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the National Guard, enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and improvement of Federal-State military coordination in domestic emergency response, and for other purposes.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1048, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to the Islamic Republic of Iran, North Korea, and Syria, and for other purposes.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr.

NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1094, a bill to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–416).

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1119, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Marine Debris Research, Prevention, and Reduction Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1214

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1214, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, regarding restrictions on the use of Department of Defense funds and facilities for abortions.

S. 1219

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1219, a bill to require Federal agencies to assess the impact of Federal action on jobs and job opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 1223

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1223, a bill to address voluntary location tracking of electronic communications devices, and for other purposes.

S. 1231

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1231, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 1251, a bill to amend title XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1273

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1273, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act with regard to certain exemptions under that Act for direct care workers and to improve the systems for the collection and reporting of data relating to the direct care workforce, and for other purposes.

S. 1299

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1299, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of Lions Clubs International.

S. 1324

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit the importation, exportation, transportation, and sale, receipt, acquisition, or purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1361, a bill to reduce human exposure to endocrine-disrupting chemicals, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1369, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 1392

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) 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. 1460

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1460, a bill to grant the congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

S. 1472

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) 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. 1477

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1477, a bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to prevent the dissemination to the public of certain information with respect to noncommercial flights of private aircraft owners and operators.

S. 1494

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1494, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act.

S. 1514

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1514, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Elouise Pepion Cobell, in recognition of her outstanding and enduring contributions to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and the Nation through her tireless pursuit of justice.

S. 1528

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1528, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to limit Federal regulation of nuisance dust in areas in which that dust is regulated under State, tribal, or local law, to establish a temporary prohibition against revising any national ambient air quality standard applicable to coarse particulate matter, and for other purposes.

S. 1535

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1535, a bill 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.

S. 1538

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors 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 Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) 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. 1578

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S.

1578, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act with respect to consumer confidence reports by community water systems.

S. 1585

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1585, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. RES. 201

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 201, a resolution expressing the regret of the Senate for the passage of discriminatory laws against the Chinese in America, including the Chinese Exclusion Act.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

S. 1586. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish a Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise today with Senator TOM UDALL to introduce the Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Act of 2011. Recently, the United States Council for International Business, which represents America's top global companies, joined with an array of leading U.S. business groups in urging ramped-up efforts to promote U.S. clean energy exports.

Global demand, particularly in rapidly-growing markets such as Brazil, China, India and Russia, will be especially critical in expanding America's clean energy technology industries and driving U.S. leadership of a 21st Century clean energy economy. According to a report by the Economic Policy Institute, the U.S. trade deficit with China in clean energy products more than doubled from 2008 to 2010 and was estimated to cost more than 8,000 U.S. jobs in 2010.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Department of Commerce International Trade Administration to establish a Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Program to ensure that United States clean energy technology firms, including clean energy technology parts suppliers and engineering and design firms, have the information and assistance they need to be competitive and create clean energy technology sector jobs in the United States.

The Commerce Department is the leading agency to promote clean energy exports for the President's newly established Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee within his National Export Initiative. Specifically, the bill requires the International Trade Administration to assist U.S. Clean Tech firms with export assistance to help them navigate foreign markets to export their goods and services abroad, enhance U.S. Clean Tech Manufacturing firms by requiring ITA to promote policies that will reduce production costs and encourage innovation, investment, and productivity in the clean energy technology sector, and to develop and implement a National Clean Energy Technology Export Strategy.

Arkansas is becoming a national leader in clean energy technology. Several companies—LM Windpower, Nordex, and Mitsubishi Power Systems—have established wind turbine manufacturing plants in Arkansas. Arkansas Power Electronics International, Inc. is a small business dedicated to developing and marketing state-of-the-art technology in power electronics systems, electronic motor drives, and power electronics packaging. BlueInGreen, a Fayetteville company, makes energy efficient products to improve and maintain water quality. Silicon Solar Solutions, an Arkansas-based startup, is commercializing its large grain polysilicon technology company. All of these companies will benefit by having a focused clean energy trade and export program established within the International Trade Administration.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 644. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 645. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, supra.

SA 646. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 647. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 648. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 649. Mr. BROWN, of Ohio (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 650. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 651. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 652. Mr. REID (for Mrs. MURRAY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 633, to prevent fraud in small business contracting, and for other purposes.

SA 653. Mr. INOUYE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 654. Mr. INOUYE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 644. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 9, line 23, insert ''but not more than 10 percent'' after ''not less than 5 percent''.

SA 645. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 221 and insert the following:

SEC. 221. REPEAL OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 233 or any other provision of this subtitle—

(1) effective October 1, 2011, chapter 3 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2341 et seq.) is repealed; and

(2) no technical assistance or grants may be provided under that chapter on or after that date.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by striking the items relating to chapter 3 of title II.

SA 646. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 45, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 234. REPEAL OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

Effective January 1, 2015—

(1) chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.) are repealed; and

(2) the table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by striking the items relating to chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of title II.

SA 647. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr.

CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 19, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 217. IMPOSITION OF FEE ON FIRMS THAT BENEFIT FROM TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than January 1, 2012, the Secretary of Labor shall establish a system to impose a fee on a fiscal year basis on firms described in subsection (b) to recoup the costs incurred by the Federal Government of providing benefits under and administering trade adjustment assistance for workers under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.).

(b) FIRMS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a firm described in this paragraph is a firm from which a group of workers is totally or partially separated on or after the date of the enactment of this Act if that group of workers is subsequently certified under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2272) as eligible to apply for trade adjustment assistance under chapter 2 of title II of that Act (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.) as a result of the workers' separation from that firm.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR FIRMS IN BANKRUPTCY.—The fee imposed under subsection (a) shall not be imposed on a firm that has filed for bankruptcy protection under title 11, United States Code.

(c) TOTAL AMOUNT OF FEE.—The Secretary of Labor shall determine the amount of fees to be imposed under subsection (a) so that the amount of fees collected equals the amount expended by the Federal Government in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the fees are imposed to provide benefits under and administer trade adjustment assistance for workers under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.).

(d) IMPOSITION OF FEE.—The Secretary of Labor shall impose the fee under subsection (a) on a firm described in subsection (b)—

(1) for each fiscal year during which any worker separated from the firm receives trade adjustment assistance under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.) or remains eligible to apply for such assistance; and

(2) based on the number of workers described in paragraph (1) separated from the firm.

(e) USE OF FEES.—Any fees collected pursuant to subsection (a) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury and used to offset the costs of providing benefits under and administering trade adjustment assistance for workers under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.).

(f) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate on the date that is one year after the date on which all expenditures by the Federal Government to provide benefits under or administer trade adjustment assistance for workers under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.) have terminated.

SA 648. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE ____—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. __01. MANDATORY DISCLOSURE BY THE UNITED STATES IF MEMBERS OF THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION FAIL TO DISCLOSE SUBSIDIES UNDER THE AGREEMENT ON SUBSIDIES AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States Trade Representative shall—

(1) review each notification of subsidies submitted under Article 25 of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures by a member of the World Trade Organization with which the United States maintains a material and persistent trade deficit;

(2) identify any such member that, for 2 consecutive years—

(A) fails to submit such a notification; or

(B) omits information or includes inaccurate information in such a notification that is material with respect to the totality of the subsidies of the member; and

(3) notify the Committee on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures under Article 25 of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures of the subsidies of a member identified under paragraph (2) not later than 180 days after—

(A) in the case of a member identified under paragraph (2)(A), the date on which the second notification not submitted by the member was required to be submitted; or

(B) in the case of a member identified under paragraph (2)(B), the date of the submission of the second notification in which the information was omitted or the inaccurate information was included, as the case may be.

(b) AGREEMENT ON SUBSIDIES AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES DEFINED.—The term ''Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures'' means the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures referred to in section 101(d)(12) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(12)).

SA 649. Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE __—FUNDAMENTALLY UNDERVALUED CURRENCY

SEC. __01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act''.

SEC. __02. CLARIFICATION REGARDING DEFINITION OF COUNTERVAILABLE SUBSIDY.

(a) BENEFIT CONFERRED.—Section 771(5)(E) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(5)(E)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting '', and''; and

(3) by inserting after clause (iv) the following new clause:

''(v) in the case in which the currency of a country in which the subject merchandise is produced is exchanged for foreign currency obtained from export transactions, and the currency of such country is a fundamentally undervalued currency, as defined in paragraph (37), the difference between the amount of the currency of such country provided and the amount of the currency of such country that would have been provided if the real effective exchange rate of the currency of such country were not undervalued, as determined pursuant to paragraph (38).''.

(b) EXPORT SUBSIDY.—Section 771(5A)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(5A)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''In the case of a subsidy relating to a fundamentally undervalued currency, the fact that the subsidy may also be provided in circumstances not involving export shall not, for that reason alone, mean that the subsidy cannot be considered contingent upon export performance.''.

(c) DEFINITION OF FUNDAMENTALLY UNDERVALUED CURRENCY.—Section 771 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(37) FUNDAMENTALLY UNDERVALUED CURRENCY.—The administering authority shall determine that the currency of a country in which the subject merchandise is produced is a 'fundamentally undervalued currency' if—

''(A) the government of the country (including any public entity within the territory of the country) engages in protracted, large-scale intervention in one or more foreign exchange markets during part or all of the 18-month period that represents the most recent 18 months for which the information required under paragraph (38) is reasonably available, but that does not include any period of time later than the final month in the period of investigation or the period of review, as applicable;

''(B) the real effective exchange rate of the currency is undervalued by at least 5 percent, on average and as calculated under paragraph (38), relative to the equilibrium real effective exchange rate for the country's currency during the 18-month period;

''(C) during the 18-month period, the country has experienced significant and persistent global current account surpluses; and

''(D) during the 18-month period, the foreign asset reserves held by the government of the country exceed—

''(i) the amount necessary to repay all debt obligations of the government falling due within the coming 12 months;

''(ii) 20 percent of the country's money supply, using standard measures of M2; and

''(iii) the value of the country's imports during the previous 4 months.''.

(d) DEFINITION OF REAL EFFECTIVE EXCHANGE RATE UNDERVALUATION.—Section 771 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677), as amended by subsection (c) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(38) REAL EFFECTIVE EXCHANGE RATE UNDERVALUATION.—The calculation of real effective exchange rate undervaluation, for purposes of paragraph (5)(E)(v) and paragraph (37), shall—

''(A)(i) rely upon, and where appropriate be the simple average of, the results yielded from application of the approaches described in the guidelines of the International Monetary Fund's Consultative Group on Exchange Rate Issues; or

''(ii) if the guidelines of the International Monetary Fund's Consultative Group on Exchange Rate Issues are not available, be based on generally accepted economic and econometric techniques and methodologies to measure the level of undervaluation;

''(B) rely upon data that are publicly available, reliable, and compiled and maintained by the International Monetary Fund or, if the International Monetary Fund cannot provide the data, by other international organizations or by national governments; and

''(C) use inflation-adjusted, trade-weighted exchange rates.''.

SEC. __03. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF TITLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States

shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the amendments made by this title.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include a description of the extent to which United States industries that have been materially injured by reason of imports of subject merchandise produced in foreign countries with fundamentally undervalued currencies have received relief under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.), as amended by this title.

SEC. __04. APPLICATION TO GOODS FROM CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act of 1993 (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by section __02 of this title shall apply to goods from Canada and Mexico.

SA 650. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE _____—ITC REPORT

SEC. ___01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Quantifying the Effects of Failure to Act on Trade Act''.

SEC. ___02. ITC REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) FAILURE TO ACT ON AGREEMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date that the President enters into a trade agreement, the International Trade Commission shall submit a report described in subsection (b) to Congress, if —

(A) legislation to implement the agreement has not been submitted to Congress;

(B) a bill to implement the agreement has not been considered by either House of Congress; or

(C) the agreement has not entered into force with respect to the United States.

(2) FOLLOW UP REPORT.—The International Trade Commission shall update the report required by paragraph (1) each year thereafter, if legislation to implement the agreement has not been submitted to Congress, a bill to implement the agreement has not been considered by either House of Congress, or the agreement has not entered into force.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall contain the following:

(1) A quantitative analysis of the impact on United States businesses and individuals caused by the delay in the implementation of the agreement. The analysis shall examine all relevant factors impacting United States businesses and individuals, including—

(A) lost market shares for United States exports in foreign markets resulting from new trade agreements implemented between the country with respect to which the trade agreement was entered into and any other country, and market shares lost for United States exports resulting from any other factor;

(B) how the delay in implementing the agreement is affecting the advancement of United States trade objectives, described in the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002 (or any subsequent trade promotion authority); and

(C) how the delay in implementing the agreement is affecting the protection of intellectual property rights of United States businesses operating in foreign markets.

(2) The impact on employment in the United States resulting from the delay in implementing the agreement.

(3) An estimate of the probable impact on United States businesses, in terms of exports, profitability, and employment, if the trade agreement does not enter into force by the end of the calendar year following the date of the Commission report

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The International Trade Commission shall submit the report required by this section with respect to—

(1) any trade agreement entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) any trade agreement entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act if such agreement has not entered into force with respect to the United States by June 30, 2012.

SA 651. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5 of the amendment, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

SEC. 212. REQUIREMENT THAT TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE WORKERS BE LAID OFF BECAUSE OF IMPORTS FROM, OR A SHIFT IN PRODUCTION TO, A COUNTRY WITH WHICH THE UNITED STATES HAS A FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IN EFFECT.

Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2272), as amended by section 211 of this Act, is further amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A group of workers shall be certified by the Secretary as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under this chapter pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 if the Secretary determines that—

''(1) a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated; and

''(2)(A)(i) the sales or production, or both, of such firm have decreased absolutely;

''(ii)(I) imports from a country with which the United States has a free trade agreement in effect of articles or services like or directly competitive with articles produced or services supplied by such firm have increased;

''(II) imports from such a country of articles like or directly competitive with articles—

''(aa) into which one or more component parts produced by such firm are directly incorporated, or

''(bb) which are produced directly using services supplied by such firm,

have increased; or

''(III) imports of articles directly incorporating one or more component parts produced in such a country that are like or directly competitive with imports of articles incorporating one or more component parts produced by such firm have increased; and

''(iii) the increase in imports described in clause (ii) contributed importantly to such workers' separation or threat of separation and to the decline in the sales or production of such firm; or

''(B)(i)(I) there has been a shift by such workers' firm to a country with which the United States has a free trade agreement in effect in the production of articles or the supply of services like or directly competitive with articles which are produced or services which are supplied by such firm; or

''(II) such workers' firm has acquired from such a country articles or services that are like or directly competitive with articles which are produced or services which are supplied by such firm; and

''(ii) the shift described in clause (i)(I) or the acquisition of articles or services described in clause (i)(II) contributed importantly to such workers' separation or threat of separation.''.

(No material received for amendment 652 at time of printing. It will be printed in the next issue of the RECORD.)

SA 653. Mr. INOUYE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE ____—PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT FOR PHILIPPINES

SEC. ___01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Save Our Industries Act of 2011'' or the ''SAVE Act''.

SEC. ___02. FINDINGS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States and the Republic of the Philippines (in this title referred to as the ''Philippines''), a former colony, share deep historical and cultural ties. The Philippines holds enduring political and security significance to the United States. The 2 countries have partnered very successfully in combating terrorism in Southeast Asia.

(2) The United States and the Philippines maintain a fair trading relationship that should be expanded to the mutual benefit of both countries. In 2010, United States exports to the Philippines were valued at $7,375,000,000, and United States imports from the Philippines were valued at $7,960,000,000.

(3) United States textile exports to the Philippines were valued at just over $48,000,000 in 2010, consisting mostly of industrial, specialty, broadwoven, and nonwoven fabrics. The potential for export growth in this area can sustain and create thousands of jobs.

(4) The Philippines' textile and apparel industries, like that of their counterparts in the United States, share the same challenges and risks stemming from the end of the textile and apparel quota system and from the end of United States safe-guards that continued to control apparel imports from the People's Republic of China until January 1, 2009.

(5) The United States apparel fabrics industry is heavily dependent on sewing outside the United States, and, for the first time, United States textile manufacturers would have a program that utilizes sewing done in an Asian country. In contrast, most sewing of United States fabric occurs in the Western Hemisphere, with about two-thirds of United States fabric exports presently going to countries that are parties to the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement. Increased demand for United States fabric in Asia will increase opportunities for the United States industry.

(6) Apparel producers in the Western Hemisphere are excellent at making basic garments such as T-shirts and standard 5-pocket jeans. However, the needle capability does not exist to make high fashion, more sophisticated garments such as embroidered T-shirts and fashion jeans with embellishments. Such apparel manufacturing is done almost exclusively in Asia.

(7) A program that provides preferential duty treatment for certain apparel articles of the Philippines will provide a strong incentive for Philippine apparel manufacturers

to use United States fabrics, which will open new opportunities for the United States textile industry and increase opportunities for United States yarn manufacturers. At the same time, the United States would be provided a more diverse range of sourcing opportunities.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are—

(1) to encourage higher levels of trade in textiles and apparel between the United States and the Philippines and enhance the commercial well-being of their respective industries in times of global economic hardship;

(2) to enhance and broaden the economic, security, and political ties between the United States and the Philippines;

(3) to stimulate economic activity and development throughout the Philippines, including regions such as Manila and Mindanao; and

(4) to provide a stepping stone to an eventual free trade agreement between the United States and the Philippines, either bilaterally or as part of a regional agreement.

SEC. ___03. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CLASSIFICATION UNDER THE HTS.—The term ''classification under the HTS'' means, with respect to an article, the 6-digit subheading or 10-digit statistical reporting number under which the article is classified in the HTS.

(2) DOBBY WOVEN FABRIC.—The term ''dobby woven fabric'' means fabric, other than jacquard fabric, woven with the use of a dobby attachment that raises or lowers the warp threads during the weaving process to create patterns including, stripes, and checks and similar designs.

(3) ENTERED.—The term ''entered'' means entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, in the customs territory of the United States.

(4) HTS.—The term ''HTS'' means the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(5) KNIT-TO-SHAPE.—An article is ''knit-to shape'' if 50 percent or more of the exterior surface area of the article is formed by major parts that have been knitted or crocheted directly to the shape used in the article, with no consideration being given to patch pockets, appliqués, or the like. Minor cutting, trimming, or sewing of those major parts shall not affect the determination of whether an article is ''knit-to-shape''.

(6) WHOLLY ASSEMBLED.—An article is ''wholly assembled'' in the Philippines or the United States if—

(A) all components of the article pre-existed in essentially the same condition as the components exist in the finished article and the components were combined to form the finished article in the Philippines or the United States; and

(B) the article is comprised of at least 2 components.

(7) WHOLLY FORMED.—A yarn is ''wholly formed in the United States'' if all of the yarn forming and finishing operations, starting with the extrusion of filaments, strips, film, or sheet, and including slitting a film or sheet into strip, or the spinning of all fibers into yarn, or both, and ending with a finished yarn or plied yarn, takes place in the United States.

SEC. ___04. TRADE BENEFITS.

(a) ELIGIBLE APPAREL ARTICLE.—For purposes of this section, an eligible apparel article is any one of the following:

(1) Men's and boys' cotton shirts, T-shirts and tank tops (other than underwear T-shirts and tank tops), pullovers, sweatshirts, tops, and similar articles classifiable under subheading 6105.10, 6105.90, 6109.10, 6110.20, 6110.90, 6112.11, or 6114.20 of the HTS.

(2) Women's and girls' cotton shirts, blouses, T-shirts and tank tops (other than underwear T-shirts and tank tops), pullovers, sweatshirts, tops, and similar articles classifiable under subheading 6106.10, 6106.90, 6109.10, 6110.20, 6110.90, 6112.11, 6114.20, or 6117.90 of the HTS.

(3) Men's and boys' cotton trousers, breeches, and shorts classifiable under subheading 6103.10, 6103.42, 6103.49, 6112.11, 6113.00, 6203.19, 6203.42, 6203.49, 6210.40, 6211.20, 6211.32 of the HTS.

(4) Women's and girls' cotton trousers, breeches, and shorts classifiable under subheading 6104.19, 6104.62, 6104.69, 6112.11, 6113.00, 6117.90, 6204.12, 6204.19, 6204.62, 6204.69, 6210.50, 6211.20, 6211.42, or 6217.90 of the HTS.

(5) Men's and boys' cotton underpants, briefs, underwear-type T-shirts and singlets, thermal undershirts, other undershirts, and similar articles classifiable under subheading 6107.11, 6109.10, 6207.11, or 6207.91 of the HTS.

(6) Men's and boys' manmade fiber underpants, briefs, underwear-type T-shirts and singlets, thermal undershirts, other undershirts, and similar articles classifiable under subheading 6107.12, 6109.90, 6207.19, or 6207.99 of the HTS.

(7) Men's and boys' manmade fiber shirts, T-shirts and tank tops (other than underwear T-shirts and tank tops), pullovers, sweatshirts, tops, and similar articles classifiable under subheading 6105.20, 6105.90, 6110.30, 6110.90, 6112.12, 6112.19, or 6114.30 of the HTS.

(8) Women's and girls' manmade fiber shirts, blouses, T-shirts and tank tops (other than underwear T-shirts and tank tops), pullovers, sweatshirts, tops, and similar articles classifiable under subheading 6106.20, 6106.90, 6110.30, 6110.90, 6112.12, 6112.19, 6114.30, or 6117.90 of the HTS.

(9) Men's and boys' manmade fiber trousers, breeches, and shorts classifiable under subheading 6103.43, 6103.49, 6112.12, 6112.19, 6112.20, 6113.00, 6203.43, 6203.49, 6210.40, 6211.20, or 6211.33 of the HTS.

(10) Women's and girls' manmade fiber trousers, breeches, and shorts classifiable under subheading 6104.63, 6104.69, 6112.12, 6112.19, 6112.20, 6113.00, 6117.90, 6204.63, 6204.69, 6210.50, 6211.20, 6211.43, or 6217.90 of the HTS.

(11) Men's and boys' manmade fiber shirts classifiable under subheading 6205.30, 6205.90, or 6211.33 of the HTS.

(12) Cotton brassieres and other body support garments classifiable under subheading 6212.10, 6212.20, or 6212.30 of the HTS.

(13) Manmade fiber brassieres and other body support garments classifiable under subheading 6212.10, 6212.20, or 6212.30 of the HTS.

(14) Manmade fiber swimwear classifiable under subheading 6112.31, 6112.41, 6211.11, or 6211.12 of the HTS.

(15) Cotton swimwear classifiable under subheading 6112.39, 6112.49, 6211.11, or 6211.12 of the HTS.

(16) Men's and boys' manmade fiber coats, overcoats, carcoats, capes, cloaks, anoraks (including ski-jackets), windbreakers, padded sleeveless jackets with attachments for sleeves, and similar articles classifiable under subheading 6101.30, 6101.90, 6112.12, 6112.19, 6112.20, or 6113.00 of the HTS.

(17) Women's and girls' manmade fiber coats, overcoats, carcoats, capes, cloaks, anoraks (including ski-jackets), windbreakers, padded sleeveless jackets with attachments for sleeves, and similar articles classifiable under subheading 6102.30, 6102.90, 6104.33, 6104.39, 6112.12, 6112.19, 6112.20, 6113.00, or 6117.90 of the HTS.

(18) Gloves, mittens, and mitts of manmade fibers classifiable under subheading 6116.10, 6116.93, 6116.99, or 6216.00 of the HTS.

(b) DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN ELIGIBLE APPAREL ARTICLES.—

(1) DUTY-FREE TREATMENT.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), an eligible apparel article shall enter the United States free of duty if the article is wholly assembled in the United States or the Philippines, or both, and if the component determining the article's classification under the HTS consists entirely of—

(A) fabric cut in the United States or the Philippines, or both, from fabric wholly formed in the United States from yarns wholly formed in the United States;

(B) components knit-to-shape in the United States from yarns wholly formed in the United States; or

(C) any combination of fabric or components knit-to-shape described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(2) DYEING, PRINTING, OR FINISHING.—An apparel article described in paragraph (1) shall be ineligible for duty-free treatment under such paragraph if any component determining the article's classification under the HTS comprises any fabric, fabric component, or component knit-to-shape in the United States that was dyed, printed, or finished at any place other than in the United States.

(3) OTHER PROCESSES.—An apparel article described in paragraph (1) shall not be disqualified from eligibility for duty-free treatment under such paragraph because it undergoes stone-washing, enzyme-washing, acid-washing, permapressing, oven baking, bleaching, garment-dyeing, screen printing, or other similar processes in either the United States or the Philippines.

(c) KNIT-TO-SHAPE APPAREL ARTICLES.—A knit-to-shape apparel article shall enter the United States free of duty if it is wholly assembled in the Philippines and if the component determining the article's classification under the HTS consists entirely of components knit-to-shape in the Philippines from yarns wholly formed in the United States.

(d) DE MINIMIS RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An article that would otherwise be ineligible for preferential treatment under this section because the article contains fibers or yarns not wholly formed in the United States or in the Philippines shall not be ineligible for such treatment if the total weight of all such fibers or yarns is not more than 10 percent of the total weight of the article.

(2) ELASTOMERIC YARNS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), an article described in subsection (b) or (c) that contains elastomeric yarns in the component of the article that determines the article's classification under the HTS shall be eligible for duty-free treatment under this section only if such elastomeric yarns are wholly formed in the United States or the Philippines.

(3) DIRECT SHIPMENT.—Any apparel article described in subsection (b) or (c) is an eligible article only if it is imported directly into the United States from the Philippines.

(e) SINGLE TRANSFORMATION RULES.—Any of the following apparel articles that are cut and wholly assembled, or knit-to-shape, in the Philippines from any combination of fabrics, fabric components, components knit-to-shape, or yarns and are imported directly into the United States from the Philippines shall enter the United States free of duty, without regard to the source of the fabric, fabric components, components knit-to-shape, or yarns from which the articles are made:

(1) Except for brassieres classified in subheading 6212.10 of the HTS, any apparel article that is of a type listed in chapter rule 3(a), 4(a), or 5(a) for chapter 62 of the HTS, as such chapter rule is contained in paragraph 9 of section A of the Annex to Proclamation 8213 of the President of December 20, 2007, (as

amended by Proclamation 8272 of June 30, 2008, or any subsequent proclamation by the President).

(2) Any article not described in paragraph (1) that is any of the following:

(A) Baby garments, clothing accessories, and headwear classifiable under subheading 6111.20, 6111.30, 6111.90, 6209.20, 6209.30, 6209.90, or 6505.90 of the HTS.

(B) Women's and girls' cotton coats, over coats, carcoats, capes, cloaks, anoraks (including ski-jackets), windbreakers, padded sleeveless jackets with attachments for sleeves, and similar articles classifiable under subheading 6102.20, 6102.90, 6104.19, 6104.32, 6104.39, 6112.11, 6113.00, 6117.90, 6202.12, 6202.19, 6202.92, 6202.99, 6204.12, 6204.19, 6204.32, 6204.39, 6210.30, 6210.50, 6211.20, 6211.42, or 6217.90 of the HTS.

(C) Cotton dresses classifiable under subheading 6104.42, 6104.49, 6204.42, or 6204.49 of the HTS.

(D) Manmade fiber dresses classifiable under subheading 6104.43, 6104.44, 6104.49, 6204.43, 6204.44, or 6204.49 of the HTS.

(E) Men's and boys' cotton shirts classifiable under statistical reporting number 6205.20.1000, 6205.20.2021, 6205.20.2026, 6205.20.2031, 6205.20.2061, 6205.20.2076, 6205.90, or 6211.32 of the HTS.

(F) Men's and boys' cotton shirts not containing dobby woven fabric classifiable under statistical reporting number 6205.20.2003, 6205.20.2016, 6205.20.2051, 6205.20.2066 of the HTS.

(G) Manmade fiber pajamas and sleepwear classifiable under subheading 6107.22, 6107.99, 6108.32, 6207.22, 6207.99, or 6208.22 of the HTS.

(H) Women's and girls' wool coats, overcoats, carcoats, capes, cloaks, anoraks (including ski-jackets), windbreakers, padded sleeveless jackets with attachments for sleeves, and similar articles classifiable under subheading 6102.10, 6102.30, 6102.90, 6104.31, 6104.33, 6104.39, 6117.90, 6202.11, 6202.13, 6202.19, 6202.91, 6202.93, 6202.99, 6204.31, 6204.33, 6204.39, 6211.20, 6211.41, or 6117.90 of the HTS.

(I) Women's and girls' wool trousers, breeches, and shorts classifiable under subheading 6104.61, 6104.63, 6104.69, 6117.90, 6204.61, 6204.63, 6204.69, 6211.20, 6211.41, or 6217.90 of the HTS.

(J) Women's and girls' cotton shirts and blouses classifiable under subheading 6206.10, 6206.30, 6206.90, 6211.42, or 6217.90 of the HTS.

(K) Women's and girls' manmade fiber shirts, blouses, shirt-blouses, sleeveless tank styles, and similar upper body garments classifiable under subheading 6206.10, 6206.40, 6206.90, 6211.43, or 6217.90 of the HTS.

(L) Women's and girls' manmade fiber coats, jackets, carcoats, capes, cloaks, anoraks (including ski-jackets), windbreakers, padded sleeveless jackets with attachments for sleeves, and similar articles classifiable under subheading 6202.13, 6202.19, 6202.93, 6202.99, 6204.33, 6204.39, 6210.30, 6210.50, 6211.20, 6211.43, or 6217.90 of the HTS.

(M) Cotton skirts classifiable under subheading 6104.19, 6104.52, 6104.59, 6204.12, 6204.19, 6204.52, or 6204.59 of the HTS.

(N) Manmade fiber skirts classifiable under subheading 6104.53, 6104.59, 6204.53, or 6204.59 of the HTS.

(O) Men's and boys' manmade fiber coats, overcoats, carcoats, capes, cloaks, anoraks (including ski-jackets), windbreakers, padded sleeveless jackets with attachments for sleeves, and similar articles classifiable under subheading 6201.13, 6201.19, 6201.93, 6201.99, 6210.20, 6210.40, 6211.20, or 6211.33 of the HTS.

(P) Women's and girls' manmade fiber slips, petticoats, briefs, panties, and underwear classifiable under subheading 6108.11, 6108.22, 6108.92, 6109.90, 6208.11, or 6208.92 of the HTS.

(Q) Gloves, mittens, and mitts of cotton classifiable under subheading 6116.10, 6116.92, 6116.99, or 6216.00 of the HTS.

(R) Other men's or boys' garments classifiable under statistical reporting number 6211.32.0081 of the HTS.

(f) REVIEW AND REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall, not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 3 years thereafter, review the effectiveness of this section in supporting the use of United States fabrics and make recommendations necessary to improve or expand the provisions of this section to ensure support for the use of United States fabrics.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—After the second review required under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall make a determination regarding whether this section is effective in supporting the use of United States fabrics and recommend to Congress whether or not this section should be renewed.

(g) ENFORCEMENT.—Preferential treatment under this section shall not be provided to textile and apparel articles that are imported from the Philippines unless the President certifies to Congress that the Philippines is meeting the following conditions:

(1) A valid original textile visa issued by the Philippines is provided to U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to any article for which preferential treatment is claimed. The visa issued is in the standard 9-digit format required under the Electronic Visa Information System (ELVIS) and meets all reporting requirements of ELVIS.

(2) The Philippines is implementing the Electronic Visa Information System (ELVIS) to assist in the prevention of transshipment of apparel articles and the use of counterfeit documents relating to the importation of apparel articles into the United States.

(3) The Philippines is enforcing the Memorandum of Understanding between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines Concerning Cooperation in Trade in Textile and Apparel Goods, signed on August 23, 2006.

(4) The Philippines agrees to provide, on a timely basis at the request of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and consistently with the manner in which the records are kept in the Philippines, a report on exports from the Philippines of apparel articles eligible for preferential treatment under this section, and on imports into the Philippines of yarns, fabrics, fabric components, or components knit-to-shape that are wholly formed in the United States.

(5) The Philippines agrees to cooperate fully with the United States to address and take action necessary to prevent circumvention as provided in Article 5 of the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing referred to in section 101(d)(4) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(4)).

(6) The Philippines agrees to require Philippines producers and exporters of articles eligible for preferential treatment under this section to maintain, for at least 5 years after the date of export, complete records of the production and the export of such articles, including records of yarns, fabrics, fabric components, and components knit-to-shape and used in the production of such articles.

(7) The Philippines agrees to provide, on a timely basis, at the request of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, documentation establishing the country of origin of articles eligible for preferential treatment under this section, as used by that country in implementing an effective visa system.

(8) The Philippines is to establish, within 60 days after the date of the President's certification under this paragraph, procedures that allow the Office of Textiles and Apparel of the Department of Commerce (OTEXA) to obtain information when fabric wholly formed in the United States is exported to the Philippines to allow for monitoring and verification before the imports of apparel articles containing the fabric for which preferential treatment is sought under this section reach the United States. The information provided upon export of the fabrics shall include, among other things, the name of the importer of the fabric in the Philippines, the 8-digit HTS subheading covering the apparel articles to be made from the fabric, and the quantity of the apparel articles to be made from the fabric for importation into the United States.

(9) The Philippines has enacted legislation or promulgated regulations to allow for the seizure of merchandise physically transiting the territory of the Philippines and that appears to be destined for the United States in circumvention of the provisions of this title.

(h) CUSTOMS PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) PENALTIES FOR EXPORTERS.—If the President determines, based on sufficient evidence, that an exporter has engaged in transshipments as defined in paragraph (2), then the President shall deny for a period of 5 years all benefits under this section to such exporter, any successor of such exporter, and any other entity owned or operated by the principal of the exporter.

(B) PENALTIES FOR IMPORTERS.—If the President determines, based on sufficient evidence, that an importer has engaged in transshipments as defined in paragraph (2), then the President shall deny for a period of 5 years all benefits under this section to such importer, any successor of such importer, or any entity owned or operated by the principal of the importer.

(2) DEFINITION OF TRANSSHIPMENT.—For purposes of paragraph (1) and subsection (g), transshipment has occurred when preferential treatment for an apparel article under this section has been claimed on the basis of material false information concerning the country of origin, manufacture, processing, cutting, or assembly of the article or of any fabric, fabric component, or component knit-to-shape from which the apparel article was cut and assembled. For purposes of this paragraph, false information is material if disclosure of the true information would have meant that the article is or was ineligible for preferential treatment under this section.

(i) PROCLAMATION AUTHORITY.—The President shall issue a proclamation to carry out this section not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title. The President shall consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in preparing such proclamation.

SEC. ___05. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the 15th day after the date on which the President issues the proclamation required by section ___04(i).

SEC. ___06. TERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The preferential duty treatment provided under this title shall remain in effect for a period of 7 years beginning on the effective date provided for in section ___05.

(b) GSP ELIGIBILITY.—The preferential duty treatment provided under this title shall terminate if and when the Philippines becomes ineligible for designation as a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.).

SA 654. Mr. INOUYE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE __—MODIFICATION OF TONNAGE TAX

SEC. ___. MODIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION OF THE TONNAGE TAX ON VESSELS OPERATING IN THE DUAL UNITED STATES DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN TRADES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 1355 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to definitions and special rules) is amended to read as follows:

''(f) EFFECT OF OPERATING A QUALIFYING VESSEL IN THE DUAL UNITED STATES DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN TRADES.—For purposes of this subchapter—

''(1) an electing corporation shall be treated as continuing to use a qualifying vessel in the United States foreign trade during any period of use in the United States domestic trade, and

''(2) gross income from such United States domestic trade shall not be excluded under section 1357(a), but shall not be taken into account for purposes of section 1353(b)(1)(B) or for purposes of section 1356 in connection with the application of section 1357 or 1358.''.

(b) REGULATORY AUTHORITY FOR ALLOCATION OF CREDITS, INCOME, AND DEDUCTIONS.—Section 1358 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to allocation of credits, income, and deductions) is amended—

(1) by striking ''in accordance with this subsection'' in subsection (c) and inserting ''to the extent provided in such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations consistent with the provisions of this subchapter for the purpose of allocating gross income, deductions, and credits between or among qualifying shipping activities and other activities of a taxpayer.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1355(a)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''exclusively''.

(2) Section 1355(b)(1)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''as a qualifying vessel'' and inserting ''in the transportation of goods or passengers''.

(3) Section 1355 of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (g), and

(B) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 21, 2011, at 10 a.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 21, 2011 at 10 a.m., in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Dually-Eligible Beneficiaries: Improving Care While Lowering Costs.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 21, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. CASEY. 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 21, 2011, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CASEY. 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 21, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Transforming Wartime Contracting: Recommendations of the Commission on Wartime Contracting.''

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 21, 2011, in room SDG–50 in the Dirksen Senate Office Building beginning at 10 a.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION, POLICY, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy, and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 21, 2011, at 2 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Power of Google: Serving Consumers or Threatening Competition?''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 21, 2011, at 11 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Countering Terrorist Financing: Progress and Priorities.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Nationals Parks be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 21, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Joseph Scovitch and Danielle Dellerson, Finance Committee staff, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of the Generalized System of Preferences Act.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that John Cole, a fellow in the office of Senator PRYOR, be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of the consideration of H.R. 2832, the Generalized System of Preferences Act.

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

TAIWAN OBSERVER STATUS IN THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 115, S. Con. Res. 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) expressing the sense of Congress that Taiwan should be accorded observer status in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 17

Whereas the Convention on International Civil Aviation, signed in Chicago, Illinois, on December 7, 1944, and entered into force April 4, 1947, approved the establishment of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), stating ''The aims and objectives of the Organization are to develop the principles and techniques of international

air navigation and to foster the planning and development of international air transport so as to . . . meet the needs of the peoples of the world for safe, regular, efficient and economical air transport'';

Whereas, following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the ICAO convened a high-level Ministerial Conference on Aviation Security that endorsed a global strategy for strengthening aviation security worldwide and issued a public declaration that ''a uniform approach in a global system is essential to ensure aviation security throughout the world and that deficiencies in any part of the system constitute a threat to the entire global system,'' and that there should be a commitment to ''foster international cooperation in the field of aviation security and harmonize the implementation of security measures'';

Whereas, the 37th ICAO Assembly in October 2010 adopted a Declaration on Aviation Security largely in response to the attempted sabotage of Northwest Airlines Flight 253 on December 25, 2009, which established new criminal penalties for the use of civil aircraft as a weapon, the use of dangerous materials to attack aircraft or other targets on the ground, and the unlawful transport of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons and related materials, along with extradition arrangements that facilitate cooperation among nations in apprehending and prosecuting those who have undertaken these and other criminal acts;

Whereas, on October 8, 2010, the Department of State praised the 37th ICAO Assembly on its adoption of the Declaration on Aviation Security, but noted that ''because every airport offers a potential entry point into this global system, every nation faces the threat from gaps in aviation security throughout the world—and all nations must share the responsibility for securing that system'';

Whereas the Taipei Flight Information Region, under the jurisdiction of Taiwan, ROC, covers an airspace of 176,000 square nautical miles and provides air traffic control services to over 1,350,000 flights annually, with the Taiwan Taoyuan International Airport recognized as the 8th and 18th largest airport by international cargo volume and number of international passengers, respectively;

Whereas exclusion from the ICAO since 1971 has impeded the efforts of the Government of Taiwan to maintain civil aviation practices that comport with evolving international standards, due to its inability to contact the ICAO for up-to-date information on aviation standards and norms, secure amendments to the organization's regulations in a timely manner, obtain sufficient and timely information needed to prepare for the implementation of new systems and procedures set forth by the ICAO, receive technical assistance in implementing new regulations, and participate in technical and academic seminars hosted by the ICAO;

Whereas the United States, in the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review, clearly declared its support for the participation of Taiwan in appropriate international organizations, in particular, on September 27, 1994, with the announcement by the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs that, pursuant to the Review and recognizing Taiwan's important role in transnational issues, the United States ''will support its membership in organizations where statehood is not a prerequisite, and [the United States] will support opportunities for Taiwan's voice to be heard in organizations where its membership is not possible''; and

Whereas ICAO rules and existing practices have allowed for the meaningful participation of noncontracting countries as well as other bodies in its meetings and activities through granting of observer status: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) meaningful participation by the Government of Taiwan as an observer in the meetings and activities of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) will contribute both to the fulfillment of the ICAO's overarching mission and to the success of a global strategy to address aviation security threats based on effective international cooperation;

(2) the United States Government should take a leading role in garnering international support for the granting of observer status to Taiwan in the ICAO for the purpose of such participation; and

(3) the Department of State should provide briefings to or consult with Congress on any efforts conducted by the United States Government in support of Taiwan's attainment of observer status in the ICAO.

SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING FRAUD PREVENTION ACT OF 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business be discharged from further consideration of S. 633 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 633) to prevent fraud in small business contracting, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to address the Department of Veterans Affairs' role in S. 633, the Small Business Contracting Fraud Prevention Act of 2011.

As introduced, S. 633 contains a provision that would require the Department of Veterans Affairs, through its Center for Veterans Enterprise, to verify the status of any small business seeking to be registered as a veteran-owned or service-disabled veteran-owned small business. S. 633 would also require the head of each Federal agency to confirm the status of any service-disabled veteran-owned small business before permitting that business to compete for Federal sole-source or set-aside contracts.

I agree that governmentwide verification of veteran-owned and service-disabled veteran-owned small business status is an important step towards fraud prevention. But we must ensure that enactment of S. 633 does not add to the backlog of veterans currently awaiting verification of their small businesses, and that veterans' businesses are not unfairly delayed in their ability to compete for contracts.

I am pleased that Senators LANDRIEU and SNOWE have agreed to my amendment to S. 633. Under my amendment, the verification provisions in S. 633 would not take effect until the Department of Veterans Affairs first certifies it possesses the necessary resources and capacity to undertake the new requirements imposed by S. 633. This means that the Department gets to set the timeline for implementing the provisions so that implementation is done right.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Murray amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 652) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To delay the effective date of the veterans contracting provisions)

On page 10, beginning on line 8, strike ''Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the'' and insert ''The''.

On page 10, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (b) and the requirements under subsection (c) shall take effect on the date on which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (referred to in this subsection as the ''Secretary'') publishes in the Federal Register a determination that the Department of Veterans Affairs has the necessary resources and capacity to carry out the additional responsibility of determining whether small business concerns registered with the VetBiz database of the Department of Veterans Affairs are owned and controlled by a veteran or a service-disabled veteran, as the case may be, in accordance with subsection (g) of section 4 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633), as added by subsection (b).

(2) TIMELINE.—If the Secretary determines that the Secretary is not able to publish the determination under paragraph (1) before the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a report containing an estimate of the date on which the Secretary will publish the determination under paragraph (1) to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

The bill (S. 633), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 633

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 ''Small Business Contracting Fraud Prevention Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''8(a) program'' means the program under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a));

(2) the terms ''Administration'' and ''Administrator'' mean the Small Business Administration and the Administrator thereof, respectively;

(3) the terms ''HUBZone'' and ''HUBZone small business concern'' and ''HUBZone map'' have the meanings given those terms in section 3(p) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)), as amended by this Act; and

(4) the term ''recertification'' means a determination by the Administrator that a

business concern that was previously determined to be a qualified HUBZone small business concern is a qualified HUBZone small business concern under section 3(p)(5) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(5)).

SEC. 3. FRAUD DETERRENCE AT THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.

Section 16 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 645) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''Whoever'' and all that follows through ''oneself or another'' and inserting the following: ''A person shall be subject to the penalties and remedies described in paragraph (2) if the person misrepresents the status of any concern or person as a small business concern, a qualified HUBZone small business concern, a small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, a small business concern owned and controlled by women, or a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, in order to obtain for any person'';

(ii) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) prime contract, subcontract, grant, or cooperative agreement to be awarded under subsection (a) or (m) of section 8, or section 9, 15, 31, or 36;'';

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B);

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively; and

(v) in subparagraph (C), as so redesignated, by striking '', shall be'' and all that follows and inserting a period;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) be subject to the civil remedies under subchapter III of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the 'False Claims Act');''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) In the case of a violation of paragraph (1)(A), (g), or (h), for purposes of a proceeding described in subparagraph (A) or (C) of paragraph (2), the amount of the loss to the Federal Government or the damages sustained by the Federal Government, as applicable, shall be an amount equal to the amount that the Federal Government paid to the person that received a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement described in paragraph (1)(A), (g), or (h), respectively.

''(B) In the case of a violation of subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), for the purpose of a proceeding described in subparagraph (A) or (C) of paragraph (2), the amount of the loss to the Federal Government or the damages sustained by the Federal Government, as applicable, shall be an amount equal to the portion of any payment by the Federal Government under a prime contract that was used for a subcontract described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), respectively.

''(C) In a proceeding described in subparagraph (A) or (B), no credit shall be applied against any loss or damages to the Federal Government for the fair market value of the property or services provided to the Federal Government.'';

(2) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) Any representation of the status of any concern or person as a small business concern, a HUBZone small business concern, a small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, a small business concern owned and controlled by women, or a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, in order to obtain any prime contract, subcontract, grant, or cooperative agreement described in subsection (d)(1) shall be made in writing or through the Online Representations and Certifications Application process required under section 4.1201 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, or any successor thereto.'';

and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) A person shall be subject to the penalties and remedies described in subsection (d)(2) if the person misrepresents the status of any concern or person as a small business concern, a qualified HUBZone small business concern, a small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, a small business concern owned and controlled by women, or a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans—

''(1) in order to allow any person to participate in any program of the Administration; or

''(2) in relation to a protest of a contract award or proposed contract award made under regulations issued by the Administration.

''(h)(1) A person that submits a request for payment on a contract or subcontract that is awarded under subsection (a) or (m) of section 8, or section 9, 15, 31, or 36, shall be deemed to have submitted a certification that the person complied with regulations issued by the Administration governing the percentage of work that the person is required to perform on the contract or subcontract, unless the person states, in writing, that the person did not comply with the regulations.

''(2) A person shall be subject to the penalties and remedies described in subsection (d)(2) if the person—

''(A) uses the services of a business other than the business awarded the contract or subcontract to perform a greater percentage of work under a contract than is permitted by regulations issued by the Administration; or

''(B) willfully participates in a scheme to circumvent regulations issued by the Administration governing the percentage of work that a contractor is required to perform on a contract.''.

SEC. 4. VETERANS INTEGRITY IN CONTRACTING.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 3(q)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)(1)) is amended by striking ''means a veteran'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''means—

''(A) a veteran with a service-connected disability rated by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as zero percent or more disabling; or

''(B) a former member of the Armed Forces who is retired, separated, or placed on the temporary disability retired list for physical disability under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code.''.

(b) VETERANS CONTRACTING.—Section 4 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) VETERAN STATUS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A business concern seeking status as a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans shall—

''(A) submit an annual certification indicating that the business concern is a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans by means of the Online Representations and Certifications Application process required under section 4.1201 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, or any successor thereto; and

''(B) register with—

''(i) the Central Contractor Registration database maintained under subpart 4.11 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, or any successor thereto; and

''(ii) the VetBiz database of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or any successor thereto.

''(2) VERIFICATION OF STATUS.—

''(A) VETERANS AFFAIRS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall determine whether a business concern registered with the VetBiz database of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or any successor thereto, as a small business concern owned and controlled by veterans or a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans is owned and controlled by a veteran or a service-disabled veteran, as the case may be.

''(B) FEDERAL AGENCIES GENERALLY.—The head of each Federal agency shall—

''(i) for a sole source contract awarded to a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans or a contract awarded with competition restricted to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans under section 36, determine whether a business concern submitting a proposal for the contract is a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans; and

''(ii) use the VetBiz database of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or any successor thereto, in determining whether a business concern is a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans.

''(3) DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION.—If the Administrator determines that a business concern knowingly and willfully misrepresented that the business concern is a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, the Administrator may debar or suspend the business concern from contracting with the United States.''.

(c) INTEGRATION OF DATABASES.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that data is shared on an ongoing basis between the VetBiz database of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Central Contractor Registration database maintained under subpart 4.11 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (b) and the requirements under subsection (c) shall take effect on the date on which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (referred to in this subsection as the ''Secretary'') publishes in the Federal Register a determination that the Department of Veterans Affairs has the necessary resources and capacity to carry out the additional responsibility of determining whether small business concerns registered with the VetBiz database of the Department of Veterans Affairs are owned and controlled by a veteran or a service-disabled veteran, as the case may be, in accordance with subsection (g) of section 4 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633), as added by subsection (b).

(2) TIMELINE.—If the Secretary determines that the Secretary is not able to publish the determination under paragraph (1) before the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a report containing an estimate of the date on which the Secretary will publish the determination under paragraph (1) to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5. SECTION 8(a) PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS.—Section 8(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(22) Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

''(A) conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of the program under this subsection, including an examination of—

''(i) the number and size of contracts applied for, as compared to the number received by, small business concerns after successfully completing the program;

''(ii) the percentage of small business concerns that continue to operate during the 3-year period beginning on the date on which the small business concerns successfully complete the program;

''(iii) whether the business of small business concerns increases during the 3-year period beginning on the date on which the small business concerns successfully complete the program; and

''(iv) the number of training sessions offered under the program; and

''(B) submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report regarding each evaluation under subparagraph (A).''.

(b) OTHER IMPROVEMENTS.—In order to improve the 8(a) program, the Administrator shall—

(1) not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, begin to—

(A) evaluate the feasibility of—

(i) using additional third-party data sources;

(ii) making unannounced visits of sites that are selected randomly or using risk-based criteria;

(iii) using fraud detection tools, including data-mining techniques; and

(iv) conducting financial and analytical training for the business opportunity specialists of the Administration;

(B) evaluate the feasibility and advisability of amending regulations applicable the 8(a) program to require that calculations of the adjusted net worth or total assets of an individual include assets held by the spouse of the individual; and

(C) develop a more consistent enforcement strategy that includes the suspension or debarment of contractors that knowingly make misrepresentations in order to qualify for the 8(a) program; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date on which the Comptroller General submits the report under section 8(a)(22)(B) of the Small Business Act, as added by subsection (c), issue, in final form, proposed regulations of the Administration that—

(A) determine the economic disadvantage of a participant in the 8(a) program based on the income and asset levels of the participant at the time of application and annual recertification for the 8(a) program; and

(B) limit the ability of a small business concern to participate in the 8(a) program if an immediate family member of an owner of the small business concern is, or has been, a participant in the 8(a) program, in the same industry.

SEC. 6. HUBZONE IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to reform and improve the HUBZone program of the Administration.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall—

(1) ensure the HUBZone map is—

(A) accurate and up-to-date; and

(B) revised as new data is made available to maintain the accuracy and currency of the HUBZone map;

(2) implement policies for ensuring that only HUBZone small business concerns determined to be qualified under section 3(p)(5) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(5)) are participating in the HUBZone program, including through the appropriate use of technology to control costs and maximize, among other benefits, uniformity, completeness, simplicity, and efficiency;

(3) submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report regarding any application to be designated as a HUBZone small business concern or for recertification for which the Administrator has not made a determination as of the date that is 60 days after the date on which the application was submitted or initiated, which shall include a plan and timetable for ensuring the timely processing of the applications; and

(4) develop measures and implement plans to assess the effectiveness of the HUBZone program that—

(A) require the identification of a baseline point in time to allow the assessment of economic development under the HUBZone program, including creating additional jobs; and

(B) take into account—

(i) the economic characteristics of the HUBZone; and

(ii) contracts being counted under multiple socioeconomic subcategories.

(c) EMPLOYMENT PERCENTAGE.—Section 3(p) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by adding at the end the following:

''(E) EMPLOYMENT PERCENTAGE DURING INTERIM PERIOD.—

''(i) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term 'interim period' means the period beginning on the date on which the Administrator determines that a HUBZone small business concern is qualified under subparagraph (A) and ending on the day before the date on which a contract under the HUBZone program for which the HUBZone small business concern submits a bid is awarded.

''(ii) INTERIM PERIOD.—During the interim period, the Administrator may not determine that the HUBZone small business is not qualified under subparagraph (A) based on a failure to meet the applicable employment percentage under subparagraph (A)(i)(I), unless the HUBZone small business concern—

''(I) has not attempted to maintain the applicable employment percentage under subparagraph (A)(i)(I); or

''(II) does not meet the applicable employment percentage—

''(aa) on the date on which the HUBZone small business concern submits a bid for a contract under the HUBZone program; or

''(bb) on the date on which the HUBZone small business concern is awarded a contract under the HUBZone program.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) HUBZONE PROGRAM.—The term 'HUBZone program' means the program established under section 31.

''(9) HUBZONE MAP.—The term 'HUBZone map' means the map used by the Administration to identify HUBZones.''.

(d) REDESIGNATED AREAS.—Section 3(p)(4)(C)(i) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(4)(C)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) 3 years after the first date on which the Administrator publishes a HUBZone map that is based on the results from the 2010 decennial census; or''.

SEC. 7. ANNUAL REPORT ON SUSPENSION, DEBARMENT, AND PROSECUTION.

The Administrator shall submit an annual report to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives that contains—

(1) the number of debarments from participation in programs of the Administration issued by the Administrator during the 1-year period preceding the date of the report, including—

(A) the number of debarments that were based on a conviction; and

(B) the number of debarments that were fact-based and did not involve a conviction;

(2) the number of suspensions from participation in programs of the Administration issued by the Administrator during the 1-year period preceding the date of the report, including—

(A) the number of suspensions issued that were based upon indictments; and

(B) the number of suspensions issued that were fact-based and did not involve an indictment;

(3) the number of suspension and debarments issued by the Administrator during the 1-year period preceding the date of the report that were based upon referrals from offices of the Administration, other than the Office of Inspector General;

(4) the number of suspension and debarments issued by the Administrator during the 1-year period preceding the date of the report based upon referrals from the Office of Inspector General; and

(5) the number of persons that the Administrator declined to debar or suspend after a referral described in paragraph (8), and the reason for each such decision.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, September 22; 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 therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2832. At a time to be determined tomorrow, there will be up to five votes on amendments to trade adjustment assistance and passage of the bill. In addition, we await action in the House on the continuing resolution.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:13 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 22, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ANIMAL REFUGE LEAGUE IN PORTLAND, MAINE

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, in 1911, the Animal Refuge League in Portland, Maine was incorporated and in 1956, former Maine Governor Percival Baxter helped fund and establish the League's new location on Stroudwater Street in Westbrook, Maine. Each year, the Animal Refuge League of Greater Portland (ARLGP) rescues and places more than 4,000 dogs, cats, rabbits, birds, gerbils and other animals all around Maine each year. The dedicated staff and volunteers nurture wounded, neglected and abandoned animals so they can be placed in loving homes. The organization has an impressive 92 percent placement rate for cats and dogs, which is among the highest in the country.

This year, the Animal Refuge League marks its one hundredth anniversary. In addition to fulfilling its original mission to provide temporary care and permanent shelter for stray, abandoned and relinquished animals, the ARLGP is also developing innovative programs to meet the needs of Maine communities in new ways.

Through Paws in Stripes, the ARLGP maintains a working relationship with Maine Correctional Center in Windham whereby the prisoners play a major role in the socialization of select puppies from the shelter. A new Seniors to Seniors program matches senior citizens with senior cats, and the ongoing foster program works with families to provide temporary homes to animals who need time, rest, recuperation, medical care or socialization before they are ready for adoption. Humane Education is a program that teaches children of all ages respect for all living things.

As someone who spent years working as an organic farmer, I have a deep appreciation for the many roles that animals play in all our lives. Today, I am happy to celebrate the ALRGP's one hundred years of successful work rescuing animals. Congratulations, and thank you for the work that you do.

CONGRATULATORY REMARKS FOR OBTAINING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SANDY ADAMS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mrs. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Andrew Bosch for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

Throughout the history of the Boy Scouts of America, the rank of Eagle Scout has only been attained through dedication to concepts such as honor, duty, country and charity. For his Eagle Scout Project Andrew provided plant and tree identification markers for a local Historic Park. By applying these concepts to daily life, Andrew has proven his true and complete understanding of their meanings, and thereby deserves this honor.

I offer my congratulations on a job well done and best wishes for the future.

CONGRATULATORY REMARKS FOR OBTAINING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SANDY ADAMS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mrs. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Zachary Peter Stephens for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

Throughout the history of the Boy Scouts of America, the rank of Eagle Scout has only been attained through dedication to concepts such as honor, duty, country and charity. For his Eagle Scout Project Zachary completed a restoration project of a garden area called the Harbor House. By applying these concepts to daily life, Zachary has proven his true and complete understanding of their meanings, and thereby deserves this honor.

I offer my congratulations on a job well done and best wishes for the future.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, ADMIRAL MICHAEL G. MULLEN'S 43 YEARS OF SERVICE TO OUR NATION

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Admiral Michael G. Mullen, for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to the United States of America as the 17th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Admiral "Mike" Mullen will retire as the highest-ranking officer in the United States Armed Forces and the President's principle military advisor. His service spans more than four decades of active military duty to the United States Navy and the Department of Defense.

Born in Los Angeles, California, Admiral Mike Mullen was commissioned into the Navy after graduating with the Class of 1986, from the United States Naval Academy. His rise in the Navy began at sea, when Ensign Mullen reported aboard the destroyer, USS *Collett*, as an Anti-Submarine Officer. While aboard the ship, he deployed to the Western Pacific and participated in combat operations off the coast of Vietnam. Afterwards, he subsequently served on six other warships, including command of three of those vessels at sea, and he commanded the George Washington Carrier Strike Group and United States Second Fleet. His shore assignments have been focused in the areas of resourcing and personnel which included duty with the Bureau of Personnel, the Navy staff, and the staff of the Secretary of Defense. He helped train, educate, and mentor future generations of naval officers during tours at the United States Naval Academy. Throughout his career, he has demonstrated exemplary service in duty to the mission and care for his sailors.

In August 2003, Admiral Mike Mullen was selected to serve as the Navy's 32nd Vice Chief of Naval Operations. During the first half of 2005, he served as Commander of NATO's Joint Force Command Naples and Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Europe, leading the Alliance's peacekeeping operations in the Balkans and its important training mission in Iraq.

In July of 2005, Admiral Mike Mullen was sworn in as the 28th Chief of Naval Operations, serving as the top uniformed leader of the Navy and representative to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. During his tenure, he oversaw the service's efforts to man, train, and equip the United States Navy to fulfill its traditional missions at sea. Admiral Mike Mullen also conceived and championed the Navy's contributions to the ground war efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan and other regions to combat violent terrorism. Admiral Mike Mullen further led efforts to provide a framework and concrete plan to stabilize the Navy's shipbuilding program to support a three hundred-thirteen ship fleet to maintain the United States' maritime superiority in a dynamic and uncertain world.

On October 1st, 2007, the President of the United States and the United States Senate appointed Admiral Mike Mullen as the 17th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Since assuming duties as Chairman, he has overseen continuous joint military operations with our Nation's allies to eradicate terrorist networks throughout the world. Admiral Mike Mullen's overall leadership supported the incredible turnaround in security and stability in Iraq and has bolstered the efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) alliance in Afghanistan. Additionally during his tenure, Admiral Mike Mullen oversaw military humanitarian assistance operations in relief of major international disasters to include the 2010 Haiti Earthquake and 2011 Japan Earthquake and Tsunami.

Although Admiral Mike Mullen's dedication to service has been honored by a wide array of leadership awards and decorations over the years, this consummate military professional's commitment to his Nation is driven by much more profound reasons. My wife Beverly and I have seen personally that he is a man who cares deeply for our men and women in uniform, their families, and the families of the fallen and missing. Admiral Mike Mullen, along with his wife Deborah, have passionately represented our men and women in uniform, particularly those who have returned from this

decade's wars as they and their families heal from wounds both seen and unseen. His attention to our most critically wounded has been a testament to his willingness to ensure our wounded Service Members and their families receive the best care and support the Nation has to offer. I have no doubt his commitment to these Americans, who have given so much, will indeed endure far beyond his days in uniform.

The United States Navy, the Department of Defense and the Nation will dearly miss one of its most respected and valued leaders as Admiral Mike Mullen leaves active duty and this Congressman and my wife Beverly will deeply miss his counsel on many important issues and most important his personal friendship. We will miss his humility, his selflessness, his candor and his integrity. When history looks back at this leader and his legacy it will be clear that his leadership produced the best military the world has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to work closely with Admiral Mike Mullen over the last several years of his long and decorated career. On behalf of a grateful Nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending Admiral Mike Mullen for a lifetime of service to his country. For all he and his family have given and continue to give to our country; we are in their debt. We wish him, his wife Deborah, and his two sons, John and Michael, all the best in his retirement.

JUSTICE FOR IRANIAN PEOPLE

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, thousands of Iranian-Americans from 41 states across America attended a rally outside the Department of State on August 26, 2011, calling on the Secretary to remove the principal Iranian opposition movement, the Mujahedin-e Khalq (MEK) from the list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTO).

Mrs. Maryam Rajavi, President-elect of the National Council of Resistance of Iran, which acts as Iran's Parliament-in-exile, addressed the rally via satellite from Paris. Excerpts of her remarks follow:

Honorable and brave Iranians, I salute your protest and gathering, which symbolizes an uprising for the freedom of the Iranian people and in defense of the persecuted and besieged Ashraf; an uprising against a discredited label against the Iranian Resistance. Today, your calls echo the calls for justice emanating from an enchained nation, which rejects the velayat-e faqih (absolute clerical rule) dictatorship. Ashraf is proud to have such admirable representatives and defenders like you; And the Iranian people are proud to have stored in your being the most prized possession required for the attainment of freedom and democracy.

Dear Compatriots, It has been more a year since the ruling of the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, which ordered the State Department to review the terrorist listing of the People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran (PMOI/MEK). The Iranian people and the Iranian Resistance have paid the price for this unjustified delay with the blood of their most courageous children. Political prisoners in Iran, like Ali Saremi, were hanged by Khamenei's henchmen. And, the 36 heroes of freedom in Ashraf, who were martyred on the orders of the velayat-e faqih regime, were all part of this bloody price. The terror listing in the U.S. is openly used as a justification to legitimize such bloodletting, both by the cruel mullahs in Tehran as well as their proxy government in Iraq. Therefore, the Iranian people are asking the United States, ''Why are you not annulling the license to kill our children?''

The decision of the appeals court in Washington stated that the State Department violated due process rights during the listing process. And, 20 judgments by European courts against the terrorism charge leave absolutely no doubt that this label is completely discredited. Thousands of parliamentarians and human rights advocates in the Arab world and in Europe, joined by a large number of members of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate, forming a great global voice in defense of the freedom-loving Iranian Resistance. This constitutes an exceptional consensus in the face of 14 years of injustices committed against the PMOI and the Iranian Resistance. Dozens of the most honorable former senior officials serving in the country's administrations over the last two decades have taken a clear stance in the course of their multiple international conferences in Washington, Brussels, Paris, Berlin, London and Rome, leaving absolutely no credibility for this listing. Hail to their sense of justice and clear-sightedness through which the great historical symbols of America like Jefferson and Lincoln are resurrected.

We have seen how the mullahs' regime and the insignificant factions directed by Tehran utilize cruelty and insolence to attack and avenge these dignified personalities. But, these officials have shown extraordinary courage by placing their credibility and political reputation in support of this Resistance. We recognize the United States in the image of these noble human beings and not those who have succumbed to religious fascism. They represent an America that recognizes democracy and human rights in Iran as the precondition for global peace and security and guarantor of the American people's genuine interests. This is the United States that is standing by the Iranian people. For the past 170 days, your courageous and resilient friends have staged a sit-in across from the State Department. They echo the Iranian nation's call for the upholding of justice for the protection of Ashraf and removal of the PMOI from the terror list night and day, both under the summer heat and the winter chill.

Letters from more than 800 religious leaders and 2,000 priests across the U.S. in support of this Resistance. Thirteen hearing sessions in the U.S. House and Senate to pursue the issue of protecting Ashraf and annulling the discredited terror label against the PMOI Passing of multiple resolutions in Congress, and especially the amendment passed by the House Foreign Affairs Committee last month about the imperative to prevent the displacement of Ashraf residents inside Iraq And thousands of political, parliamentary, media and social initiatives, all of which have inspired the admiration of everyone. The evil forces that have laid a siege on your sisters and brothers in Camp Ashraf seek to destroy and annihilate Ashraf and its freedom-seeking residents. But, you have spread the flames of Ashraf in your society and hoisted its flag. Hold onto this flag more powerfully, because this is the banner of freedom and democracy in Iran.

Clearly, the U.S. bears special responsibility for ensuring the protection of these residents on the basis of its agreements with every single one of the residents in Camp Ashraf. We urge the U.S. to listen to Congress and the resolution passed by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and abandon the idea of displacing Ashraf residents within Iraq. We call on the U.S. to support the European solution instead of this dangerous idea which will have no results other than a humanitarian catastrophe. Similarly, we want the United Nations to rise up to its irrevocable obligations in ensuring the protection of Ashraf . . .

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE HOLIDAY ISLES ELKS LODGE 1912 IN MADEIRA BEACH, FLORIDA

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize an outstanding group of individuals that I have the privilege to represent in Madeira Beach, Florida, which has dedicated years of generous care and hospitality for our Nation's veterans. Over the years, in cooperation with the Bay Pines Veterans Hospital, the Holiday Isles Elks Lodge 1912 has proved that their commitment to our troops is unwavering.

Every day, members of Lodge 1912 can be found at the local Bay Pines Veterans Hospital demonstrating their commitment to those who have already sacrificed so much. For example, member Betty Ryan takes the initiative on a regular basis to find out what exactly it is our hospitalized veterans need. And within the lodge, Betty has set up a box for donations which she routinely presents to veterans at Bay Pines.

The Elks community also offers and supports many individual programs designed to help and enhance the lives of our veterans. One of these supported programs is the Wounded Warrior Project which, in 2009, the Elks National Veterans Service Commission made available $50,000 to launch the Elks/Wounded Warrior Project. Just as the Wounded Warrior Project assists injured veterans of the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Elks offers a program known as the Army of Hope which assists the families of those who have been called to duty during these very difficult times of conflict.

These constituents of mine provide an outstanding service to our veterans; however, this commitment does not end with Lodge 1912. There are 2000 lodges nationwide and you will find their members hard at work in each of the 172 VA Medical centers around the country living up to their pledge: ''So long as there are veterans, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks will never forget them.''

Mr. Speaker, Holiday Isles Elks Lodge 1912 not only shines in their display of compassion and patriotism, but also reminds us of the characteristics of great people that make up a great nation. Thank you to all the members for their excellent service in the past and for your continued assistance to the community and our veterans in the future.

HONORING THE SELFRELIANCE UKRAINIAN AMERICAN FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ON ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Selfreliance Ukrainian American Federal Credit Union (SUAFCU) which will celebrate 60 years of service on September 21, 2011. This organization has helped countless Ukrainian families and businesses in my district and across Illinois live the American dream.

SUAFCU was founded in 1951 as a financial cooperative whose mission was to benefit local members of the Ukrainian American community. Open to anyone of Ukrainian descent or members of other Ukrainian organizations, SUAFCU stays very focused on its original mission. The democratic tenets to which the Union strictly adheres make it a unique institution that provides an example of what hard working communities can achieve.

During its first 15 years, SUAFCU was incredibly active, providing its members with over $4,156,000 in loans. Thanks to the responsible lending practices of this community, many Ukrainian doctors, dentists, and veterinarians were able to found successful practices. Dozens of other businesses opened thanks to SUAFCU, but just as important, 1200 families were able to purchase homes in the Chicago area. This community came together to exemplify the American dream through smart practices and a closely-knit community.

Around these businesses, the ''Ukrainian Village'' prospered into a network of interconnected community organizations including cultural and social clubs, and churches. SUAFCU works closely with churches and others to ensure the assimilation process is less difficult for Ukrainian immigrants—a population that brings diversity and new ideas to the area. SUAFCU continues to prosper and help families and businesses under current President and CEO Bohdan Watral and Chairman of the Board of Directors Michael Kos, two strong advocates for Ukrainian Americans.

Please join me in honoring the Selfreliance Ukrainian American Federal Credit Union, a group that has brought immeasurable benefit to Illinois by helping Ukrainians thrive and contribute to the community. I know SUAFCU will continue to help individuals realize their dreams and I wish them prosperity over their next 60 years.

HONORING JULIO ALVARADO

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Julio Alvarado, who passed away on September 13, 2011, just four days short of his 85th birthday.

Born in Puerto Rico in 1926, Julio Alvarado arrived in San Pedro in 1949 where he made his home and became a beloved member of the community. While in San Pedro, Julio worked on the docks at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach as member of ILWU Local 13.

Julio Alvarado was an immensely caring person with a large, generous heart and was always ready to help anyone in need. He will be missed dearly by all who knew him. His children and grandchildren will especially miss his baking and his homemade bread.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Julio's daughter, Daisy Ybarra, for almost 20 years. For nearly two years while I served on the Los Angeles City Council, Daisy was my Community Advocate in Watts, but Daisy had been following in her father's footsteps and serving her community long before then by teaching kids to say no to gangs through GAP, the Gang Alternatives Program. Lives were saved because of the work that she did and I know that her father was very proud of her.

Julio Alvarado was preceded in death by his loving wife Ana.

I extend my deepest condolences to his sons, Julio, Jr., and Robert; daughters Angela, Daisy, Miriam, and Maria Luisa; his brother and sister Victor Gotay and Carmen Martinez, both of Puerto Rico; and to his three grandchildren, three great-granddaughters as well as several nieces and nephews. Though Julio is no longer with us, his legacy lives on in the lives of the loved ones he has left behind and in the community he made his home.

CONGRATULATING OUR FRIEND AND ALLY, TAIWAN

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, 2011 we celebrate the 100th anniversary of the emergence of the Chinese people from the dynastic rule that has permeated their history.

Rising against the Qing rulers, Chinese Doctor Sun Yat-sen rose to free his people from totalitarian rule which in turn provided them the opportunity to produce the model Democracy that is Taiwan.

Taiwan today is one of the leading democracies of the world, an economic power and a leading force for peace in the Pacific.

Taiwan's present leader, Ma Ying-jeou is to be congratulated for his efforts and success in providing a climate for Peace and continuing the best traditions of the Chinese people.

Congratuations to the people of Taiwan on the occasion of their 100th anniversary.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DUWAMISH TRIBAL RECOGNITION ACT

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Duwamish Tribal Recognition Act, legislation to grant federal recognition to the Duwamish Tribe of the Seattle, Washington area.

The Duwamish people were the first indigenous people of the Greater Seattle area and lived in the area for more than a thousand years before the first European-Americans arrived in 1851. In 1855, the Duwamish Tribe, represented by Chief Si'ahl (Seattle), signed the Treaty of Point Elliott, which guaranteed fishing rights and federal recognition to all Tribes represented by the Native signers. However, despite ratification by the U.S. Congress in 1859, the promises made by the United States in the treaty were never fulfilled.

Since then, it has been a struggle spanning more than 150 years for the Duwamish people to attain the recognition that was promised to them in the Treaty of Point Elliott. Most recently, in the waning hours of the Clinton Administration, the Tribe was granted federal recognition by the Department of Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs. However, the Bush Administration reversed this decision, questioning the administrative procedures utilized by the Clinton Administration.

Mr. Speaker, for far too long the Duwamish people have waited for federal recognition, which will provide those enrolled in the Tribe access to federal finances for tribal government, as well as cultural, education, health care, and housing programs. Now is the time to recognize the Duwamish people. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

HONORING NATIONAL TRUCK DRIVER APPRECIATION WEEK

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Truck Driver Appreciation Week. I want to commend America's 3.2 million professional truck drivers who serve our nation by expediting commerce and goods essential to our homes and businesses.

One out of every fifteen people across the country are employed in the trucking industry, making it one of the nation's largest employers. The trucking industry is responsible for nearly 68 percent of the total U.S. freight tonnage and over 80 percent of communities rely solely on it for their goods and commodities. This industry is fundamental to our economy.

America's truck drivers are dedicated to keeping our highways safe. They follow stringent safety regulations, attend frequent training programs and educate the motoring public to help keep our highways and interstates safe.

While regulation of transportation commerce and safety is necessary, we need to be careful we do not over-regulate and harm such a vital industry. We need to allow these dedicated and hard working professionals to perform their jobs with the support of our government and without unnecessary government interference.

This week I join my colleagues in extending a warm thank you to them and to their families for the sacrifices they make each and every day for this country.

Today, I honor these wonderful Americans for their dedication and service rendered to our nation's economy and for delivering everyday life's essentials safely and securely.

PATRIOT GUARD RIDERS—STANDING FOR THOSE WHO STOOD FOR US

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, to be a member of the United States military is a gift, a sacrifice and it is an honor. Theodore Roosevelt said: "No man is worth his salt who is not ready at all times to risk his well-being, to risk his body, to risk his life, in a great cause." Every day our warriors risk their lives, and today I would like to pay tribute to a special group of at home warriors who stand for those fallen heroes who stood for us. They are known as the Patriot Guard Riders.

The Patriot Guard Riders are a group of motorcyclists who pay tribute to those who have died serving our country. Their mission is to attend the funeral services of fallen soldiers; upholding President Roosevelt's belief that brave soldiers who gave the utmost sacrifice for their country deserve respect and reverence during their final tribute.

Each of the riders missions have two objectives, to show sincere respect for America's fallen heroes, their families, and their communities; and to shield the mourning family and their friends from interruptions caused by protesters. They have the patriotic understanding that each of America's fallen heroes deserves respect.

Decked out in leather, wearing shades and bandanas, waving Old Glory and riding 500 plus pounds of steel, the Patriot Guard Riders are a terrifying but inspiring looking bunch. They have nicknames like Bronco, Dark Horse, Puddles and Wild Bill. They are right thinking Americans with big hearts.

The Guard is activated each time the military reports the death of a soldier in Iraq or Afghanistan. This nationwide organization of volunteers is very efficient. State Captains send out e-mails to members in the city where the soldier will be buried, and everyone jumps into action. They ensure that streets along the funeral procession are lined with American flags. Each mission is accomplished through legal and non-violent means. If protestors are present and become loud, the Patriot Guard Riders form a flag line, turn their backs on protesters, and will even drown the sound of the protestors by singing and reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

One involved Patriot biker, Rich "Boomer" Ford, a former Navy SEAL who served in Vietnam, is a retired Deputy State Captain and Road Guard Captain for the Texas Patriot Guard Riders. He is the man in charge of the "missions." If you ask Boomer why he rides, he will tell you that he remembers the lack of respect received when returning home from Vietnam. He wants to make sure that doesn't happen to these brave men and women. Boomer feels that each "mission" recognizes and honors the hard work our soldiers are doing for us overseas. These men and women like Boomer, who volunteer their time to help guard our Nation's heroes should be forever remembered for their honor and dignity.

I commend the Patriot Guard Riders for riding for our soldiers whose lives were given in pursuit of a great cause, American freedom. I am proud to recognize these angels on bikes with hearts bigger than Texas. They show their respect for our troops, their families, and our community in an honorable way, one funeral at a time. They make a difference and represent all that is right and good in America.

And that's just the way it is.

REMEMBERING COLONEL DAVID A. McCRACKEN OF NEW CASTLE, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. JASON ALTMIRE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the achievements of Colonel David A. McCracken, a graduate of the Army ROTC program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania and a native of New Castle, Pennsylvania, who passed away on September 2, 2011 after a battle with brain cancer.

I, along with all Americans, am extremely grateful for his brave and honorable service in the United States Army during such an important period in our Nation's history.

Colonel McCracken's awards and decorations include the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal with one oak leaf cluster, the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal with one silver and one bronze oak leaf cluster, the National Defense Service Medal with bronze star, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal (Bosnia), Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal, Armed Forces Reserve Medal with an "M" device, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, Army Reserve Components Overseas Training Ribbon, NATO Medal and Army Engineer Associations and the Bronze DeFleury Medal.

His career was celebrated and his bravery unflagging, even as he received treatment for cancer. His service is an example of courage, dedication, and the values that make western Pennsylvania and our country great.

Our prayers, gratitude, and condolences go to his family in New Castle: his parents Theo and Laura McCracken, as well as his wife of 15 years, Tammy, sons, PFC Tyler Hindley and Connor, and daughter Maitlin.

9/11 IMPACTS ON INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS TRENDS

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to present to my colleagues a succinct academic analysis written by Dr. Michael Czinkota of the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University, and his fellow professors, Gary Knight and Gabriele Suder, regarding their analysis of the impact of 9/11 on the international business climate and the trends in globalizations. In light of the 10th anniversary of the terrorist attacks on the United States, I commend to you their observations.

TERRORISM AND INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS—LOOKING BACK AND STRIVING FORWARD

(By Michael R. Czinkota, Gary Knight, and Gabriele Suder)

The airplanes of 9/11 forced countless multinational corporations (MNCs) to update their strategic planning. Our work with executives at more than 150 MNCs shows that ten years later, companies are still grappling with how best to manage the terrorist threat.

In the two decades before 2001, the rate at which firms launched international ventures was growing rapidly. After 9/11, foreign direct investment fell dramatically as firms withdrew to their home markets. The popularity of international-sounding company and brand names decreased appreciably as managers now emphasize domestic and local affiliations.

The tendency to reverse course on globalization has been accompanied by declining international education in the United States, as revealed by falling enrollments in foreign language and international business courses. In the past decade, managers shifted much of their focus from proactive exploration of international opportunities to a defensive posture emphasizing threats and vulnerable foreign operations.

In Europe, the radicalization of individuals and groups, motivated by ideology, religion or economic concerns, threatens local cooperation and social harmony. European business schools have benefited from tighter restrictions on international student enrollments in the U.S., but the focus of teaching has shifted from global to regional trade.

Another outcome of the terrorism threat has been a rise of public-private partnerships, in which governments and firms collaborate to counter them. For example, global police agencies now partner regularly with private firms to combat cyber crime and attacks on critical computer infrastructure. Governments and activist groups now use social media to organize campaigns fighting against threats ranging from dictators to disease. But nations also have begun to curtail social media when they are contrary to government interests.

The cost of protecting against terrorism is many billions, while terrorist spend millions or less on their actions. There are abundant opportunities for small groups to employ nonweapon technologies, such as aircraft, to cause massive harm. Though our capacity to protect key facilities has improved over time, the security focus on high-value assets encourages terrorists to redirect their violence at "soft targets" such as transportation systems and business facilities. Greater security at home means attacks will increasingly take aim on firms' foreign operations.

Companies have placed more emphasis on terrorism risk considerations when choosing how to enter foreign markets. In the last century, foreign direct investment (FDI) was the preferred approach. But terrorism has shifted the balance. Now many more firms favor entry through exporting, which permits broad and rapid coverage of world markets, reduces dependence on highly visible physical facilities, and offers much flexibility for making rapid adjustments. In terms of economies of scale and transaction costs, FDI is generally superior, but the risks of exporting are judged to be lower. Markets tend to punish failure more harshly than they reward success, which makes risk-minimizing strategies more effective.

Skillful management of global logistics and supply chains cuts the risk and cost of downtime. Firms seek closer relations with suppliers and clients in order to develop more trust and commitment. Some have increased "on-shoring" by bringing suppliers

back into the country when their remoteness constitutes risk.

Terrorism causes an organizational crisis whose ultimate effects may be unknown, and poses a significant threat to the performance of the firm. Corporate preparedness for the unexpected is a vital task. Innovative managers develop back-up resources, and plan for dislocations and sudden shocks with a flexible corporate response.

Terrorism is a public threat, and some managers believe government should bear the cost of protecting against it. Others argue that a public-private partnership is the most effective approach, with firms taking the lead. There is also the issue whether corporate headquarters or the locally exposed subsidiary should fund prevention and preparation expenditures. Regardless of who pays, everyone can agree on the need to guard against terrorism.

Every world region is vulnerable, and most attacks are directed at businesses and business-related infrastructure. Terrorism requires decision-making and behaviors that support vigilance and development of appropriate strategies. Managers who fail to prepare run the risk of weaker performance or even loss of the firm. While we can no longer choose the lowest cost option, ten years after 9/11 companies are more aware, less exposed, and less vulnerable to the risk of terrorism. But in the next ten years comes the really big task: What can and should we do collectively and individually to reduce the causes of terrorism.

CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of Constitution Day, as this past weekend we celebrated 224 years since this nation's founders first signed the hallowed document that governs our nation to this day.

The beauty of our Constitution is that it is a living document. When the Constitution was written, women were not permitted to own property, vote, or attend many institutions of higher learning. Today, women are earning doctorate degrees at higher rates than men, serving as CEOs of Fortune 500 Companies, and even as Cabinet Secretaries.

But even with this solemn document to guide and govern our nation, women today still earn less than their male counterparts, and minority women even less. Women are more likely to be living in poverty and without healthcare. Women still only make up 17 percent of the current Congress.

As we continue to build on women's rights in this country, we are standing on a firm foundation in the Fourteenth Amendment. As we celebrate Constitution Day, women especially must remember how far we've come—and how far we still have to go.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the vast contributions of Hispanic Americans to the culture of the United States.

Today, Hispanics make up 16.3% of the total United States' population—that's nearly 50.5 million people.

Their buying power was $1 trillion in 2010, and is expected to reach $1.5 trillion by 2015.

Hispanic-owned business grew between 2002 and 2007 by 44%—and these businesses generated $345.2 billion in sales in 2007 alone.

Hispanics are involved with every aspect of our culture—from science, to sports, business, government, and the arts.

They will continue to contribute to our nation economically, culturally, and politically.

This is why it's vital to make the correct choices when it comes to immigration.

Here in Washington, we need a bipartisan effort to make comprehensive immigration reform a reality.

As Members of Congress, we must work for a stronger United States—a nation that recognizes diversity and embraces it.

HONORING CORPORAL MICHAEL JOSEPH DUTCHER FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. HEATH SHULER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Corporal Michael Joseph Dutcher of Asheville, North Carolina for his valiant service in the United States Marine Corps. The sacrifices Corporal Michael Joseph Dutcher made will not be forgotten as he put his country above his own needs, serving to fight for freedom.

Born on November 21, 1988, Cpl. Dutcher grew up in Asheville, North Carolina. At Asheville High School, Cpl. Dutcher was involved in band, wrestling, and ROTC. Immediately after graduation, Cpl. Dutcher enrolled in the Marine Corps on June 18, 2007. Cpl. Dutcher served in Bravo Company. He served 1st Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, including a tour of duty in Afghanistan. His personal service awards include the Purple Heart, Combat Action Ribbon, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Sea Service Deployment with three Bronze Stars, Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, National Defense Service Medal and NATO Medal ISAF–Afghanistan.

Cpl. Dutcher was a Non-Commissioned Officer of Marines, regarded by his unit as a selfless leader who always put the well-being of his fellow Marines above his own. In Afghanistan, his unit served at the tip of the spear in the Sangin District of Helmand Province, the site of some of the fiercest fighting in all of Afghanistan. On September 15, 2011, he gave his life while leading his Marines from the front against enemy forces.

Mr. Speaker, Cpl. Dutcher embodied the most essential qualities of a United States Marine. He was selfless, dedicated, and brave. He is remembered as a man who had a tremendous impact not only on his fellow Marines, but also on his family, friends, and community. Through his exemplary service in Afghanistan, Cpl. Michael Joseph Dutcher has brought pride to Western North Carolina. It is truly my honor to commemorate him and I urge my colleagues to join me today in honoring the life of Cpl. Michael Joseph Dutcher for the sacrifices he made for our country.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today our national debt is $14,711,870,126,618.47.

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 $4,073,444,380,324.67 since then. This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH PRESIDENT OBAMA ON THE AFGHANISTAN/PAKISTAN STUDY GROUP

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have been writing President Obama and administration officials since August 2010 outlining my concerns about the progress of the war in Afghanistan and asking that an Afghanistan/Pakistan Study Group be established to engage outside experts to bring fresh eyes to U.S. strategy in South Asia.

It's now over a year later and the administration continues to balk at any suggestion for such a panel to be formed. Yet we continue to read headlines every week reporting about casualties among our brave troops and stepped up attacks by the Taliban, including assassinations of Afghan leaders.

I firmly believe that success in South Asia requires a complete reexamination of U.S. policy with both Afghanistan and Pakistan. Establishing the Af/Pak Stud Group will demonstrate that U.S. political leaders and government officials are willing to take whatever steps necessary to ensure we have the best strategy for long-term success in South Asia.

I will begin today to insert in the RECORD my correspondence with the administration on this matter. My letter of August 4, 2010, to the president follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 4, 2010.

Hon. BARACK H. OBAMA,
The President,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On September 14, 2001, following the catastrophic and deliberate terrorist attack on our country, I voted to go to war in Afghanistan. I stand by that decision and have the utmost confidence in General Petraeus's proven leadership. I also remain unequivocally committed to the success of our mission there and to the more than 100,000 American troops sacrificing toward that end. In fact, it is this

commitment which has led me to write to you. While I have been a consistent supporter of the war effort in both Afgahnistan and Iraq, I believe that with this support comes a responsibility. This was true during a Republican administration in the midst of the wars, and it remains true today.

In 2005, I returned from my third trip to Iraq where I saw firsthand the deteriorating security situation. I was deeply concerned that Congress was failing to exercise the necessary oversight of the war effort. Against this backdrop I authored the legislation that created the Iraq Study Group (ISG). The ISG was a 10-member bipartisan group of well-respected, nationally known figures who were brought together with the help of four reputable organizations—the U.S. Institute for Peace, the Center for the Study of the Presidency, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and the Baker Institute for Public Policy at Rice University—and charged with undertaking a comprehensive review of U.S. efforts there. This panel was intended to serve as ''fresh eyes on the target''—the target being success in Iraq.

While reticent at first, to their credit President Bush, State Secretary Rice and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld came to support the ISG, ably led by bipartisan co-chairs, former Secretary of State James Baker and former Congressman Lee Hamilton. Two members of your national security team, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and CIA Director Leon Panetta, saw the merit of the ISG and, in fact, served on the panel. Vice President Biden, too, then serving in the Senate, was supportive and saw it as a means to unite the Congress at a critical time. A number of the ISG's recommendations and ideas were adopted. Retired General Jack Keane, senior military adviser to the ISG, was a lead proponent of ''the surge,'' and the ISG referenced the possibility on page 73. Aside from the specific policy recommendations of the panel, the ISG helped force a moment of truth in our national conversation about the war effort.

I believe our nation is again facing such a moment in the Afghanistan war effort, and that a similar model is needed. In recent days I have spoken with a number of knowledgeable individuals including former senior diplomats, public policy experts and retired and active military. Many believe our Afghanistan policy is adrift, and all agreed that there is an urgent need for what I call an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group (APG). We must examine our efforts in the region holistically, given Pakistan's strategic significance to our efforts in Afghanistan and the Taliban's presence in that country as well, especially in the border areas.

This likely will not come as a surprise to you as commander in chief. You are well acquainted with the sobering statistics of the past several weeks—notably that July surpassed June as the deadliest month for U.S. troops. There is a palpable shift in the nation's mood and in the halls of Congress. A July 2010 CBS news poll found that 62 percent of Americans say the war is going badly in Afghanistan, up from 49 percent in May. Further, last week, 102 Democrats voted against the war spending bill, which is 70 more than last year, and they were joined by 12 members of my own party. Senator Lindsay Graham, speaking last Sunday on CNN's ''State of the Union,'' candidly expressed concern about an ''unholy alliance'' emerging of anti-war Democrats and Republicans.

I have heard it said that Vietnam was not lost in Saigon; rather, it was lost in Washington. While the Vietnam and Afghanistan parallels are imperfect at best, the shadow of history looms large. Eroding political will has consequences—and in the case of Afghanistan, the stakes could not be higher. A year ago, speaking before the Veterans of Foreign Wars National Convention, you rightly said, ''Those who attacked America on 9/11 are plotting to do so again. If left unchecked, the Taliban insurgency will mean an even larger safe haven from which al Qaeda would plot to kill more Americans. So this is not only a war worth fighting . . . this is fundamental to the defense of our people.'' Indeed it is fundamental. We must soberly consider the implication of failure in Afghanistan. Those that we know for certain are chilling—namely an emboldened al Qaeda, a reconstituted Taliban with an open staging ground for future worldwide attacks, and a destabilized, nuclear-armed Pakistan.

Given these realities and wavering public and political support, I urge you to act immediately, through executive order, to convene an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group modeled after the Iraq Study Group. The participation of nationally known and respected individuals is of paramount importance. Among the names that surfaced in my discussions with others, all of whom more than meet the criteria described above, are ISO co-chairs Baker and Hamilton; former Senators Chuck Robb, Bob Kerrey and Sam Nunn; former Congressman Duncan Hunter; former U.S. ambassador Ryan Crocker, former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger, and General Keane. These names are simply suggestions among a cadre of capable men and women, as evidenced by the makeup of the ISG, who would be more than up to the task.

I firmly believe that an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group could reinvigorate national confidence in how America can be successful and move toward a shared mission in Afghanistan. This is a crucial task. On the Sunday morning news shows this past weekend, it was unsettling to hear conflicting statements from within the leadership of the administration that revealed a lack of clarity about the endgame in Afghanistan. How much more so is this true for the rest of the country? An APSG is necessary for precisely that reason. We are nine years into our nation's longest running war and the American people and their elected representatives do not have a clear sense of what we are aiming to achieve, why it is necessary and how far we are from attaining that goal. Further, an APSG could strengthen many of our NATO allies in Afghanistan who are also facing dwindling public support, as evidenced by the recent Dutch troop withdrawal, and would give them a tangible vision to which to commit.

Just as was true at the time of the Iraq Study Group, I believe that Americans of all political viewpoints, liberals and conservatives alike, and varied opinions on the war will embrace this ''fresh eyes'' approach. Like the previous administration's support of the Iraq Study Group, which involved taking the group's members to Iraq and providing high-level access to policy and decision makers, I urge you to embrace an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group. It is always in our national interest to openly assess the challenges before us and to chart a clear course to success.

As you know, the full Congress comes back in session in mid-September—days after Americans around the country will once again pause and remember that horrific morning nine years ago when passenger airlines became weapons, when the skyline of one of America's greatest cities was forever changed, when a symbol of America's military might was left with a gaping hole. The experts with whom I have spoken in recent days believe that time is of the essence in moving forward with a study panel, and waiting for Congress to reconvene is too long to wait. As such, I am hopeful you will use an executive order and the power of the bully pulpit to convene this group in short order, and explain to the American people why it is both necessary and timely. Should you choose not to take this path, respectfully, I intend to offer an amendment by whatever vehicle necessary to mandate the group's creation at the earliest possible opportunity.

The ISO's report opened with a letter from the co-chairs that read, ''There is no magic formula to solve the problems of Iraq. However, there are actions that can be taken to improve the situation and protect American interests.'' The same can be said of Afghanistan.

I understand that you are a great admirer of Abraham Lincoln. He too, governed during a time of war, albeit a war that pitted brother against brother, and father against son. In the midst of that epic struggle, he relied on a cabinet with strong, oftentimes opposing viewpoints. Historians assert this served to develop his thinking on complex matters. Similarly, while total agreement may not emerge from a study group for Afghanistan and Pakistan, I believe that vigorous, thoughtful and principled debate and discussion among some of our nation's greatest minds on these matters will only serve the national interest. The biblical admonition that iron sharpens iron rings true.

Best wishes.

P.S. We as a nation must be successful in Afghanistan. We owe this to our men and women in the military serving in harm's way and to the American people.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, the Republic of China (Taiwan), will celebrate its 100th anniversary as a nation.

One hundred years ago, on October 10, 1911, Dr. Sun Yat-Sen and his Revolutionary Alliance ended China's rule of Taiwan.

Since then, Taiwan has proven itself a beacon of democracy and freedom for the global community.

Taiwanese leaders have consistently and peacefully transferred power amongst each other, and its residents act in ways that embody democratic philosophies and principles.

I am proud to call Taiwan a friend and ally, and I hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing the Taiwanese people and their century of accomplishments.

As a friend, I happily extend my congratulations to Taiwan on its upcoming 100th anniversary.

COMMENDING THE SERVICE OF JUDGE LACY THORNBURG TO WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. HEATH SHULER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Judge Lacy Thornburg for more than fifty-five years of public service to our country and Western North Carolina.

Judge Lacy Thornburg was born in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina in 1929. After

graduating from Huntersville High School, he served in the U.S. Army, graduated from Mars Hill College and received his law degree from The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Following his law school graduation in 1954, Judge Thornburg and his wife moved to Jackson County, North Carolina where he began a law practice with former Congressman David Hall. He became active in church, civic, and political affairs, holding offices in the Presbyterian Church, the Jaycees, the Lions, and the Young Democrats.

During Judge Thornburg's thirteen years as a practicing trial lawyer, he was elected to three terms in the North Carolina General Assembly. He was appointed as a Superior Court Judge in 1966 and served on the bench for sixteen years. Through his hard work and respect for others, Judge Thornburg was elected Attorney General of North Carolina in November of 1984 and served two four-year terms. As Attorney General, he personally argued three cases before the United States Supreme Court: Riley v. National Federal of the Blind in 1988, N.C. Department of Transportation v. Crest St. Council in 1986, and Thornburg v. Gingles in 1986.

In 1994, President Bill Clinton nominated Judge Thornburg as U.S. District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina and he was confirmed by the 104th Congress on January 11, 1995. He served with distinction on the federal bench until his retirement in 2009.

It is an honor to represent selfless, hard-working public servants like Judge Lacy Thornburg. His devotion to public service is a great source of pride to me and to Western North Carolina. I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Judge Lacy Thornburg for his lasting impact on Western North Carolina.

IN CELEBRATION OF FLORENCE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the work of the Florence Congregational Church located in Florence, Massachusetts. It was originally a community church named "The Church of Christ In Florence." Its founders visualized it as the center of the abolitionist movement in the village, which was already an active station on the underground railroad, with its charter members being sympathetic to the movement. Its first settled pastor, Horace Carter Hovey, had been driven from his pulpit in Indiana because of his ardent opposition to slavery. Article nine of the church's bylaws, adopted on June 3, 1862, declared "our decided protest against the sin of slavery."

The church was dedicated on October 9, 1861, in the sixth month of the Civil War. The Reverend Hovey twice took a leave of absence to volunteer with the United States Christian Commission, serving troops on battlefields in Virginia. Meanwhile, members of the infant church sewed clothing for the soldiers and sent them "comfort bags" and food to supplement army rations.

During the 150 years that followed, fifteen successive pastors have served this faith community in Florence. The original twenty-six members increased to a peak of over 900 in the 1960s; subsequently membership settled at its current level of about 200.

The church has continued to function as a center of community life. Today it shares its facilities with the Cloverdale Cooperative Nursery School and Beit Ahavah, a reformed Jewish congregation. It hosts an AA chapter, regular public suppers, a Boy Scout troop, and a summer vacation bible school that draws children from the surrounding area. The present pastor, the Reverend Irven A. Gammon, is deeply committed to his work with the Cancer Connection and to the community.

SUPPORT OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of China, also known as Taiwan, which will occur on October 10, 2011.

On October 10, 1911, revolutionaries led by Dr. Sun Yat-sen launched an uprising in Taiwan to overturn dynastic rule that prevailed in China for over two thousand years. The Provisional Government of the Republic of China was established, declaring the Republic of China (ROC) an independent and sovereign state and the first republic in Asia. Dr. Sun Yat-sen served as their first president. October 10th is now celebrated annually as ROC's national day, also known as "Double Ten Day."

In honor of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of China, we remember and celebrate the struggles the Republic of China faced in order to become a democratic republic state. We also acknowledge Dr. Sun Yat-sen's dedication to the principles of nationalism, democracy and the people's livelihood. Since its founding nearly a century ago, the Republic of China has undergone tremendous transformations and has matured into a free-market, multi-party democracy that plays key roles in the global economy and in maintaining regional peace and stability.

As a proud member of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, I have had the privilege to travel to Taiwan this past May as part of a bipartisan delegation. I had the pleasure of meeting President Ma Ying-jeou and other government officials. I was strongly encouraged by their commitment to maintaining strong ties with the United States.

As we celebrate Taiwan's progress and development during the past century, we must also applaud their commitment to the ideals of freedom and democracy. I would like to congratulate the people of Taiwan for continuing in the traditions of Sun Yat-sen and maintaining the vibrant democracy that is a model for the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the Republic of China on the 100th anniversary of its founding.

RECOGNIZING JOHN D. WAGNER ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE TRI-COUNTY REGIONAL LABOR COUNCIL, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR—CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

HON. BETTY SUTTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge an individual who has tirelessly advocated on behalf of working families in my Congressional District.

John D. Wagner is a tenacious leader and has been a voice for workers in a career that spans several decades. As Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the Tri-County Regional Labor Council, John has worked to improve the lives of workers and promote the beliefs of organized labor so that working class families can have a fair shake. A member in good standing with the United Association of Plumbers & Pipefitters Local Union #219, John served as the Business Manager and administered the business operations and always worked towards for best interests of its membership.

John has never ceased in his efforts to address the issues and reality of working Americans. He is a political force who does not waver in his belief that each and every American deserves decent, affordable health care and a secure retirement after a lifetime of hard work. His voice and actions have inspired many, and we are grateful for his willingness to stand up for good wages and benefits for the middle class.

Though he is retiring from the Tri-County Regional Labor Council, John will continue his service on the Barberton City Council, where he is highly regarded for his responsiveness to the concerns of the residents in Ward Three. I commend John on his service and I look forward to working with him to improve the quality of life for working families across Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the dedicated service of Mr. John D. Wagner as he retires from the Tri-County Regional Labor Council, American Federation of Labor—Congress of Industrial Organizations.

HONORING THE FRIENDS OF THE FRELINGHUYSEN ARBORETUM

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Friends of the Frelinghuysen Arboretum, located in Morris County, New Jersey, as they celebrate their 40th anniversary.

Originaly a working farm and personal summer house, bequeathed to the citizens of Morris County, the property is now the Frelinghuysen Arboretum, dedicated in 1971.

In 1972, The Friends of the Frelinghuysen Arboretum was founded in an effort to support the projects of the arboretum. With the help of funding provided by the Friends, through events like their annual plant sale, the Arboretum is able to provide educational and interactive programs to people of all ages. One

such program is the Branching Out Program. This initiative gives youth in the community a chance to roll up their sleeves and work a garden, learning about plants from the garden to the table. Due to the tireless dedication of the Friends of the Frelinghuysen Arboretum, programs like these enable community members to explore the natural beauty that lies in their own backyard.

Under the guidance of the Morris County Park Commission, its mission is to support and/or sponsor projects and educational programs that will provide opportunities to the public to expand their knowledge and enjoyment of horticulture and the natural world.

The Friends of the Frelinghuysen Arboretum is made up a dedicated group of men and women with a passion for horticultural and volunteerism. Though the Frelinghuysen Arboretum is their primary focus, the Friends also provide support to two other facilities within the Morris County Park Commission: Bamboo Brook Outdoor Education Center and the Willowwood Arboretum.

It is with many great thanks to the Friends, that Morris County is able to offer such an invaluable resource to its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Friends of the Frelinghuysen Arboretum on their Fortieth Anniversary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 714 on H.R. 2646. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING THE CARIBBEAN FESTIVAL COMMITTEE ON THEIR 25TH ANNUAL CARIBBEAN FESTIVAL AT PENN'S LANDING

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Caribbean Festival Committee (CFC) on the occasion of their 25th Annual Caribbean Festival at Penn's Landing.

Since the Festival's inception, the CFC has focused on educating the Philadelphia region on the beauty and culture of the Caribbean and creating greater awareness of the significant contributions people of the Caribbean have made.

In addition to the cultural outreach and education the CFC and the Caribbean Festival provide, the CFC is dedicated to bettering their community. Proceeds obtained from annual events are used for a variety of charitable outlets. The CFC has used these proceeds to aid to hurricane victims and bereavement support in the Caribbean/American Community. Also, the CFC has awarded scholarships to Caribbean and Caribbean/American students attending two or four year colleges. To date, over 125 scholarships have been awarded to deserving students.

For 25 years, the Caribbean Festival Committee has been dedicated to educating the Philadelphia region on Caribbean culture, and providing outreach to the area's Caribbean/American community. I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in thanking the Caribbean Festival Committee for all they have done to improve and enrich the lives of many people in Philadelphia and beyond.

CONGRATULATING SABIC INNOVATIVE PLASTICS MOUNT VERNON FACILITY FOR RECEIVING THE NATIONAL POLLUTION PREVENTION ROUNDTABLE'S MVP2 PROJECT AWARD

HON. LARRY BUCSHON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the SABIC Innovative Plastics facility in Mount Vernon, Indiana as recipient of the National Pollution Prevention Roundtable's MVP2 Project Award. SABIC Innovative Plastics is one of the largest producers of thermoplastics, glycols, methanol and fertilizers and this award is testament to its facilities dedication to pollution prevention.

The project garnering this award recovered and commercialized sodium nitrate. This initiative reduced water use by 19 million gallons and carbon dioxide generation by 10 million pounds for a combined savings of $4.45 million annually.

I am proud to have the global headquarters of SABIC in our district and their commitment to environmental sustainability should be commended. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Mt. Vernon SABIC Innovative Plastics facility for receipt of the MVP2 Project Award.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR FLIGHT OF EASTERN OREGON AND HONOR FLIGHT OF PORTLAND, OREGON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 47 World War II veterans from Oregon who will be visiting their memorial this Friday in Washington, DC through Honor Flight of Eastern Oregon and the newly created Honor Flight of Portland, Oregon. On behalf of a grateful state and country, we welcome these heroes to the Nation's Capital.

The veterans on this flight from Oregon are: Elmer Beickel, U.S. Navy; Hayes Bickford, U.S. Navy; John Cleveland, U.S. Navy; Charles Decker, U.S. Navy; Leon Devereaux, Jr., U.S. Navy; Melvin Elder, U.S. Navy; Robert Ervin, U.S. Navy; Roice Fulleton, U.S. Navy; Robert Heisey, U.S. Navy; Dale Herbert, U.S. Navy; James Ogle, U.S. Navy; Edward Rose, Jr., U.S. Navy; Willard Rudd, U.S. Navy; Cameron Seitz, U.S. Navy; Russell Williams, U.S. Navy; Glen Winkler, U.S. Navy; Peter McNab, U.S. Navy; Henry Campuzano, U.S. Army; Vyvyan Clift, U.S. Army; James Dorgan, U.S. Army; Neil Farnham, U.S. Army; Howard Heimbuch, U.S. Army; James Howard, U.S. Army; Charles Keim, U.S. Army; Gerald Mattox, U.S. Army; William McCluhan, U.S. Army; Elliott Preble, U.S. Army; Erwin Regan, U.S. Army; James Sehorn, U.S. Army; Darrell Thompson, U.S. Army; Donald Thompson, U.S. Army; Clayton Vincent, U.S. Army; Patsy Seaman, U.S. Women's Army Corps; Bernard Anderson, U.S. Army Air Forces; Lee Berry, Jr., U.S. Army Air Forces; T. Carl Juhl, U.S. Army Air Forces; Jack Lewis, U.S. Army Air Forces; Robert Marble, U.S. Army Air Forces; Frank Ramirez, U.S. Army Air Forces; Walter Seaman, U.S. Army Air Forces; Gilbert Sharp, U.S. Army Air Forces; Dewey Thomas, U.S. Army Air Forces; Delbert Stafford, U.S. Army Air Forces; Donald Foelker, U.S. Marine Corps; Charles Porter, Jr., U.S. Coast Guard; Wayne Carlson, U.S. Merchant Marine; Paul Kirk, U.S. Merchant Marine.

These 47 heroes join more than 63,000 veterans from across the country who, since 2005, have journeyed from their home states to Washington, DC to reflect at the memorials built in honor of our nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, each of us is humbled by the courage of these soldiers, sailors, airmen, mariners and one Marine who put themselves in harm's way for our country and way of life. As a nation, we can never fully repay the debt of gratitude owed to them for their honor, commitment, and sacrifice in defense of the freedoms we have today. I will be hosting a special forum on Capitol Hill on Friday for these highly distinguished Americans, and I'm very eager to thank them all in person.

My colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Eastern Oregon and Portland, Oregon for their exemplary dedication and service to this great country. I especially want to recognize Dick Tobiason, a U.S. Army veteran, and the Bend Heroes Foundation whose tireless work will result in over 100 WWII veterans from Oregon visiting the memorials and U.S. Capitol.

HONORING CAPTAIN B.G. ''SHAKEY'' HOLDER

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to honor the service of an outstanding public servant in the 24th Congressional District of Texas. Firefighter Captain B.G. "Shakey" Holder is a hardworking, family-oriented individual who has served the Irving area selflessly throughout his personal and professional life. Captain Holder is retiring after 56 years of public service with the city of Irving.

Captain Holder has been married to his wife, Virginia "Ginger" Holder, for 19 years. They have a wonderful family of five children, seven grandchildren, and two great- grandchildren. His daughter, Cindy Jeffery, describes him as a man that "just gives to all."

"Shakey" joined the Irving Fire Department on December 1, 1955. Since then, he has become a well-respected officer who has mentored many young firefighters. Over the last 30 years, he has been assigned to two

important positions: working at Irving Fire Station 2 and serving as captain of Fire Station 1.

A strict routine of great health practices allowed Captain Holder to perform his tasks at the highest possible level of skill, which helped him as the lead man for his shift's Swift Water Rescue Team. His commitment to conditioning, training, firefighting, and enjoying life has been a leading example to all the members of the Irving Fire Department.

In 2005, Captain Holder was honored with a Texas State Proclamation and the city of Irving declared December 1st ''Shakey Holder Day'' in recognition of his outstanding service. In 2006, Captain Holder received The ''Shakey'' Gene Holder Lifetime Achievement Award, named after him for his lifetime dedication to the Irving Fire Department as a frontline firefighter. In 2010, he received the Fire Chief Award, and in the spring of 2011, the captain was recognized at the Texas State Capital for his 55 years of service.

On behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Captain Holder for his years of public service to the city of Irving.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BENJAMIN QUAYLE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, September 20, 2011, I missed rollcall votes numbered 712, 713, and 714. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on H.R. 2944, the United States Parole Commission Extension Act of 2011, ''aye'' on H.R. 2189, the Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2011 and ''aye'' on H.R. 2646, to authorize certain Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility projects and leases, to extend certain expiring provisions of law, and to modify certain authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

ON THE REPEAL OF ''DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL''

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for the repeal of ''Don't Ask, Don't Tell.''

Today, we are one step closer to our nation's promise of liberty and justice for all people. The repeal of this misguided policy has ensured that our country's laws are applied equally and that gay, lesbian, and bisexual service members will no longer have to lie about who they are in order to serve their country. It will also enhance our national security.

As a member of the House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, I believe that one of my most important jobs is to ensure that the U.S. armed forces remain the best equipped, best prepared, and most powerful in the world. By sending home more than 13,500 motivated and qualified patriotic service members since 1994, who were willing and fit to serve this country, ''Don't Ask Don't Tell'' has without a doubt weakened our military. I was privileged to have had the opportunity to vote in favor of its repeal.

Today, all those in our society who are ready, able, and willing to serve in the U.S. military will be guaranteed their right to do so. The U.S. Constitution, specifically the 14th Amendment, requires the government to apply our laws equally. Now, only negative conduct, not one's sexual orientation, will be grounds for dismissal from our nation's military. Investing many millions of dollars to train these individuals and then dismissing them, in the absence of bad conduct, has wasted many millions of precious taxpayer dollars and compromised our national security.

As we celebrate this major milestone, many formerly discharged service members will reenter the armed services to serve alongside their friends and military family. We must ensure that the U.S. military treats all of our service members equally. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals must have access to the same rights as their hererosexual peers. Anything less is unacceptable and utterly un-American.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in my family, I was absent for legislative business on Tuesday, September 20, 2011. As a result, I missed rollcall votes 712–714. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes: Rollcall 712–H.R. 2944, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, ''yes''; rollcall 713–H.R. 2189, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, ''yes''; rollcall 714–H.R. 2646, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, ''yes.''

CELEBRATING THE RELOCATION OF METROCREST SOCIAL SERVICES RESALE

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to celebrate the relocation of the Metrocrest Social Services Resale facility. From its humble beginnings in 1971, this organization has exemplified charity and service throughout its rich history in the Metrocrest community.

Metrocrest Social Services opened its doors in Farmers Branch as the TRUTH House, serving underprivileged teens. By 1984, the nonprofit organization changed its name to Metrocrest Social Services and expanded its operations, volunteer base, and geographic areas served. Today, Metrocrest Social Services has established itself as a vital part of the Metrocrest community, providing emergency assistance and beneficial programs to move families toward self-sufficiency. Metrocrest Social Services serves the residents of Carrollton, Farmers Branch, Addison, Coppell and parts of Dallas. During 2010, the organization assisted 12,052 individuals with one or more services.

In 1989, the first Metrocrest Thrift Store opened in the Old Carrollton Square to help people receive clothing, household goods, and support. In 2002, the Thrift Store relocated to Beltline Road and Josey Lane. The new 8,238 square foot Metrocrest Resale facility, located at Midway Road and Trinity Mills Road, will continue to support day-to-day operations of Metrocrest Social Services and its mission to prevent homelessness in the Metrocrest community.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Metrocrest Social Services as they relocate their Resale facility. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Metrocrest Social Services for its faithful service to our community.

SUPPORT FOR THE NATIONAL BREAST CANCER COALITION'S BREAST CANCER DEADLINE 2020

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have pledged my strong support for the goals of the National Breast Cancer Coalition's, NBCC, newly launched initiative, Breast Cancer Deadline 2020, and I encourage all of my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—to join me. This initiative represents an historic commitment to dedicating the resources, expertise, and strategic planning we need to end breast cancer, once and for all. Breast cancer has affected too many of my constituents, family members, and friends to count, and caused far too much heartache. We can no longer tolerate stagnant rates of incidence and mortality. We must generate the will, and the investment we need, to eliminate breast cancer within the next decade.

The National Breast Cancer Coalition assures us that this goal is within reach, but it will require strategy and wisdom to attain. That is why NBCC has developed a multi-faceted strategy that has the potential to deliver the results we have been waiting for. The Breast Cancer Deadline 2020 plan includes a strong focus on science and research, with an emphasis on metastasis and primary prevention. The plan also includes a role for government; key players will convene to identify the most effective role for government to play in supporting research and health care. NBCC will release annual progress reports on the state of its work, and set forth guidance for the coming year. Alongside these strategic efforts, NBCC will engage in a large-scale effort to change the conversation surrounding breast cancer and engage the public to build momentum for the campaign.

NBCC's Breast Cancer Deadline 2020 campaign holds the promise of a new and improved approach to ending breast cancer. This is not an easy task, but with this kind of renewed energy and commitment, I have faith that we can get the job done. I know that the National Breast Cancer Coalition will wage a smart, well-organized fight in the next few years. I look forward to doing whatever I can to lend my voice and support for this campaign.

THE OVARIAN CANCER AWARENESS RESOLUTION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this important bipartisan resolution that will help to raise awareness of the warning signs for ovarian cancer. This is an important vote that, put simply, will save lives of women across the country.

While we have made considerable progress in recent years in the war against cancer, thanks to the hard work of biomedical researchers at NIH and elsewhere, ovarian cancer has been a stubborn enemy. It remains the fifth most common cancer among women, and one I myself suffered from 25 years ago. It causes more deaths than any other female reproductive cancer. More than 15,000 of our friends and family are expected to perish from it this year.

Perhaps the saddest thing about these grim numbers is that some of these deaths are readily preventable. We know that women who catch their ovarian cancer at an earlier stage are over three times more likely to survive the disease than those who do not. Sadly, over 60% of the women diagnosed with ovarian cancer between 1999 and 2006 fell into this latter category.

That's why it is so important that we pass this resolution, and continue to help raise awareness about ovarian cancer. Of course, there are other steps we should also take. We need to re-fund Johanna's Law this year, which, despite strong bipartisan support, was zeroed out in the 2011 budget. And we need to continue to support the congressional-directed medical research program for ovarian cancer research at the Department of Defense, which was cut by 20% in the House's 2012 Defense Appropriations Bill.

But today, we can do our part by standing up against ovarian cancer, and passing this resolution. Cancer is indiscriminate. It does not care about your age, your family, your sex, your race, your religion, or your political party. It reminds us that we are all human and vulnerable. And that we must all come together—man and woman, young and old, Democrat and Republican—to fight it on every front.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and to help put an end to deaths from ovarian cancer.

CONCERNS REGARDING ''EXTRAVAGANT AND WASTEFUL'' SPENDING AT THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit a letter that I sent to Attorney General Holder on the report by the Office of Inspector General on the ''extravagant and wasteful'' spending on conference planning and refreshments.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, September 20, 2011.

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

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER: I was deeply concerned to read the Audit of Department of Justice Conference Planning and Food and Beverage Costs, which was released today by the Office of the Inspector General. This report details the Acting Inspector General's finding that DOJ spent more than $120 million on 1,832 conferences over two years, including ''extravagant and wasteful'' spending on food and beverages.

In one egregious example that occurred during your tenure as Attorney General, the Department spent $16 on each of 250 muffins served at an Executive Office for Immigration Review conference. In another case, the audit found that neither the Office of Justice Programs nor the Office on Violence Against Women required event planners to track and report salary and benefit costs on contracts totaling more than half a million dollars.

As Chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that funds the Justice Department, I am troubled about the financial mismanagement that has taken place at the Department during the same period in which this country has weathered a severe recession and a tenuous economic recovery. It is clear that while American taxpayers were tightening their belts and making difficult financial decisions, the Department was splurging on wasteful snacks and drinks as well as unnecessary event planning ''consultants.''

Over the last year, the House Appropriations Committee has had to make difficult choices about deep spending reductions to reflect the austere budget environment. Appropriations for the Department were reduced by 2.8% overall in fiscal year 2011, and are reduced by another 3.4% in the House-reported bill for fiscal year 2012, a total reduction of more than $1.7 billion over two years.

Clearly there is still more work to be done to address wasteful spending at the Department. I expect you and other Department officials to immediately address the OIG's recommendations, and renew efforts to root out and eliminate wasteful spending practices such as those detailed in this report.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE RESTORING PROTECTION TO VICTIMS OF PERSECUTION ACT

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleague, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, to reintroduce the Restoring Protection to Victims of Persecution Act, a bill that would end the practice of barring asylum claims by those who have been in our country for more than a year.

In 1996, this one-year bar to asylum was enacted as a way to prevent fraudulent claimants from being granted asylum. Sixteen years later, there is no evidence to show that deadlines of this nature are effective in preventing fraud. Rather, the implementation of this law has resulted in the return of refugees to countries where they face persecution because of their gender, religion, nationality, or political involvement.

Although the law includes exceptions to excuse those who are determined to have valid reasons for applying for asylum after one year, adjudicators routinely deny applicants who meet these exceptions. People who are attempting to care for their children, hide from their abusers, cope with past trauma, and deal with the challenges of surviving in a new country are repeatedly and arbitrarily denied asylum status because of missing the one-year deadline.

Once denied, an applicant has only two other possibilities for safety: to petition for withholding of removal or to seek protection under the Convention Against Torture. Both these forms of relief demand an applicant surmount a much higher standard of proof than asylum and do not allow reunification with family members or provide them permanency.

Everyone in Congress can agree that our immigration system is overwhelmed with a massive backlog of cases and in desperate need of reform. The one-year deadline only adds to this amassment of immigration cases and leads to government waste. More importantly, this law is hurting the very people we ought to be helping. This is a human rights issue that must be addressed as quickly as possible, and I implore my colleagues to support this desperately needed legislation.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MADISON AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 100th anniversary of Madison Area Technical College and to honor the education and enrichment this institution brings to the people of Wisconsin.

Madison College was founded in 1912 and quickly gained the reputation of a prestigious technical and community college. The technical school offers associate degrees, professional certificates, and specialized vocational training that reaches far beyond the walls of its main campus in Madison. The ability to receive specific training in 140 pertinent and growing career fields from a technical college is essential to the success of our community, especially in the tough economic times we find ourselves in today.

Madison College's vision is to transform lives, one at a time. This vision holds true from the Madison campuses all the way to each of the regional campuses in Fort Atkinson, Portage, Reedsburg, and Watertown. The skills students gain while attending the institution provide them with the tools to be successful in their future endeavors. The class size of only 20 students allows students and dedicated instructors to form a close bond, enhancing the educational experience.

The mission of the institution is to provide ''accessible, high-quality learning experiences that serve the community.'' Madison College's affordable tuition, financial aid, and scholarship opportunities ensure students from all

backgrounds can receive the education they deserve. Further, the Transfer U program allows students to gain the first two years of general education requirements and continue on for a bachelor's degree at another college or university, including the University of Wisconsin–Madison. This program saves the student an average of $11,000 in tuition each year. The technical college is also recognized as a state leader in delivering specialized training for future employees and nearly 90 percent of graduates find employment within 6 months of matriculation.

Not only does Madison College deliver a high-quality education to its students, but it also provides a fun and well-rounded college atmosphere. There are many student activities, campus events, and athletics that students can participate in to enrich their experience. Through its educational and community programs, Madison College serves approximately 42,000 people each year.

Madison College has effectively promoted its values of excellence, respect, and integrity over the past 100 years and will undoubtedly continue to do so in the future. I proudly join those across South Central Wisconsin, the entire state of Wisconsin, and this great Nation in celebrating the 100th anniversary of Madison Area Technical College and in thanking the many instructors, administrators, and students that make this institution such an outstanding place.

HONORING THE INSTITUTE OF TRANSPORTATION STUDIES AT UC DAVIS OF DAVIS, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 20th anniversary of the Institute of Transportation Studies (ITS) at the University of California, Davis. ITS-Davis is the world's leading university research center on sustainable transportation. Through research, education, outreach, and the use of advanced models and analytical techniques, the Institute develops business and public-policy strategies for a healthy transportation future.

When ITS-Davis was established in 1991, alternative fuels and vehicles were nowhere near commercial reality. California's Zero Emission Vehicle mandate had just been adopted. Hybrid cars were the stuff of dreams.

Founding director Dr. Daniel Sperling, a UC Davis engineering professor, wanted to build an academic institute where several academic worlds—engineering, social science and public policy—would merge; where modelers and lab technicians shared ideas with consumer-behavior and marketing experts; and where academia engaged with industry and government to craft creative real-world solutions to help transport people and goods to make the world a better place.

Today, the Institute is the world's leading university center on sustainable transportation. It has more than 60 affiliated faculty and researchers, 125 graduate students, and $12 million in annual research funding. ITS-Davis has redefined transportation research with its unique multidisciplinary approach encompassing transportation technology, fuels, basic science, human behavior and public policy.

At the core of ITS-Davis' success are its strong partnerships with the automobile and energy industries; governments here and abroad; and the environmental community. Together they integrate research with university and public education, for the benefit of all of us.

The Institute has been an innovative and inspirational leader in helping California and the nation envision, develop and implement pioneering public activities that unite transportation stakeholders in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Those include: California's Assembly Bill 1493, which required rules to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks (2002); the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB32), which set goals to cut emissions statewide to 1990 levels by 2020; the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (2007); the Sustainable Communities Planning Act (SB 375), intended to reduce the vehicle miles an average family travels (2008); the Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle Research Roadmap (2011); and the U.S. Low Carbon Fuel Standard, which is now nearing completion.

Throughout, the Institute has been an essential partner to our federal agencies, working on cleaner systems, fuels and vehicles with scientists and policy planners at the U.S. Departments of Transportation, Energy and Agriculture, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

We also benefit from the Institute's work as forum leader and collaboration builder. Earlier this month, ITS-Davis hosted the 13th biennial Asilomar Conference for the U.S. Transportation Research Board of the National Academies. This is the highest-caliber international conference dedicated to transportation-sector energy issues. The Asilomar meeting exemplifies how the Institute's inclusive approach creates the basis for constructive long-term dialogue.

Our country's transportation future shows great promise, in part because of what ITS-Davis has accomplished over the past 20 years. After 100 years of reliance on the internal combustion engine, today we see hybrid gasoline-electric vehicles everywhere, with plug-in electric vehicles coming up fast. On the horizon are vehicles powered by biofuels, electric batteries and hydrogen; intelligently planned cities where walking replaces driving; and transit networks that let us travel between communities quickly and cleanly.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time for us to congratulate and thank the faculty, students, staff and supporters of the Institute of Transportation Studies at UC Davis, who have done so much to ensure that our transportation options are sustainable and secure. We wish them continued success in their second 20 years.

RECOGNITION OF DR. CYNTHIA D. STARR

HON. ALBIO SIRES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to recognize Dr. Cynthia D. Starr and her contributions to the medical field and the New Jersey community. On October 29, 2011, Dr. Starr will be honored by Warren Hospital at their 30th annual Foundation Gala for her forty years of dedicated service to her community in the field of hematology and oncology.

Born in Jersey City, New Jersey, Dr. Starr graduated from the Chicago School of Medicine prior to an internship, residency, and fellowship at Montefiore Hospital in Bronx, New York where she mastered internal medicine, hematology, and oncology. Dr. Starr then continued her career in private practice and as an active member on the Warren Hospital staff in Phillipsburg, New Jersey, where she has specialized in hematology and oncology for the past four decades. Additionally, Dr. Starr is a consulting staff member to Easton Hospital in Easton, Pennsylvania and a founding member of the Karen Ann Quinlan Hospice.

During her time at Warren Hospital, Dr. Starr has served as Chairperson of the Warren Hospital Tumor Board and Chairperson of the Warren Hospital Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee. She continues to serve as Chairperson of the Warren Hospital Cancer Committee and as a member of the Warren Hospital Transfusion Committee. Her recognition on October 29th will be the latest of several honors Dr. Starr has been bestowed throughout her career. She has been elected President of Warren Hospital Medical Staff, elected by colleagues and patients as Warren County Home Care Physician of the Year, and she is a recipient of the First Clinical Instructor of the Year Award for the Warren Hospital Residency Program. In 2001, Warren Hospital opened its new Cynthia D. Starr Breast Care Center in honor of her service to the hospital's field of oncology.

It is with the highest esteem that I congratulate Dr. Cynthia Starr on her upcoming honor, as well as her accomplished career. Dr. Starr is a prime example of how one individual's dedication and service can positively impact an entire community.

CONCERNS REGARDING THE COLLAPSE OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit a letter that I sent to Attorney General Holder on the closure of additional Federal Prison Industries factories and warn of the gradual collapse of this important work program for prison inmates. I urge the attorney general to take immediate action to bolster the program.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, September 20, 2011.

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

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER: As you know, on September 13, 2011, the Federal Bureau of Prisons announced the closure of UNICOR operations at eleven institutions and the reduction of personnel at two other institutions. These actions are expected to result in the elimination of 74 staff positions and 325 inmate jobs. Unfortunately, this is a result of the UNICOR Board of Directors'

projection that the corporation would suffer losses of $23 million in FY 2012 unless changes were made.

These drastic reductions lead me to believe that you are presiding over the collapse of Federal Prison Industries (FPI). While I have worked to include language in the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill to bolster FPI, it takes more than Congressional leadership to ensure that this institution will weather the challenging economic climate. What is needed is strong executive leadership to encourage other Federal agencies to purchase goods manufactured in UNICOR facilities.

Therefore, I ask that you lead a corresponding effort to reverse this trend of downsizing at FPI. In prisons, work is dignity, and it is essential for prisoners' rehabilitation and successful reentry into society. Inmates need to learn skills and behavior that will enable them to succeed in a job outside of prison. There is no excuse for not ensuring that every Federal prisoner has a job. By working with OMB and other agencies, DOJ can assist in finding new or expanded opportunities for FPI in Federal contracts.

Restoring FPI should be at the center of any plan to improve reentry programs for Federal prisoners. I would appreciate hearing from you promptly about ways you and the Department can exercise leadership within the Executive Branch to restore FPI and create more meaningful work opportunities for Federal inmates.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GME SUPPORT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1852, the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education (CHGME) Support Reauthorization Act.

The future of pediatric health care cannot be compromised. As a supporter of the original legislation that established the CHGME program, and a cosponsor of H.R. 1852, I believe we must provide all the resources needed to guarantee that children's hospitals can continue to provide quality and timely care to their patients. As a mother and grandmother, I know how important it is for families in the Chicagoland area to know that Children's Memorial Hospital is there for them.

Support for physician education and training is essential to ensure patient access to care. Multiple expert bodies have identified a need for more pediatric subspecialists and have recommended expansion of medical education for pediatrics. In a letter to members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the National Association of Children's Hospitals wrote that "thanks to CHGME, children's hospitals have enriched their training experience by providing greater community-based opportunities in underserved urban and rural areas. This has increased access to care and the likelihood that residents will practice in medically underserved areas."

The funding from the CHGME program helps to ensure that children have access to the trained professionals they need. CHGME currently provides funding to 56 hospitals in 30 states to support pediatric residency training. Today, freestanding children's hospitals train over 40 percent of pediatricians, 43 percent of pediatric specialists, and most pediatric researchers.

Taking care of the health needs of children must be a top priority—we cannot afford to jeopardize their well-being and future. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1852, doing so will help to ensure that children have access to the trained pediatricians they need.

FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, due to a funeral, I was regrettably unable to attend the Full Committee markup of H. Res. 255; H.R. 1447; H.R. 1299; H.R. 915; H.R. 1801; and H.R. 1165 held on September 21, 2011. I submit this statement for the record to reflect my support for each of the measures and amendments considered during the markup. However, in regard to H.R. 1299, my constituents and I have serious reservations over any legislative language that does not properly differentiate between high-risk areas like the U.S.-Mexico border and low-risk areas like the Cape Cod National Sea Shore. Although I understand that this bill's intention is not to pave the way for DHS to take jurisdiction over from the Department of the Interior, I hope that future discussions on our national security will take into account the differences between high-risk and low-risk borders to better address threats without sending the wrong message to residents who live in low-risk regions.

DR. ROBERT E. DUNKER

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to recognize a constituent of mine, Dr. Robert E. Dunker.

Dr. Dunker recently retired from Western Iowa Tech Community College after a distinguished 20-year career. During his time at Western Iowa Tech, Dr. Dunker initiated and oversaw infrastructure improvements which have contributed to new program development and enrollment growth at the College. The infrastructure improvements have allowed Western Iowa Tech to create several new programs of study and to procure state-of-the-art equipment to best prepare students for what they will encounter in the workplace.

I can confidently say that I have known few people over the years who possess Dr. Dunker's vision and determination to effect positive change, not just for the students at Western Iowa Tech, but for the community at large. Dr. Dunker recognized early on that to meet the educational needs of the area, Western Iowa Tech needed to transition from a vocational/technical school to a full service, comprehensive community college, with arts and general science classes complementing the school's existing foundation of technical and career education. Dr. Dunker also saw the need to develop partnerships with area K–12 schools, postsecondary institutions, and the broader education community in order to leverage the educational resources of Western Iowa for the betterment of all Iowans.

I know that Dr. Dunker will be missed in his capacity as President of Western Iowa Tech, not only by me but by all of the stakeholders who have built partnerships and working relationships with him throughout the years. However, knowing Dr. Dunker as I do, I know that retirement will not diminish his passion for effecting positive changes in western Iowa. I look forward to continuing my relationship with Dr. Dunker, and I wish him the very best in all that's before him in retirement.

HONORING DR. GERI BERGER

HON. FRANCISCO "QUICO" CANSECO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today in honor of Dr. Geri Berger. Dr. Berger is the recipient of the 2011 Texas Association of Secondary School Principals Texas High School Principal of the Year Award. She is the Principal at the Louis D. Brandeis High School, Northside in San Antonio in the Independent School District, and I am honored to have students in my district attend the school under her exceptional leadership.

Dr. Berger began her noteworthy career with a Bachelor of Science in Education from St. Mary's University and a Master of Arts and Doctorate in Education from the University of Texas at San Antonio. Since coming to the Brandeis High School, she has brought her lifelong dedication to excellence in education, and it shows in the success of her teachers and students. Dr. Berger has worked tirelessly to ensure that Brandeis High School is a place where each and every student can improve and thrive. Under her leadership, the Louis D. Brandeis High School was named an Exemplary School by the Texas Education Agency, in 2009, another testament to her outstanding direction.

By ensuring that Brandeis High School improves each year offering students the best possible education they can receive, Dr. Berger is tirelessly working to ensure that the next generation's Americans receive a top-notch education and are ready to compete on a global scale. Dr. Berger is an extraordinary example to principals across Texas and the nation. I thank her for her hard work and enthusiasm and congratulate her on her remarkable accomplishment.

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 22, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 23

10 a.m.

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Corinne Ann Beckwith, and Catharine Friend Easterly, both to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and Ronald David McCray, of Texas, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board.

SD–342

OCTOBER 4

10 a.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the economic outlook.

SH–216

CORRECTION

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5795–S5848

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1586–1598. **Page S5838**

Measures Reported:

S. 1280, to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, and the development of sexual assault protocol and guidelines, the establishment of victims advocates, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 112–82)

S. 1596, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012. (S. Rept. No. 112–83) **Pages S5836**

Measures Passed:

Taiwan International Civil Aviation Organization: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 17, expressing the sense of Congress that Taiwan should be accorded observer status in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). **Pages S5845–46**

Small Business Contracting Fraud Prevention Act: Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship was discharged from further consideration of S. 633, to prevent fraud in small business contracting, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S5846–48**

Reid (for Murray) Amendment No. 652, to delay the effective date of the veterans contracting provisions. **Page S5846**

Measures Considered:

Generalized System of Preferences Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S5800–30**

Rejected:

By 44 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 142), Hatch Amendment No. 641 (to Amendment No. 633), to make the effective date of the amendments expanding the trade adjustment assistance program contingent on the enactment of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act, and the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S5800, S5804–06, S5809**

By 46 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 143), McCain Amendment No. 625 (to Amendment No. 633), to extend trade adjustment assistance as in effect before the enactment of the Trade and Globalization Adjustment Assistance of 2009. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S5800–04, S5806–10**

By 40 yeas to 57 nays (Vote No. 144), Hatch Amendment No. 642 (to Amendment No. 633), to modify the eligibility requirements for trade adjustment assistance. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S5810–16, S5827–28**

By 43 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 145), Kyl Amendment No. 645 (to Amendment No. 633), to repeal trade adjustment assistance for firms. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S5816–27, S5828**

Pending:

Reid (for Casey) Amendment No. 633, to extend and modify trade adjustment assistance. **Page S5800**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, September 22, 2011; that the only remaining amendments in order to the Reid (for Casey) Amendment No. 633 (listed above), and the bill be the following: Rubio Amendment No. 651; Thune Amendment No. 650; and Cornyn Amendment No. 634; that there be up to 5 hours of debate on the Rubio, Thune, and Cornyn

amendments equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees, with Senator Cornyn controlling 1 hour of the Republican time, and with Senators Rubio and Thune each controlling 30 minutes of the Republican time; that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Republican Leader, Senate vote on or in relation to the Rubio, Thune, Cornyn, and Reid (for Casey) amendments, in that order; that there be no amendments, points of order or motions in order to the amendments prior to the votes other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that each amendment be subject to a 60 affirmative vote threshold; that there be two minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote; that upon the disposition of the amendments, the bill, as amended, if amended, be read a third time; that there be up to ten minutes of debate equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees, prior to a vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended; that the bill be subject to a 60 affirmative vote threshold; and finally, that there be no points of order or motions in order to the bill prior to the vote on passage of the bill other than budget points of order and the applicable motion to waive.

Pages S5830, S5848

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was established in Executive Order 13224 on September 23, 2001; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM—923) **Page S5835**

Messages from the House: **Page S5835**

Measures Referred: **Page S5835**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S5835**

Executive Communications: **Pages S5835–36**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S5836–38**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5838–40**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Page S5840**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5833–35**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S5840–45**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S5845**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S5845**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—145) **Pages S5809–10, S5827–28**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:13 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 22, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5848.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012;

An original bill making appropriations for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012; and

An original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Ashton B. Carter, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, and 2,210 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine a recently released report by the National Park Service, *A Call to Action: Preparing for a Second Century of Stewardship and Engagement*, after receiving testimony from Jonathan B. Jarvis, Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Neil J. Mulholland, National Park Foundation, Washington, D.C.; and Jason Morris, NatureBridge, San Francisco, California.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 97, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay, with an amendment;

S. 893, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to the State of Louisiana for a pilot program to develop measures to

eradicate or control feral swine and to assess and restore wetlands damaged by feral swine;

S. 1400, to restore the natural resources, ecosystems, fisheries, marine and wildlife habitats, beaches, and coastal wetlands of Gulf Coast States, to create jobs and revive the economic health of communities adversely affected by the explosion on, and sinking of, the mobile offshore drilling unit Deepwater Horizon, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

A proposed resolution regarding the Federal Communications Commission, a proposed resolution regarding the Food and Drug Administration, and a proposed resolution regarding the National Institutes of Health; and

The nomination of Kenneth J. Kopocis, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

DUALLY-ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARIES

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine dually-eligible beneficiaries, focusing on improving care while lowering costs, after receiving testimony from Melanie Bella, Director, Medicare-Medicaid Coordination Office, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, to be Ambassador to Luxembourg, who was introduced by Senator Nelson (FL), Thomas Charles Krajeski, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Bahrain, Dan W. Mozena, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of Bangladesh, and Michael A. Hammer, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 1546, to authorize certain programs of the Department of Homeland Security, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

TRANSFORMING WARTIME CONTRACTING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine transforming wartime contracting, focusing on recommendations of the Commission on Wartime Contracting, after receiving testimony from Senators McCaskill and Webb; former Representative Christopher Shays, Co-Chair, and Clark Kent Ervin, Robert J. Henke, Katherine Schinasi, Charles Tiefer, and Dov S. Zakheim, each a Commissioner, all of the Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan; Patrick F. Kennedy, Under Secretary of State for Management; and Richard T. Ginman, Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense.

COUNTERING TERRORIST FINANCING

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism concluded a hearing to examine countering terrorist financing, focusing on progress and priorities, after receiving testimony from Lisa O. Monaco, Assistant Attorney General, National Security Division, and Ralph S. Boelter, Acting Assistant Director, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, both of the Department of Justice; and Daniel L. Glaser, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorist Financing.

GOOGLE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights concluded a hearing to examine Google, focusing on consumers and competition, after receiving testimony from Eric Schmidt, Google Inc., Mountain View, California; Jeffrey Katz, Nextag, Inc., San Mateo, California; Jeremy Stoppelman, Yelp! Inc., San Francisco, California; and Thomas O. Barnett, Covington and Burling LLP, and Susan A. Creighton, Wilson Sonsini Goodrich and Rosati, P.C., both of Washington, D.C.

THE AMERICAN LEGION LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of The American Legion, after receiving testimony from Fang A. Wong, Daniel M. Dellinger, Tim Tetz, Michael D. Helm, and Verna Jones, all of the American Legion, Washington, D.C.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 28 public bills, H.R. 12, 2981–3007 were introduced.

Pages H6341–44

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H6344–45

Reports Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 409, waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (H. Rept. 112–214). Page H6341

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative McClintock to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H6275

Recess: The House recessed at 10:43 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. Pages H6279–80

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Judith Wright, First Parish Unitarian Universalist Church, Northborough, Massachusetts.

Page H6280

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal: S. Con. Res. 28, to authorize the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 424 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 717;

Pages H6284–88, H6314

Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse Designation Act: S. 846, to designate the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 407 yeas to 2 nays with 2 voting "present", Roll No. 718; Pages H6288–89, H6314–15

Short-Term TANF Extension Act: H.R. 2943, to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through December 31, 2011; and

Pages H6289–92

Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act: H.R. 2883, amended, to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend the child and family services program through fiscal year 2016, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 395 yeas to 25 nays, Roll No. 720.

Pages H6292–H6304, H6328–29

Small Business Program Extension and Reform Act of 2011: The House failed to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to H.R. 2608, to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, by a yea-and-nay vote of 195 yeas to 230 nays, Roll No. 719.

Pages H6315–28

H. Res. 405, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 185 nays, Roll No. 716, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 237 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 715.

Pages H6304–14

Recess: The House recesed at 7:35 p.m. and reconvened at 7:58 p.m. Page H6340

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2011—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 112–57).

Page H6284

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6316, H6313–14, H6314, H6315, H6328 and H6329. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7.59 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ARMY RESERVE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD READINESS, TRAINING AND OPERATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing on Army Reserve, Army National Guard and Air National Guard readiness, training and operations. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Jasck C. Stultz, USA, Chief, U.S. Army Reserve; Major General Raymond W. Carpenter, USA, Acting Director, Army National Guard; and Lieutenant General Harry M. Wyatt, USAF, Director, Air National Guard.

BROKEN BUDGET PROCESS: PERSPECTIVES FROM FORMER CBO DIRECTORS

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Broken Budget Process: Perspectives from Former CBO Directors.'' Testimony was heard from the following former Congressional Budget Office Directors: Alice M. Rivlin, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution; and Rudolph G. Penner, Institute Fellow, Urban Institute.

ENSURING THE EDUCATION SYSTEM IS ACCOUNTABLE TO PARENTS AND COMMUNITIES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education held a hearing entitled ''Education Reforms: Ensuring the Education System is Accountable to Parents and Communities.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee continued markup of the following: H.R. 2250, the ''EPA Regulatory Relief Act of 2011''; H.R. 2681, the ''Cement Sector Regulatory Relief Act of 2011''; and H.R. 2937, the ''Pipeline Infrastructure and Community Protection Act of 2011.'' The following were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 2250; H.R. 2681; and H.R. 2937.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO FACILITATE SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL FORMATION AND JOB CREATION

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals to Facilitate Small Business Capital Formation and Job Creation.'' Testimony was heard from Meredith Cross, Director, Division of Corporation Finance, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission; and public witnesses.

IMPACT OF THE WORLD BANK AND MULTI-LATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing entitled ''The Impact of the World Bank and Multi-Lateral Development Banks on National Security.'' Testimony was heard from Marisa Lago, Assistant Secretary for International Markets and Development, Department of the Treasury; and Rear Admiral Michelle Howard, Chief of Staff to the Director, Strategic Plans and Policy, J5, the Joint Staff.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup of the following: H.R. 2699, to establish policies and procedures in the Peace Corps to provide for the safety and security of volunteers from rape and sexual assault, and for other purposes; and H.R. 2337, to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, the development of sexual assault protocol and guidelines, the establishment of victims advocates, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, and for other purposes. Both bills were ordered reported, as amended.

CHINA'S MONOPOLY ON RARE EARTHS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled ''China's Monopoly on Rare Earths: Implications for U.S. Foreign and Security Policy.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup of the following: H. Res. 255, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that effective sharing of passenger information from inbound international flight manifests is a crucial component of our national security and that the Department of Homeland Security must maintain the information sharing standards required under the 2007 Passenger Name Record Agreement between the United States and the European Union; H.R. 915, the ''Jaime Zapata Border Enforcement Security Task Force Act''; H.R. 1165, the ''Transportation Security Administration Ombudsman Act of 2011''; H.R. 1299, the ''Secure Border Act of 2011''; H.R. 1447, the ''Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2011''; and H.R. 1801, the ''Risk-Based Security Screening for Members of The Armed Forces Act''. The following were ordered reported without amendment: H. Res. 255; and H.R. 1447. The following were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 915; H.R. 1165; H.R. 1299; and H.R. 1801.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee continued markup of the following: H.R. 2885, the ''Legal Workforce Act''; H.R. 2847, the ''American Specialty Agriculture Act''; and H.J. Res. 70. H.R. 2192 was ordered reported without amendment. The following were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 2855; and H.J. Res. 70, to grant the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the States of Missouri and Illinois providing that bonds issued by the Bi-State Development Agency may mature in not to exceed 40 years.

ANWR

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''ANWR: Jobs, Energy and Deficit Reduction.'' Testimony was heard from Sean Parnell, Governor, Alaska; Sen. Murkowski; Sen. Begich; Rep. Young of Alaska; Renton Rexford, Council Member, City of Kaktovik, Alaska; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Technology, Information Policy, Intergovernmental Relations and Procurement Reform held a markup of H.R. 373, the ''Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2011.'' The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

ABUSES OF MEDICAID ELIGIBILITY RULES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Health Care, District of Columbia, Census and the National Archives held a hearing entitled ''Examining Abuses of Medicaid Eligibility Rules.'' Testimony was heard from Janice Eulau, Assistant Administrator, Medicaid Services Division, Suffolk County Department of Social Services; Julie Hamos, Director, Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and Labor Policy held a markup of H.R. 2309, the ''Postal Reform Act.'' The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by record vote of 8 to 3, a rule waiving clause 6(a) of rule XIII (requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee) against certain resolutions reported from the Rules Committee. The rule applies the waiver to any resolution reported through the legislative day of September 30, 2011, relating to a measure making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012.

NEXT IT REVOLUTION

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation held a hearing entitled ''The Next IT Revolution? Cloud Computing Opportunities and Challenges.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Science Education held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Program and Priorities for the Future.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ELIMINATING JOB-SAPPING FEDERAL RULES THROUGH RETROSPECTIVE REVIEWS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Eliminating Job-Sapping Federal Rules through Retrospective Reviews—Oversight of the President's Efforts.'' Testimony was heard from Cass Sunstein, Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budge.

NATION'S INLAND WATERWAYS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled ''The Economic Importance and Financial Challenges of Recapitalizing the Nation's Inland Waterways Transportation System.'' Testimony was heard from Jo Ellen Darcy, Assistant Secretary of the Army—Civil Works, United States Department of the Army; and public witnesses.

ANALYZE AND SCORE TAX REFORM LEGISLATION

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing to review and examine the variety of economic models used by the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) to analyze and score tax reform legislation. Testimony was heard from Thomas Barthold, Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Taxation; and public witnesses.

EXPIRING MEDICARE PROVIDER PAYMENT PROVISIONS

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing to examine certain expiring Medicare provider payment provisions. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

MANUFACTURING IN THE USA

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine manufacturing in the United States of America, focusing on how United States trade policy offshores jobs, after receiving testimony from Arvind Subramanian, Peterson Institute for

International Economics and Center for Global Development, Philip I. Levy, American Enterprise Institute, and Greg Slater, Intel Corporation, all of Washington, D.C.; and Richard W. Bloomingdale, Pennsylvania American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL–CIO), Harrisburg.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the United States strategy in Afghanistan and Iraq, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Alan B. Krueger, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers, Executive Office of the President, David A. Montoya, of Texas, to be Inspector General, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Cyrus Amir-Mokri, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Subcommittee on Security and International Trade and Finance, to hold hearings to examine the European debt and financial crisis, focusing on origins, options and implications for the United States and global economy, 2:30 p.m., SD–538.

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 educational outcomes for our military and veterans, 1:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on 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, 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 Evan Jonathan Wallach, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, Dana L. Christensen, to be United States District Judge for the District of Montana, Cathy Ann Bencivengo, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, Gina Marie Groh, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of West Virginia, Margo Kitsy Brodie, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, and David B. Barlow, to be United States Attorney for the District of Utah, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, to hold hearings to examine protecting seniors and persons with disabilities, focusing on an examination of court-appointed guardians, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on 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, 2:30 p.m., SD–138.

House

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee, hearing on Afghan national security forces, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Panel on Defense Financial Management and Auditability Reform, hearing on the Department of Defense's efforts to improve payment and funds control, 8 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing on the Future of U.S. Special Operations Forces: Ten Years After 9/11 and Twenty-Five Years After Goldwater-Nichols, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn. This is a closed hearing.

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Broken Budget Process: Perspectives from Budget Experts.'' 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, hearing entitled ''Culture of Union Favoritism: Recent Actions of the National Labor Relations Board.'' 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Regulatory Reform Series #7—The EPA's Regulatory Planning, Analysis, and Major Actions.'' 9 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled ''An Examination of the Availability of Credit for Consumers.'' 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Financial Services and the Subcommittee on TARP, Financial Services and Bailouts of Public and Private Programs of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, joint hearing entitled ''Potential Conflicts of Interest at the SEC: The Becker Case.'' 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, hearing entitled ''Axis of Abuse: U.S. Human Rights Policy toward Iran and Syria, Part II.'' 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights, hearing entitled ''China's One-Child Policy: The Government's Massive Crime Against Women and Unborn Babies.'' 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security, hearing entitled ''TSA Reform: Exploring Innovations in Technology Procurement to Stimulate Job Growth.'' 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing on the following: H.R. 2852, the ''Action Plan for Public Lands and Education Act of 2011''; and legislation regarding the ''National Forest County Revenue, Schools, and Jobs Act of 2011.'' 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs, markup of the following: H.R. 443, to provide for the conveyance of certain property from the United States to the Maniilaq Association located in Kotzebue, Alaska; H.R. 444, to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium; H.R. 1461, to authorize the Mescalero Apache Tribe to lease adjudicated water rights; H.R. 1556, to amend the Omnibus Indian Advancement Act to allow certain land to be used to generate income to provide funding for academic programs, and for other purposes; and H.R. 2444, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes. 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing on the following legislation: H.R. 1719, the ''Endangered Species Compliance and Transparency Act of 2011''; and H.R. 2915, the ''American Taxpayer and Western Area Power Administration Customer Protection Act of 2011.'' 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee, hearing entitled ''How Obama's Green Energy Agenda is Killing Jobs.'' 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee, hearing entitled ''NASA Human Spaceflight Past, Present, and Future: Where Do We Go from Here?'' 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures and Subcommittee on Oversight, joint hearing on the intersection of energy policy and tax policy, with a focus on the dual priorities of comprehensive tax reform and a sustainable energy policy that addresses our economic, security, and environmental needs, 9:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee, hearing of ongoing intelligence activities, 11 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine Russia's upcoming elections and the struggle for public and competitive politics, 2 p.m., 210, Cannon Building.

Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction: to hold hearings to examine an overview of revenue options and reforming the tax code, 10 a.m., 2123, Rayburn Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, September 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 2832, Generalized System of Preferences Act, and vote on or in relation to the Rubio Amendment No. 651, Thune Amendment No. 650, Cornyn Amendment No. 634, Reid (for Casey) Amendment No. 633, and passage of the bill at a time to be determined by the two Leaders.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, September 22

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 2401—Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation Act of 2011 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Adams, Sandy, Fla., E1669, E1669
Altmire, Jason, Pa., E1672
Baca, Joe, Calif., E1673
Baldwin, Tammy, Wisc., E1678
Barton, Joe, Tex., E1671
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E1676
Bucshon, Larry, Ind., E1676
Canseco, Francisco ''Quico'', Tex., E1680
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1673
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E1678
Filner, Bob, Calif., E1670
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1675
Hahn, Janice, Calif., E1671
Hurt, Robert, Va., E1676
Keating, William R., Mass., E1680
King, Steve, Iowa, E1680
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E1671
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E1671
Manzullo, Donald A., Ill., E1672
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1676, E1677
Mica, John L., Fla., E1671
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1677
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E1675
Pingree, Chellie, Me., E1669
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1672
Quayle, Benjamin, Ariz., E1677
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E1674
Richardson, Laura, Calif., E1675
Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E1677
Ryan, Paul, Wisc., E1677
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1680
Shuler, Heath, N.C., E1673, E1674
Sires, Albio, N.J., E1679
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E1678
Sutton, Betty, Ohio, E1675
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1679
Walden, Greg, Ore., E1676
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E1673
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1673, E1678, E1679
Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E1669, E1670

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.