United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 2012 No. 98

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 27, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RICHARD B. NUGENT 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 17, 2012, 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.

COMPANION CARE WORKERS BILL

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

Mr. WALBERG. Rising health care costs remain a top concern for many Americans, particularly the Baby Boomers heading off into retirement and individuals with disabilities. However, one service in particular—home companion care—has come under attack from the Department of Labor and faces a sharp rise in costs. Currently, the Fair Labor Standards Act provides exemptions for home care workers. And for more than four decades now, the exemption has helped seniors and individuals with disabilities maintain access to affordable in-home care.

Companion care workers play a crucial role for those who desire to remain independent, performing a range of everyday tasks like helping to prepare meals, opening the mail, providing light housekeeping, and even offering someone to talk with, which is immensely helpful. However, the greatest service these individuals play is providing families with a sense that mom or dad or their loved ones are not alone when we need to be away.

But in December of 2011, the Department of Labor introduced a proposal championed by President Obama to remove the companionship exemption from the Fair Labor Standards Act, a move which would virtually eliminate the current exemption. On top of that, it will raise costs for businesses and families and lead to reduced hours for home companion care workers. Even the Department estimates the cost of companion care under the proposed rule may increase by up to $2.3 billion over the first 10 years. It will be families and seniors and the disabled that will struggle to pay these costs out of their own pockets. These changes run in stark contrast to what Congress intended when it first established this important exemption nearly four decades ago. While I recognize the delivery of services has evolved over the years, the need to maintain access to affordable in-home care has not.

Seniors and the disabled in my home State of Michigan have been devastated by the fallout from this flawed policy. In 2006, Michigan made similar changes to the State law that the Department of Labor is currently considering. This was confirmed by a constituent in my home State who testified that his home companion care business, employees, and clients are worse off since the change went into effect. Seniors, those with disabilities, and their families are often unable to pay higher prices for the overtime requirement, forcing them to take on different caregivers throughout the day. This disruption to their schedule takes away the certainty of working with trusted caregivers. Many seniors and individuals with disabilities are then left with no choice but to leave their own homes because of the cost.

In response, I have introduced two bills to ensure seniors and individuals with disabilities keep their access to affordable companion care. Both bills will also prevent the Federal Government from interfering with decisions that should be made by families. The first bill, H.R. 5969, the Ensuring Access to Affordable and Quality Companion Care Act, will clarify that home caregivers employed by a third-party employer or living with the individuals receiving care continue to be exempt from the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The second, H.R. 5970, The Protecting in-Home Care From Government Intrusion Act, will stop the Secretary of Labor from finalizing or enforcing a proposed rule that severely narrows the Fair Labor Standards Act exemption for in-home caregivers.

If the Obama administration's proposal is not stopped, home care workers will lose hours and possibly their jobs. Seniors and those with disabilities will lose affordable care they want and need. This is simply a risk that we cannot afford to take.

TRANSPORTATION BILL

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. There's a transportation agreement rumored to be in the works that would be shortsighted in the extreme if these rumors prove to

Printed on recycled paper.

be accurate. Our problem was created because for years Congress and the last two administrations have been unwilling to deal meaningfully with the large gap of funding for transportation created because we rely on an outmoded funding system based on the number of gallons of fuel consumed. With more efficient gas and diesel vehicles augmented by more hybrids, plug-in hybrids, and electric cars, the transportation trust fund is locked into an inevitable downward spiral. Like the looming Social Security deficit, the longer we wait, the worse it will get.

Not this year, but over the next few years, we should temporarily increase and then replace the gas tax with a system that is based on the amount of road use. The new legislation should be laying the foundation for this transition. Unfortunately, it doesn't.

The rumored agreement would also take us backward on enabling alternative modes of transportation. In the last 20 years of transportation reform we've used enhancement funding to get more out of the transportation projects. These include long-neglected and wildly popular bike and pedestrian safety programs such as Safe Routes to School. In a recent Princeton survey, 83 percent of the public wanted these programs maintained or the funding increased. They place an emphasis on intermodalism so that transportation modes work together and minimize direct conflict between truckers, rail, and commuters that can paralyze not just transportation but transportation planning.

From what I hear, efforts to provide incentives to ''fix it first'' are being undercut. It's never as popular to maintain what you've got in face of the drumbeat of a few focused special interests for a new particular project. But ''fixing it first'' creates more transportation jobs, provides more safety, alleviates congestion and pollution, and has more overall economic impact. And it, of course, alleviates long-term pressure to create more roads that we can't adequately maintain.

The bill before us also misses an opportunity to reform the system to have more performance-based environmental protections. We absolutely can make the process work better and faster. But the answer is not to gut the protections, which will only create more conflict and ultimately more delays. Projects take more time when they're not done right, when citizens are not involved with the plan, and the myriad of interests aren't working together. Involving the public in the planning process works.

I'll never forget a conversation with a very conservative Republican mayor of Phoenix, who told me that it was only when they got the citizens working together on a balanced transportation program of transit and roads that they were able to get the resources and the momentum to go forward.

I will be extremely disappointed if the legislation shatters the coalition that I have been working for years to develop for the big picture, the big programs, and proper funding that's going to be necessary if we're going to be successful. It will be wrong if we have a scaled-down 2-year extension that will make it harder to give the American public what they need, adequate resources that are sustainable over time, more economic opportunity, and more construction and maintenance employment.

A good transportation program will protect the environment, enhance the quality of life, making our communities more livable and our families safer, healthier and more economically secure.

□ 1010

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, it has been very interesting the last couple of weeks. I have been listening to my colleagues on both sides talking about the debt, the deficit, spending, cutting, all of this, going on and on. Then I got to thinking, and I heard about this book and I went out and bought the book. The book title is ''Funding the Enemy: How U.S. Taxpayers Bankroll the Taliban,'' by Douglas Wissing. The book is a must-read for the American people.

I want to share a synopsis of this book:

> With the vague intention of winning hearts and minds in Afghanistan, the U.S. Government has mismanaged billions of development and logistics dollars, bolstered the drug trade, and dumped untold millions into Taliban hands.

That is the sobering message of this scathing critique of our war effort in Afghanistan by investigative journalist Douglas Wissing. According to Wissing, America has already lost the war. It draws on the voices of hundreds of combat soldiers, ordinary Afghans, private contractors, aid workers, international consultants, and government officials. From these contacts, it became glaringly clear, as the author details, that American taxpayer dollars have been flowing into Taliban coffers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to you a critique of the book given by former State Department foreign service officer Peter van Buren:

> Sober, sad, and important, ''Funding the Enemy'' peels back the layers of American engagement in Afghanistan to reveal its rotten core: that United States' dollars meant for the country's future instead fund the insurgency and support the Taliban. Paying for both sides of the war ensures America's ultimate defeat.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this to the floor for this reason: I continue to be amazed that both sides want to continue to spend $10 billion a month in Afghanistan. It is borrowed money from the Chinese, and there is no concern. We just spend more and more money to support President Karzai, who is a corrupt leader. And as this book says, have the American taxpayer bankroll the Taliban.

The American people have said in poll after poll: Bring our troops home now. As many as 72 to 73 percent of the American people say bring our people home now. Our soldiers have won the war. Bin Laden is dead; al Qaeda is dispersed.

I hope that Members of Congress will find the time to read this book, and I hope the American people will read this book and be outraged, as I am outraged, how our taxpayers are funding the Taliban so they can kill Americans.

Wake up, Congress. Let's get together and bring our troops home from Afghanistan and do what's right for the American people. But more importantly, do what's right for our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. And God, within Your loving arms, hold the families who've given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to bless the House and Senate, my friends on both sides, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God. And I ask God to bless President Obama that he will do what is right in the eyes of God. And I will ask three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

ARIZONA IMMIGRATION POLICY

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. This week, the U.S. Supreme Court declared the immigration policy of the State of Arizona, a policy that Mitt Romney has called ''a model for America,'' to be largely unconstitutional. I applaud the Court for stating that immigration enforcement is a Federal responsibility.

The ''show me your papers'' law allows police to demand that individuals prove that they are legally in this country. This law is not just a problem for people who are undocumented. It's not just a problem for immigrants. It's not just a problem for anybody who looks like they might have come to America from somewhere else. It's a problem for every American who cares about freedom. It's a problem for all of us who believe no person should be treated as a suspect based on how they look, their accent, or the spelling of their name.

In Arizona today, all that stands between you and a legal nightmare is whether a police officer feels there is a reasonable suspicion to inquire about your country of origin. Yet Arizona politicians will tell you, with a straight face no less, that they can

apply this law without using racial profiling, without assuming that someone named Gutierrez isn't less likely to be in this country legally than someone named Smith.

That's an amazing skill. Maybe with practice, we can all become like Arizona politicians and police officers who are able to telepathically determine who to accuse of not belonging in America.

But let's take a quiz together this morning and learn how to pick out the suspect. Here are two journalists, Geraldo Rivera and Ted Koppel.

At a traffic stop, to the untrained eye, we might guess that Geraldo Rivera, for some reason that clearly has nothing to do with the way he looks, might not be from America. Geraldo Rivera's mustache wouldn't confuse an Arizona law enforcement professional. They would know that Geraldo Rivera was born in Brooklyn, New York, and that Ted Koppel was born in Europe, in England, where his parents moved to flee from Hitler and Nazi Germany.

Round two, this for our young fans of C–SPAN. This is Justin Bieber and Selena Gomez. These young people have overcome their very different national origins and become apparently a happy couple. I'm sure Justin helped Gomez learn all about American customs and feel more at home in her adopted country. Oh, wait a minute. I'm sorry, because I'm not a trained Arizona official, I somehow got that backwards. Actually, Ms. Gomez, of Texas, has helped Mr. Bieber, of Canada, learn about his adopted country.

Justin, when you perform in Phoenix, remember to bring your papers.

The next round shows how tricky Arizona's game of pick out the immigrant is to play. Here are two basketball superstars. Neither one is Latino. That's confusing already. You have to dig deeper to figure out who isn't the real American. So let's consider their names—Jeremy Lin and Tony Parker. Clearly, ''Lin'' sounds kind of foreign while ''Tony Parker'' sounds American to me. But I'm not an Arizona police officer who would know that Jeremy Lin was born in Los Angeles, and Tony Parker—oops—Europe, Belgium. Wrong once again.

Finally, here's just one more.

In case the Supreme Court ever wants to meet in Phoenix to consider its ruling about Arizona's ''show me your papers'' law, if these two Justices step out to Starbucks, which one do you think is likeliest to be a suspect, the Anglo male or the Latina? Neither is an immigrant, but Antonin Scalia's father came through Ellis Island from Italy, and Sonia Sotomayor is a proud Puerto Rican with generations of U.S. citizen ancestors.

We could play this game all day, but the point is simple. The idea that any government official can determine who belongs in America and who doesn't simply by looking at them is completely ridiculous, unfair, and un-American, and yet this absurdity is the law of Arizona.

The Court signaled that it will be watching this law closely, and it should, because we count on the Court to protect our liberties, not restrict them.

□ 1020

Because, in America, people should always be judged by their actions. No person, not one, should be judged by the way they look, the sound of their voice, or the pronunciation of their last name—not in Arizona, not anywhere, not ever.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

AMERICAN CENTER FOR THE CURES

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, as the Supreme Court is about to rule on the health care law, Americans all across the country are focusing again on health care.

Health care makes up about one-fifth of the United States' economy, and it is increasingly taking up a larger share of our Federal budget, so it's important that we look to implement strategies that bend the cost curve down.

Scientific research over the years has enhanced our understanding of disease and has continuously led to many breakthrough treatments. However, it is critical that we emphasize not just treatment, but specifically cures for diseases as well.

Last year, the United States Government spent just under $32 billion to help the National Institutes of Health carry out its critical mission: seeking fundamental knowledge about the nature and behavior of living systems, applying that knowledge to enhance health, lengthen life, and reduce the burdens of illness and disability.

The NIH, Mr. Speaker, has earned a proud reputation for its research and has made a positive impact in the health care world. I'm a firm supporter of the NIH, and I spoke this past March to the House Budget Committee about the importance of funding NIH's mission. However, I also believe that we can always do more with the resources that we have and believe that we should refocus a portion of our health care resources toward a new mission. One idea that has been brought to me is a center that concentrates exclusively on eliminating diseases rather than continuing the practice of just treating diseases.

This center, known as the American Center for Cures, would be a public-private partnership that utilizes the resources of the government with the creativity and accountability of the private sector to find cures for the diseases that in some way affect almost everyone on the planet—diabetes, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, just to name a new.

By bringing our Nation's best and brightest minds together, from business boardrooms to scientists from around the world, the center would singularly devote its efforts to curing diseases by establishing renewed lines of communication amongst the world's most reputable scientists, funding collaborative research, unblocking bottlenecks in clinical research, facilitating speedy clinical trials, and ensuring that the research performed remains focuses on outcomes and results.

In addition to promoting the United States as the leading place for innovations and pioneering medical research, finding cures to some of mankind's deadliest diseases would also have global implications. The money saved by not having to dedicate it to treating or managing a disease could be freed up and invested in education, infrastructure, and deficit reduction, and we would be able to further help raise the standards of living for everyone in developing nations and around the globe.

During these difficult fiscal times, Mr. Speaker, here in our own country we have to start thinking differently. Today, we spend approximately $235 billion annually on treating diabetes alone. Think about the cost if we add Alzheimer's and Parkinson's. If the American Center for Cures could find a cure, think about the possibilities. Think about the good we could do, for instance, with 235 billion extra dollars right here. That's what we spend in our country. Think about what gets spent all around the globe.

We need to start thinking differently, Mr. Speaker. Change is hard, and change in Washington is even harder, but I believe that we have an obligation, as stewards of our taxpayers' hard-earned money, not only to effectively allocate their tax dollars in a manner that produces results, but change the way that we look at all the possibilities for our future. This mission could impact not just every American life, but every human on the planet.

ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER CONTEMPT VOTE

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my colleagues in the Congressional Black, Hispanic, and Asian Pacific American Caucuses for coming to the floor to denounce the deeply partisan and divisive effort by congressional Republicans to hold Attorney General Holder in contempt. We need to be doing what the American people elected us to do, and that is to create jobs and to get our economy back on its feet.

This contempt vote stands in stark contrast to our duties in Congress. We should be devoting our time to creating jobs, addressing our Nation's neglected infrastructure, and ensuring that student loan rates don't balloon starting next week.

Too many hardworking American families are looking for their next paycheck, and yet this Tea Party-led Republican Congress is wasting precious legislative time and energy on a purely partisan effort to generate conflict where none exists.

The Republicans' claims against Attorney General Holder defy belief. The simple fact is the Bush administration developed the inappropriate tactics, and once this Justice Department, under President Obama, learned about it, Attorney General Holder stopped the program—stopped it.

So instead of handling our Nation's priorities, this Tea Party-led Republican Congress is choosing to stick its head in the sand, ignoring the wide range of documents and open cooperation provided by the Justice Department but now engage in a game of political theater with no regard for struggling families across America.

The true motivation behind this contempt resolution is simple: As Leader PELOSI remarked last week, this is really about suppressing voter turnout. The National Rifle Association, unfortunately, has insisted that their supported Members of Congress vote for it or face political peril.

Let me tell you, these Tea Party Republicans don't like it when their ideological efforts to prevent people from voting get blocked by the Justice Department doing its job—and that's defending the Constitution of the United States. They know they can't win in judicial courts and they cannot win in the court of public opinion, so instead they're doing all they can to undermine the Justice Department by dragging Attorney General Holder through the mud, making endless demands, changing the goal posts, and monopolizing his time so that they can continue their efforts to undermine the democratic process. And they're asking for information that would violate the law. Furthermore, this is unprecedented. The House has never voted to hold an Attorney General in contempt.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of seeing these Tea Party Republicans pursue a senseless and destructive agenda. There's a reason that Congress has the lowest approval rating in history, and it has everything to do with efforts like this—a contempt vote that does nothing to improve the economy, does nothing to create jobs, and does nothing to strengthen our middle class or to help those trying to raise themselves out of poverty.

We need to invest in transportation, in education, and in ensuring above all that jobs and jobs and more jobs are added to our economic recovery. We only have a matter of weeks before Congress effectively shuts down for the August recess, and we cannot waste any more time doing anything other than putting Americans back to work. Jobs should be our number one priority, our number two priority, and our number three priority.

So I join my colleagues in the tri-caucuses calling for an end to this useless path of petty politics. Let us work during the remainder of time we have this congressional session to do the work that we were sent here to do. No more political witch hunts, no more political fishing expeditions, no more excuses. It's time to get back to work.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

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

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, two new words were added to the American immigration policy: ''Prosecutorial discretion.''

Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano recently ordered Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials to not deport certain classes of aliens who are in the country illegally. Instead, these illegal aliens will be given 2-year work permits that can be renewed indefinitely. The reason Secretary Napolitano and President Obama have given the American people for this de facto amnesty program is prosecutorial discretion.

The Secretary and the President claim that the Department of Homeland Security personnel can use their discretion to decide what individuals they can and cannot deport. But in Federal immigration law, this discretion does not exist. Congress took it away from the executive branch in 1996 when it passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act.

□ 1030

The law requires, and I will repeat that, this law requires immigration officials to address illegal aliens when they become aware that they are in the country illegally. It clearly spells out the actions that must be taken by Federal officials.

In fact, according to one of the Nation's leading experts on immigration, Congress, frustrated at the time because the Clinton administration was using it to let thousands of illegal aliens remain in the United States, wrote the law to remove that discretion. In other words, the discretion that President Obama and Secretary Napolitano claim they use no longer exists because Congress deliberately eliminated it in 1996. By stating they still have it, President Obama and Secretary Napolitano are actually ordering Federal immigration officials to break the law.

Since the executive branch is citing a privilege that no longer exists in ordering Federal immigration officials to break the 1996 immigration act which was passed by Congress and signed into law, today, I'm calling on the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees to hold hearings to investigate the legality of this decision to use so-called ''prosecutorial discretion.''

Just this week we heard from the United States Supreme Court that because the Federal Government writes immigration laws, State laws must work in harmony with the Federal Government. In striking down part of Arizona's S.B. 1070, the High Court's majority said that Federal law shall be the supreme law of the land when laws do not work in harmony with the Federal scheme or when Federal law is explicit. Well, in this case, the law is very clear: there is no prosecutorial discretion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my district in Pennsylvania has one of the highest unemployment rates in the State, and our country is still reeling from one of the worst recessions we have ever faced. The Department of Homeland Security's unlawful action could have grave consequences on our labor force and on our economy, both at the local and national levels.

Additionally, allowing individuals with forged documents to remain in this country could pose a serious threat to our homeland security.

Let me also state that I am troubled by the expansion of the authority of the President that he believes he has. In the past, President Obama clearly stated he had to follow existing immigration laws. During a town hall meeting with Univision in March 2011, he said:

> America is a Nation of laws, which means I, as the President, am obligated to enforce the law. I don't have a choice about that.

During that same town hall meeting, President Obama also said:

> There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system, that for me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.

So what changed? In the last 15 months, did Congress grant the President new powers? I don't remember doing that. Fifteen months ago, President Obama said he can't ignore congressional mandates. But suddenly, 2 weeks ago, he can? Again, I ask, what changed?

I'm concerned President Obama overstepped his constitutional authority in this case, just as he did in claiming executive privilege in Operation Fast and Furious. That's why these two committees must hold formal hearings and investigate this claim of discretion and the unilateral rewriting of Federal immigration policy.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the centerpiece of President Obama's 2008 Presidential campaign was the promise of health care reform. He told us, time and time again, that every President has seen the urgency of reform, that all of them had attempted reform, and none succeeded.

President Obama reminded us of the fact that having more than 40 million uninsured Americans is unacceptable. It is not only bad for the individual, but it is for the American economy. It is bad for hospitals who absorb the loss for these indigent patients or shift the costs to other patients.

During the campaign, the President went on to painfully highlight the unfair practices of some insurance companies in making people think they have quality insurance policies, when, in fact, in many instances, it is not worth the paper it is written on.

After fierce debate, and after the right-wing Tea Party instilled unfounded fear in the hearts of good Americans, the Congress passed the Affordable Care Act, and it is good policy for the American people. But there are those who have exploited the legitimacy of the Affordable Care Act, and now we await a ruling from the Supreme Court on the act's constitutionality.

Should the Supreme Court decide to undermine the most vital provision of the law, the individual mandate, one thing will be clear: it would be an act of judicial activism and judicial overreach, placing the Court firmly in the role of Congress.

Precedent for the Affordable Care Act already exists. Social Security is a program which all Americans are required to pay into and to participate. Car insurance is mandated in almost every State; yet the Supreme Court is on precipice of possible unfastening the linchpin that makes true health care reform attainable.

Such a decision would confiscate benefits that the public and businesses largely support. Lifetime coverage limits could be re-imposed on 100 million Americans. Seventeen million children with preexisting conditions could lose insurance coverage, and 6 million young adults may be forced off their parents' insurance plans.

Preservation of this law means 40 million uninsured Americans will be insured. It creates state-run health exchanges to give consumers maximum choice when selecting a policy, and it contains skyrocketing costs in medical care. The Affordable Care Act will lower insurance premiums driven by uncompensated care for the uninsured, saving the average family in North Carolina $1,400 a year.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act has already paid great dividends in my district. Under the law, 94,000 seniors have received Medicare preventive services without paying a dime. More than 5,000 young adults have health insurance when they previously did not. About 400 small businesses received tax credits to expand care to their employees; 34,000 children with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied.

As a policy-maker representing 700,000 people, I hope the act will remain intact. As a former judge, I hope the Supreme Court recognizes the impact an unfavorable decision will have on the role of Congress.

We cannot let the perfect, Mr. Speaker, be the enemy of the good. We should explore ways to improve upon the law instead of ways to further deny Americans access to affordable health care.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY OF MISCHIEF AND INTERVENTION

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced legislation, H.R. 5993, that would prohibit the President from providing military or paramilitary aid of any sort to any faction in the internal fighting in Syria. Unfortunately, it appears that the administration is already very much involved in supporting the overthrow of the Assad government.

There's nary a whimper of criticism in Congress over our growing involvement in the civil war in Syria. The only noise we hear from Congress, and repeated in the media, is the complaint that we're not doing enough and that immediate, direct U.S. military action must be taken.

Tragically, our political leaders show both bad judgment and short memories when it comes to the downside of our foreign policy of mischief and intervention. Our compulsion to engage ourselves in every conflict around the world is dangerous to our national security.

In dealing with Syria, the administration pretends to pursue diplomacy and provide humanitarian assistance to the people. In reality, the U.S. Government facilitates weapons transfers to the rebels who are demanding immediate regime change.

My goal is to stop our dangerous participation in the violence in Syria; yet evidence mounts that we're already deeply involved, with no expectation that the administration will back away from military engagement.

□ 1040

Recent reports indicate that the U.S. is providing logistics and communication assistance to the rebel forces. Assistance in getting arms to the rebels through surrogates is hardly a secret. Cooperating with the rebels' propaganda efforts has been reported and is used to prepare the American people for our coming involvement.

There is every reason to expect that the well-laid plans to, once again, coordinate a favorable regime change will end badly. Even the strongest supporters of our direct and immediate military involvement in Syria admit that the rebel forces are made up of many groups, including al Qaeda, and no one is sure to whom the assistance should be given. All they claim is the need for the immediate removal of Assad.

This policy is nothing new, and too often in our recent history our assistance with dollars and weapons used to overthrow a government ends up with the weapons being used, instead, against us. The blow-back from our policy of intervention has caused a great deal of harm to us since World War II:

Propping up the Shah in Iran for 26 years was a powerful factor in motivating radical Islamists to eventually overthrow the Shah in 1979. The hostages taken at the U.S. Embassy at that time was as a consequence of our putting the Shah into power in 1953;

In working with the mujahadeen in the 1980s, our CIA supported radical Islam in an effort to combat communist occupation in Afghanistan. Later, this led to the radical Islamists' hatred being turned against us over our occupation and interference in Muslim countries;

The $40 billion given to Egypt for over 30 years to prop up the Musharraf dictatorship and to buy an unstable peace with Israel has ended with what appears to be the takeover of Egypt by the Muslim Brotherhood. They may well turn Egypt into a theocratic Islamic state unless our CIA is able to, once again, gain control. Al Qaeda now has a presence in parts of Egypt and has been involved in the bombing of the pipelines carrying gas to Israel. This is hardly a policy that is enhancing Israel's security.

What are the possible unintended consequences of this policy if we foolishly escalate the civil war in Syria?

The worst scenario would be an all-out war in the region involving Russia, the United States, Israel, Iran, Turkey, and others. The escalating conflict could rapidly make containment virtually impossible.

Chaos in this region could encourage the Kurds in Syria, Iraq, Turkey, and Iran to decide it's an opportunity to move on their long-sought-after goal of establishing a Kurdish state. Significant hostilities in the region would jeopardize the free flow of oil from the Middle East, causing sharp increases in the price of oil. The already weak economy of the West would suffer immensely. Some will argue erroneously that a major war would be beneficial to the economy and distract the people from their economic woes.

War, however, is never an economic benefit, although many have been taught that for many decades. If liberty and prosperity are to be our goals, peace is a necessary ingredient of that process.

PARTISAN ACRIMONY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Tomorrow will be a peculiar day in Washington and in American politics.

Republicans will denounce ideas that they enthusiastically supported until those ideas became associated somehow with the Obama administration.

We expect to hear the ruling on the individual mandate across the street at the Supreme Court. The individual mandate was the centerpiece of Republican health care proposals until the Obama administration embraced it. Then the Republicans decided it was an outrageous infringement on personal liberty.

Here in this Chamber, we will debate Operation Fast and Furious. Most Democrats, including me, don't really even quite get what the supposed scandal is about, but have always thought that gun sales in large quantities to drug cartels was just generally a bad idea. For Republicans, on the other hand, the gun sales that were part of Operation Fast and Furious appear to be the only gun sales they've ever had a problem with. We will also have a 180-degree reversal on the issue of information that Congress can require as part of our oversight powers.

I was an Oversight Subcommittee chairman for 4 years. I believe congressional oversight is an important check on the executive branch of government, an established, important part of our Republic system of checks and balances. I support investigations that might make an administration of my own party look foolish or worse. I want people who have the power of government, of either party, to be accountable for their decisions. I want them to pause over how they will explain their decisions in public; and if they can't explain them, maybe they shouldn't do it. Congressional oversight exposes and deters abuses of power and garden-variety stupidity of which there is plenty in the public sector, in the private sector, and in all activities in which human beings are involved.

But the courts have also recognized that uninhibited, candid discussions improve decisions. Decisions are less likely to be stupid when they are carefully discussed, and the courts protect the privacy of some discussions within the executive branch to further the goal of fewer stupid decisions. The courts recognize a strong privilege for discussion between the President and his top advisers and a lesser privilege, a qualified privilege, for other debates within the executive branch.

When I was an Oversight Subcommittee chairman, I read many of the court decisions that discussed those privileges. Anyone who says that the law is clear, in that what is privileged and what is not is well defined, is misinformed or dishonest.

Five years ago, the Democratic majority disagreed with a Republican President over whether information we sought as part of our oversight powers was privileged. There was plenty of partisan acrimony at the time, but we found a simple solution. We filed a lawsuit to ask a judge to decide whether we were entitled to the testimony and the documents that we had subpoenaed. The Bush administration argued that the court shouldn't decide the case. The judge disagreed. The judge said that enforcing subpoenas and deciding what testimony or documents are privileged is something courts do every day. Judges expect lawyers to make careful, calm arguments based on the law and the facts; and they have little patience for tedious, dishonest talking points or personal attacks.

The debate here tomorrow will not even remotely resemble a legal argument in court. So we could go now to a court to clarify the law. I would support that. Many Democrats would support that—but no. Instead, House Republicans are going to force a vote to prosecute the Attorney General for the crime of taking a plausible position on uncertain legal issues. Instead of asking for a careful, calm decision by a judge on a legal issue, House Republicans are choosing an intemperate, acrimonious debate here in this Chamber over legal issues about which few Members have the first clue.

Why? The only possible reason is that House Republicans just like partisan acrimony.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SPECIALIST JARROD LALLIER, AN AMERICAN HERO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heart full of sadness and sorrow to honor the life of Specialist Jarrod Lallier.

Jarrod was a proud member of the prestigious 82nd Airborne Division, serving his first tour in Afghanistan. He was a graduate of Mead High School and a lifelong resident of Spokane, Washington. He was an athlete, a son, a brother, and an American hero.

Jarrod was just 20 years old when he lost his life last week in Afghanistan. He was just 20 years old when men in Afghan police uniforms turned their weapons on his unit and robbed him of his life. He was just 20 years old when he said goodbye to his family forever.

He would have celebrated his 21st birthday this week.

But since he is not here to do that, I want to celebrate the life he lived and the country he served.

Today, we celebrate a man who dreamed of serving America since he was young. We celebrate a man who fought for America, who protected America, who defended America. We celebrate a man who died in the name of American freedom.

Today, my thoughts and prayers and gratitude are with Specialist Jarrod Lallier and with all those who will carry on his legacy forever: his father, Gary; his mother, Kim; his sister, Jessica; and his brother, Jordan.

May God bless this great American hero, his family, and all the brave men and women who have answered America's call to freedom.

□ 1050

THE PATHWAY OF CONTEMPT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn place and a solemn moment when Members come to express their views.

A previous speaker drew us to heroes, and we thank those who have served us in the United States military. This morning I draw us toward constitutional and congressional responsibility. It is all intertwined in the honor that we have in serving in this august institution entrusted to us by the American public, our individual constituents.

I first suggest that earlier this week the Supreme Court established the superiority of the United States Government in immigration reform. In all of the points that were brought by the State of Arizona, two-thirds were rejected under the understanding and the law that the United States Government is in charge of immigration enforcement, immigration benefits, and that we should do our job.

For the one provision that remained standing—and as the ranking member formally of the Immigration Subcommittee and on Homeland Security, I see this every day. Having just come from Arizona, I have seen the good work Congressman GRIJALVA and Congressman PASTOR and others are doing. I know that we are working to ensure the safety of the border, but I also recognize the need for the dignity of human beings. I fight for the dignity.

Congress should get out of the way in terms of being in the midst of confusion and stand in the way and close the gap on immigration reform. The only provision left standing was a provision that the Court warned the State that if they engage in racial profiling, that too may be proven unconstitutional.

Law enforcement officers have always had the right in a legitimate stop to ask for the credentials of anyone they stop. The question is now burdening those officers to see who they stop and why they stop. Again, I speak to the issue of congressional responsibility.

Now I come to the act that is going to take place tomorrow, and a number of us are writing the Speaker and asking and imploring him, as Speaker Newt Gingrich did in 1998, refusing to bring forward a contempt charge against Janet Reno that was pointedly personal. We suggest now that there is much work to be done. As my colleague indicated, this case could be taken to the courts to determine what documents should be brought in.

In addition, the work has not been completed. Kenneth Melson, who headed the ATF, has never been allowed to speak before the committee to explain that he never told any of the officials, including the Attorney General, about the intricacies of Fast and Furious. The former Attorney General, who has

appeared before the Judiciary Committee on a number of times, I know that he would not in any way flee from coming and telling what he knew. General Mukasey, he has not been asked.

There have been 7,600 documents presented to the Oversight Committee, but yet we will be on the floor tomorrow in a purely personal relating of why Attorney General Holder, a lifelong law enforcement officer, the senior officer of the United States, the one who has come riding in and helping the most vulnerable in the United States, those who cannot get to vote, the disabled, and others who have been denied by the oppressive rules that have been passed by many States.

Thank God for the Federal Government and the attorney general of the United States. If it had not been for him, I would not be standing here because I would have still been bent down in the Deep South with hoses on top of me because the General of the United States in the 1960s and the Department of Justice came in and helped Dr. Martin Luther King after Bull Connor turned those hoses on in Birmingham.

Tomorrow we malign the very officer that has come to the aid of any American, those whose homes are being foreclosed. This General led a massive settlement to be able to stand and to be able to provide for the most vulnerable of Americans.

Congress has the responsibility of creating jobs, of passing an important transportation HUD bill that will provide housing and rebuilding of our highways and freeways. Tomorrow we will stop and pause and begin to call each other names and to take a man whose very life has been in public service, who has led the Department of Justice with dignity and respect, who has answered questions, who has prepared, who has appeared before us with a demeanor that is respective of his position. All I ask is that we not bring this to the floor and cooler heads will come and sit down and resolve the remaining documents.

For the love of this Nation, for the patriotism and the honor of serving in the United States Congress, I beg of this Speaker and this House: Do not go down the pathway of contempt. I beg of you to raise this House to a level of dignity.

THERE GOES THE RULE OF LAW

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Texas. We do have some disagreements, but I want to go back to the issue of jobs.

People are hurting. Without jobs, the unemployment has been higher than the President said it would ever get if we would just simply give him about a trillion dollars to give away to his friends, that that would make it all better. Well, it didn't.

What we've seen over and over from this administration is a complete disregard for the rule of law. When you look at all the people who have been drawn into this country illegally, in violation of our immigration laws—even though there is no country in the world that allows the immigration that this country does and the wide open gates that we do. But we do have parameters.

We've been told there may be a billion, billion and a half people who want to come to this country. If they did all at once, they would overwhelm us, and there would be no country for others to come to.

Why do so many want to come here? It's because we've always had regard for the rule of law. When there were those who would ignore the rule of law and put partisan and personal benefit above the law, eventually they had to account. Some have gotten away, but this country has done a better job of being fair across the board than any other country in history. That's why so many want to come here, because we've had more jobs, a better economy, and made more advancements than any country in history.

Yet, on the issue of immigration, this President stands up and announces we're going to ignore the law, just as he did on marriage. There is a proper law that was signed into law by President Bill Clinton, enacted by Congress, upheld, and he says we're going to ignore that because we don't like it. There goes the rule of law.

When it comes to ObamaCare, we've passed this law. But you know what? So many of the people that pushed this through and rammed it down the throats of America, they're asking for waivers and they're good friends, so we're going to give them waivers so they can ignore the rule of law.

How about the auto bailout? Ignored. The bankruptcy law? It ignored the Constitution and took away dealerships and gave them to others. This was a place where the rule of law was completely ignored.

Then this President stands up and says: Not only are we going to ignore the rule of law, duly passed law, but as I speak, I will create law. I now speak into effect new work visas and work permits that have never existed. But just as the ancient pharaohs or the leaders of the ancient world, as I speak, so it must be. I'm speaking into effect new work permits. I'm speaking into effect an ignoring of the laws that were duly passed. I'm speaking into effect a chance to give them jobs that Americans are hurting and trying to get.

We also have an Attorney General who was not only asked about Fast and Furious, he was asked about Justice Kagan on the Supreme Court: Are you aware of any instances during Justice Kagan's tenure as Solicitor General of the United States in which information related to patient protection and affordable care and/or litigation related thereto was related or provided? He refused to answer.

When did your staff begin removing Solicitor General Kagan from meetings in this matter? On what basis did you take this action? On what other matters was such action taken?

□ 1100

Look, the rule of law required that when it turned out there were possibly thousands of abuses of the national security letter in a Republican administration, I picked up the phone, called the chief of staff of my President, and said, This is unforgivable. We need a new Attorney General. Where is my friend across the aisle who will step up and say, the rule of law is too important?

We have Justice Kagan, who is ignoring law 28 U.S.C. 455 that says, You must disqualify yourself in any case in which your impartiality might reasonably be questioned. It must be reasonably expected that either she ignored the law, did not do her job as Solicitor General, was totally negligent, or she did her job, and she should not have sat on this case. She should have disqualified.

I beg and plead for my colleagues across the aisle to step up, as I did when the Attorney General was responsible for presiding over an injustice, and call for her resignation. It is contemptuous of Congress.

SOME DAYS ARE BETTER THAN OTHERS

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, U2 has a song, ''Some Days Are Better Than Others.'' The lyrics go something like this:

> Some days are dry. Some days are leaky. Some days come clean. Other days are sneaky. Some days take less, but most days take more. Some slip through your fingers and onto the floor.

Well, Mr. Speaker, today it is certainly threatening to slip through onto the floor. The House is apparently preparing for an unprecedented floor vote to hold a sitting Attorney General, the Nation's chief law enforcement officer, in contempt. The path that has led us to this sorry day is so long, so bizarre, so tortuous, so fantastical, so unbelievable that it stretches the imagination of individuals to try to make some sense out of our actions.

The Oversight Committee started out investigating the so-called ''gun walking'' which was initiated under the Bush administration. The Department of Justice produced thousands of pages of documents. The Attorney General testified nine times, and the committee found no wrongdoing by the Attorney General.

So the committee majority turned its attention to a February 4, 2011, letter sent by the Department of Justice to Senator GRASSLEY, initially denying allegations of gun walking. The DOJ acknowledged the errors in the letter

to Senator GRASSLEY and provided more than 1,300 pages of internal documents showing how the letter came to be drafted. The documents demonstrated that the staff did not intentionally mislead Congress but relied on assurances from ATF leaders and officials in Arizona who ran the operation.

Did the committee call the head of the ATF, Ken Melson, to testify as to how this happened, as Democratic members of the committee requested? The answer is no. Did the committee call former Attorney General Mukasey, who was briefed on the botched effort to coordinate arms interdiction with Mexico in 2007? The answer is no.

Instead, the majority members demanded more internal deliberative documents from the Department of Justice after the Grassley letter had been sent. Instead, the committee leadership made an ever-escalating series of allegations regarding the involvement of the White House, documented in YouTube videos and news clips viewed on the Internet, which were subsequently withdrawn. The committee leadership has refused the Attorney General's offer to resolve the conflict.

The President has now claimed executive privilege over a very narrow group of documents from the Department of Justice in response to Chairman ISSA's threat to hold the Attorney General in contempt of Congress. This is the first time the President has claimed executive privilege, in sharp contrast to recent previous Presidents who used the claim on numerous occasions in similar circumstances.

Should the House continue to pursue this irresponsible action, it is likely that it would lead to many years of judicial action and would, of course, further poison the highly charged partisan atmosphere leading up to the elections and critical decisions regarding the Federal budget and all of the other things that we really seriously need to deal with.

So I join with others who are asking the Speaker, who are imploring this House not to take such an irresponsible vote, not to take an irresponsible action, but to sit with the Attorney General, and let's resolve the conflict between the House and the executive branch. That's what reasonable people would do.

DARK MONEY DONORS, SHOW YOURSELVES

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, money has taken over our political process. Big corporations and high-rolling political schemers tell us everything is still mom and apple pie, and there's nothing to worry about.

But some of us have seen the effects of these hidden million-dollar dark money donations. We've seen the ads that tell you what to think and who to vote for, without telling you who's talking. We've seen the multimillion-dollar lawsuits that help elite corporate interests, without explaining who's paying the bill. We've seen more and more elections bought and paid for by the only people who can afford it. And those people are not us.

It's time to start naming names and asking why these people won't tell us who they are. We must start to fight back and ask them what they have to hide.

A front group called the National Federation of Independent Business is suing to block the Affordable Care Act. The president of the group says he's doing this to help small businesses. When I and my colleague Representative KEITH ELLISON wrote him a letter, asking him who his members are, he refused to answer. We asked him who gave him several recent million-dollar-plus donations that have helped fund the lawsuit; he refused to answer. We asked him why Karl Rove's Crossroads GPS political group gave him $3.7 million just when he initiated the lawsuit; he refused to answer. And he thinks that's good enough. Well, it's not.

NFIB has never liked answering questions. In 2006, according to an article in the Nashville Scene, the organization claimed 600,000 member businesses nationwide. Today on its Web site, it claims about 300,000. But when we asked NFIB to disclose where its money comes from, instead of providing us the courtesy of a written response, the group told the press that its membership has been growing by leaps and bounds since the lawsuit began. It described shrinking by 50 percent as big, new expansion, and it said new members had made small donations that covered the cost of this complex lawsuit before the Supreme Court.

In other words, NFIB won't tell us the truth about who it represents or how big it is. What does it have to hide?

Our democracy has always been about people. It's been about individuals and families making choices about who represents their interests. It's about what kind of country we want to live in, not about what kind of country the very wealthy want to choose for us.

Today, as we prepare for the Supreme Court ruling on the Affordable Care Act, millions of Americans with preexisting health conditions, with sick children, with long-term medical needs, and with no insurance stand together on one side. A front group with bottomless pockets that won't explain its motives sits on the other.

Mr. Speaker, this is not what our democracy is supposed to be about. Our Founding Fathers did not believe wealth makes a man more important than his neighbor. They didn't believe money is more important than the dignity of the individual. They didn't believe that any company or any organization is entitled to a special set of rules. And they certainly didn't believe that an incorporated business entity is the same thing as a human being.

There is no reason we have to accept the choices that the very, very wealthy few in this country are making for the rest us. Today we stand up to be counted, and we demand that dark money donations come to light; that anyone who wants to influence our democracy step forward and state his name for the record and be honest and transparent with the American people.

□ 1110

Democracy is not for sale, and an election should not be an auction. I'm proud to be on the floor today and say that I am on the side of people that want disclosure, want fair elections, and are tired of the influence of dark money in our collective democracy.

I challenge those front groups to ''put up'' or ''shut up.'' Tell us who's funding you and what you really want. It's about 4 months and a little more time until America elects a new Congress and a President. Let the voters decide. They know where I stand. And we want these front groups to tell us where they stand, where they get their money, who they are, and who they represent.

The American people in this great democracy of ours should make the choice whether we like it or not. The influence by a very few secretive groups that are fronting for others should not be the ones that decide who represents the American people, who will run this country, and who will set the priorities for this country.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE HOLDER CONTEMPT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this resolution to hold in contempt Attorney General of the United States Mr. Eric Holder. This contempt resolution does no good in moving along the investigation of the gun-walking operations across our borders nor in the investigation of the death of Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry, whose killing was associated with the recovery of two firearms linked with Operation Fast and Furious.

Last year, the House Oversight Committee initiated an investigation into allegations of this operation in the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms and Explosives, or ATF, field division in Arizona. Over the past year, the committee has extended its investigation by requesting thousands of pages of documents from the Department of Justice and interviewing about two dozen officials. In response, the Department has made extraordinary attempts, in my opinion, to accommodate these requests by submitting over almost 8,000 pages of documents. Attorney General Holder has also testified before the committee about nine times on this matter.

But the current contempt debate has lost its focus. This debate is no longer about gun-walking and Operation Fast and Furious. Having already discovered that Fast and Furious was the fourth in a series of gun-walking operations run by ATF's Phoenix field division in Arizona, dating back from the time of former President George W. Bush's administration, and finding no evidence of wrongdoing on the part of the Attorney General, the committee is now turning their focus to a single letter sent by the Department of Justice's Office of Legislative Affairs to Senator GRASSLEY on February 4, 2011, which initially denied allegations of gun-walking.

The Department has acknowledged that its letter was inaccurate and has formally withdrawn the letter. The Department has also turned over 1,300 pages of internal deliberative documents relating to how it was drafted, showing that staffers who drafted the letter relied on inaccurate assurances from ATF leaders and officials in Arizona who ran the operation. Again, the focus has shifted from the real matter of investigation and bringing justice to Agent Brian Terry's family.

During the 16-month investigation, the committee refused all Democratic requests for key witnesses and hearings, as well as requests to interview any Bush administration appointees. For example, the committee refused a public hearing with Ken Melson, the head of ATF, as well as a hearing or even a private meeting with former Attorney General Mukasey.

Attorney General Holder has worked in good faith, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to respond to the committee's requests and even met with the bipartisan leaders from both Chambers last week, offering to provide additional documents regarding the Fast and Furious initiative. His offer was rejected, and even yet the committee has continue to move the goal posts by demanding additional internal deliberative documents from after the February 4 letter that is now in question.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is the concluding step of what has turned out to be, in my opinion, an unfair process of defaming a public servant who has thus far made all good-faith efforts to cooperate with the Oversight Committee.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest that today's debate and deliberations on this proposed contempt resolution against Attorney General Holder is a profound example of democracy at its best may also be considered a sad day—a sad day for our Nation and a recognition of the fact that there has been a failure of the system to function properly.

I would respectfully urge the Speaker not to bring this resolution to the floor and allow the leadership of both sides of the Oversight Committee not to give up, and continue the dialogue, continue the deliberation, and not to question the motives and integrity of our colleagues on the committee, but solve the problem that is before us today, Mr. Speaker.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to give a special tribute to those fathers and their families who have come to America as refugees, escaping the harsh political and economic conditions in their home countries. On June 20, we celebrated World Refugee Day. Like many of our forefathers, refugees came to America hoping for a better life. Refugees receive sanctuary in the United States because they are in harm's way, they cannot return home safely, and they have nowhere else to turn.

For generations, we have resettled millions of refugees from all over the world. They have come from many backgrounds and ethnicities. America has offered sanctuary to countless Jews, Eastern Europeans, and many others displaced during World War II. We have welcomed people from Cuba, Vietnam, and other Asian countries who were fleeing repressive regimes.

In my home State of Georgia, I have seen how refugees have become an asset, contributing to the local economy and to the local culture. According to data from the Matching Grant Program, on average, 85 percent of refugee families in Georgia are self-sufficient 180 days after arrival.

Many Americans know the remarkable story of the Lost Boys of Sudan. Thousands of Sudanese boys were displaced and separated from their families during the second Sudanese civil war between 1983 and 2005. They traveled by foot for weeks and sometimes years to refugee camps in Ethiopia and Kenya just to survive. Their resilience and hard work should be an example for us all.

Defying all odds, these young men pursued their dream of getting an education in America and grew to become productive members of my congressional district in Scottdale and Clarkston, Georgia. Nonprofit organizations such as Refugee Family Services and RRSIA, located in my district, provide refugees with the resources they need to become self-sufficient and adapt to life here in America.

Thanks to services provided by these organizations, Ram, a young man who grew up in a Nepali refugee camp, was awarded a prestigious Gates Millennium Scholarship, a full 4-year scholarship to any college in the country. Ram chose to remain close to his family in Georgia, and he is attending Georgia Tech and plans to become a doctor.

So as we celebrate and recognize World Refugee Day this month, let us take a moment to think of those refugees, and let us recognize those organizations and volunteers working tirelessly every day helping refugees build a better future for generations to come. Let us also be proud as Americans for following our age-old tradition of welcoming those who have lost almost everything, but have found in our great country a promise for a better tomorrow.

□ 1120

Moreover, let us celebrate the generosity of the American people who have granted to refugees the best gift of all—freedom and hope.

So I ask all of my colleagues not to cut funding for refugees just to score cheap political points. Let us instead embrace refugees. Except for Native Americans, we are all descendants of progenitors who came here under some form of duress. Let us uphold our better nature of compassion and kindness that lies at the heart of who we are as Americans.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

As the energy and tensions of the Second Session gather, may there be peace among the Members of the people's House. Grant that all might be confident in the mission they have been given and buoyed by the spirit of our ancestors who built our Republic through many trials and contentious debates. May all strive with noble sincerity for the betterment of our Nation.

Many centuries ago, You blessed Abraham for his welcome to strangers by the oaks of Mamre. Bless this Chamber this day with the same spirit of hospitality, so that all Americans might know that in the people's House all voices are respected, even those with whom there is disagreement.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

OUR NATION IS ANXIOUSLY AWAITING DECISION ON OBAMACARE

(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, Americans will find out what we've been anxiously awaiting for the past 2 years: whether or not the government health care takeover bill is constitutional. Tomorrow, at 10 a.m., people across the Nation will be closely watching and listening as the Supreme Court delivers its opinion.

In efforts to rally her party for ObamaCare, former House Speaker NANCY PELOSI outraged Americans at a press conference by stating, ''We have to pass the bill so we can find out what's in it.'' The American people now know this bill, and they overwhelmingly disapprove of this bill, which the National Federation of Independent Business reveals will destroy 1.6 million jobs.

It is my hope that the Supreme Court will side with the best interests of the American people and overturn the job-destroying, out-of-control spending, and overreaching government health care takeover bill, which will hurt senior citizens with waiting lists, rationing, and denial of service.

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

Congratulations, Tom Rice of Myrtle Beach.

OPPOSING CONTEMPT CITATION AGAINST THE HONORABLE ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, tomorrow we risk bringing dishonor to this House.

For Members who revere Congress as the legislative branch of government, the majority's irresponsible and unprecedented contempt vote is just another sad chapter in our recent institutional decline. I implore my colleagues to give careful consideration as to whether we truly want the 112th Congress to become the first in history to hold a sitting Cabinet member in contempt of Congress.

Do we really want our legacy to be establishing one of the most partisan House of Representatives of all time, so clouded in judgment, so besotted with rancor and partisanship, that we are incapable of addressing vital separation of powers conflicts in a serious and fair fashion?

Further negotiations with the Department of Justice and the Attorney General are clearly available if we want a solution. I urge my colleagues to join me in restoring honor and dignity to this House by opposing the nuclear option: a contempt citation.

SMALL BUSINESS LENDING FOR JOBS ACT OF 2012

(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. An important part of the continued viability of our Nation's small businesses is their access to capital. To foster this access, we need to provide community financial institutions with responsible regulatory relief so they can increase lending to small businesses.

That is why, today, I have introduced the Small Business Lending for Jobs Act of 2012. This bipartisan legislation will allow community banks to spread losses in commercial real estate over a 7-year period. This will allow banks to retain more capital and use these funds to make new loans to small businesses in their communities.

The bill also establishes a dual mission for Federal banking regulators and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, mandating these entities promote credit availability so long as that credit is provided in a safe and sound manner. This will bring a greater balance to banking regulations. A dual mission will lead to regulators factoring in the impact on banks, communities, and customers in making their decision.

I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan Small Business Lending for Jobs Act of 2012.

AMERICA'S CUP

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work being done in my home State of Rhode Island as we host the final leg of the inaugural America's Cup World Series, an incredible boost to our tourism economy and a great moment for our State.

Teams of competitors and spectators from around the world have come to Newport for the America's Cup World Series, which according to some estimates is expected to bring in $70 million for our State's economy.

Although Newport hosted the America's Cup from 1930 to 1983, this marks the first time in history that America's Cup races are actually being held inside Narragansett Bay.

The opportunity to host a leg of this year's America's Cup not only provides a source of real economic benefit for our State, but also an intangible level of pride for all Rhode Islanders.

Thank you to the organizers for their hard work. I wish the competitors good luck, and to all those likely to benefit from the enormous economic impact of these events, much success.

BAXTER BOMB SQUAD RECOGNITION

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the members of the Mountain Home High School FIRST Robotics team, first known as the ''Baxter Bomb Squad,'' who recently won the For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology championship. The team was made up of 22 students and 14 adults, including several pairs of father-and-son teams.

Together they spent hundreds of hours building a robot, which competed in the Rebound Rumble, a basketball-inspired game. The team competed in front of an audience of 30,000 people and against more than 400 other teams.

The Baxter Bomb Squad has been competing for 17 years, and for the very first time this year, they won the championship. They were sponsored by local businesses, including Baxter Healthcare and Mountain Home High School.

The For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology championship has helped influence thousands of students throughout the country to pursue higher education in engineering and related scientific fields. Students who participated in this competition are 50 percent more likely to attend college and twice as likely to major in science and engineering.

Congratulations to the Baxter Bomb Squad. Best of luck of luck for years to come.

ORAL CHEMOTHERAPY

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, every day more and more cancer patients across the country are denied coverage for smart drugs because insurance companies refuse to cover them.

A resident in my district called my office last month to say that her insurance company refused to cover an oral chemotherapy drug she was prescribed to fight her cancer because her policy only covered generic drugs.

Madam Speaker, the insurance paradigm has not kept pace with the

science, and this is unacceptable. That is why I have introduced H.R. 2746, the Cancer Drug Coverage Parity Act, to mandate parity in coverage for all forms of chemotherapy, whether they're administered orally or through the vein.

I urge colleagues to support this legislation because cancer treatment should be determined by a physician, not by arbitrary and outdated insurance policies.

□ 1210

REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, more than 2 years ago, the President signed into law one of the most egregious attacks upon our freedom that this Nation has ever seen. Two years later, almost 60 percent of the American people still want to see ObamaCare repealed before the price of their health care goes up even more than it already has. Believe me, if we let this law take effect as planned, costs will skyrocket, and millions of Americans will lose their insurance altogether.

On top of restrictive mandates, higher taxes, Medicare cuts, and more government overreach, ObamaCare is flat out unconstitutional. We simply cannot force the American people to buy health insurance if they don't want it. I'm hopeful that tomorrow the Supreme Court will do its job and apply the Constitution as our Founding Fathers intended.

I look forward to repealing ObamaCare and getting started on real health care reform, as soon as the court reaches a decision.

POLITICAL VENDETTA

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, with so few days left in this legislative session, this is a time when we could be talking about how to help create jobs, improve education, and lower the deficit. That is surely what the American people really care about.

Instead, the greatest deliberative body in the world is quarreling about bringing a contempt charge to the floor of Congress against the Attorney General. It has never happened before. And let's be clear: it's not about finding the truth or creating reforms or finding out how gun walking started. We know how that started—it started under the Bush administration.

What this is about is just the Republican leadership pursuing single-mindedly a political vendetta, a political obsession. Like Ahab going after the great white whale, they are hoping to spill political blood.

This is the type of gamesmanship and partisanship that understandably makes the American people lose faith in their Congress and in their leaders.

Tomorrow, if it comes to the floor, vote ''no'' and let's get back to work on the real problems.

A FAST AND FURIOUS ATTACK

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, tomorrow the House is intending to vote on the contempt of our outstanding Attorney General, Eric Holder. It's because the Republicans have been obsessed with Fast and Furious.

Fast and Furious was a plan that went awry. It was started by the Bush administration, and it went awry. It was fatally flawed, and it resulted in the tragic death of a border agent. But nothing in this resolution will get to the bottom of it, and nothing will change it.

The fact is Fast and Furious is misnamed. Fast and furious is what the Republicans—starting with Senator MITCH MCCONNELL—have been doing since President Obama was elected. In a fast and furious way they've tried to do everything they can to taint the President of the United States and to taint anybody associated with him. That's what they are doing with Eric Holder. They want to blemish him and blemish the President.

Their fast and furious attack on the health care bill, which will save lives in America, and on this administration, is shameless. We should be creating jobs, helping the middle class, and putting America on the road to recovery. Instead, what we've been doing is a fast and furious attack on this administration.

A POLITICAL WITCH HUNT

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, while we have decried bullying in our schools, unfortunately it's going on right here in this House.

Tomorrow, the Issa resolution holding our Attorney General in contempt is to come to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to put an end to this totally politically inspired attack on Attorney General Holder and President Obama's administration.

Thousands of documents have been produced, many interviews have been held, and Mr. Holder has testified before Congress nine times on the operation Fast and Furious, which was started in Arizona no less, and under President Bush's administration. Democrats were not allowed one witness or a hearing that would have made this a fair, balanced, and likely closed investigation.

At the end of this extreme, unprecedented, partisan attack on the current administration, which is what it's all about and what can only be called a political witch hunt, what you will find in Attorney General Eric Holder is an intelligent, competent, patriotic, dedicated, and humble public servant who is upholding the integrity of his office and serving this country with honor.

Madam Speaker, I urge the House not to sully the history and decorum of this body with this first-ever vote to hold a sitting Attorney General in contempt.

SHAMEFUL

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

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, tomorrow this House is about to do something unprecedented and unwarranted. Motivated solely by politics, the leadership of this House is planning to smear a dedicated public servant.

For the first time in our history, they are planning to hold the Attorney General of the United States in contempt of Congress. This is shameful. Not even during the nakedly partisan speakership of Newt Gingrich has this House even considered such a resolution. But even more shameful is that they are ignoring the real issue, the easily available assault weapons and the gun related violence that continues unabated in this country.

Madam Speaker, they need to put aside politics and start caring about the safety of all of our citizens.

INVEST IN JOBS AND OUR INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I live in the Village of Cos Cob, Connecticut, where years ago a major bridge spanning the Mianus Harbor on Route 95 fell into the Mianus Harbor, killing a number of people, devastating the quality of life in the area, and hurting businesses up and down the coastline.

It fell into Mianus Harbor because we failed to invest in our transportation infrastructure. We failed to do something that we all understand is critical to our economy and just plain good sense.

On June 30, thousands of projects—like keeping the Mianus Harbor Bridge intact—will come to a halt because this House will not approve a reauthorization of the transportation bill. That's bad economics. It's bad for jobs, and it's bad for safety.

What do we do? Seventy-four Senators, lots of Republicans, and lots of Democrats, passed a 2-year bill that would keep the funding going and preserve or save or create 2 million jobs. But not in this House. No. In this House we've got to get the President to approve Keystone. We should do that, but let's do it separately and invest in jobs and our infrastructure.

RECOGNIZING THE VALUE OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, tomorrow the United States Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act.

Let us all step back and recognize those portions that people like. These are the highlights: For seniors, it closes the infamous doughnut hole for prescription drugs. This means, to date, about 5.3 million seniors have experienced savings of $3.7 billion. That doughnut hole will close completely by the year 2020.

For women, we no longer are going to suffer the discrimination against us. Ninety percent of the plans today charge more for women than they do for men for the same process. In 2014, this stops. Women can no longer be discriminated against for what they call preexisting conditions. Do you know what these preexisting conditions are? Breast cancer, C-section and childbirth, pregnancy, victims of domestic abuse.

And there will be a ban on maximum coverage in your lifetime for medical care. You will no longer need to have a referral to go see an OB/GYN. Children will also benefit.

Madam Speaker, let's all recognize the value of the Affordable Care Act.

WE HAVE TO PUT OUR HEADS TOGETHER

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, if you know you're approaching a cliff, wouldn't you take steps to avoid it?

Consumer confidence is flagging. It's flagging in part because some Members of the House have taken to brandishing the debt ceiling as a weapon designed to undercut economic growth. That just isn't responsible.

We have to put our heads together now to find a responsible way to cut spending and increase revenues rather than play the blame game. We cannot allow this year's approaching fiscal crisis to go the way of the budget supercommittee. That means both parties must find common ground. I know that's what San Diegans expect.

It is critical that we deal with our real problems. Those who are underemployed need jobs, doctors facing reimbursement cuts must be paid, and everything cannot be paid for on the backs of the middle class.

□ 1220

WELCOMING HIS HOLINESS, HAZRAT MIRZA MASROOR AHMAD TO THE CAPITOL

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor today to welcome to the House of Representatives His Holiness, Hazrat Mirza Masroor Ahmad. He is with us today in the gallery. His Holiness is the worldwide spiritual leader of the Ahmadiyya Muslim community, which has tens of millions of adherents around the world in 190 countries and tens of thousands of adherents here in the United States.

Today at a historic event in the Gold Room of the Rayburn Building, we recognized His Holiness' commitment to world peace, to brotherhood, to justice, and to religious freedom. I am proud to join with my colleague from California, ZOE LOFGREN, and others in introducing a resolution today in honor of His Holiness' visit here to our Nation's Capitol. In the United States, the Ahmadi community is one of the oldest and most organized Islamic communities.

I also want to take this opportunity to recognize two distinguished leaders from Los Angeles, Dr. Asif Mahmood and Kareem Ahmed, who are also in the gallery here and who show such leadership of the Muslim community in the Los Angeles area.

It is my honor to recognize His Holiness, to invite him to be with us here in the people's House. And I want to commend the Ahmadi motto: ''Love for all. Hatred for none.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Members should not refer to occupants of the gallery. In addition, the Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of its proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

CAP STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I will say to the American people, to the over 1 million online supporters of my legislation to forgive student loans, I want to thank you all for creating a national movement, a movement so strong that we are now demanding that this House and this Congress do something to cap student loan interest rates. But we can't give up. We can't stop there. We've got to cut this debt to bring people hope and to create jobs.

NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, every year, California dairies produce over 17 billion pounds of milk products that provide families with affordable, nutrient-rich products that we consume. California is the Nation's top milk-producing State, and much of the production takes place in the San Joaquin Valley, which I represent a part of. Many of these dairies in my district have been passed down from generation to generation, including the one that I grew up on in Kearney Park, near Fresno, California.

Over the last few years, dairy producers have seen milk prices continue to drop and feed prices increase and even skyrocket. In the coming weeks, the Ag Committee is slated to begin consideration of the 2012 farm bill. It is my hope that we can find a way to bring more certainty in prices and prevent extreme market volatility to help our producers across the country stay afloat.

As National Dairy Month comes to a close, I would like to commend our dairymen and -women for the work they do every day on the farm, 365 days a year, that allows families nationwide to enjoy the nutritious, cost-effective food that they are putting on our tables.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MUNICH VICTIMS

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, several weeks ago, my friend from New York, Congressman HANNA, and I sent a bipartisan letter to the International Olympic Committee, asking them to hold a moment of silence during the opening ceremonies of this year's Olympic Games in commemoration of the victims of the 1972 Munich massacre.

On September 5, 1972, 2 weeks after the start of the Olympic games in Munich, members of a Palestinian terrorist group, Black September, broke into the Olympic Village. Eleven Israelis were killed in that massacre. Now, 40 years later, in London, we are convening another Olympic ceremony. We asked the International Olympic Committee to recognize this 40-year anniversary, and the response we got was, No.

That is the wrong response, Madam Speaker. We, again, on a bipartisan basis, appealed to the International Olympic Committee in London, when these Olympics begin, to commemorate those Israelis who were massacred, which fits the ideals of the Olympics and, that is, international friendship and fraternity.

Eleven lives were lost. We should remember them in London when the Olympics convene.

STOP STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES FROM DOUBLING

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, today I rise to draw attention to the fact that there are only 4 days left until Federal student loan interest rates double. On July 1, the interest rate for 7 million students could rise to 6.8 percent. Failure to act and to act now would add $6.3 billion to students' debt burdens in 1 year alone.

Frankly, Madam Speaker, this rise in rates would happen at a time when our young people can least afford it. Our young people who are recent college graduates have the highest unemployment rate of any age group in the Nation, and more of them are graduating with debt than ever before. In fact, two-thirds of the class of 2010 graduated with student loan debt.

Madam Speaker, this is a real problem. It should be solved now, and it shouldn't be solved on the backs of the working class and the poor. I urge my colleagues to join me and do the right thing. Let's stop the interest rates from doubling before it's too late.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS' BENEFITS IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 4018) to improve the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATHAM. 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. 5972 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 697 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5972.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1228

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 26, 2012, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 74, line 6.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I submit the following for the RECORD.

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses	102,481	110,450	108,277	+5,796	-2,173
Immediate Office of the Secretary	(2,618)	---	(2,635)	(+17)	(+2,635)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	(984)	---	(992)	(+8)	(+992)
Office of the General Counsel	(19,515)	---	(19,615)	(+100)	(+19,615)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy	(10,107)	---	(11,248)	(+1,141)	(+11,248)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	(10,538)	---	(12,825)	(+2,287)	(+12,825)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	(2,500)	---	(2,601)	(+101)	(+2,601)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	(25,469)	---	(27,095)	(+1,626)	(+27,095)
Office of Public Affairs	(2,020)	---	(2,034)	(+14)	(+2,034)
Office of the Executive Secretariat	(1,595)	---	(1,701)	(+106)	(+1,701)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	(1,369)	---	(1,539)	(+170)	(+1,539)
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response	(10,778)	---	(10,875)	(+97)	(+10,875)
Office of the Chief Information Officer	(14,988)	---	(15,117)	(+129)	(+15,117)
Research and Development	---	13,670	---	---	-13,670
National Infrastructure Investments	500,000	500,000	---	-500,000	-500,000
Livable Communities Initiative	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Financial Management Capital	4,990	10,000	10,000	+5,010	---
Cyber Security Initiatives	10,000	6,000	6,000	-4,000	---
Office of Civil Rights	9,384	9,773	9,773	+389	---
Transportation Planning, Research, and Development	9,000	10,000	8,000	-1,000	-2,000
Working Capital Fund	(172,000)	---	(174,128)	(+2,128)	(+174,128)
Minority Business Resource Center Program	922	1,285	1,285	+363	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(18,367)	(21,955)	(21,955)	(+3,588)	---
Minority Business Outreach	3,068	3,234	3,234	+166	---
Payments to Air Carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	143,000	114,000	114,000	-29,000	---
Rescission of excess compensation for general aviation operations	-3,254	---	---	+3,254	---
Total, Office of the Secretary	779,591	783,412	260,569	-519,022	-522,843
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations	9,653,395	9,718,000	9,718,000	+64,605	---
Air traffic organization	(7,442,738)	---	(7,513,850)	(+71,112)	(+7,513,850)
Aviation safety	(1,252,991)	---	(1,255,000)	(+2,009)	(+1,255,000)
Commercial space transportation	(16,271)	---	(16,700)	(+429)	(+16,700)
Finance and management	(582,117)	---	(573,591)	(-8,526)	(+573,591)
Human resources programs	(98,858)	---	---	(-98,858)	---
Staff offices	(200,286)	---	(298,795)	(+98,509)	(+298,795)
NextGen	(60,134)	---	(60,064)	(-70)	(+60,064)
Facilities and Equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,730,731	2,850,000	2,749,596	+18,865	-100,404
Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund	167,556	180,000	175,000	+7,444	-5,000
Rescission	---	-26,184	-26,184	-26,184	---
Subtotal	167,556	153,816	148,816	-18,740	-5,000
Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(3,435,000)	(3,400,000)	(3,400,000)	(-35,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(3,350,000)	(3,350,000)	(3,350,000)	---	---
Administration	(101,000)	(103,000)	(105,000)	(+4,000)	(+2,000)
Airport Cooperative Research Program	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	---	---
Airport technology research	(29,250)	(29,300)	(29,300)	(+50)	---
Small community air service development program	(6,000)	---	---	(-6,000)	---
Chapter 471 reform obligation limitation reduction (legislative proposal)	---	(-926,000)	---	---	(+926,000)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Aviation Insurance Revolving Fund (Sec. 117)	---	-1,000	---	---	+1,000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	12,551,682	12,720,816	12,616,412	+64,730	-104,404
Appropriations	(12,551,682)	(12,747,000)	(12,642,596)	(+90,914)	(-104,404)
Rescissions	---	(-26,184)	(-26,184)	(-26,184)	---
Limitations on obligations	(3,350,000)	(2,424,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+926,000)
Total budgetary resources	(15,901,682)	(15,144,816)	(15,966,412)	(+64,730)	(+821,596)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on Administrative Expenses	(412,000)	(437,780)	(392,855)	(-19,145)	(-44,925)
Federal-Aid Highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(39,882,583)	(42,569,000)	(39,882,583)	---	(-2,686,417)
(Limitation on obligations)	(39,143,583)	(41,830,000)	(39,143,583)	---	(-2,686,417)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Emergency Relief (disaster relief category)	1,662,000	---	---	-1,662,000	---
Total, Federal Highway Administration	1,662,000	---	---	-1,662,000	---
Disaster relief category	(1,662,000)	---	---	(-1,662,000)	---
Limitations on obligations	(39,143,583)	(41,830,000)	(39,143,583)	---	(-2,686,417)
Exempt contract authority	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total budgetary resources	(41,544,583)	(42,569,000)	(39,882,583)	(-1,662,000)	(-2,686,417)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (Highway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(247,724)	(250,000)	(244,144)	(-3,580)	(-5,856)
(Limitation on obligations)	(247,724)	(250,000)	(244,144)	(-3,580)	(-5,856)
Motor Carrier Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(307,000)	(330,000)	(307,000)	---	(-23,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(307,000)	(330,000)	(307,000)	---	(-23,000)
CVISN contract authority (Sec. 131)	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Rescission of contract authority	-1,000	---	---	+1,000	---
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration	---	---	---	---	---
Limitations on obligations	(554,724)	(580,000)	(551,144)	(-3,580)	(-28,856)
Total budgetary resources	(554,724)	(580,000)	(551,144)	(-3,580)	(-28,856)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and Research (general fund)	140,146	---	152,000	+11,854	+152,000
Vehicle Safety	---	188,000	---	---	-188,000
Operations and Research (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(109,500)	(150,000)	(122,360)	(+12,860)	(-27,640)
(Limitation on obligations)	(109,500)	---	(122,360)	(+12,860)	(+122,360)
Highway Safety Research and Development (Limitation on obligations)	---	(150,000)	---	---	(-150,000)
Subtotal	249,646	338,000	274,360	+24,714	-63,640
Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(550,328)	(643,000)	(501,828)	(-48,500)	(-141,172)
(Limitation on obligations)	(550,328)	(643,000)	(501,828)	(-48,500)	(-141,172)
Highway safety programs (23 USC 402)	(235,000)	(317,500)	(235,000)	---	(-82,500)
Occupant protection incentive grants(23 USC 405)	(25,000)	(40,000)	(25,000)	---	(-15,000)
Safety belt performance grants (23 USC 406)	(48,500)	---	---	(-48,500)	---
Distracted driving prevention	---	(50,000)	---	---	(-50,000)
State traffic safety information system improvement(23 USC 408)	(34,500)	(34,500)	(34,500)	---	---
Impaired driving countermeasures (23 USC 410)	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)	---	---
Grant administration	(25,328)	(18,000)	(25,328)	---	(+7,328)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
High visibility enforcement	(29,000)	(37,000)	(29,000)	---	(-8,000)
Child safety and booster seat grants	(7,000)	---	(7,000)	---	(+7,000)
Motorcyclist safety	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	---	---
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	140,146	188,000	152,000	+11,854	-36,000
Limitations on obligations	(659,828)	(793,000)	(624,188)	(-35,640)	(-168,812)
Total budgetary resources	(799,974)	(981,000)	(776,188)	(-23,786)	(-204,812)
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and Operations	178,596	196,000	184,000	+5,404	-12,000
Offsetting fee collections (legislative proposal)	---	-40,000	---	---	+40,000
Direct appropriation	178,596	156,000	184,000	+5,404	+28,000
Railroad Research and Development	35,000	35,500	35,500	+500	---
System Preservation	---	1,546,000	---	---	-1,546,000
Network Development	---	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000
National Railroad Passenger Corporation:					
Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	466,000	---	350,000	-116,000	+350,000
Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	952,000	---	1,452,000	+500,000	+1,452,000
Subtotal	1,418,000	---	1,802,000	+384,000	+1,802,000
Next Gen High Speed Rail Service (rescission)	---	-1,973	-1,973	-1,973	---
Northeast Corridor Improvement Program (rescission)	---	-4,419	-4,419	-4,419	---
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	1,631,596	2,731,108	2,015,108	+383,512	-716,000
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative Expenses	98,713	---	100,000	+1,287	+100,000
Formula and Bus Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(9,400,000)	---	(9,400,000)	---	(+9,400,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(8,360,565)	---	(8,360,565)	---	(+8,360,565)
Rescission of prior year contract authority	---	-72,496	-72,496	-72,496	---
Research and Technology Deployment	---	120,957	---	---	-120,957
Transit Formula Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization)	---	(9,500,000)	---	---	(-9,500,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	---	(4,759,372)	---	---	(-4,759,372)
Transit Expansion and Livable Communities (liquidation of contract authorization)	---	(1,500,000)	---	---	(-1,500,000)
(limitation on obligations)	---	(212,185)	---	---	(-212,185)
Capital Investment Grants	---	2,235,486	---	---	-2,235,486
Operations and Safety	---	166,000	---	---	-166,000
Administrative programs	---	(129,700)	---	---	(-129,700)
Rail transit safety programs	---	(36,300)	---	---	(-36,300)
Research and University Research Centers	44,000	---	44,000	---	+44,000
Bus and Rail State of Good Repair (liquidation of contract authorization)	---	(1,500,000)	---	---	(-1,500,000)
(limitation on obligations)	---	(3,207,000)	---	---	(-3,207,000)
Capital Investment Grants	1,955,000	---	1,816,993	-138,007	+1,816,993
Rescission	-58,500	-11,429	-11,429	+47,071	---
Subtotal	1,896,500	-11,429	1,805,564	-90,936	+1,816,993

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority					
Capital and Preventive Maintenance	150,000	135,000	150,000	---	+15,000
Rescission	---	-523	-523	-523	---
Subtotal	150,000	134,477	149,477	-523	+15,000
University Transportation Research (rescission)	---	-293	-293	-293	---
Job Access and Reverse Commute Grants (rescission)	---	-14,662	-14,662	-14,662	---
Research, Training and Human Resources (rescission)	---	-248	-248	-248	---
Interstate Transfer Grants (rescission)	---	-2,662	-2,662	-2,662	---
Urban discretionary accounts (rescission)	---	-578	-578	-578	---
Total, Federal Transit Administration	2,189,213	2,554,552	2,008,102	-181,111	-546,450
Appropriations	(2,247,713)	(2,657,443)	(2,110,993)	(-136,720)	(-546,450)
Rescissions	(-58,500)	(-30,395)	(-30,395)	(+28,105)	---
Limitations on obligations	(8,360,565)	(8,178,557)	(8,360,565)	---	(+182,008)
Total budgetary resources	(10,549,778)	(10,733,109)	(10,368,667)	(-181,111)	(-364,442)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and Maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	32,259	33,000	33,000	+741	---
Maritime Administration					
Maritime Security Program	174,000	184,000	184,000	+10,000	---
Operations and Training	156,258	146,298	145,753	-10,505	-545
Rescission	-980	---	---	+980	---
Ship Disposal	5,500	10,000	4,000	-1,500	-6,000
Assistance to Small Shipyards	9,980	---	---	-9,980	---
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:					
Administrative expenses	3,740	3,750	3,750	+10	---
Rescission	-35,000	---	---	+35,000	---
Subtotal	-31,260	3,750	3,750	+35,010	---
Total, Maritime Administration	313,498	344,048	337,503	+24,005	-6,545
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Operational Expenses:					
General Fund	20,721	20,408	22,391	+1,670	+1,983
Pipeline Safety Fund	639	639	639	---	---
Pipeline Safety information grants to communities	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,500)	(+500)	(+500)
Subtotal	21,360	21,047	23,030	+1,670	+1,983
Hazardous Materials Safety	42,338	50,673	42,546	+208	-8,127
Pipeline Safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund	90,679	150,500	90,679	---	-59,821
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	18,573	21,510	18,573	---	-2,937
Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund (leg. proposal)	---	4,000	2,000	+2,000	-2,000
Subtotal	109,252	176,010	111,252	+2,000	-64,758
Subtotal, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	172,950	247,730	176,828	+3,878	-70,902
Pipeline safety user fees	-91,318	-151,139	-91,318	---	+59,821
Special permit and approval fees (leg. proposal)	---	-12,000	---	---	+12,000
Pipeline Safety Design Review fee (leg. proposal)	---	-4,000	-2,000	-2,000	+2,000

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Emergency Preparedness Grants:					
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)	---	---
(Emergency preparedness fund)	(188)	(188)	(188)	---	---
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	81,632	80,591	83,510	+1,878	+2,919
Research and Innovative Technology Administration					
Research and Development	15,981	---	13,500	-2,481	+13,500
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and Expenses	79,624	84,499	84,499	+4,875	---
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and Expenses	29,310	31,250	31,250	+1,940	---
Offsetting collections	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250	---	---
Total, Surface Transportation Board	28,060	30,000	30,000	+1,940	---
Total, title I, Department of Transportation	19,505,282	19,550,026	17,634,203	-1,871,079	-1,915,823
Appropriations	(17,942,016)	(19,685,493)	(17,769,670)	(-172,346)	(-1,915,823)
Rescissions	(-97,734)	(-62,971)	(-62,971)	(+34,763)	---
Disaster relief category	(1,662,000)	---	---	(-1,662,000)	---
Rescissions of contract authority	(-1,000)	(-72,496)	(-72,496)	(-71,496)	---
Limitations on obligations	(52,068,700)	(53,805,557)	(52,029,480)	(-39,220)	(-1,776,077)
Total budgetary resources	(71,573,982)	(73,355,583)	(69,663,683)	(-1,910,299)	(-3,691,900)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Management and Administration					
Administration, Operations and Management	537,789	532,546	518,068	-19,721	-14,478
Program Office Salaries and Expenses:					
Public and Indian Housing	200,000	211,634	206,500	+6,500	-5,134
Community Planning and Development	100,000	103,882	103,500	+3,500	-382
Housing	391,500	398,832	396,500	+5,000	-2,332
Policy Development and Research	22,211	21,394	22,326	+115	+932
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	72,600	74,296	72,904	+304	-1,392
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control	7,400	6,816	6,816	-584	---
Subtotal	793,711	816,854	808,546	+14,835	-8,308
Total, Management and Administration	1,331,500	1,349,400	1,326,614	-4,886	-22,786
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals	17,242,351	17,237,948	17,237,948	-4,403	---
Tenant protection vouchers	75,000	75,000	75,000	---	---
Administrative fees	1,350,000	1,575,000	1,575,000	+225,000	---
Family self-sufficiency coordinators	60,000	---	60,000	---	+60,000
Veterans affairs supportive housing	75,000	75,000	75,000	---	---
Sec. 811 mainstream voucher renewals	112,018	111,335	111,335	-683	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-25,000)	---	---	(+25,000)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year)	18,914,369	19,074,283	19,134,283	+219,914	+60,000

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Advance appropriations	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	---	---
Total, Tenant-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill	18,914,369	19,074,283	19,134,283	+219,914	+60,000
Public Housing Capital Fund	1,875,000	2,070,000	1,985,000	+110,000	-85,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-10,350)	---	---	(+10,350)
Public Housing Operating Fund	3,961,850	4,524,000	4,524,000	+562,150	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-22,620)	---	---	(+22,620)
Choice neighborhoods	120,000	150,000	---	-120,000	-150,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-750)	---	---	(+750)
Family Self-Sufficiency	---	60,000	---	---	-60,000
Native American Housing Block Grants	650,000	650,000	650,000	---	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-3,250)	---	---	(+3,250)
Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant	13,000	13,000	---	-13,000	-13,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-65)	---	---	(+65)
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account	6,000	7,000	6,000	---	-1,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(360,000)	(900,000)	---	(-360,000)	(-900,000)
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-35)	---	---	(+35)
Native Hawaiian Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account	386	1,000	---	-386	-1,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(41,504)	(107,000)	---	(-41,504)	(-107,000)
Housing Certificate Fund (rescission)	-200,000	---	---	+200,000	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing	25,340,605	26,549,283	26,299,283	+958,678	-250,000
Community Planning and Development					
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS	332,000	330,000	330,000	-2,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,650)	---	---	(+1,650)
Community Development Fund	2,948,090	2,948,090	3,404,000	+455,910	+455,910
Indian CDBG	60,000	60,000	---	-60,000	-60,000
Sustainable housing and communities	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Capacity building	---	35,000	---	---	-35,000
Disaster relief	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
(Disaster relief category)	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Subtotal	3,408,090	3,143,090	3,404,000	-4,090	+260,910
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-15,715)	---	---	(+15,715)
Community Development Loan Guarantees (Section 108):					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(240,000)	(500,000)	---	(-240,000)	(-500,000)
Credit subsidy	5,952	---	6,000	+48	+6,000
HOME Investment Partnerships Program	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,200,000	+200,000	+200,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-5,000)	---	---	(+5,000)
Self-help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program	53,500	---	60,000	+6,500	+60,000
Homeless Assistance Grants	1,901,190	2,231,000	2,000,000	+98,810	-231,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-11,155)	---	---	(+11,155)
Total, Community Planning and Development	6,700,732	6,704,090	7,000,000	+299,268	+295,910
Housing Programs					
Project-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals	9,050,672	8,440,400	8,440,400	-610,272	---
Contract administrators	289,000	260,000	260,000	-29,000	---
Subtotal (available this fiscal year)	9,339,672	8,700,400	8,700,400	-639,272	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-19,000)	---	---	(+19,000)
Advance appropriations	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances	-400,000	-400,000	-400,000	---	---
Total, Project-based rental assistance appropriated in this bill	9,339,672	8,700,400	8,700,400	-639,272	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Housing for the Elderly	374,627	475,000	425,000	+50,373	-50,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-2,375)	---	---	(+2,375)
Housing for Persons with Disabilities	165,000	150,000	165,000	---	+15,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-750)	---	---	(+750)
Housing Counseling Assistance	45,000	55,000	45,000	---	-10,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-275)	---	---	(+275)
Rental Housing Assistance	1,300	---	---	-1,300	---
Rent Supplement (rescission)	-231,600	---	---	+231,600	---
Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund	6,500	8,000	4,000	-2,500	-4,000
Offsetting collections	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000	---	---
Subtotal	2,500	4,000	---	-2,500	-4,000
Total, Housing Programs	9,696,499	9,384,400	9,335,400	-361,099	-49,000
Appropriations	(9,932,099)	(9,388,400)	(9,339,400)	(-592,699)	(-49,000)
Rescissions	(-231,600)	---	---	(+231,600)	---
Offsetting collections	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
Federal Housing Administration					
Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts	-4,427,000	-9,676,000	-9,676,000	-5,249,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM)(Sec. 210)	-286,000	-170,000	-170,000	+116,000	---
Additional offsetting receipts (Sec. 238)	-59,000	---	---	+59,000	---
Administrative contract expenses	207,000	215,000	215,000	+8,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,075)	---	---	(+1,075)
Working capital fund (transfer out)	(-71,500)	(-71,500)	(-71,500)	---	---
General and Special Risk Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts	-400,000	-588,000	-588,000	-188,000	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration	-4,965,000	-10,219,000	-10,219,000	-5,254,000	---
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of Mortgage-backed Securities Loan Guarantee Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses (legislative proposal)	19,500	21,000	20,500	+1,000	-500
Offsetting receipts (legislative proposal)	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	---	---
Offsetting receipts	-521,000	-647,000	-647,000	-126,000	---
Offsetting receipts (Sec. 238)	-5,000	---	---	+5,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM) (Sec. 210)	-24,000	-23,000	-23,000	+1,000	---
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association	-630,500	-749,000	-749,500	-119,000	-500
Policy Development and Research					
Research and Technology	46,000	52,000	52,000	+6,000	---
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair Housing Activities	70,847	68,000	68,000	-2,847	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-205)	---	---	(+205)
Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes					
Lead Hazard Reduction	120,000	120,000	120,000	---	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-600)	---	---	(+600)
Management and Administration					
Working Capital Fund	199,035	170,000	175,000	-24,035	+5,000
(By transfer)	(71,500)	(71,500)	(71,500)	---	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General	124,000	125,600	125,600	+1,600	---
Transformation Initiative	50,000	---	50,000	---	+50,000
(By transfer)	---	(119,870)	---	---	(-119,870)
Total, Management and Administration	373,035	295,600	350,600	-22,435	+55,000
(Grand total, Management and Administration)	(1,704,535)	(1,645,000)	(1,677,214)	(-27,321)	(+32,214)
General Provisions					
Rescission of prior-year advance	-650,000	---	---	+650,000	---
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development	37,433,718	33,554,773	33,583,397	-3,850,321	+28,624
Appropriations	(39,841,318)	(40,362,773)	(40,391,397)	(+550,079)	(+28,624)
Rescissions	(-431,600)	---	---	(+431,600)	---
Disaster relief category	(100,000)	---	---	(-100,000)	---
Advance appropriations	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Rescissions of prior year advances	(-650,000)	---	---	(+650,000)	---
Offsetting receipts	(-5,822,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-5,382,000)	---
Offsetting collections	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
(by transfer)	71,500	191,370	71,500	---	-119,870
(transfer out)	-71,500	-191,370	-71,500	---	+119,870
(Limitation on direct loans)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(925,641,504)	(926,507,000)	(925,000,000)	(-641,504)	(-1,507,000)
TITLE III - OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Access Board	7,400	7,400	7,400	---	---
Federal Maritime Commission	24,100	26,000	25,000	+900	-1,000
Amtrak Office of Inspector General	20,500	22,000	25,000	+4,500	+3,000
National Transportation Safety Board	102,400	102,400	102,400	---	---
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	215,300	213,000	225,300	+10,000	+12,300
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness	3,300	3,600	3,300	---	-300
Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies	373,000	374,400	388,400	+15,400	+14,000
Grand total (net)	57,312,000	53,479,199	51,606,000	-5,706,000	-1,873,199
Appropriations	(58,156,334)	(60,422,666)	(58,549,467)	(+393,133)	(-1,873,199)
Rescissions	(-529,334)	(-62,971)	(-62,971)	(+466,363)	---
Disaster relief category	(1,762,000)	---	---	(-1,762,000)	---
Rescissions of contract authority	(-1,000)	(-72,496)	(-72,496)	(-71,496)	---
Advance appropriations	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Rescissions of prior year advances	(-650,000)	---	---	(+650,000)	---
Offsetting receipts	(-5,822,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-5,382,000)	---
Offsetting collections	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(52,068,700)	(53,805,557)	(52,029,480)	(-39,220)	(-1,776,077)
(by transfer)	71,500	191,370	71,500	---	-119,870
(transfer out)	-71,500	-191,370	-71,500	---	+119,870
Total budgetary resources	(109,380,700)	(107,284,756)	(103,635,480)	(-5,745,220)	(-3,649,276)
Discretionary total	(55,550,000)	(53,479,199)	(51,606,000)	(-3,944,000)	(-1,873,199)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses	102,481	110,450	108,277	+5,796	-2,173
Immediate Office of the Secretary	(2,618)	---	(2,635)	(+17)	(+2,635)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	(984)	---	(992)	(+8)	(+992)
Office of the General Counsel	(19,515)	---	(19,615)	(+100)	(+19,615)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy	(10,107)	---	(11,248)	(+1,141)	(+11,248)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	(10,538)	---	(12,825)	(+2,287)	(+12,825)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	(2,500)	---	(2,601)	(+101)	(+2,601)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	(25,469)	---	(27,095)	(+1,626)	(+27,095)
Office of Public Affairs	(2,020)	---	(2,034)	(+14)	(+2,034)
Office of the Executive Secretariat	(1,595)	---	(1,701)	(+106)	(+1,701)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	(1,369)	---	(1,539)	(+170)	(+1,539)
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response	(10,778)	---	(10,875)	(+97)	(+10,875)
Office of the Chief Information Officer	(14,988)	---	(15,117)	(+129)	(+15,117)
Research and Development	---	13,670	---	---	-13,670
National Infrastructure Investments	500,000	500,000	---	-500,000	-500,000
Livable Communities Initiative	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Financial Management Capital	4,990	10,000	10,000	+5,010	---
Cyber Security Initiatives	10,000	6,000	6,000	-4,000	---
Office of Civil Rights	9,384	9,773	9,773	+389	---
Transportation Planning, Research, and Development	9,000	10,000	8,000	-1,000	-2,000
Working Capital Fund	(172,000)	---	(174,128)	(+2,128)	(+174,128)
Minority Business Resource Center Program	922	1,285	1,285	+363	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(18,367)	(21,955)	(21,955)	(+3,588)	---
Minority Business Outreach	3,068	3,234	3,234	+166	---
Payments to Air Carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	143,000	114,000	114,000	-29,000	---
Rescission of excess compensation for general aviation operations	-3,254	---	---	+3,254	---
Total, Office of the Secretary	779,591	783,412	260,569	-519,022	-522,843
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations	9,653,395	9,718,000	9,718,000	+64,605	---
Air traffic organization	(7,442,738)	---	(7,513,850)	(+71,112)	(+7,513,850)
Aviation safety	(1,252,991)	---	(1,255,000)	(+2,009)	(+1,255,000)
Commercial space transportation	(16,271)	---	(16,700)	(+429)	(+16,700)
Finance and management	(582,117)	---	(573,591)	(-8,526)	(+573,591)
Human resources programs	(98,858)	---	---	(-98,858)	---
Staff offices	(200,286)	---	(298,795)	(+98,509)	(+298,795)
NextGen	(60,134)	---	(60,064)	(-70)	(+60,064)
Facilities and Equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,730,731	2,850,000	2,749,596	+18,865	-100,404
Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund	167,556	180,000	175,000	+7,444	-5,000
Rescission	---	-26,184	-26,184	-26,184	---
Subtotal	167,556	153,816	148,816	-18,740	-5,000
Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(3,435,000)	(3,400,000)	(3,400,000)	(-35,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(3,350,000)	(3,350,000)	(3,350,000)	---	---
Administration	(101,000)	(103,000)	(105,000)	(+4,000)	(+2,000)
Airport Cooperative Research Program	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	---	---
Airport technology research	(29,250)	(29,300)	(29,300)	(+50)	---
Small community air service development program	(6,000)	---	---	(-6,000)	---
Chapter 471 reform obligation limitation reduction (legislative proposal)	---	(-926,000)	---	---	(+926,000)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Aviation Insurance Revolving Fund (Sec. 117)	---	-1,000	---	---	+1,000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	12,551,682	12,720,816	12,616,412	+64,730	-104,404
Appropriations	(12,551,682)	(12,747,000)	(12,642,596)	(+90,914)	(-104,404)
Rescissions	---	(-26,184)	(-26,184)	(-26,184)	---
Limitations on obligations	(3,350,000)	(2,424,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+926,000)
Total budgetary resources	(15,901,682)	(15,144,816)	(15,966,412)	(+64,730)	(+821,596)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on Administrative Expenses	(412,000)	(437,780)	(392,855)	(-19,145)	(-44,925)
Federal-Aid Highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(39,882,583)	(42,569,000)	(39,882,583)	---	(-2,686,417)
(Limitation on obligations)	(39,143,583)	(41,830,000)	(39,143,583)	---	(-2,686,417)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Emergency Relief (disaster relief category)	1,662,000	---	---	-1,662,000	---
Total, Federal Highway Administration	1,662,000	---	---	-1,662,000	---
Disaster relief category	(1,662,000)	---	---	(-1,662,000)	---
Limitations on obligations	(39,143,583)	(41,830,000)	(39,143,583)	---	(-2,686,417)
Exempt contract authority	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total budgetary resources	(41,544,583)	(42,569,000)	(39,882,583)	(-1,662,000)	(-2,686,417)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (Highway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(247,724)	(250,000)	(244,144)	(-3,580)	(-5,856)
(Limitation on obligations)	(247,724)	(250,000)	(244,144)	(-3,580)	(-5,856)
Motor Carrier Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(307,000)	(330,000)	(307,000)	---	(-23,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(307,000)	(330,000)	(307,000)	---	(-23,000)
CVISN contract authority (Sec. 131)	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Rescission of contract authority	-1,000	---	---	+1,000	---
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration	---	---	---	---	---
Limitations on obligations	(554,724)	(580,000)	(551,144)	(-3,580)	(-28,856)
Total budgetary resources	(554,724)	(580,000)	(551,144)	(-3,580)	(-28,856)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and Research (general fund)	140,146	---	152,000	+11,854	+152,000
Vehicle Safety	---	188,000	---	---	-188,000
Operations and Research (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(109,500)	(150,000)	(122,360)	(+12,860)	(-27,640)
(Limitation on obligations)	(109,500)	---	(122,360)	(+12,860)	(+122,360)
Highway Safety Research and Development (Limitation on obligations)	---	(150,000)	---	---	(-150,000)
Subtotal	249,646	338,000	274,360	+24,714	-63,640
Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(550,328)	(643,000)	(501,828)	(-48,500)	(-141,172)
(Limitation on obligations)	(550,328)	(643,000)	(501,828)	(-48,500)	(-141,172)
Highway safety programs (23 USC 402)	(235,000)	(317,500)	(235,000)	---	(-82,500)
Occupant protection incentive grants(23 USC 405)	(25,000)	(40,000)	(25,000)	---	(-15,000)
Safety belt performance grants (23 USC 406)	(48,500)	---	---	(-48,500)	---
Distracted driving prevention	---	(50,000)	---	---	(-50,000)
State traffic safety information system improvement(23 USC 408)	(34,500)	(34,500)	(34,500)	---	---
Impaired driving countermeasures (23 USC 410)	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)	---	---
Grant administration	(25,328)	(18,000)	(25,328)	---	(+7,328)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
High visibility enforcement	(29,000)	(37,000)	(29,000)	---	(-8,000)
Child safety and booster seat grants	(7,000)	---	(7,000)	---	(+7,000)
Motorcyclist safety	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	---	---
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	140,146	188,000	152,000	+11,854	-36,000
Limitations on obligations	(659,828)	(793,000)	(624,188)	(-35,640)	(-168,812)
Total budgetary resources	(799,974)	(981,000)	(776,188)	(-23,786)	(-204,812)
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and Operations	178,596	196,000	184,000	+5,404	-12,000
Offsetting fee collections (legislative proposal)	---	-40,000	---	---	+40,000
Direct appropriation	178,596	156,000	184,000	+5,404	+28,000
Railroad Research and Development	35,000	35,500	35,500	+500	---
System Preservation	---	1,546,000	---	---	-1,546,000
Network Development	---	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000
National Railroad Passenger Corporation:					
Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	466,000	---	350,000	-116,000	+350,000
Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	952,000	---	1,452,000	+500,000	+1,452,000
Subtotal	1,418,000	---	1,802,000	+384,000	+1,802,000
Next Gen High Speed Rail Service (rescission)	---	-1,973	-1,973	-1,973	---
Northeast Corridor Improvement Program (rescission)	---	-4,419	-4,419	-4,419	---
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	1,631,596	2,731,108	2,015,108	+383,512	-716,000
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative Expenses	98,713	---	100,000	+1,287	+100,000
Formula and Bus Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(9,400,000)	---	(9,400,000)	---	(+9,400,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(8,360,565)	---	(8,360,565)	---	(+8,360,565)
Rescission of prior year contract authority	---	-72,496	-72,496	-72,496	---
Research and Technology Deployment	---	120,957	---	---	-120,957
Transit Formula Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization)	---	(9,500,000)	---	---	(-9,500,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	---	(4,759,372)	---	---	(-4,759,372)
Transit Expansion and Livable Communities (liquidation of contract authorization)	---	(1,500,000)	---	---	(-1,500,000)
(limitation on obligations)	---	(212,185)	---	---	(-212,185)
Capital Investment Grants	---	2,235,486	---	---	-2,235,486
Operations and Safety	---	166,000	---	---	-166,000
Administrative programs	---	(129,700)	---	---	(-129,700)
Rail transit safety programs	---	(36,300)	---	---	(-36,300)
Research and University Research Centers	44,000	---	44,000	---	+44,000
Bus and Rail State of Good Repair (liquidation of contract authorization)	---	(1,500,000)	---	---	(-1,500,000)
(limitation on obligations)	---	(3,207,000)	---	---	(-3,207,000)
Capital Investment Grants	1,955,000	---	1,816,993	-138,007	+1,816,993
Rescission	-58,500	-11,429	-11,429	+47,071	---
Subtotal	1,896,500	-11,429	1,805,564	-90,936	+1,816,993

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority					
Capital and Preventive Maintenance	150,000	135,000	150,000	---	+15,000
Rescission	---	-523	-523	-523	---
Subtotal	150,000	134,477	149,477	-523	+15,000
University Transportation Research (rescission)	---	-293	-293	-293	---
Job Access and Reverse Commute Grants (rescission)	---	-14,662	-14,662	-14,662	---
Research, Training and Human Resources (rescission)	---	-248	-248	-248	---
Interstate Transfer Grants (rescission)	---	-2,662	-2,662	-2,662	---
Urban discretionary accounts (rescission)	---	-578	-578	-578	---
Total, Federal Transit Administration	2,189,213	2,554,552	2,008,102	-181,111	-546,450
Appropriations	(2,247,713)	(2,657,443)	(2,110,993)	(-136,720)	(-546,450)
Rescissions	(-58,500)	(-30,395)	(-30,395)	(+28,105)	---
Limitations on obligations	(8,360,565)	(8,178,557)	(8,360,565)	---	(+182,008)
Total budgetary resources	(10,549,778)	(10,733,109)	(10,368,667)	(-181,111)	(-364,442)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and Maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	32,259	33,000	33,000	+741	---
Maritime Administration					
Maritime Security Program	174,000	184,000	184,000	+10,000	---
Operations and Training	156,258	146,298	145,753	-10,505	-545
Rescission	-980	---	---	+980	---
Ship Disposal	5,500	10,000	4,000	-1,500	-6,000
Assistance to Small Shipyards	9,980	---	---	-9,980	---
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:					
Administrative expenses	3,740	3,750	3,750	+10	---
Rescission	-35,000	---	---	+35,000	---
Subtotal	-31,260	3,750	3,750	+35,010	---
Total, Maritime Administration	313,498	344,048	337,503	+24,005	-6,545
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Operational Expenses:					
General Fund	20,721	20,408	22,391	+1,670	+1,983
Pipeline Safety Fund	639	639	639	---	---
Pipeline Safety information grants to communities	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,500)	(+500)	(+500)
Subtotal	21,360	21,047	23,030	+1,670	+1,983
Hazardous Materials Safety	42,338	50,673	42,546	+208	-8,127
Pipeline Safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund	90,679	150,500	90,679	---	-59,821
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	18,573	21,510	18,573	---	-2,937
Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund (leg. proposal)	---	4,000	2,000	+2,000	-2,000
Subtotal	109,252	176,010	111,252	+2,000	-64,758
Subtotal, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	172,950	247,730	176,828	+3,878	-70,902
Pipeline safety user fees	-91,318	-151,139	-91,318	---	+59,821
Special permit and approval fees (leg. proposal)	---	-12,000	---	---	+12,000
Pipeline Safety Design Review fee (leg. proposal)	---	-4,000	-2,000	-2,000	+2,000

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Emergency Preparedness Grants:					
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)	---	---
(Emergency preparedness fund)	(188)	(188)	(188)	---	---
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	81,632	80,591	83,510	+1,878	+2,919
Research and Innovative Technology Administration					
Research and Development	15,981	---	13,500	-2,481	+13,500
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and Expenses	79,624	84,499	84,499	+4,875	---
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and Expenses	29,310	31,250	31,250	+1,940	---
Offsetting collections	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250	---	---
Total, Surface Transportation Board	28,060	30,000	30,000	+1,940	---
Total, title I, Department of Transportation	19,505,282	19,550,026	17,634,203	-1,871,079	-1,915,823
Appropriations	(17,942,016)	(19,685,493)	(17,769,670)	(-172,346)	(-1,915,823)
Rescissions	(-97,734)	(-62,971)	(-62,971)	(+34,763)	---
Disaster relief category	(1,662,000)	---	---	(-1,662,000)	---
Rescissions of contract authority	(-1,000)	(-72,496)	(-72,496)	(-71,496)	---
Limitations on obligations	(52,068,700)	(53,805,557)	(52,029,480)	(-39,220)	(-1,776,077)
Total budgetary resources	(71,573,982)	(73,355,583)	(69,663,683)	(-1,910,299)	(-3,691,900)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Management and Administration					
Administration, Operations and Management	537,789	532,546	518,068	-19,721	-14,478
Program Office Salaries and Expenses:					
Public and Indian Housing	200,000	211,634	206,500	+6,500	-5,134
Community Planning and Development	100,000	103,882	103,500	+3,500	-382
Housing	391,500	398,832	396,500	+5,000	-2,332
Policy Development and Research	22,211	21,394	22,326	+115	+932
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	72,600	74,296	72,904	+304	-1,392
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control	7,400	6,816	6,816	-584	---
Subtotal	793,711	816,854	808,546	+14,835	-8,308
Total, Management and Administration	1,331,500	1,349,400	1,326,614	-4,886	-22,786
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals	17,242,351	17,237,948	17,237,948	-4,403	---
Tenant protection vouchers	75,000	75,000	75,000	---	---
Administrative fees	1,350,000	1,575,000	1,575,000	+225,000	---
Family self-sufficiency coordinators	60,000	---	60,000	---	+60,000
Veterans affairs supportive housing	75,000	75,000	75,000	---	---
Sec. 811 mainstream voucher renewals	112,018	111,335	111,335	-683	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-25,000)	---	---	(+25,000)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year)	18,914,369	19,074,283	19,134,283	+219,914	+60,000

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Advance appropriations	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	---	---
Total, Tenant-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill	18,914,369	19,074,283	19,134,283	+219,914	+60,000
Public Housing Capital Fund	1,875,000	2,070,000	1,985,000	+110,000	-85,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-10,350)	---	---	(+10,350)
Public Housing Operating Fund	3,961,850	4,524,000	4,524,000	+562,150	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-22,620)	---	---	(+22,620)
Choice neighborhoods	120,000	150,000	---	-120,000	-150,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-750)	---	---	(+750)
Family Self-Sufficiency	---	60,000	---	---	-60,000
Native American Housing Block Grants	650,000	650,000	650,000	---	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-3,250)	---	---	(+3,250)
Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant	13,000	13,000	---	-13,000	-13,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-65)	---	---	(+65)
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account	6,000	7,000	6,000	---	-1,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(360,000)	(900,000)	---	(-360,000)	(-900,000)
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-35)	---	---	(+35)
Native Hawaiian Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account	386	1,000	---	-386	-1,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(41,504)	(107,000)	---	(-41,504)	(-107,000)
Housing Certificate Fund (rescission)	-200,000	---	---	+200,000	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing	25,340,605	26,549,283	26,299,283	+958,678	-250,000
Community Planning and Development					
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS	332,000	330,000	330,000	-2,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,650)	---	---	(+1,650)
Community Development Fund	2,948,090	2,948,090	3,404,000	+455,910	+455,910
Indian CDBG	60,000	60,000	---	-60,000	-60,000
Sustainable housing and communities	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Capacity building	---	35,000	---	---	-35,000
Disaster relief	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
(Disaster relief category)	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Subtotal	3,408,090	3,143,090	3,404,000	-4,090	+260,910
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-15,715)	---	---	(+15,715)
Community Development Loan Guarantees (Section 108):					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(240,000)	(500,000)	---	(-240,000)	(-500,000)
Credit subsidy	5,952	---	6,000	+48	+6,000
HOME Investment Partnerships Program	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,200,000	+200,000	+200,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-5,000)	---	---	(+5,000)
Self-help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program	53,500	---	60,000	+6,500	+60,000
Homeless Assistance Grants	1,901,190	2,231,000	2,000,000	+98,810	-231,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-11,155)	---	---	(+11,155)
Total, Community Planning and Development	6,700,732	6,704,090	7,000,000	+299,268	+295,910
Housing Programs					
Project-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals	9,050,672	8,440,400	8,440,400	-610,272	---
Contract administrators	289,000	260,000	260,000	-29,000	---
Subtotal (available this fiscal year)	9,339,672	8,700,400	8,700,400	-639,272	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-19,000)	---	---	(+19,000)
Advance appropriations	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances	-400,000	-400,000	-400,000	---	---
Total, Project-based rental assistance appropriated in this bill	9,339,672	8,700,400	8,700,400	-639,272	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Housing for the Elderly	374,627	475,000	425,000	+50,373	-50,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-2,375)	---	---	(+2,375)
Housing for Persons with Disabilities	165,000	150,000	165,000	---	+15,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-750)	---	---	(+750)
Housing Counseling Assistance	45,000	55,000	45,000	---	-10,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-275)	---	---	(+275)
Rental Housing Assistance	1,300	---	---	-1,300	---
Rent Supplement (rescission)	-231,600	---	---	+231,600	---
Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund	6,500	8,000	4,000	-2,500	-4,000
Offsetting collections	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000	---	---
Subtotal	2,500	4,000	---	-2,500	-4,000
Total, Housing Programs	9,696,499	9,384,400	9,335,400	-361,099	-49,000
Appropriations	(9,932,099)	(9,388,400)	(9,339,400)	(-592,699)	(-49,000)
Rescissions	(-231,600)	---	---	(+231,600)	---
Offsetting collections	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
Federal Housing Administration					
Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts	-4,427,000	-9,676,000	-9,676,000	-5,249,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM)(Sec. 210)	-286,000	-170,000	-170,000	+116,000	---
Additional offsetting receipts (Sec. 238)	-59,000	---	---	+59,000	---
Administrative contract expenses	207,000	215,000	215,000	+8,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,075)	---	---	(+1,075)
Working capital fund (transfer out)	(-71,500)	(-71,500)	(-71,500)	---	---
General and Special Risk Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts	-400,000	-588,000	-588,000	-188,000	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration	-4,965,000	-10,219,000	-10,219,000	-5,254,000	---
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of Mortgage-backed Securities Loan Guarantee Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses (legislative proposal)	19,500	21,000	20,500	+1,000	-500
Offsetting receipts (legislative proposal)	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	---	---
Offsetting receipts	-521,000	-647,000	-647,000	-126,000	---
Offsetting receipts (Sec. 238)	-5,000	---	---	+5,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM) (Sec. 210)	-24,000	-23,000	-23,000	+1,000	---
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association	-630,500	-749,000	-749,500	-119,000	-500
Policy Development and Research					
Research and Technology	46,000	52,000	52,000	+6,000	---
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair Housing Activities	70,847	68,000	68,000	-2,847	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-205)	---	---	(+205)
Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes					
Lead Hazard Reduction	120,000	120,000	120,000	---	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-600)	---	---	(+600)
Management and Administration					
Working Capital Fund	199,035	170,000	175,000	-24,035	+5,000
(By transfer)	(71,500)	(71,500)	(71,500)	---	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General	124,000	125,600	125,600	+1,600	---
Transformation Initiative	50,000	---	50,000	---	+50,000
(By transfer)	---	(119,870)	---	---	(-119,870)
Total, Management and Administration	373,035	295,600	350,600	-22,435	+55,000
(Grand total, Management and Administration)	(1,704,535)	(1,645,000)	(1,677,214)	(-27,321)	(+32,214)
General Provisions					
Rescission of prior-year advance	-650,000	---	---	+650,000	---
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development	37,433,718	33,554,773	33,583,397	-3,850,321	+28,624
Appropriations	(39,841,318)	(40,362,773)	(40,391,397)	(+550,079)	(+28,624)
Rescissions	(-431,600)	---	---	(+431,600)	---
Disaster relief category	(100,000)	---	---	(-100,000)	---
Advance appropriations	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Rescissions of prior year advances	(-650,000)	---	---	(+650,000)	---
Offsetting receipts	(-5,822,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-5,382,000)	---
Offsetting collections	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
(by transfer)	71,500	191,370	71,500	---	-119,870
(transfer out)	-71,500	-191,370	-71,500	---	+119,870
(Limitation on direct loans)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(925,641,504)	(926,507,000)	(925,000,000)	(-641,504)	(-1,507,000)
TITLE III - OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Access Board	7,400	7,400	7,400	---	---
Federal Maritime Commission	24,100	26,000	25,000	+900	-1,000
Amtrak Office of Inspector General	20,500	22,000	25,000	+4,500	+3,000
National Transportation Safety Board	102,400	102,400	102,400	---	---
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	215,300	213,000	225,300	+10,000	+12,300
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness	3,300	3,600	3,300	---	-300
Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies	373,000	374,400	388,400	+15,400	+14,000
Grand total (net)	57,312,000	53,479,199	51,606,000	-5,706,000	-1,873,199
Appropriations	(58,156,334)	(60,422,666)	(58,549,467)	(+393,133)	(-1,873,199)
Rescissions	(-529,334)	(-62,971)	(-62,971)	(+466,363)	---
Disaster relief category	(1,762,000)	---	---	(-1,762,000)	---
Rescissions of contract authority	(-1,000)	(-72,496)	(-72,496)	(-71,496)	---
Advance appropriations	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Rescissions of prior year advances	(-650,000)	---	---	(+650,000)	---
Offsetting receipts	(-5,822,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-5,382,000)	---
Offsetting collections	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(52,068,700)	(53,805,557)	(52,029,480)	(-39,220)	(-1,776,077)
(by transfer)	71,500	191,370	71,500	---	-119,870
(transfer out)	-71,500	-191,370	-71,500	---	+119,870
Total budgetary resources	(109,380,700)	(107,284,756)	(103,635,480)	(-5,745,220)	(-3,649,276)
Discretionary total	(55,550,000)	(53,479,199)	(51,606,000)	(-3,944,000)	(-1,873,199)

□ 1230

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $6,500,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $6,500,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. My amendment would reduce the proposed funding for salaries and expenses of the Office of Public and Indian Housing by $6.5 million. This is one of 13 offices which would receive increases for administrative expenses in the underlying bill.

Madam Chairman, we're in an economic emergency as a Nation. We're broke. We absolutely must stop spending money that we don't have. We're borrowing 40 cents or more on every dollar that the Federal Government expends. Raising the funding for the Office of Public and Indian Housing by $6.5 million while we're broke makes no fiscal sense to me.

This particular increase is among the highest for all the offices funded under this legislation. My amendment would simply freeze funding for this office for this next year. Passage of my amendment would bring this account back to this year's FY 2012 levels.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

It's a good talking point, reducing administration accounts that received increases. We've scrubbed these accounts. We've held hearings, asked questions, and made recommendations about what should be funded rather than looking at an arbitrary number. The bill cuts $4 billion from fiscal year 2012, which is a fiscally responsible level.

I would urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. The amendment that has been offered removes a 3 percent increase in the administrative account for the Office of Public and Indian Housing. I rise to oppose the amendment.

In this instance, the cuts in the Office of Public and Indian Housing cover a number of things, including the VASH program. We're adding $75 million for additional VASH vouchers—veterans' homelessness vouchers—and that has to be administered. The arbitrary $6.5 million simply does not help with that effort. It hurts that effort.

The Office also implements the operating and capital funds for public housing and the Native American housing grants. All of these require either layoffs, removal of people, because the salaries and expenses of the Office are subject to normal increases, small increases year by year for salaries for people in those places, and they are clearly going to end up having to reduce the number of personnel while they're administering more, and particularly the housing and the homeless program for veterans.

So on that basis, I think this is an unwise reduction and one that is unjustified as well as unwise, and I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Community Planning and Development, $103,500,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,500,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,500,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. My amendment would reduce the proposed funding for salaries and expenses for the Office of Community Planning and Development by $3.5 million.

This amendment, like the ones I presented last night and the one I just presented, would freeze the funding for these offices. I've heard my good friend from Iowa and my good friends on the other side talk about how the underlying bill has cut expenses for this whole underlying bill, but here in the House of Representatives, we've reduced our expenses by over 11 percent. It seems to me that it just makes fiscal sense to freeze funding for these offices in the underlying bill and not raise them.

We're in an economic emergency as a Nation. We are spending money that we simply do not have. We've got to stop the outrageous spending that's going on here in Washington, and I'm just asking a simple thing: let's freeze all of these offices at the current year's levels for 1 more year. Hopefully, next year we'll have policy put in place that will increase our economy and start creating jobs here in this Nation, but we're not doing that this year with this administration and the policies that we see in the other body on the other side of the Hill.

So let's just freeze the expenses of this office, and I'm proposing to freeze the expenses of virtually all the offices in this bill—most of them, anyway—and my amendment would bring the spending level that's proposed back to the current spending level of 2012.

When families and businesses get overextended, they don't continue to raise their spending levels, and we should not be raising this one either. My amendment would just freeze it at the current spending levels.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. This amendment again, as the gentleman has said, is an amendment that would freeze at the level of the 2012 funding here for salaries and expenses of the Office of Community Planning and Development.

Now, this office, it turns out, administers and implements the CDBG program, which in the bill, as presented by my chairman, is increased substantially—several hundred million dollars in the CDBG program—and increases the funding for the HOME program, which had been held at a much lower level in last year's program. In both of those cases, they were considerably lower.

□ 1240

And just last night, we added an amendment to increase the funding for HPWA, Helping Persons With AIDS, one of those vulnerable populations that we have, and our housing programs—as with veterans who are homeless, others who are homeless, those who are vulnerable such as those living with AIDS—have proven to be rather strong programs that have strong support.

Furthermore, already, across the board in HUD, there has been a reduction in personnel services and in the salaries and expenses of $20 million already compared with last year's overall within HUD. So this is a duplicate and hitting at vulnerable populations that we do not want to or should not want to be reducing. The reduction again requires that there be some reduction in personnel because people's salaries go up. They go up because people get a COLA, or a cost-of-living increase, of some sort with their salaries, or they move up in their category because of

longevity. So it ends up putting people who have jobs out of work and reducing the personnel to provide service to the American people and slows down the work of the offices in all these places where I think we all have a stake in making certain that they are efficiently implemented.

So I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We went through the hearing process. We have worked on these numbers to, number one, stay within our allocation, which we have done—we are actually cutting $4 billion in this bill—but also to prioritize. There's no one more sensitive about hardworking taxpayer dollars than I am. But the fact of the matter is, this is an absolutely critical function. The increase that is here is extremely important so that these programs are carried out properly without waste, fraud, and abuse.

For that reason, I would again urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Housing, $396,500,000, of which at least $8,200,000 shall be for the Office of Risk and Regulatory Affairs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, my amendment would reduce the proposed funding for salaries and expenses of bureaucrats here in Washington at the Office of Housing by $5 million. That's absolutely correct.

This amendment, as well as all of my amendments, will not cut the programs. It will not cut the programs one iota. What this does is it reduces the salaries.

I just heard my good friend from Massachusetts talking about Federal bureaucrats getting raises. I have frozen the salaries of people who work for me, and I know many Members of Congress have, for the last 2 years. Why should we be giving Federal bureaucrats more money when the American people are not getting raises? It makes no sense to me, particularly as we are in an economic emergency. We are spending money we don't have. We have to stop the outrageous spending that's going on here in Washington. Enough is enough. And raising this office, as well as all these offices, above the 2012 makes no economic sense to me whatsoever. Let's be fiscally responsible.

My good friend from Iowa, who I have the utmost respect for, has done a tremendous job in this bill, and I do appreciate the tremendous hard work that he and his committee has done. And I appreciate the $4 million that they've cut. But why raise the salaries of Federal bureaucrats?

My amendment would simply reduce the proposed funding back to the 2012 levels. I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I again rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. There are some factors that we need to take into consideration. For one thing next year, next fiscal year, we have an additional compensable day which has to be paid for. We have GSA that has raised rents. We have already cut $14 million out of salaries and expenses, so we would not be able to meet our requirements. We are not giving Federal employees raises, but there are additional costs that come into play because of rents, because of the additional day that our Federal workers will be working next year. And for those reasons—and again, I want to reiterate, we have cut $14 million out of this account—I would just urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. OLVER. In this instance, it is again a case of freezing a salaries and expenses account at the previous year's level. But this one has an interesting sidelight in that, in the legislation that we have before us, we have adopted a Presidential recommendation for a partial-year funding for project-based section 8 vouchers, which is going to cause considerable additional administration than the usual program of doing full-year continuation of those voucher programs. There is going to be much uncertainty if this goes on all the way to adoption. There would be much uncertainty for the people who are the owners and providers of that housing, and probably some loss in actual affordable housing available under the project-based section 8 program. So this is a case where they need that assistance. This is where we administer the housing programs for the elderly and disabled, the so-called 202 programs and 811, chapters 202 and chapter 811 for elderly and disabled people, as well as housing counseling assistance.

In addition, we have the Federal Housing Administration, which is having a much larger level of activity as we are trying to dig out of the foreclosure crisis from the past, and that agency needs to have personnel that are qualified and able to do the right job.

So again here—and by the way, I made an error in my previous comments when I said there was a reduction across the board for HUD. What I should have indicated was that it was a reduction in the salaries and expenses account over a period of time going back to 2010 of $20 million across the programs of salaries and expenses within HUD over that time.

□ 1230

So I made a mistake saying it was a $20 million reduction in 1 year. But for all those reasons, I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Policy Development and Research, $22,326,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $115,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $115,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, again I rise to propose an amendment just to freeze the salaries of this Office of Policy Development and Research by a mere $115,000.

Madam Chairman, I hear colleagues around here talking as if millions of dollars, tens of millions—hundreds of millions of dollars is nothing. Well,

most of my constituents at home in Georgia, most Americans think that $1 million is a lot of money, and I certainly think $1 million is a lot of money. But we have proposed, in this underlying bill, to raise the administrative expenses and salaries.

My good friend from Massachusetts, in the previous amendment, said we need to increase the salaries of the bureaucrats. I hope my good friend from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), when he stood up on the last amendment saying that we weren't going to increase salaries of Federal bureaucrats, is factual. I hope that that goes in the RECORD and it becomes true that we're not going to raise the salaries of Federal bureaucrats.

But they're proposing raising the administrative expenses and salaries in all of these offices, so I'm proposing just to freeze these expenses for 1 more year. Let's bring this account back down to this current year's levels of spending.

We cannot continue on this road.

Madam Chairman, I'm a medical doctor. As a medical doctor, part of my medical practice for many years has been involved in treating addictions, drug and alcohol addictions. In addiction medicine, we have a saying: When there's no denial, there's no addiction.

Congress and government have a spending addiction. It's a spending addiction, and there's a tremendous amount of denial here in this city—in all branches of government, actually. We need to face the fact: We're broke as a Nation. We've got to stop the outrageous spending.

I'm proposing just a mere $115,000 to freeze the expenses for this office and salaries for this office for 1 more year. I don't think that's too much for me to ask. I don't think that's too much for the American taxpayer, the hard-working American taxpayer to ask for us to freeze the salaries of these bureaucrats here in Washington and freeze their expenses for 1 more year—not only for this amendment, but for the amendments that I've already presented and the ones that I will present. Let's freeze this spending for 1 more year, keep it at the FY 2012 levels.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairperson, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. OLVER. The gentleman from Georgia just wants to freeze everything. But our personnel, in an agency like this, they are subject to the civil service laws, to the personnel laws under OPM, and they are assigned in grades and then steps. They add several steps as they gain seniority and go from step 1 to step 7, and then they may sit for a while. But you end up with people—unless you're really trying to put people out of work. Unless you're trying to put people out of work—and there's no reason to do that for this kind of an agency at all—then there has to be a slow, small increase for those people who move from step to step along the salary scale.

So this is an amendment that would essentially cause disruption in the processing and in the personnel system for the agency, which has lots of work to do. We should be worrying about how to get productivity in the processing rather than about trying to jigger and freeze a step system's pay scale for the people who do the work at these agencies.

I again urge that this amendment not be adopted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I rise to disagree with the rhetoric and the mythology propounded here by the gentleman from Georgia.

The mythology is that we have a tremendous spending binge that we must reduce, that the country is broke, and it's broke because we're spending much too much money and we've got to reduce the spending. It's simply not true.

Twelve years ago, in 2000, we were looking at a $5.6 trillion surplus over the next 10 years. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Alan Greenspan, testifying in favor of President Bush's tax reductions, said we have to reduce taxes, because if we don't, we will pay off the entire national debt by 2012 and that would be a bad thing, for some reason which I won't go into now. He thought it would be a bad thing if we paid off the entire national debt.

The entire debate between the two candidates, Bush and Gore, then was: What should we do with this $5.6 trillion surplus.

How did we change from a $5.6 trillion surplus to the budget deficits we have right now? Not by increasing spending. If you look at the spending amount other than military, if you look at the discretionary spending of the Federal Government other than military, adjusted for inflation and population growth, it has not increased by a nickel since 2001, not by a nickel.

What has changed? What has changed to create the deficit? Because if you want to solve the deficit, you have to know what created it to undo it. What has changed to create the deficit is several things:

One, 40 percent of the deficit is caused by the Bush tax cuts, which will expire at the end of the year unless we change that. Forty percent of the current and anticipated deficits were caused by the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003;

Second, two unfunded wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—the first time in American history we fought major wars without increasing taxes to pay for them;

Third, aside from the wars, completely aside from the wars, we have doubled Pentagon spending since 2001 in real terms; and

Finally, we have a depression, or a recession. When you have a recession that started in 2007 or 2008, tax receipts go down. Expenses on things like food stamps and unemployment insurance goes up. That's when you should run a deficit. You should run a surplus in good times; you should run a deficit during a depression or recession in order to stimulate the economy and get it back up.

If we want to deal with the deficit—and we should deal with the deficit—we shouldn't reduce necessary government spending and certainly not nickel-and-dime step pay increases for Federal employees. If we want to reduce the deficit, we should undo most of the Bush tax cuts for the rich, because most of the Bush tax cuts went to rich people and to very large corporations. We are only collecting about 14 or 15 percent of GDP in taxes this year.

□ 1300

The normal range is between 19 and 21 percent. And I say ''normal,'' meaning the entire post-World War II period ranges between 18 or 19 and 22 percent. We're collecting 14 or 15 percent in the last couple of years because, one, the recession, and, two, because we greatly reduced effective taxes on multi-national corporations and on rich people.

We used to have in this country, under President Reagan, 25 different tax brackets. Someone making $5 million paid a higher tax rate than someone making $1 million, who paid a higher tax rate than someone making $250,000 and so forth. Now, the highest tax rate kicks in at below $250,000, and someone making $250 million pays no higher tax rate than someone making $175,000 or $200,000. There's something very wrong with that.

So if we want to deal with the deficit, deal not with the nonexistent problem, which is the huge nonexistent spending surge that didn't occur. And we have great needs in this country. We have to fix our highways, our roads, our bridges, our hospitals, our broadband. We have to invest so this country will be economically competitive, and our schools and our teachers and our cops and all of these things.

If you want to fix the deficit, don't shortchange what we should be doing to invest in this country. Get rid of the Bush tax cuts, or most of them, or get rid of those portions of the Bush taxes that went to rich people, high-income people and to big corporations. Make corporations, the large corporations, pay an effective tax rate again, instead of a large number of our top corporations paying zero dollars in taxes.

Reduce the Pentagon budget, which we can do. We no longer need all those troops in Germany to protect against a Soviet tank invasion, which is not likely to occur since the Soviets don't exist anymore. That's what we ought to be doing.

But the key thing is don't have this mythology that we have greatly expanded Federal spending over the last

10 years, or even over the last 3 years, which is simply not the case.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, $72,904,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $304,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $304,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, again I rise just to freeze the funding for salaries and office expenses for the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity by a meager $304,000. If we cannot cut out $115,000 or $304,000, what are we going to cut?

And as my friend from Massachusetts already said, actually, on two of my amendments, that it's to increase salaries of Federal bureaucrats. We've got to freeze the salaries of these bureaucrats. We've got to be fiscally responsible.

My amendment doesn't cut any program, doesn't cut any service, doesn't cut out any part of the necessary aspects of the Federal Government. All it does is it freezes the salaries and the expenses of this office, as the other amendments would do. It freezes it at this year's levels. Doesn't even go backwards, freezes it at this year's levels.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chair, now at this point we have—I think this is the last of this group of amendments that have been proposed in this area, in essence. And when you put them together, because one was for $6.5 million, one was for about $5 million, then there were a couple that were a little—there was one that was a little over $1 million and then a couple that were smaller—the sum total of people who will be taken out of the—who this would require, the freeze, in that way, would require that some number around 200-or-so employees would be put out of positions.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia thinks that, well, they're Federal bureaucrats; but they're providing a service. In this instance, it is the service in the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, which has a budget, total budget, of $70-million-or-so. And this 300,000 is only a couple of percent out of it.

Most of the salaries and expenses, most of these agencies that he has been affecting are mostly done in salaries and expenses of the operation of the office. But they all provide a public service to people. In this instance, it's the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.

Well, it ensures that Americans have the same right, that all Americans have the same right to housing and investigates instances where those rights have been violated. So we are, in every instance of them, and we dealt with a couple of similar ones last night before in the other department under this bill—they only serve to slow down the effective operation of those offices to provide services across the whole gamut of things which have been given to them to do, whether it be public housing, whether it be the Veterans Administration program, here the Fair Housing Administration program, the FHA, the housing for elders, housing for disabled people. All of them are the same ilk. There's no reason to do anything other than the same thing that we have done in the past. And so I'm urging, again, a ''no'' vote on this.

I yield back the balance of my time;

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I understand the gentleman, and I appreciate the fact that he wants to cut spending. We have, in fact, in this bill cut the spending from the request $1.4 million on this particular line item in the budget.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Chair, we have additional rent that we have to pay. We have an extra day of work for the Federal workers next year that we have to pay. So there's not going to be any increase. It's basically going to maintain where we are in this function.

But, again, we have already cut from the President's request, $1.4 million. And there are additional costs we're going to incur just to stay even from last year. So with that, I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF HEALTHY HOMES AND LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control, $6,816,000.

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) (''the Act'' herein), not otherwise provided for, $15,134,283,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2012 (in addition to the $4,000,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available on October 1, 2012), and $4,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2013: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading are provided as follows:

(1) $17,237,948,000 shall be available for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts (including renewals of enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act) and including renewal of other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, from amounts provided under this paragraph and any carryover, the Secretary for the calendar year 2013 funding cycle shall provide renewal funding for each public housing agency based on validated voucher management system (VMS) leasing and cost data for the prior calendar year and by applying an inflation factor as established by the Secretary, by notice published in the Federal Register, and by making any necessary adjustments for the costs associated with the first-time renewal of vouchers under this paragraph including tenant protection and HOPE VI vouchers: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this paragraph may be used to fund a total number of unit months under lease which exceeds a public housing agency's authorized level of units under contract, except for public housing agencies participating in the Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration, which are instead governed by the terms and conditions of their MTW agreements: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, to the extent necessary to stay within the amount specified under this paragraph, pro rate each public housing agency's allocation otherwise established pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That except as provided in the following provisos, the entire amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this Act) shall be obligated to the public housing agencies based on the allocation and pro rata method described above, and the Secretary shall notify public housing agencies of their annual budget not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the 60-day notification period, with the prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That up to $75,000,000 shall be available only: (1) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies, after application for an adjustment by a public housing agency, that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs of vouchers resulting from unforeseen circumstances or from portability under section 8(r) of the Act; (2) for vouchers that

were not in use during the 12-month period in order to be available to meet a commitment pursuant to section 8(o)(13) of the Act; (3) for adjustments for costs associated with HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD–VASH) vouchers; and (4) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs as a result of participation in the Small Area Fair Market Rent demonstration: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall allocate amounts under the previous proviso based on need as determined by the Secretary;

(2) $75,000,000 shall be for section 8 rental assistance for relocation and replacement of housing units that are demolished or disposed of pursuant to section 18 of the Act, conversion of section 23 projects to assistance under section 8, the family unification program under section 8(x) of the Act, relocation of witnesses in connection with efforts to combat crime in public and assisted housing pursuant to a request from a law enforcement or prosecution agency, enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act, HOPE VI vouchers, mandatory and voluntary conversions, and tenant protection assistance including replacement and relocation assistance or for project-based assistance to prevent the displacement of unassisted elderly tenants currently residing in section 202 properties financed between 1959 and 1974 that are refinanced pursuant to Public Law 106–569, as amended, or under the authority as provided under this Act: *Provided*, That when a public housing development is submitted for demolition or disposition under section 18 of the Act, the Secretary may provide section 8 rental assistance when the units pose an imminent health and safety risk to residents: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may only provide replacement vouchers for units that were occupied within the previous 24 months that cease to be available as assisted housing, subject only to the availability of funds: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this paragraph, $10,000,000 may be available to provide tenant protection assistance, not otherwise provided under this paragraph, to residents residing in low-vacancy areas and who may have to pay rents greater than 30 percent of household income, as the result of (1) the maturity of a HUD-insured, HUD-held or section 202 loan that requires the permission of the Secretary prior to loan prepayment; (2) the expiration of a rental assistance contract for which the tenants are not eligible for enhanced voucher or tenant protection assistance under existing law; or (3) the expiration of affordability restrictions accompanying a mortgage or preservation program administered by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That such tenant protection assistance made available under the previous proviso may be provided under the authority of section 8(t) or section 8(o)(13) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(t)): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement the previous provisos, including, but not limited to, requirements for defining eligible at-risk households within 120 days of the enactment of this Act;

(3) $1,575,000,000 shall be for administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program, of which up to $50,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary to allocate to public housing agencies that need additional funds to administer their section 8 programs, including fees associated with section 8 tenant protection rental assistance, the administration of disaster-related vouchers, Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers, and other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That no less than $1,525,000,000 of the amount provided in this paragraph shall be allocated to public housing agencies for the calendar year 2013 funding cycle based on section 8(q) of the Act (and related Appropriation Act provisions) as in effect immediately before the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–276): *Provided further*, That if the amounts made available under this paragraph are insufficient to pay the amounts determined under the previous proviso, the Secretary may decrease the amounts allocated to agencies by a uniform percentage applicable to all agencies receiving funding under this paragraph or may, to the extent necessary to provide full payment of amounts determined under the previous proviso, utilize unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading from prior fiscal years, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That all public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements, and shall be subject to the same uniform percentage decrease as under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That amounts provided under this paragraph shall be only for activities related to the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under section 8, including related development activities;

(4) $60,000,000 shall be available for family self-sufficiency coordinators under section 23 of the Act;

(5) $111,335,000 for the renewal of tenant-based assistance contracts under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), including necessary administrative expenses;

(6) $75,000,000 for incremental rental voucher assistance for use through a supported housing program administered in conjunction with the Department of Veterans Affairs as authorized under section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make such funding available, notwithstanding section 204 (competition provision) of this title, to public housing agencies that partner with eligible VA Medical Centers or other entities as designated by the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, based on geographical need for such assistance as identified by the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, public housing agency administrative performance, and other factors as specified by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for (in consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs), any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development administers in connection with the use of funds made available under this paragraph (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective delivery and administration of such voucher assistance: *Provided further*, That assistance made available under this paragraph shall continue to remain available for homeless veterans upon turn-over; and

(7) The Secretary shall separately track all special purpose vouchers funded under this heading.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 75, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $460,000,000)''.

Page 75, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $460,000,000)''.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1310

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, we spend a lot of time talking about how we need to do more with less. The reality is that, all too often, we do less with less. This is the unfortunate reality facing our rental assistance programs if the House-proposed funding levels are enacted.

The Housing Choice Voucher program, more commonly known as section 8, provides rental assistance to over 2 million households with very low incomes. Half of these households are of seniors or people with disabilities. Most of the rest are of families with children.

Experts agree with HUD's assessment of section 8. It is a cost-effective means of delivering decent, safe, and affordable housing to low-income families in the private market. Because of the widely accepted success of the program, section 8 has enjoyed bipartisan support for many years.

Despite agreement among policy experts and politicians, section 8 funding levels continue to come up short of the actual need. The National Low Income Housing Coalition found that, according to the latest census data, for every 100 households with extremely low incomes, only 30 rental units are affordable and available. Three-quarters of renters with extremely low incomes pay housing costs that exceed half of their incomes, placing them at a high risk of housing instability and homelessness. Yet, because of limited funds, only one in four eligible families receives rental assistance.

Without increasing funds beyond what is included in this bill for the section 8 program, an estimated 58,000 low-income families will lose their existing rental assistance next year, putting these families at risk of homelessness. Even the more conservative estimate of the section 8 budget shortfall by the OMB finds that 30,000 low-income families will be at risk of losing their current vouchers and, therefore, of losing their homes.

With housing instability and homelessness comes the destabilizing of families and the possible long-term negative impacts on kids. That's why I'm offering this amendment.

This amendment would increase funding for section 8 voucher renewals

by $460 million to cover the actual costs of ensuring that existing vouchers will continue and that no family will lose an existing section 8 voucher. This does not increase the number of vouchers, though I would love to do that, but it does ensure that no families would lose their currently existing section 8 vouchers.

Additionally, by funding section 8 at the figures necessary to continue existing vouchers, we can make sure that it would be unnecessary for HUD to implement its proposal for $75 minimum rent even if that $75 exceeds the normal section 8 rental limit of 30 percent of income. To most of us here, $75 may not seem like a lot of money as it's a meal for two in many Washington and New York City restaurants, but for 500,000 of the poorest HUD-assisted families, families who have annual incomes of less than $3,000—that's around $250 a month—$75 is a lot of money. For 400,000 HUD-assisted families, $75 minimum would be a 50 percent rent increase from what they're paying now, leaving these families with less money for food, transportation, and other basic necessities. We're talking about families with annual incomes of $2,000 or $2,500 annually.

Madam Chairman, our first objective must be to prevent further hardship to the poorest people in our country and to prevent additional potential homelessness among vulnerable low-income families. To do this, we must ensure that we do not lose current section 8 assistance and that we do not impose a new minimum rent that could be way beyond 30 percent of income for people earning $2,000 and $2,500. This amendment is necessary in order to do that, so I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states:

It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, the necessity for this amendment is undeniable.

The hardship and the suffering this budget would cause without this amendment, by imposing minimum rentals way beyond 30 percent of income on people with incomes of $2,000 to $2,500 annually, is undeniable. That this Congress should do such a thing is regrettable, to put it mildly.

I understand the rule. The rule would require an offset of an equal amount of money; but in this overly restrictive bill to start with, there is no way of finding such an offset of that amount of money without hurting people in an equal fashion in other ways. So that says that we have a choice of really injuring ''these'' people or of really injuring ''those'' people. It's not an acceptable choice. I understand the rule. That is regrettable.

I hope that as we progress with this budget that we can find a way of finding the funds that we have in this amendment for this purpose so that we do not injure all of these thousands and thousands of very low-income people.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

(RESCISSION)

Unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading, the heading, ''Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing'', and the heading ''Project-Based Rental Assistance'', for fiscal year 2013 and prior years may be used for renewal of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts and for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were appropriated: *Provided*, That any obligated balances of contract authority from fiscal year 1974 and prior that have been terminated shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That amounts previously recaptured, or recaptured during the current fiscal year, from section 8 project-based contracts from source years fiscal year 1975 through fiscal year 1987 are hereby rescinded, and an amount of additional new budget authority, equivalent to the amount permanently cancelled is hereby appropriated, to remain available until expended, for the purposes set forth under this heading, in addition to amounts otherwise available.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) (the ''Act'') $1,985,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, during fiscal year 2013 the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not delegate to any Department official other than the Deputy Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing any authority under paragraph (2) of section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such section: *Provided further*, That for purposes of such section 9(j), the term ''obligate'' means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays, immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That up to $15,345,000 shall be to support the ongoing Public Housing Financial and Physical Assessment activities of the Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC): *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary to make grants, notwithstanding section 204 of this Act, to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs including safety and security measures necessary to address crime and drug-related activity as well as needs resulting from unforeseen or unpreventable emergencies and natural disasters excluding Presidentially declared emergencies and natural disasters under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) occurring in fiscal year 2013: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading $50,000,000 shall be for supportive services, service coordinator and congregate services as authorized by section 34 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437z-6) and the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.): *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to $5,000,000 is to support the costs of administrative and judicial receiverships: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary shall provide bonus awards in fiscal year 2013 to public housing agencies that are designated high performers.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 84, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $110,000,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $110,000,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, the underlying bill is suggesting that Congress allot an increase of $110 million in Federal funding for the Public Housing Capital Fund from this fiscal year, from fiscal year 2012.

My amendment would simply freeze funding at our current level and reduce the proposed funding by $110 million. We've got to stop spending. That's what all my efforts are geared towards. We can continue to perform the necessary functions of the Federal Government for those who need it. My amendment would just freeze the proposed increase in funding so that we keep it at this current year's level.

I urge my colleagues to support this very simple amendment, which would save over $110 million for the hardworking taxpayers of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. The amendment that the gentleman from Georgia has now offered has to do with the Public Housing Capital Fund.

The public housing infrastructure currently has an estimated $26 billion of maintenance backlog. In fact, capital repairs accumulate at the rate of something over $3 billion a year, which is considerably higher than $1.9 billion that is contained in this—$1.985 billion that's contained in this bill. So what we are doing is, year by year, continuing to provide maintenance funding: the replacement of utilities, the replacement of appliances, as well as such simple maintenance as painting if it's needed, and so on.

□ 1320

In our more than a million housing units, in the 3,500 or so of our total housing authorities around the country, we are steadily putting these in a situation where we're building a further capital maintenance backlog gap year by year by year.

This is never a wise thing to do when it's at the extent that we are presently doing it. But the $110 million at least is a little bit better than not having the $110 million, which would be an even greater increase in the backlog gap that we have for maintenance, repair, and upgrading of our housing units.

All of those housing units are intended to last for many years and be used long into the future. If we don't maintain them properly in a reasonable way, then eventually we will lose those units. It is much more expensive to replace the units with new units than it is to maintain them in a proper way.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment so that we do not continue to dig our hole deeper on the maintenance needs for the stock of housing that we have in our 3,500 public housing authorities around the country.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in support of this amendment. This is a $110 million increase in spending, and it is simply too much under the circumstances.

I want to first of all, though, certainly commend Chairman LATHAM and all those who have worked on this bill because the material that has been provided to our office said that this bill overall contains a 7.1 percent decrease in funding, which I think is the biggest cut of any appropriations bill that we've dealt with so far. I also want to commend and salute the gentleman from Georgia for trying even harder to rein in spending, because I think almost everyone on both sides of the aisle knows that we have to reduce spending and we have to do more than we've been doing.

This $110 million increase is double the rate of inflation. The amendment by the gentleman from Georgia does not reduce the funding of this agency. It just holds it at the same level. We've cut our own budgets, Madam Chairwoman, for the last couple of years. We've tried to cut many other things. But megabillions have been poured into this program over the last 10 or 15 years. Even with the gentleman's amendment, this fund will still get $1.765 billion. I can tell you most people around the country think that's an awful lot of money.

I rise in support of this amendment. I certainly hope that if this amendment does not pass, that we will at least pass the much smaller cut in the gentleman's next amendment. But I think this is a good amendment.

We have to get serious about cutting spending when we're facing a national debt of over $16 trillion, which is going much higher and much faster. Unless we want this country to become a gigantic Greece and have the problems that we're seeing all over the world, then we've got to do more than we're doing.

So I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back that balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We have been fiscally responsible in this bill by reducing the public housing capital fund by $85 million below the budget request, and we're hearing that this funding level will be a challenge because there's a backlog, Madam Chairman, of over $25 billion in capital projects. However, this does represent one of the toughest choices we've had to make to meet our allocation in this bill. A deeper cut to this account will merely defer projects to future years and I believe will cost more money in the future by running up the cost of those projects in the years ahead.

With that, I would urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I was going to introduce another amendment to this same program which would have been a decrease of just 10 percent of the increase. As I see things going on here today, we can't even cut out $115,000. Cutting out $11 million, I'm sure, is out of the question for my colleagues.

Madam Chair, we've just got to stop this outrageous spending here in Washington. So I'm not going to offer the other one. I would anticipate a point of order being brought against it, and rightfully so. So I'm not going to introduce that amendment.

I just ask my colleagues—and I hope that they hear from Americans all over this country—to stop the spending.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For 2013 payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)), $4,524,000,000: *Provided*, That in determining public housing agencies', including Moving to Work agencies', calendar year 2013 funding allocations under this heading, the Secretary may, contingent on authorization, take into account the impact of changes in minimum rents, flat rents, and medical expense thresholds on public housing agencies' formula income levels.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 86, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $562,150,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $562,150,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairwoman, the underlying bill increases funding for the public housing operating fund by over $500 million for fiscal year 2013.

My amendment would simply return the funding back to this year from the proposed levels. It's a $500 million increase at a time when our Nation is broke and American taxpayers are struggling to put food on their tables and looking for jobs.

It is imperative that we look for commonsense cuts wherever we can, and this is one of those. It's a lot of money, $500 million. Some would say it's a very small amount compared to the overall funding level proposed in this bill, but it's still $500 million. We just have to stop spending money that we don't have.

I urge my colleagues to support this very simple amendment that would save over $500 million, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I do rise in opposition to the gentleman's

amendment. This is an amendment that on face value is somewhat confusing, shall we say.

While it appears that there is a large increase in this account when it says $562 million over last year, this account is approximately level funded from last year because last year we went in and took $500 million out of reserve funds of the public housing authorities that were sitting there that were unexpended balances.

□ 1330

Those reserves are no longer there. So what we're having to do in this bill basically to stay virtually even is to have the $562 million over last year.

This fund provides many of the necessary operating and maintenance activities for our housing authorities, including health, safety, and sanitation. Our funding levels for public housing build in savings from reform proposals that we urge the authorizers to complete before we go to a final conference on this bill. Again, in this entire bill, while you talk about the highway bill, financial services doing their work, but that would be extremely helpful if, in fact, we had authorizations that would actually limit spending and that we could follow.

But again, I just wanted to reiterate: We used $500 million a year ago out of the funds that were available, sitting there idle. So what, in fact, this does is basically even from last year. While it appears to be a large increase, it, in fact, is not because the use of those funds from last year, the reserve funds.

I believe we are providing a responsible level of funding for this program. And again, I want to reiterate, Madam Chairman, we are cutting about $4 billion in this appropriation bill—I think the gentleman earlier mentioned that's the largest percentage cut of any bill so far on the floor. But this particular issue, this particular amendment would be extremely devastating because of funding issues in the reserve account that we used last year. With that, I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. OLVER. I'm not sure I have anything much to add to what my chairman has said, other than to just point out, if you look back at the number of dollars that were assigned for the fiscal year '11 bill, that was over $4.6 billion. So in 2012, the amount of money brought that down to under $4 billion. The $500-plus million that the gentleman from Iowa had pointed out was part of the reserves that were taken from those housing authorities around the country that had substantial reserves. So that has been done. That was a one-shot kind of a deal. And now the funding has to go back to something that is in line with the yearly fundings, going back to a period of time of well into a decade ago, that were on a different guide path. So this is just returning to that.

It is at the President's request. It's below the amount that has been granted in the other body's allocation. They had a larger allocation in their numbers for it. This particular account is well below ours. It's $70 million or so below what has been provided by the chairman in the mark for this year.

So I think this is entirely appropriate, given the size of the maintenance gaps and the need to keep maintaining your facilities, your housing quality so that you don't end up losing that or ending up with much higher expense for replacement. I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq.), $650,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to determine the amount of the allocation under title I of such Act for each Indian tribe, the Secretary shall apply the formula under section 302 of such Act with the need component based on single-race census data and with the need component based on multi-race census data, and the amount of the allocation for each Indian tribe shall be the greater of the two resulting allocation amounts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, $2,000,000 shall be contracted for assistance for national or regional organizations representing Native American housing interests for providing training and technical assistance to Indian housing authorities and tribally designated housing entities: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $2,000,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $20,000,000: *Provided further*, That the Department will notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 88, after line 2, insert the following:

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program, as authorized under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4221 et seq.), $13,000,000, to remain available until expended, which amount shall be derived by transfer from the amount provided in this title under ''Management and Administration—Administration, Operations, and Management'' for the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HANABUSA. My amendment inserts the amount of $13 million for the Native Hawaiian housing block grant. This is in line with the President's budget. The President provided for the same amount and states that the Native Hawaiian block grant that is authorized under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self Determination Act of 1996, easier called NAHASDA. The block grant authorizes an annual grant to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands for housing and housing-related assistance.

Madam Chair, let us understand the significance of this block grant to this Congress and the Nation. In 1921, the Congress passed into law the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. Congress recognized that it was necessary to return Native Hawaiians to their land to support self-sufficiency, and the preservation of their values, traditions, and culture.

Madam Chair, in 1893, when the queen was overthrown, Hawaii was a vibrant, modern nation. And what happened after the overthrow resulted in the need—and Congress saw the need—to look at the return of Native Hawaiians to their lands.

In essence, a trust relationship was created by the creation of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act made very clear that only Hawaiians of 50 percent blood quantum qualify, that the lands could only be leased, not owned, and it also restricted the ability to mortgage and have occupancy restrictions as well.

This block grant assists in fulfilling the special trust relationship which was created and acknowledged in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. It assures the return to the land of Native Hawaiians, which was the concern of Congress. If this provision is authorized and people vote for it, what it will do is it will permit the existing and ongoing projects, along with those planned, to be competed with the ultimate goal of putting Native Hawaiians on the land, which was the purpose of

the trust relationship that we created in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. Clause 2 of rule XXI states in pertinent part: ''An appropriation may not be in order as an amendment for an expenditure not previously authorized by law.''

Madam Chairman, the amendment proposes to appropriate funds for a program that has not been authorized. The amendment, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek to be heard on the point of order?

The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chair, I understand the point of order that has been raised. But let me, with all due respect, say that when we look at the language of any rule—the language that is, I guess, suspect here is not previously authorized by law—in fact, as stated by the President, as well as in my amendment, this provision has been authorized by law, and it is found in NAHASDA, title VIII.

□ 1340

When we look at the wording ''not previously authorized,'' the technical argument may be that it was authorized at some point in time and then expired in 2005. However, that is not what the rule says. The rule says: not previously authorized. And this has been previously authorized.

In the recent United States Supreme Court case of Lamie v. U.S. Trustee, it's very clear. And we can borrow from the Supreme Court when it gives its opinion as to what it means. The plain language is what controls in any interpretation of any statute or any rule. It is clearly plain language that what is being referred to here is the fact that it was not previously authorized. And it has been previously authorized.

In addition to that, I would also like to say that there is an exception to this rule that says that you can continue appropriations for public works and objects that are already in progress. And to that, Madam Chair, I point out that, as we have said, this money is used for the return of the Native Hawaiians to the lands, and it includes, of course, construction and public works.

They are projects ongoing that need this money in Kakaina, Waimanalo; Piilani Mai ke kai, phase II in Anahola on the island of Kauai; Laiopua on the Big Island on the Kona side; Lalamilo, Waimea; Kanehili, Kapolei; and East Kapolei, II, also in Kapolei, Kapolei being on the island of Oahu.

So on this point of order, Madam Speaker, I believe that it has been misinterpreted. The words are ''not previously authorized.'' And in addition to that, this specific provision has been authorized. In addition to that, the exception is for public works projects in progress. And the public works projects are the ones that I have listed, which as we know, is the object of the grant of the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member seek to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I will insist on my point of order. The fact of the matter is this program is not currently authorized. There are no ongoing public works in progress.

So, once again, I would insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The proponent of an item of appropriation carries the burden of persuasion on the question whether it is supported by an authorization in law.

Having reviewed the amendment and entertained arguments on the point of order, the Chair is unable to conclude that the item of appropriation in question is authorized in law. In response to one of the specific arguments. An authorization that has lapsed does not qualify under the rule.

The Chair is therefore constrained to sustain the point of order under clause 2(a) of rule XXI. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a), $6,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, up to $633,000,000: *Provided further*, That up to $750,000 of this amount may be used for administrative contract expenses including management processes and systems to carry out the loan guarantee program.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.), $330,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, except that amounts allocated pursuant to section 854(c)(3) of such Act shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall renew all expiring contracts for permanent supportive housing that were funded under section 854(c)(3) of such Act that meet all program requirements before awarding funds for new contracts and activities authorized under this section: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, $3,404,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, unless otherwise specified: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided, $3,344,000,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (the ''Act'' herein) (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.): *Provided further*, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading, not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended for planning and management development and administration: *Provided further*, That $60,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act, of which, notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 204 of this Act), up to $3,960,000 may be used for emergencies that constitute imminent threats to health and safety: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for grants for the Economic Development Initiative (''EDI'') or Neighborhood Initiatives activities, Rural Innovation Fund, or for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5307): *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 89, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $396,000,000)''.

Page 89, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $396,000,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $396,000,000)''.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I first want to applaud and thank the committee for their work. They've reached the laudable goal of reducing the overall expenditures by $4 billion. And that is much appreciated and noted. I just happen to think we can do just a little bit better.

I'm looking at the committee report regarding the committee's recommendation on the Community Development Fund, specifically the Community Development Block Grants. And I read:

''This is $396 million above both fiscal year 2012 and the budget request.''

So you have the President making a budget request, and you have last year's expenditures. What this amendment does is reduces by $396 million to get it back to where we were. Again, I think the President is even also on the same page.

Now, Madam Chair, we have to recognize what a dire financial strait we're in in this country. We have to understand that we have a multitrillion-dollar challenge. We talk about a trillion with a capital T and it's hard to get your arms around it. But if you were to spend a million dollars a day everyday, it would take you almost 3,000 years to get to $1 trillion.

So when we're racking up a trillion-plus-dollar deficit each year, when our

national debt at the end of this year will approach $16 trillion, when we're spending more than $600 million a day in interest on our national debt, we're going to have to cut some spending.

To actually bring back and reduce this to the proper level, I think would be more appropriate. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. It returns the funding to the fiscal year 2012 level. Again, as the committee report says, this is $396 million above both fiscal year 2012 and the budget request. I think this is reasonable. I hope the committee would find a place where we can join on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chair, this is an amendment that would take a huge chunk out of the CDBG program. This is one of the areas in which I have been particularly, I thought, most commendable about what the chairman's mark is in the bill for the CDBG.

The CDBG is a hugely popular program in communities around the country. We have, as I have mentioned in my opening remarks at the beginning of this bill, 65 percent of our population living in communities in metropolitan areas with over half a million people, and close to 90 percent of our people live in communities with over 50,000 people. It's roughly around 50,000 people that are entitlement communities and get an amount of money that they may use in a flexible kind of a way in their cities and towns of large size, and can directly get that money to use for things that they need in their cities. Their cities and towns have suffered greatly in the Great Recession that we have had before us, and they have housing needs which are very substantial.

Now I would point out to the gentleman from Utah that the amount for the CDBG program as proposed by Chairman LATHAM I am commending him for and strongly support his allocation for this. The amount that he has provided in this bill within the allocation and with the $4 billion reduction that the bill entails is below the number that CDBG was given all the way back in 2008. It has varied up and down, depending upon the allocations and depending upon what has gone on. But this one still is below. And I strongly support it and would urge that it be maintained.

And by the way, about 20 percent of the whole amount goes directly to States, which then can use it in a discretionary way in groups of smaller communities. So it actually gets into rural areas and small communities—in communities like those of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, whose district has no community larger than about 15,000 people. But his district manages to get a considerable amount of money through the State of Kentucky for the congressional district.

□ 1350

So it is something that goes to everybody in their districts in a flexible way for things that are eligible under the law.

But when it is being used for the development of housing, then it ends up clearly directly providing for jobs. If it's used in the way of social services through nonprofit organizations, again it is providing jobs for people who are doing great service for our population. So I'm a strong supporter of this.

I certainly urge that the amendment be defeated, and I will stop there because other people wish to speak, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I will be brief because I know we have many more amendments to consider, but I want to focus on this one because I think this proposal to cut the Community Development Block Grant program by $396 million is particularly ill-advised, and I suspect Members on both sides of the aisle will understand that and will agree. We are all, after all, hearing from our mayors and from our local communities with great regularity that CDBG is money well spent.

First of all, this program has been much better funded in past years. Even with the increase in the current bill, for which we commend the chairman, even with that, the funding is much less than could be utilized.

We know the CDBG program has some very strong virtues. One of them is flexibility and community self-determination in terms of how this money is spent, how it is applied, and the kind of leverage that this money represents, for bringing forth participation and funding from other sources.

This is a program that has stood the test of time, that has strong bipartisan support in this Chamber and across the country. So I think the notion that we would cut back this appropriation by hundreds of millions of dollars is most unwise, and I urge defeat of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Community Development Block Grant program is very important to cities and States across the country. There is a great deal of local control in this program. Communities use the block grants to meet local needs such as building water and sewer infrastructure, community centers, housing for low-income families, and other development important to their local communities. Although the bill increases the funding, this funding level is still well below what it was in fiscal year 2010. The bill actually is $1.046 billion below the level of 2010, to be exact.

Madam Chair, as we were going through this bill, we had many Members on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, request additional funding for these grants. For many Members, there is strong constituent support for these programs. We have seen individual cases of abuse, not unlike a lot of other government programs, but really the way to fix those reforms, and we're not going to do it through the appropriations process, is through the authorizers, to have them do their work and make sure that these programs are well run, that they're focused and they actually do what the intention is.

Again, I want everybody to understand that we are actually below fiscal year 2010 levels on a very, very important program, and I would recommend and urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 89, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 89, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 89, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $60,000,000)''.

Page 90, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $3,960,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,404,000,000)''.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, this amendment finishes the good work begun by the gentleman from Utah on the previous amendment. It saves $3.4 billion by eliminating all funding for the Community Development Block Grant program.

This program was created in 1974 with the stated objective of eliminating blight and providing affordable housing, but in the nearly four decades since then, it has degenerated into a Federal slush fund for pet projects of local politicians and politically connected businesses. It is plagued by profligate waste and outright fraud.

This is an unauthorized expenditure. The legal authority for it expired back in 1994, 18 years ago, and Congress has not bothered to renew it ever since, but we keep shoveling money at it year after year. Madam Chair, $3.5 billion averages to almost $50 from the earnings of a family of four, and they have a right to know where their $50, taken from their family budgets, is going.

Senator COBURN gave some examples in his Back to Black report: Summit County, Ohio, spent $100,000 of CDBG funds to create a doggie daycare and kennel last year, and Nyack, New York, directed $10,000 of CDBG funds to Amazing Grace Circus in 2009 to put on ''A Day At the Circus.''

CDBG funds are being spent creating a ''hip'' atmosphere for employees of an L.A. architectural firm, providing decorative sidewalks in a wealthy Virginia community, and upgrading Victorian cottages in Alabama. Indeed, some communities use these funds to pay off Federal loans they've taken out on projects that are now defaulting because they've utterly failed to produce all of the benefits they've promised.

Even in the best of circumstances, these are all projects that exclusively benefit local communities or private interests and ought to be paid for exclusively by those local communities or private interests. They are of such questionable merit that no city council is willing to face its constituents and say, This is how we have spent your local taxes. But they are more than happy to spend somebody else's Federal taxes, so we end up robbing St. Petersburg to pay St. Paul for projects so dubious that the purported beneficiaries won't pay for them.

And that's all before we discuss the realm of fraud. This program is replete with individuals directing six-figure sums to their personal bank accounts or political activities. The Office of Management and Budget has repeatedly branded this program as ''ineffective.'' That's its official designation for government programs that cannot ascertain how their funds are spent. HUD's own inspector general found that, in a relatively short 2-year timespan, over 150 criminal indictments were issued for false claims, bribery, fraudulent contracts, theft, embezzlement, or corruption in connection with this program.

This a slush fund that cries for abolition, and it should be one of the first places that we look to bring spending under control and stop wasting our constituents' money. Once again, though, this unauthorized program is not targeted for elimination by the Appropriations Committee. It is not even targeted for a token reduction in spending. As we just discussed, the Appropriations Committee proposes spending $400 million more than we spent last year, indeed, $400 million more than even the President requested.

Now, let's be very clear on this. The House Appropriations Committee, with a Republican majority that has a clear mandate to stop wasting money, is about to appropriate $400 million more than requested by the most spendthrift administration in our Nation's history on a program with no Federal nexus, with a solid history of fraud, and that funds the most unworthy of local projects and special interest handouts.

□ 1400

The rules of the House were specifically written to prevent this type of unauthorized expenditure, and they provide for a point of order to be raised if it's included in an appropriations bill. That is exactly what we have here. But, alas, that rule is routinely waived when these measures are brought to the floor, making this amendment necessary.

Madam Chairwoman, this is another critical test of the Republican majority's intention to stand by the promises it made to the American people in the most dangerous fiscal crisis in our Nation's history. I pray that we rise to the occasion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I believe, with the offering of this amendment, we are in great need of a reality check in this Chamber. After all, it was President Nixon, and it was a strong, bipartisan majority, with the Republicans playing a leading role, that first initiated the Community Development Block Grant programs, and I assume that this amendment will be rejected today by that same kind of bipartisan coalition.

The whole idea of the CDBG program was to get away from inflexible, one-size-fits-all approaches to urban development. The whole idea was to get away from top-down bureaucratic direction. CDBG was designed to empower communities, to give them flexibility, to maximize the possibility for leverage of private sector funds, to let the community determine its own projects and its own priorities.

All of us have experience with this program, I dare say. My experience has been that the bang for the buck from CDBG is virtually unmatched in any other Federal program. Housing rehabilitation, for example, is one of the main uses in many communities of CDBG funds. What you're doing with housing rehabilitation is not building public housing from scratch. You're not totally developing new neighborhoods, but you're taking houses that are likely to deteriorate, where a relatively small investment can rehab those houses, can salvage those houses, and can make quality housing available more widely in the community.

Another major use of CDBG funds is infrastructure. How many Habitat for Humanity communities have been built across our country with CDBG funds furnishing the basic infrastructure, and from there the volunteer efforts take off?

The gentleman sponsoring this amendment made the incredible statement that these are projects that communities wouldn't undertake on their own. On the contrary, no CDBG project is going to be undertaken without community participation, financial and otherwise, without community self-determination that this is a priority.

So there's an air of unreality about this debate. These are programs that maximize the values that many of our colleagues profess—self-determination, flexibility, leveraging of private funds. They're programs that have stood the test of time. And we, in this bill, should be proud to appropriate CDBG funds, because we know these funds will have great multiplier effects throughout this country. So I very strongly urge colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I rise to oppose the amendment—the same, basically, that I said before: we are below fiscal year 2010 levels. Certainly, I believe the authorizing committee must set very strict parameters as to how these dollars should be used, but we are below fiscal year 2010, and I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DIAZ-BALART

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 90, line 12, before the period insert the following:

Provided further, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading, not to exceed 25 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading may be expended for public services (as such term is defined for purposes of section 105 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305))

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this amendment is subject to a point of order, but I'd like to discuss what this amendment is attempting to address.

As we all know, the Community Development Block Grant program, which is known as the CDBG grant program, is one of the most widely utilized sources of assistance by local governments. These block grants are intended to address housing, community development and economic development needs as determined by local officials.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very straightforward. It simply gives greater flexibility to the local communities and the cities and the counties, et cetera, for part of their CDBG funding. It increases the cap of what is known as public services expenditures from the current 15 percent up to 25 percent.

Now, public services, in reference to this legislation, deals with issues like child care, senior services, disabled services, educational programs, medical services, transportation services, domestic violence, crime prevention, food banks, and others.

The current 15 percent public service cap was enacted into statute over 30 years ago; and it, frankly, just doesn't reflect the reality of today. We all acknowledge, obviously, the tremendous fiscal challenges that we are facing here in Congress, that our country is facing; but we also acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, the challenges that our local communities are facing.

CDBG public services funds have really played a key role in providing crucial aid to our most at-risk, our most vulnerable populations, especially during difficult times like these. The restrictive and, frankly, outdated cap has denied many communities, Mr. Chairman, the option of providing their residents with the most basic services within the framework of the existing CDBG program. So this amendment provides flexibility to local leaders to meet certain unique challenges.

Now, I want to make something very clear: this amendment does not increase or decrease CDBG funds, does not change the formula, and does not require those communities that are entitled to use more of their funds on public services. It simply grants those cities and counties greater flexibility in their usage of certain CDBG funds. Let me mention that my colleague, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, has a standalone piece of legislation that I'm honored to be a cosponsor of.

It's imperative that the authorizing committee, the Financial Services Committee, work to update the CDBG program—for a lot of reasons. I also need to mention that Chairman LATHAM is well aware of these concerns. I want to thank him and his staff for really trying to accommodate us on this issue, but unfortunately we were not able to do it at this time for a number of different reasons. I'd like to continue to work with Chairman LATHAM and the Financial Services chairman, Chairman BACHUS, on finding real solutions that will give local communities flexibility to meet their unique challenges and to make sure that those funds are well utilized.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Diaz-Balart amendment and to draw attention to a crisis that will soon hit the city of Miami and many other cities throughout south Florida, our State of Florida, and indeed throughout the Nation.

We are all aware of the difficult funding decisions that will need to be made by many departments and programs. Programs like the Community Development Block Grant may see overall reductions because of the sad realities of the current budget constraints and in the interest of fiscal responsibility. However, because of an arbitrary Community Development Block Grant expenditure cap, countless vulnerable citizens in the city of Miami and throughout the United States will lose their only means of sustenance.

□ 1410

This amendment is not about increased funding, Mr. Chairman, nor is it about changing the overall formula of the Community Development Block Grant. It is simply about providing greater flexibility to cities on how they allocate their CDBG funds. Currently, only 15 percent of Community Development Block Grant funds can go toward public services.

Now, what are public services? Well, they include food for senior citizens, the disabled, the homeless, the abused, or neglected children. They also may be used for child care, for health services, for job training services.

The city of Miami, which I am proud to represent, currently provides these vital services, especially meals, through the current Community Development Block Grant public services. But, because of the overall decrease in CDBG allocations, many disadvantaged men, women, and children will be without the vital support that they deserve and need.

This amendment is simply a painless solution to this development, allowing cities the flexibility they need in how they expand their CDBG funds. It would allow up to 25 percent of CDBG funds to go to public services, a position that has been endorsed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities.

The current 15 percent public service expenditure cap was enacted with the original statute over 30 years ago. It does not reflect the evolution of this program, nor the necessity to provide flexibility to local leaders on how funds should be expended during this time of belt tightening. The current restrictive and outdated limit has denied many communities the option of providing their residents with the most basic and necessary services within the framework established by the program.

CDBG public services have played a key role in providing crucial aid to our most at-risk and vulnerable constituents, especially during this enduring recession. Cities across our country have had to do more with less, and this amendment will help them accomplish just that.

I wish to thank Chairman LATHAM and his staff for working with Congressman DIAZ-BALART and me on trying to give this flexibility through the proper channel to our local leaders.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. LATHAM. I do.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I just want to make the point that I want to continue to work with these two great Members from Florida. It is a real problem for the community, and I will do everything possible to try to be of assistance with addressing this real problem for them.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Miami.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, again, want to thank you and your staff, who have been great on this issue, understanding the problem.

At this time I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, HUD, and Related Agencies, Mr. LATHAM, and also with Mr. WOLF on the Driver Alcohol Detection System for Safety, or DADSS.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the chairman. As the gentlemen are aware, the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, NHTSA, has been working on a public-private research program known as the Driver Alcohol Detection System for Safety, or DADSS, that would develop a passive technology to detect if a driver's

blood alcohol content is above the legal limit.

I would urge the chairman to consider funding for the DADSS program as this bill moves forward, and I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, and rise to support his initiative.

Mr. Chairman, too many times a mother or a father or a loved one has gotten that dreaded call in the middle of the night that someone has been killed in an accident involving a drunk driver. And I appreciate my friend from Maryland raising the DADSS program, and also urge my good friend, the chairman, to look at this program as the bill moves forward.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentlemen from Maryland and Virginia. I appreciate their taking the time to raise this very important issue. I will be mindful of their concerns as the process moves forward.

Mr. SARBANES. I appreciate it, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, $6,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, as authorized by section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5308): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $244,000,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in section 108(k) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 90, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $6,000,000)''.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment eliminates funding for the Community Development loan guarantee program. Like the Community Development Block Grants that we just discussed, these loan guarantees support strictly local projects that have no Federal nexus.

Now, unlike the House Appropriations Committee, President Obama has requested no taxpayer subsidies for this program, and that's a pretty profound statement. Remember, this is the same President who had no problem placing billions of taxpayer dollars at risk for failed schemes like Solyndra, for which he was soundly and rightly criticized by many in this House.

But even the architect of the Solyndra fiasco is unwilling to risk taxpayer money on this loan guarantee program, so, enter the House Appropriations Committee that apparently has money to burn.

What are the recent projects funded by these loan guarantees? Well, $7 million went to the city of Hartford to buy a 393-room Hilton Hotel; $15 million went to build a movie studio in Norristown, Pennsylvania; a $10 million loan to Bass Pro Shops to redevelop the Memphis Pyramid.

Now, why would we put our taxpayers' money at risk for these ventures? Obviously, private investors were unwilling to risk their own money. Obviously, President Obama sees these loans as far riskier than anything that he's loaned in the Solyndra fiasco. But we're about to put our constituents' hard-earned money at risk to prop up these projects.

Now, when Bass Pro Shops takes $10 million to redevelop the Memphis Pyramid, will this mean more jobs in Memphis? Well, yes. And will it mean precisely that many fewer jobs in other regions as, once again, we take from one community to give to another? Unfortunately, the answer is yes to that question as well.

My amendment simply takes taxpayer exposure to these risky loans down to the level of fiscal restraint proposed by the least fiscally restrained President in the history of our Nation. I'd invite my Republican colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to follow.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, here we have kind of the yang that went with the yin. The gentleman's amendment here a few minutes ago, the last one that he offered, was $3.5 billion, and taking that out of this allocation.

□ 1420

In this case, it's a $6 million amount. That's about 5,000 times as much as the six. The first was 5,000 times as much as this one. Maybe I'm off by an order of magnitude. I'm not quite sure.

The gentleman from California has pointed out that the President did not want to do this at all. Well, actually, the President had asked the committee to create a user fee to pay for this rather than the mechanism by which this really very small program—this $6 million program of loan guarantees—has been functioning, which was to pay for any risk involved. The gentleman is claiming, if there were any serious risk, that it should be paid for out of the subsequent years' allocations under CDBG.

It turns out, for those places that would use this program, the loan guarantee program, there has never been a penny lost of the Federal taxpayers on any of the section 108 projects that we have issued in this program, and there have been a number of them. It actually is one of the most flexible. The Community Development loan guarantee program is exceedingly flexible and very creative. It has been used to create larger projects, projects that create jobs and that may be part of the revitalization of a whole target area, and it always ends up bringing in substantial additional private investment into the neighborhood.

So it's creating jobs. It is used often for the reuse of old factory buildings that are no longer viable in the forms that they were. Particularly in my part of the country, it has been used in that kind of a way—and successfully—to make a project that may turn out to be housing, that may turn out to be a business incubator or whatever. This is a very flexible program and one that the Federal taxpayer has never lost money on.

The creation of jobs and the development of new businesses that come into a place that may be part of a development of this sort is what gives us a robust economy. A robust economy is the best way we have of reducing the deficit because you can end up cutting and cutting and cutting programs, and if you do not end up creating jobs in the long run, you're simply not going to return to a robust economy. I think we know that.

So I rise in opposition to this amendment. I think it is a counterproductive thing to do. It's very small. It has never lost any money. It operates quite well. The chairman, with my assent—though he didn't need my assent—certainly left it in there. I support his position very strongly, and I urge the defeat of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I also oppose the amendment.

The Community Development Block Grant program is very important to cities and States throughout our country. As a former mayor, I can attest to the fact of the impact the Community Development Block Grants have on our local communities. This year, we had many Members, both Republicans and Democrats, request funding for CDBG programs. For many Members, there is strong constituent support for the program.

The section 108 CDBG loan guarantee is a good community development tool because it does something that we should be interested in doing, and that is leveraging funding. With only $6 million provided in the bill, HUD is able to

make nearly a quarter of a billion dollars in loan guarantees for community development. So it's a small amount of Federal money that creates a pretty significant impact. Now, if a fee is warranted, we would encourage the authorizing committee to enact legislation to create a fee and lower the cost of the program.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, $1,200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the amount made available under this heading, the threshold reduction requirements in sections 216(10) and 217(b)(4) of such Act shall not apply to allocation of such amount: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading used for projects not completed within 4 years of the commitment date, as determined by a signature of each party to the agreement, shall be repaid: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the deadline for 1 year if the Secretary determines that the failure to complete the project is beyond the control of the participating jurisdiction: *Provided further*, That no funds provided under this heading may be committed to any project included as part of a participating jurisdiction's plan under section 105(b), unless each participating jurisdiction certifies that it has conducted an underwriting review, assessed developer capacity and fiscal soundness, and examined neighborhood market conditions to ensure adequate need for each project: *Provided further*, That any homeownership units funded under this heading which cannot be sold to an eligible homeowner within 6 months of project completion shall be rented to an eligible tenant: *Provided further*, That no funds provided under this heading may be awarded for development activities to a community housing development organization that cannot demonstrate that it has staff with demonstrated development experience: *Provided further*, That funds provided in prior appropriations Acts for technical assistance, that were made available for Community Housing Development Organizations technical assistance, and that still remain available, may be used for HOME technical assistance notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 91, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $200,000,000)''.

Mr. FLAKE (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut $200 million from the HOME Investment Partnership and transfer the savings to the deficit reduction account. This simply takes the level of funding to where it was last year.

We are often told we need to cut spending. I think we need to. Yet, with this program, we're actually increasing the funding from $1 billion to $1.2 billion, so it's about a 20 percent increase. This is the largest Federal block grant to State and local governments, designed exclusively to create affordable housing for low-income households.

In 2011, a nationwide investigation by The Washington Post described the program as:

> a dysfunctional system that delivers billions of dollars to local housing agencies with few rules, safeguards or even a reliable way to track projects.

This was The Washington Post saying this. It wasn't some conservative Republicans. This was The Washington Post. According to The Post:

> These lapses have led to widespread misspending and delays in a two-decade-old program meant to deliver decent housing to the working poor. Nearly 700 projects awarded $400 million have been idling for years while the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has largely looked the other way. It does not track the pace of construction, and it often fails to spot defunct deals. Instead, they're trusting local agencies to police projects.

Again, that was a quote from the investigation.

In 2009–2010, HUD's Office of Inspector General came out with reports that questioned not only HUD's ability to monitor these HOME project funds but also whether the program was in compliance with its own rules. In addition, several Members of Congress have acknowledged concerns about HUD's ability to ensure that HOME funds are used in a way that produce the program's intended results.

The full Financial Services Committee has held congressional hearings in response to these concerns. In a spending bill just last year, Congress included language that placed additional restrictions on the use of HOME funds for FY12. The problem is those are the funds that are being implemented now. We don't even know if they're following the guidelines and are doing what we asked them to do. Yet here we're appropriating $200 million more to them rather than saying, Hey, we wanted you to do these things. Let's check and see if you've done them before we award you with more money.

It's difficult to evaluate these projects when they haven't been done yet. That's the reason we ought to cut back and simply go level with the funding of last year. Again, it's not a cut from last year. It's level funding from last year. It's the least we can do when running these kinds of deficits and when we have this kind of debt and when we've found massive, massive problems with this program.

□ 1430

The remedy isn't to award a 20 percent increase. If anything, we ought to be cutting the program. I'm simply saying with this amendment, let's take it back to where it was last year. What is the point of oversight that we exercise here in Congress if we exercise that oversight, we find problems, we ask for a remedy, and then we award money before we even see if the remedy was actually entered into? We have oversight here. We have the power of the purse. Let's use it.

This program is troubled. It has problems. It's not just people on one side of the aisle that recognize that. The Congress as a whole does. So why in the world are we awarding 20 percent more funding this year than we had last year? This amendment would take it back to last year's funding level.

I urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I rise today to speak on the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill on the floor.

First off, I want to say that whether it's the mayor of Jacksonville, Florida; Orlando; California; or Texas, every single mayor that I've talked to—Democrats or Republicans—support Community Development Block Grants and are very concerned with what we're doing here and making sure that we send funds that they can decide how the community is to use the funds to meet their needs.

In addition, I want to talk about transportation. I've been on the Transportation Committee for the entire 20 years that I've been here in Congress, and transportation has always been bipartisan. It did not matter who the President was, and it did not matter who the Speaker was. In fact, when Newt Gingrich was the Speaker and President Clinton was the President, the House passed the transportation bill over both of them and funded the Transportation Committee for 6 years.

This House has not been able to pass a transportation bill. For the first time, you see people who really don't want to put America to work because

the Transportation Committee is the committee that put the American people to work. When you look at the engineers or architects, they rate America as a ''D minus,'' as far as our infrastructure is concerned. Yet you have people that do not want to put the American people back to work.

In my home State of Florida, we received close to $3 billion for a high-speed train from Orlando to Tampa. What did we do? We sent it back. Eighteen States have our money, and they are putting people to work. We're talking about transportation money.

When you have people with other agendas besides putting people to work, that is a real problem in the area of transportation. We know that for every $1 billion we invest, it generates 44,000 permanent jobs. Yet you have people in this House with a different agenda, and their agenda has nothing to do with jobs and putting people to work. It is a sad state of affairs. But I've often said you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment that is ostensibly before us.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, we were talking about the amendment that the gentleman from Arizona has offered, and he has offered an amendment that would take $200 million out of the HOME Investment Partnership program as recommended by Chairman LATHAM and the subcommittee and through the procedures of the subcommittee and the full committee actions before coming to the floor.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. There have been some controversies with the HOME Investment Partnership program; but there were statutory changes last year, and HUD is now in the process of finishing the rule to go along with those statutory changes. So those reforms are now basically in place.

To my understanding, at least, there has been no instance of our actual loss of money from the HOME Partnership program at any time, but there have been projects that have been stalled. This is one of the few programs that we have in this bill that actually results in the construction of housing. Most affordable housing projects use multiple sources to complete a development, and occasionally it is possible that the private development monies don't materialize to a project that has been approved for the HOME Partnership program. If that happens, then HUD takes the money back and uses it someplace else. It doesn't in any way end up resulting in a loss to the taxpayers of the country.

The HOME program is, as I say, one of the few programs that actually funds newly constructed housing under this legislation. These funds are used. They provide needed jobs in our communities; they ease the unemployment in the construction sector; they produce housing; and they don't end up costing the taxpayers any money.

To the degree that that is followed and we can produce housing, then I am certainly in favor of it and strongly support Chairman LATHAM's assignment of the additional money. I would point out that the level of the funding at the level that has been recommended by the Appropriations Committee and by the subcommittee that Mr. LATHAM chairs, that the amount of money that has been assigned is below the amount that was assigned 5 years ago for the 2008 budget.

We have been through ups and downs on this one over time, and I certainly would urge a ''no'' vote on the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

□ 1440

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise to associate myself with the remarks of our esteemed ranking member, JOHN OLVER of Massachusetts, and rise to oppose Mr. FLAKE's proposal.

Now, if Mr. FLAKE came to the floor and cut money from well-larded Arizona projects, I might ponder that type of amendment—but I don't support cuts in HOME. With the devastation that's occurred across our housing market, we shouldn't harm housing for sure. But, if he would take the money to balance the budget from the subsidized Central Arizona Water Project, or if he would take the funds from the major Federal monuments that are stacked wall-to-wall in his State of Arizona, or if he would take the funds from all the defense facilities that help to employ and hold up the economy of his State—those might be worthy of debate.

It's very interesting where he cuts money from—from among the poorest areas in this country, some of the most devastated parts of America that are trying to rebuild themselves. It's very curious to me when he proposes amendments, whether it be this one or other ones in subcommittee, he always leaves his home turf sacrosanct.

Mr. FLAKE. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes. I would be interested in the gentleman's response.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio.

For all I know, this cuts money from my district as well. I have not discriminated in where I have taken money from. I think everybody who has followed the process over the past several years knows that.

With regard to the Central Arizona Project, Arizona repays the Federal Government to the tune of about $55 million a year, still after all these years. The fact that we are 83 percent publicly owned in Arizona means that our local communities have to run their facilities and run their services on just a narrow sliver of private land.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, all those loans were subsidized and capital was made available at very favorable terms compared to my region of Arizona. That paid its own way. Just look where federal dollar flow to Arizona—if one looks at the defense bases across northern Ohio, we don't have anything like Arizona has. Defense dollars flow heavily to Arizona. Or, if we look at the kinds of subsidies we are providing for water in the West—The Central Arizona project or for Bureau of Land Management projects, for all of the investments that have been made to allow Arizona to even get water, federal funds have built Arizona—and then to say to the part of the country that said, Well, we want the West to develop. So we're going to help you out. But now you say, No, no, no, no. Now we're going to take money away from Cleveland and Toledo and Detroit and Pittsburgh and Philadelphia and Chicago and Milwaukee—all of the places that taxed themselves for the development of the modern West.

So I would say to the gentleman, I think the answer to the problem we have is economic growth, and we have to invest in that. The housing sector has been dead in the water since 2008, largely because of the nonregulation of the Bush administration during those years when the Wall Street house of cards and derivatives were created. So let's look at what happened back then.

But, please, don't take it out of the hides of the most stressed communities in America that, despite all the odds, are in the process of reinvesting and rebuilding themselves to fuel recovery.

So I just want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER). Oppose the Flake amendment. Support programs that will help the revitalization of the housing sector of this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 92, line 16, before the period insert the following:

: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to $200,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for necessary expenses for

activities authorized under the HOME Investment Partnerships Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of housing and infrastructure, and economic revitalization in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) in 2011: *Provided further*, That such disaster relief funds shall be awarded only to States and units of general local government that were awarded funds under section 239 of Public Law 112–55 (125 Stat. 703), shall be awarded directly to such States and units of general local government at the discretion of the Secretary, and shall be awarded in accordance with such formula or requirements as the Secretary shall establish, except that such formula or requirements shall give preference to awards based on a county's unmet housing needs for renter occupied units: *Provided further*, That prior to the obligation of such disaster relief funds a grantee shall submit a plan to the Secretary detailing the proposed use of all such funds, including criteria for eligibility and how the use of these funds will address long-term recovery and restoration of infrastructure: *Provided further*, That such disaster relief funds may not be used for activities reimbursable by, or for which funds are made available by, the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Army Corps of Engineers: *Provided further*, That such disaster relief funds allocated under this heading shall not be considered relevant to the other non-disaster formula allocations under this heading: *Provided further*, That a State or subdivision thereof may use up to 5 percent of its allocation of such disaster relief funds for administrative costs: *Provided further*, That in administering such disaster relief funds under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or the use by the recipient of these funds or guarantees (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), upon a request by a State or subdivision thereof explaining why such waiver is required to facilitate the use of such funds or guarantees, if the Secretary finds that such waiver would not be inconsistent with the overall purpose of the HOME Investment Partnerships Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register any waiver of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers pursuant to HOME Investment Partnerships Act no later than 5 days before the effective date of such waiver

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the Bachus amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Let me acknowledge the point of order is due to be granted.

I am, however, here to ask for the cooperation of the appropriating committee as we move forward on addressing a problem that we found as a result of the many tornadoes that devastated our country last year. And I will use an example from the city of Tuscaloosa.

In the aftermath of the tornado that struck Tuscaloosa on April 27, HUD came in and calculated the loss of residences and rental units. Part of their charge was to replace the critical needs. However—and I will just use one census tract as an example—they came into a census tract that includes University Boulevard, which is a census tract made up almost entirely of rental units. However, according to HUD's calculation, they came in and they simply surveyed the owner-occupied units. Now, there were 23 owner-occupied units that were destroyed in the census tract, but there were 440 rental units that were destroyed in this same tract. So almost all the loss of property was rental units. It left the city of Tuscaloosa, a university town, woefully inadequate in its number of rental units.

In their calculation, they only take the owner-occupied units, and they extrapolate from that what they consider the number of rental units to be in that same census tract. Well, you can't really base a calculation of how many rental units there are based on how many owner-occupied dwellings there are. And to tell you how much they missed it, they calculated that there were no rental units destroyed, which is obviously a tremendous miscalculation.

So we've offered an amendment today which essentially will say that you have to consider—and your survey must include—both owner-occupied units and rental units and that you must calculate both of them, not simply the owner-occupied units.

HUD's model, in short, needs to be changed. We believe that our authorizing committee will correct this in future cases, but there's an urgent need to replace the rental housing that was lost in last year's tornadoes throughout the Nation. And my amendment simply creates a mechanism to do so and directs HUD to develop a formula for distributing assistance to communities that have already suffered damage. This will restore what we think is fairness and a more correct calculation.

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

Thank you for allowing me to explain the purpose of the amendment that my colleague Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL and I are proposing.

Communities in the State of Alabama and other states are still recovering from the devastating tornadoes of April 27, 2011.

A critical issue is replacing rental housing that was destroyed by the tornadoes. Rental housing is an important and affordable option for individuals and families, especially in larger cities.

Unfortunately, the methodology used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to award recovery assistance may be weighted—in some cases—against rebuilding rental housing.

To provide an example, according to a study by the office of Mayor Walt Maddox, one census tract in Tuscaloosa sustained tornado damage to 463 housing units: 23 owner-occupied units and 440 rental units. Rather than document the actual damage and distribute recovery aid accordingly, HUD used a mathematical model to calculate the damage.

The result is that only 2.2% of the units in this devastated neighborhood were deemed to have been severely damaged. None of the rental properties were included in the formula, regardless of their damage.

This bureaucratic discrepancy has put Tuscaloosa and other communities at an unfair disadvantage when it comes to receiving funding for the restoration of their rental housing stock.

HUD's model needs to be changed. We are working to correct it for future cases, but there is an urgent need to replace the rental housing that was lost during last year's tornadoes.

Our amendment creates a mechanism to do that. It directs HUD to develop a formula for distributing assistance to communities that have already suffered damage. This will help restore fairness and promote the continued recovery of our communities from some of the most devastating tornadoes in the history of the State of Alabama and our nation.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

Ms. SEWELL. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Chairman, I understand the point of order; but I rise today in support of this amendment by my fellow colleague from Alabama, which adds critical funding to assist communities devastated as a result of last year's severe weather.

This bipartisan amendment would add $200 million to the underlying bill and direct it towards communities that received CDBG disaster assistance in FY 2012. Prior to awarding of these new funds, this amendment directs HUD to establish a formula of funding that would give preference to applicants based on a county's unmet housing need, including renter-occupied units.

Currently, there is still an ongoing and urgent need for housing options, particularly rental units, across several parts of my district as well as my colleague's district. This amendment would help communities like Tuscaloosa, Alabama, receive adequate funds to help repair and rebuild the rental housing units that were destroyed by the April 27 tornadoes. This would help to provide rental housing units that will provide critical shelter for women, children, and families.

□ 1450

A recent report released by HUD estimated that the amount of unmet housing needs for Tuscaloosa County alone would exceed $56 million. Most of this figure was associated with unmet rental housing need.

The devastation and destruction that was caused by the April tornados across the State of Alabama is still being felt, especially in places that already have economically disadvantaged areas. This amendment would provide the additional funds needed for these affected areas to continue their efforts toward full recovery.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SELF-HELP AND ASSISTED HOMEOWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program, as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended, $60,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $20,000,000 shall be made available to the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended: *Provided further*, That $35,000,000 shall be made available for the second, third and fourth capacity building activities authorized under section 4(a) of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note), of which not less than $5,000,000 may be made available for rural capacity-building activities: *Provided further*, That $5,000,000 shall be made available for capacity-building activities for national organizations with expertise in rural housing, including experience working with rural housing organizations, local governments, and Indian tribes: *Provided further*, That no funds made available for capacity building activities under this heading in this Act or any prior Act may be set-aside, reserved, or awarded in connection with the Department's demand-response initiative, described in section V(A)(3)(d) of the Notices of Funding Availability for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any requirement in any Notice of Funding Availability, grant application, grant agreement, or work plan, any unexpended amounts provided under this heading for capacity building activities in fiscal years 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013 may not be used in connection with such demand-response initiative or any similar initiative, unless a grantee, in its sole discretion, decides to undertake or continue such a project: *Provided further*, That prior to undertaking, or asking others to undertake, any further demand-response or similar place-based initiatives, the Department shall submit for Congressional approval in its operating plan and budget proposal a detailed justification of such initiative, including how it fits within the Department's overall capacity building efforts, why it is consistent with authorizing legislation, and how the Department plans to implement it effectively.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the emergency solutions grants program as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended; the continuum of care program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act; and the rural housing stability assistance program as authorized under subtitle D of title IV of such Act, $2,000,000,000, of which $1,995,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, and of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for project-based rental assistance with rehabilitation projects with 10-year grant terms and any rental assistance amounts that are recaptured under such continuum of care program shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than $286,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such emergency solutions grants program: *Provided further*, That not less than $1,650,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such continuum of care and rural housing stability assistance programs: *Provided further*, That up to $6,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the national homeless data analysis project: *Provided further*, That all funds awarded for supportive services under the continuum of care program and the rural housing stability assistance program shall be matched by not less than 25 percent in cash or in kind by each grantee: *Provided further*, That for all match requirements applicable to funds made available under this heading for this fiscal year and prior years, a grantee may use (or could have used) as a source of match funds other funds administered by the Secretary and other Federal agencies unless there is (or was) a specific statutory prohibition on any such use of any such funds: *Provided further*, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible, including Medicaid, State Children's Health Insurance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, and services funding through the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grant, Workforce Investment Act, and the Welfare-to-Work grant program: *Provided further*, That all balances for Shelter Plus Care renewals previously funded from the Shelter Plus Care Renewal account and transferred to this account shall be available, if recaptured, for continuum of care renewals in fiscal year 2013: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation from amounts allocated (which may represent initial or final amounts allocated) for the emergency solutions grant program within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 94, line 19, after each of the first and second dollar amounts, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 95, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 110, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I offer this amendment on behalf of citizens who feel that they have no voice in this Congress; people who have given up hope altogether. These are citizens who earn money by scavenging through alleys to find empty bottles and cans and get their return deposits. They survive by rummaging through garbage dumpsters to find food to eat. These are citizens who have no place to live. They're on the street.

According to the Detroit Rescue Mission Ministries, every night in the city of Detroit there are nearly 20,000 people who are in need of shelter and who are homeless. Nearly a quarter of these people are children. And what is perhaps most tragic is that many of these citizens—and I have spoken to them as I have seen them in the alleys—are men who have sacrificed themselves and proudly served this country in the military. Many of the homeless in the city of Detroit are veterans.

Some of the folks on the street I know personally. I grew up with them. They need help. They need substance abuse treatment. They need a place to stay. And in Detroit, because of the housing crisis, because foreclosures forced many people out of their homes, we also have many apartment buildings that are now vacant—vacant, but could be rehabilitated and renovated to provide a home to our veterans who are currently on the street.

This amendment that I offer will add $5 million to homeless assistance grants to provide our homeless veterans with a home, but also with the hope and dignity that all Americans deserve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I would just tell the gentleman that we accept your amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 134, line 11, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

HOUSING PROGRAMS

PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of project-based subsidy contracts under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) (''the Act''), not otherwise provided for, $8,300,400,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2012 (in addition to the $400,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available October 1, 2012), and $400,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2013: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading shall be available for expiring or terminating section 8

project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for amendments to section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401), for renewal of section 8 contracts for units in projects that are subject to approved plans of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990, and for administrative and other expenses associated with project-based activities and assistance funded under this paragraph: *Provided further*, That of the total amounts provided under this heading, not to exceed $260,000,000 shall be available for performance-based contract administrators for section 8 project-based assistance: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may also use such amounts in the previous proviso for performance-based contract administrators for the administration of: interest reduction payments pursuant to section 236(a) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(a)); rent supplement payments pursuant to section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s); section 236(f)(2) rental assistance payments (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(f)(2)); project rental assistance contracts for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q(c)(2)); project rental assistance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(d)(2)); project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–372; 73 Stat. 667); and loans under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–372; 73 Stat. 667): *Provided further*, That amounts recaptured under this heading, the heading ''Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing'', or the heading ''Housing Certificate Fund'' may be used for renewals of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts or for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 8 project-based Housing Assistance Payments contract that authorizes HUD to require that surplus project funds be deposited in an interest-bearing residual receipts account and that are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary, shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amount otherwise provided by this heading for uses authorized under this heading.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

For capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, and for senior preservation rental assistance contracts, as authorized by section 811(e) of the American Housing and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000, as amended, and for supportive services associated with the housing, $425,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, up to $90,000,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects: *Provided further*, That amounts under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 202 projects: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the provisions of section 202 governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance, except that the initial contract term for such assistance shall not exceed 5 years in duration: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in this fiscal year and hereafter, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 202 Project Rental Assistance Contract that requires surplus project funds to be deposited in an interest-bearing residual receipts account and be remitted to the Secretary upon termination of the contract, shall be remitted to the Secretary and deposited in this account upon termination of such contract, to be available until expended for capital advances and other eligible assistance for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited in this account pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amounts otherwise provided by this heading for uses authorized under this heading.

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

For amendments to capital advance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of such Act and for project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–372; 73 Stat. 667), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, for project rental assistance to State housing finance agencies and other appropriate entities as authorized under section 811(b)(3) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Housing Act, and for supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811(b)(1) of such Act, $165,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 811 Projects.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

For contracts, grants, and other assistance excluding loans, as authorized under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, $45,000,000, including up to $2,500,000 for administrative contract services: *Provided*, That grants made available from amounts provided under this heading shall be awarded within 120 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That funds shall be used for providing counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners, both current and prospective, with respect to property maintenance, financial management/literacy, and such other matters as may be appropriate to assist them in improving their housing conditions, meeting their financial needs, and fulfilling the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership; for program administration; and for housing counselor training.

OTHER ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAMS

PAYMENT TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses as authorized by the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.), up to $4,000,000, to remain available until expended, which is to be derived from the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund pursuant to section 620 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such collections are received during fiscal year 2013 so as to result in no fiscal year 2013 appropriation from the general fund estimated and fees pursuant to such section 620 shall be modified as necessary to ensure such a final fiscal year 2013 appropriation: *Provided further*, That for the dispute resolution and installation programs, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may assess and collect fees from any program participant: *Provided further*, That such collections shall be deposited into the Fund, and the Secretary, as provided herein, may use such collections, as well as fees collected under section 620, for necessary expenses of such Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the requirements of section 620 of such Act, the Secretary may carry out responsibilities of the Secretary under such Act through the use of approved service providers that are paid directly by the recipients of their services.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

New commitments to guarantee single family loans insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund shall not exceed $400,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2013, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed $50,000,000: *Provided further*, That the foregoing amount in the previous proviso shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund. For administrative contract expenses of the Federal Housing Administration, $215,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which up to $71,500,000 may be transferred to and merged with the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed $200,000,000,000 on or before April 1, 2012, an additional $1,400 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each $1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below $1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed $30,000,000.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee loans insured 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 $25,000,000,000 in total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2013, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(l), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act,

shall not exceed $20,000,000, which shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed $500,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That $20,500,000 shall be available for necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Government National Mortgage Association: *Provided further*, That to the extent that guaranteed loan commitments will and do exceed $155,000,000,000 on or before April 1, 2013, an additional $100 for necessary salaries and expenses shall be available until expended for each $1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below $1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed $3,000,000: *Provided further*, That receipts from Commitment and Multiclass fees collected pursuant to title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 1(a)(1)(I) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, $52,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That with respect to amounts made available under this heading, notwithstanding section 204 of this title, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements funded with philanthropic entities, other Federal agencies, or State or local governments and their agencies for research projects: *Provided further*, That with respect to the previous proviso, such partners to the cooperative agreements must contribute at least a 50 percent match toward the cost of the project: *Provided further*, That for non-competitive agreements entered into in accordance with the previous two provisos, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall comply with section 2(b) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–282, 31 U.S.C. note) in lieu of compliance with section 102(a)(4)(C) with respect to documentation of award decisions.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, $68,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which $42,500,000 shall be to carry out activities pursuant to such section 561: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary may assess and collect fees to cover the costs of the Fair Housing Training Academy, and may use such funds to provide such training: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant or loan: *Provided further*, That, of the funds made available under this heading, $300,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the creation and promotion of translated materials and other programs that support the assistance of persons with limited English proficiency in utilizing the services provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL AND HEALTHY HOMES

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by section 1011 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, $120,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That up to $10,000,000 of that amount shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related diseases and hazards: *Provided further*, That for purposes of environmental review, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other provisions of the law that further the purposes of such Act, a grant under the Healthy Homes Initiative, Operation Lead Elimination Action Plan (LEAP), or the Lead Technical Studies program under this heading or under prior appropriations Acts for such purposes under this heading, shall be considered to be funds for a special project for purposes of section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $45,000,000 shall be made available on a competitive basis for areas with the highest lead paint abatement needs: *Provided further*, That each recipient of funds provided under the third proviso shall make a matching contribution in an amount not less than 25 percent: *Provided further*, That each applicant shall certify adequate capacity that is acceptable to the Secretary to carry out the proposed use of funds pursuant to a notice of funding availability: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading in this or prior appropriations Acts, and that still remain available, may be used for any purpose under this heading notwithstanding the purpose for which such amounts were appropriated if a program competition is undersubscribed and there are other program competitions under this heading that are oversubscribed.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For additional capital for the Working Capital Fund (42 U.S.C. 3535) for the development of, modifications to, and infrastructure for Department-wide and program-specific information technology systems, for the continuing operation and maintenance of both Department-wide and program-specific information systems, and for program-related maintenance activities, $175,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund under this Act shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund from amounts appropriated by previously enacted appropriations Acts may be used for the purposes specified under this Fund, in addition to any other information technology the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of the funds made available under this heading for Development, Modernization and Enhancement, including development and deployment of a Next Generation of Voucher Management System and development and deployment of modernized Federal Housing Administration systems may be obligated until the Secretary submits to the Committees on Appropriations a plan for expenditure that—(A) identifies for each modernization project: (i) the functional and performance capabilities to be delivered and the mission benefits to be realized, (ii) the estimated life-cycle cost, and (iii) key milestones to be met; (B) demonstrates that each modernization project is: (i) compliant with the department's enterprise architecture, (ii) being managed in accordance with applicable life-cycle management policies and guidance, (iii) subject to the department's capital planning and investment control requirements, and (iv) supported by an adequately staffed project office; and (C) has been reviewed by the Government Accountability Office.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $125,600,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within this office.

TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVE

For necessary expenses of research, evaluation, and program metrics activities; program demonstrations; and technical assistance and capacity building, $50,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That with respect to amounts made available under this heading for research, evaluation and program metrics or program demonstrations, notwithstanding section 204 of this title, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements funded with philanthropic entities, other Federal agencies, or State or local governments and their agencies for research projects: *Provided further*, That with respect to the previous proviso, such partners to the cooperative agreements must contribute at least a 50 percent match toward the cost of the project.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. Fifty percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 50 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1437 note) shall be rescinded or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury shall be used by State housing finance agencies or local governments or local housing agencies with projects approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for which settlement occurred after January 1, 1992, in accordance with such section. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate.

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2013 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a nonfrivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 203. Sections 203 and 209 of division C of Public Law 112-55 (125 Stat. 693-694) shall apply during fiscal year 2013 as if such sections were included in this title, except that during such fiscal year such sections shall be applied by substituting ''fiscal year 2013'' for ''fiscal year 2011'' and ''fiscal year 2012'', each place such terms appear.

SEC. 204. Except as explicitly provided in law, any grant, cooperative agreement or other assistance made pursuant to title II of this Act shall be made on a competitive basis and in accordance with section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3545).

SEC. 205. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1).

SEC. 206. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or through a reprogramming of funds, no part of any appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be available for any program, project or activity in excess of amounts set forth in the budget estimates submitted to Congress.

SEC. 207. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of such Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2013 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 208. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations regarding all uncommitted, unobligated, recaptured and excess funds in each program and activity within the jurisdiction of the Department and shall submit additional, updated budget information to these Committees upon request.

SEC. 209. The President's formal budget request for fiscal year 2014, as well as the Department of Housing and Urban Development's congressional budget justifications to be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall use the identical account and sub-account structure provided under this Act.

SEC. 210. A public housing agency or such other entity that administers Federal housing assistance for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California, the States of Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi shall not be required to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of assistance provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 on the board of directors or a similar governing board of such agency or entity as required under section (2)(b) of such Act. Each public housing agency or other entity that administers Federal housing assistance under section 8 for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California and the States of Alaska, Iowa and Mississippi that chooses not to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of section 8 assistance on the board of directors or a similar governing board shall establish an advisory board of not less than six residents of public housing or recipients of section 8 assistance to provide advice and comment to the public housing agency or other administering entity on issues related to public housing and section 8. Such advisory board shall meet not less than quarterly.

SEC. 211. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to the conditions listed in subsection (b), for fiscal years 2013 and 2014, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may authorize the transfer of some or all project-based assistance, debt and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions, associated with one or more multifamily housing project to another multifamily housing project or projects.

(b) PHASED TRANSFERS.—Transfers of project-based assistance under this section may be done in phases to accommodate the financing and other requirements related to rehabilitating or constructing the project or projects to which the assistance is transferred, to ensure that such project or projects meet the standards under section (c).

(c) The transfer authorized in subsection (a) is subject to the following conditions:

(1) NUMBER AND BEDROOM SIZE OF UNITS.—

(A) For occupied units in the transferring project: the number of low-income and very low-income units and the configuration (i.e. bedroom size) provided by the transferring project shall be no less than when transferred to the receiving project or projects and the net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided by the transferring project shall remain the same in the receiving project or projects.

(B) For unoccupied units in the transferring project: the Secretary may authorize a reduction in the number of dwelling units in the receiving project or projects to allow for a reconfiguration of bedroom sizes to meet current market demands, as determined by the Secretary and provided there is no increase in the project-based section 8 budget authority.

(2) The net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided to the transferring project shall remain the same as the receiving project or projects.

(3) The transferring project shall, as determined by the Secretary, be either physically obsolete or economically nonviable.

(4) The receiving project or projects shall meet or exceed applicable physical standards established by the Secretary.

(5) The owner or mortgagor of the transferring project shall notify and consult with the tenants residing in the transferring project and provide a certification of approval by all appropriate local governmental officials.

(6) The tenants of the transferring project who remain eligible for assistance to be provided by the receiving project or projects shall not be required to vacate their units in the transferring project or projects until new units in the receiving project are available for occupancy.

(7) The Secretary determines that this transfer is in the best interest of the tenants.

(8) If either the transferring project or the receiving project or projects meets the condition specified in subsection (d)(2)(A), any lien on the receiving project resulting from additional financing obtained by the owner shall be subordinate to any FHA-insured mortgage lien transferred to, or placed on, such project by the Secretary, except that the Secretary may waive this requirement upon determination that such a waiver is necessary to facilitate the financing of acquisition, construction, and/or rehabilitation of the receiving project or projects.

(9) If the transferring project meets the requirements of subsection (d)(2)(E), the owner or mortgagor of the receiving project or projects shall execute and record either a continuation of the existing use agreement or a new use agreement for the project where, in either case, any use restrictions in such agreement are of no lesser duration than the existing use restrictions.

(10) The transfer does not increase the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended) of any FHA-insured mortgage, except to the extent that appropriations are provided in advance for the amount of any such increased cost.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms ''low-income'' and ''very low-income'' shall have the meanings provided by the statute and/or regulations governing the program under which the project is insured or assisted;

(2) the term ''multifamily housing project'' means housing that meets one of the following conditions—

(A) housing that is subject to a mortgage insured under the National Housing Act;

(B) housing that has project-based assistance attached to the structure including projects undergoing mark to market debt restructuring under the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Housing Act;

(C) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 as amended by section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(D) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as such section existed before the enactment of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(E) housing that is assisted under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act; or

(F) housing or vacant land that is subject to a use agreement;

(3) the term ''project-based assistance'' means—

(A) assistance provided under section 8(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937;

(B) assistance for housing constructed or substantially rehabilitated pursuant to assistance provided under section 8(b)(2) of such Act (as such section existed immediately before October 1, 1983);

(C) rent supplement payments under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;

(D) interest reduction payments under section 236 and/or additional assistance payments under section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act;

(E) assistance payments made under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959; and

(F) assistance payments made under section 811(d)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959;

(4) the term ''receiving project or projects'' means the multifamily housing project or projects to which some or all of the project-based assistance, debt, and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions are to be transferred;

(5) the term ''transferring project'' means the multifamily housing project which is transferring some or all of the project-based

assistance, debt and the statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions to the receiving project or projects; and

(6) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(e) The Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register the terms and conditions, including criteria for HUD approval, of transfers pursuant to this section no later than 30 days before the effective date of such notice.

SEC. 212. No funds provided under this title may be used for an audit of the Government National Mortgage Association that makes applicable requirements under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.)

SEC. 213. (a) No assistance shall be provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to any individual who—

(1) is enrolled as a student at an institution of higher education (as defined under section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002));

(2) is under 24 years of age;

(3) is not a veteran;

(4) is unmarried;

(5) does not have a dependent child;

(6) is not a person with disabilities, as such term is defined in section 3(b)(3)(E) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(3)(E)) and was not receiving assistance under such section 8 as of November 30, 2005; and

(7) is not otherwise individually eligible, or has parents who, individually or jointly, are not eligible, to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

(b) For purposes of determining the eligibility of a person to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), any financial assistance (in excess of amounts received for tuition and any other required fees and charges) that an individual receives under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), from private sources, or an institution of higher education (as defined under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), shall be considered income to that individual, except for a person over the age of 23 with dependent children.

SEC. 214. The funds made available for Native Alaskans under the heading ''Native American Housing Block Grants'' in title III of this Act shall be allocated to the same Native Alaskan housing block grant recipients that received funds in fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 215. Notwithstanding the limitation in the first sentence of section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-g), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may, until September 30, 2013, insure and enter into commitments to insure mortgages under section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20).

SEC. 216. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 2013, in managing and disposing of any multifamily property that is owned or has a mortgage held by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and during the process of foreclosure on any property with a contract for rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 or other Federal programs, the Secretary shall maintain any rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and other programs that are attached to any dwelling units in the property. To the extent the Secretary determines, in consultation with the tenants and the local government, that such a multifamily property owned or held by the Secretary is not feasible for continued rental assistance payments under such section 8 or other programs, based on consideration of (1) the costs of rehabilitating and operating the property and all available Federal, State, and local resources, including rent adjustments under section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (''MAHRAA'') and (2) environmental conditions that cannot be remedied in a cost-effective fashion, the Secretary may, in consultation with the tenants of that property, contract for project-based rental assistance payments with an owner or owners of other existing housing properties, or provide other rental assistance. The Secretary shall also take appropriate steps to ensure that project-based contracts remain in effect prior to foreclosure, subject to the exercise of contractual abatement remedies to assist relocation of tenants for imminent major threats to health and safety after written notice to and informed consent of the affected tenants and use of other available remedies, such as partial abatements or receivership. After disposition of any multifamily property described under this section, the contract and allowable rent levels on such properties shall be subject to the requirements under section 524 of MAHRAA.

SEC. 217. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall report quarterly to the House of Representatives and Senate Committees on Appropriations on HUD's use of all sole-source contracts, including terms of the contracts, cost, and a substantive rationale for using a sole-source contract.

SEC. 218. During fiscal year 2013, in the provision of rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) in connection with a program to demonstrate the economy and effectiveness of providing such assistance for use in assisted living facilities that is carried out in the counties of the State of Michigan notwithstanding paragraphs (3) and (18)(B)(iii) of such section 8(o), a family residing in an assisted living facility in any such county, on behalf of which a public housing agency provides assistance pursuant to section 8(o)(18) of such Act, may be required, at the time the family initially receives such assistance, to pay rent in an amount exceeding 40 percent of the monthly adjusted income of the family by such a percentage or amount as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 219. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the recipient of a grant under section 202b of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q) after December 26, 2000, in accordance with the unnumbered paragraph at the end of section 202(b) of such Act, may, at its option, establish a single-asset nonprofit entity to own the project and may lend the grant funds to such entity, which may be a private nonprofit organization described in section 831 of the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000.

SEC. 220. The amounts provided under the subheading ''Program Account'' under the heading ''Community Development Loan Guarantees'' may be used to guarantee, or make commitments to guarantee, notes, or other obligations issued by any State on behalf of non-entitlement communities in the State in accordance with the requirements of section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided*, That any State receiving such a guarantee or commitment shall distribute all funds subject to such guarantee to the units of general local government in non-entitlement areas that received the commitment.

SEC. 221. Public housing agencies that own and operate 400 or fewer public housing units may elect to be exempt from any asset management requirement imposed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the operating fund rule: *Provided*, That an agency seeking a discontinuance of a reduction of subsidy under the operating fund formula shall not be exempt from asset management requirements.

SEC. 222. With respect to the use of amounts provided in this Act and in future Acts for the operation, capital improvement and management of public housing as authorized by sections 9(d) and 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(d) and (e)), the Secretary shall not impose any requirement or guideline relating to asset management that restricts or limits in any way the use of capital funds for central office costs pursuant to section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(g)(1), (2)): *Provided*, That a public housing agency may not use capital funds authorized under section 9(d) for activities that are eligible under section 9(e) for assistance with amounts from the operating fund in excess of the amounts permitted under section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2).

SEC. 223. No official or employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be designated as an allotment holder unless the Office of the Chief Financial Officer has determined that such allotment holder has implemented an adequate system of funds control and has received training in funds control procedures and directives. The Chief Financial Officer shall ensure that, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a trained allotment holder shall be designated for each HUD subaccount under the heading ''Administration, Operations, and Management'' as well as each account receiving appropriations for ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'' within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 224. Payment of attorney fees in program-related litigation must be paid from individual program office personnel benefits and compensation funding. The annual budget submission for program office personnel benefit and compensation funding must include program-related litigation costs for attorney fees as a separate line item request.

SEC. 225. The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall for fiscal year 2013 and subsequent fiscal years, notify the public through the Federal Register and other means, as determined appropriate, of the issuance of a notice of the availability of assistance or notice of funding availability (NOFA) for any program or discretionary fund administered by the Secretary that is to be competitively awarded. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2013 and subsequent fiscal years, the Secretary may make the NOFA available only on the Internet at the appropriate Government Web site or through other electronic media, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 226. The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to transfer up to 5 percent or $5,000,000, whichever is less, of the funds appropriated for any office funded under the heading ''Administration, Operations, and Management'' to any other office funded under such heading: *Provided*, That no appropriation for any office funded under the heading ''Administration, Operations, and Management'' shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent or $5,000,000, whichever is less, without prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to transfer up to 5 percent or $5,000,000, whichever is less, of the funds appropriated for any account funded under the general heading ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'' to any other account funded under such heading: *Provided further*,

That no appropriation for any account funded under the general heading ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'' shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent or $5,000,000, whichever is less, without prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may transfer funds made available for salaries and expenses between any office funded under the heading ''Administration, Operations, and Management'' and any account funded under the general heading ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'', but only with the prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 227. The Disaster Housing Assistance Programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, shall be considered a ''program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development'' under section 904 of the McKinney Act for the purpose of income verifications and matching.

SEC. 228. None of the funds made available by this Act, or any other Act, for purposes authorized under section 8 (only with respect to the tenant-based rental assistance program) and section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) may be used by any public housing agency for any amount of salary, for the chief executive officer of which, or any other official or employee of which, that exceeds the annual rate of basic pay payable for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule at any time during any public housing agency fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 229. Paragraph (1) of section 242(i) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-7(i)(1)) is amended by striking ''July 31, 2011'' and inserting ''July 31, 2016''.

SEC. 230. Subsection (d) of section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) GUARANTEE FEE.—The Secretary shall establish and collect, at the time of issuance of the guarantee, a fee for the guarantee of loans under this section, in an amount not exceeding 3 percent of the principal obligation of the loan. The Secretary may also establish and collect annual premium payments in an amount not exceeding 1 percent of the remaining guaranteed balance (excluding the portion of the remaining balance attributable to the fee collected at the time of issuance of the guarantee). The Secretary shall establish the amount of the fees and premiums by publishing a notice in the Federal Register. The Secretary shall deposit any fees and premiums collected under this subsection in the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund established under subsection (i).''.

SEC. 231. (a) Subsection (b) of section 225 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12755) is amended by inserting at the end the following sentence: ''Such 30 day waiting period is not required if the grounds for the termination or refusal to renew involve a direct threat to the safety of the tenants or employees of the housing, or an imminent and serious threat to the property (and the termination or refusal to renew is in accordance with the requirements of State or local law).''.

(b) Section 231 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12771) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by striking ''make such funds available by direct reallocation'' and all that follows through ''were recaptured'' and inserting ''reallocate the funds by formula in accordance with section 217(d) of this Act (42 U.S.C. 12747(d))''; and

(2) by striking subsection (c).

SEC. 232. Notwithstanding Section 24(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437v(o)), amounts made available in prior appropriations Acts under the heading ''Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI)'' or under the heading ''Choice Neighborhoods Initiative'' may continue to be provided as assistance pursuant to such Section 24.

SEC. 233. The proviso under the ''Community Development Fund'' heading in Public Laws 109–148, 109–234, 110–252, and 110–329 which requires the Secretary to establish procedures to prevent duplication of benefits and to report to the Committees on Appropriations on all steps to prevent fraud and abuse is amended by striking ''quarterly'' and inserting ''annually''.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 234. Title II of division K of Public Law 110-161 is amended by striking the item related to ''Flexible Subsidy Fund''.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 134, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 235. Notwithstanding the 13th proviso of the second undesignated paragraph under the heading ''Community Planning and Development--Community Development Fund'' in title XII of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5; 123 Stat. 218) and section 1497(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203; 124 Stat. 2209), a State or unit of general local government in a State may use not more than 75 percent of any amounts made available from a grant under such second undesignated paragraph or under such section 1497 for the purpose set forth in section 2301(c)(4)(D) of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 5301 note), at the sole discretion of the State or unit of general local government.

Mr. LATOURETTE (during the reading.) I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman for reserving the point of order. I think when I'm done consuming my 5 minutes, he will perhaps relent and think that that's a bad idea.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Fund has been a valuable tool all across America in helping to revitalize neighborhoods. I would suggest it has one fatal flaw. There are some homes in every community in America, whether it's Detroit, Los Angeles, Cleveland, where I'm from, where some homes just aren't coming back, and you can't revitalize the neighborhoods until you tear those houses down and start afresh.

One of the difficulties with the Neighborhood Stabilization Fund is it restricts the ability for a local community to use those funds to demolish homes. I will tell you from touring a number of these properties in my good friend MARCIA FUDGE's district on the east side of Cleveland, these are firetraps, these are rattraps. The last two Cleveland police officers who have been injured in the line of duty have been injured as they entered a dilapidated home. We toured one home in fact where the expression ''everything but the kitchen sink'' didn't apply because people had actually taken the kitchen sink, the toilet, the wiring, the gutters, and all of the copper.

Cities are stepping up all across the country to take care of this problem. In the State of Ohio, our Attorney General has devoted $75 million from the settlement with the top five big banks to this purpose. Mayor Jackson in Cleveland has expended a considerable amount of money. And Ms. FUDGE and I have introduced legislation that would authorize bonds through the Department of Treasury to supplement the great work that land banks all across this country are doing.

But because that bill languishes in the Ways and Means Committee, this simple amendment would give increased flexibility to communities that want to take grants that they've received from the Federal Government to stabilize their neighborhoods to give them the opportunity to use them for demolition if they reach the conclusion that in order to protect the neighbors in that neighborhood who are paying their taxes or keeping up their house, who are paying their mortgage but whose property values continue to plummet because they have this eyesore next door, that if the mayor of Cleveland or the mayor of Toledo or the mayor of Los Angeles reaches the conclusion that it's better in that instance to rip that house down and start over and work with the land banks that are popping up all across the country, they do that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully ask for passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order, but I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the gentleman from Ohio that I have really no problem with the intent of his amendment, that I think he is talking about something that is very real to a lot of folks.

My understanding is that waivers that have been asked for have all been accepted in the past, and the Secretary has said that if there's a waiver needed, that they would be glad to oblige. But having said that, I just want the gentleman to know that the reason why I must insist on the point of order is simply for consistency on the bill. We have struck on point of order every

other authorizing language that has come before the subcommittee or to the floor today. So with that, while I share his concerns that he has stated, I must insist on my point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment waives existing law.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LATOURETTE. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my great friend from Iowa for those kind words. I know his heart is in the right place, even if his legislative initiatives at this moment are not.

A lot of people don't realize the history of rule XXI. I've had great conversations in the past with the prior Parliamentarians, the last two, Mr. Sullivan and Charlie—I can't remember Charlie's last name. We talked about the notion of equity. We're not only bound by the rules of the House, but just like in courts all across the country, the Chair has the power of equity in his possession.

Rule XXI has its origins in 1844 when John Quincy Adams, the only President of the United States to come back and serve in the House of Representatives, decided that the appropriations process was bogging down and, therefore, we should have rule XXI to prohibit authorizing on appropriations bills. It was designed to keep the appropriators from poaching on the territory of the authorizing committees.

We don't have that here. The chairman of the authorizing committee was just here, Mr. BACHUS. He doesn't have any problem with this. The only person who is raising the point of order and has a problem with this is the distinguished subcommittee chair of the Appropriations Committee. So that's my first argument on equity.

Secondly, because I had some spare time today, I also looked at the precedents of the House, and I would suggest to the Chair that this is a matter of first impression. The last time that this came to the attention of the Parliamentarian was in 2006. And, sadly, there is a big problem with getting the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD online, but we did get the previous one, which was in 1995 when the gentlelady from Missouri at the time, Ms. Danner, whom many of us remember, was attempting to make a provision in order on the Transportation, it wasn't Transportation-HUD at that time, it was the Transportation appropriations bill. And in construing the context of clause 2, rule XXI, the Chair at that time indicated that what she was attempting to do is—we have out of the highway trust fund, 2.8 cents goes to transit. That yields a certain amount of money, and she was attempting to wall off $26 million to go specifically to additional transit projects. The Chair in that instance specifically, and I think correctly, found that you cannot mandate or limit the discretion of the Secretary or another Federal official, nor can you mandate that money be used in a certain way that's not contemplated by the law. As a matter of fact, in section 1057 of the House manual that we all revere here very much, it cites the indications where this has been considered before.

The common theme with all of them is that the person offering the amendment or the Appropriations Committee attempting to implement the policy was attempting to mandate action on the part of a Federal official or mandate that money be spent in a certain way.

I brought up the June 9, 2006, ruling by the Chair, which occurs on page 10673, for those who may be following this at home, and in that instance the offending language was that the statement could not say that not less than a certain sum would be expended on that particular purpose.

This amendment was very carefully crafted. As the Chair, I know being a student of the law and parliamentary procedure, will note that we don't have the words ''not less than,'' it's ''not more than.'' Already the existing legislation, the Dodd-Frank Act, contemplates that States who receive—so there's no change in the Federal appropriation. If the city of Cleveland gets a $100,000 neighborhood stabilization fund, they get to spend it. It doesn't change. There's no Federal involvement after that. It's then up to Mayor Jackson to figure out how to expend it.

This expands the contemplated purpose of that that says a portion is already permitted to be used for demolition. This just says ''not more than.'' It's not a limitation. It just is increased flexibility for the communities that have received these grants. And honest to gosh, you know, with all of the problems that we have around this place, to go back and violate the spirit of John Quincy Adams' understanding of why we needed rule XXI, to prevent State and local communities from having the flexibility to demolish homes where fires are occurring, where people are selling drugs, where people are being murdered, is really beyond me.

So I appeal to the Chair not only based upon the precedents of the House, but upon the inherent authority of the Chair to exercise equity and understand that there might be a ''t'' not crossed or an ''i'' not dotted in this particular instance, but the equitable arguments are on the side of this amendment, and I respectfully ask the Chair to overrule the point of order.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak to the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized.

Ms. KAPTUR. Normally I enjoy working on a bipartisan basis, especially with our good colleague from eastern Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and so in a way I reluctantly rise in opposition to his proposal.

Let me mention that in a way we're into quite a 200-year extensive history of the rules of the House, but in essence the legislation as enacted works. Every single community that I represent that has ever asked HUD for any type of waiver, if the percentage was operating in there to their detriment, it has been granted. And so I think the legislation as is works. It keeps the focus on reinvestment. But if a mayor or if a council wants to use more of their funds for demolition, they merely ask HUD. And, quite frankly, HUD acts in quite an expeditious manner. So I think in a way this is a solution in search of a problem.

I think the gentleman, we welcome his concern about the neighborhoods of this country that have been devastated by the Wall Street-induced housing crisis and lack of regulation here in Washington, but I really don't think it is necessary, and I would support the subcommittee chair and ranking member in their concern by raising a point of order here.

I've expressed my interest in working with the gentleman on any community that you may represent that's facing this situation because every single one that we've had come to us, we have resolved with HUD's full cooperation. So I would support the subcommittee chair's invoking of a point of order on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment explicitly supersedes existing law, namely, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 134, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 235. Notwithstanding any other provision of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f et seq.), any amounts made available under this title under the heading ''Public Housing Operating Fund'' and allocated to a public housing agency for activities under section 9(e)(1) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)(1)), and any public housing operating reserve amounts for a public housing agency, may be used by such agency for any eligible activities under section 9(d)(1), in addition to the other purposes for which the amounts

may be used under such heading: *Provided*, That an activity funded pursuant to this section shall be subject to the requirements otherwise governing activities under such section 9(d)(1).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that is of great importance to some of the strongest and best-managed housing authorities in our country.

Currently, housing authorities in our districts receive Federal funds through two distinct streams. One funds day-to-day operations, and the other provides capital funds for construction projects and important modernizations to our Nation's housing stock. Both streams are currently underfunded, not only in this bill but also in the fiscal 2013 administration request.

□ 1510

Now, I believe it's prudent to maintain these two distinct funding streams, but some of our housing authorities do need additional flexibility in tough funding years. Currently, some well-performing housing authorities, like the Raleigh Housing Authority in my district, have created efficiencies in their operating budget and pinched pennies in every way imaginable.

Unfortunately, in order to reallocate these operations savings to urgent capital needs, they have to go through a very cumbersome and cost-ineffective program, that is, HUD's Operating Fund Financing Program. This program requires authorities to go through a financial middleman rather than just letting authorities use their operating funds and savings directly. This process costs unneeded interest payments and it adds unnecessary red tape.

While I hope that our authorizers will be able to improve and streamline this process, I propose that this committee allow housing authorities to use unused operating funds for capital projects directly without having to go through the Operating Fund Financing Program.

My amendment is narrow in scope as it's targeted to 2013 funds and existing reserves only. It's not prospective.

This stopgap solution would provide flexibility for housing authorities, incentivize the wise spending of operating dollars, and help clear up the public housing capital improvement backlog at a time when the construction industry is still reeling from the recession. This amendment would be a win for Americans who need public housing and a win for Americans who are looking for jobs.

This is not a new endeavor for the Transportation and Housing Appropriations bill; indeed, it's a continuation of the public housing operating fund offset discussion that we held last year.

However, I understand that there is a point of order. So I will register the hope that the authorizers can conclude their work to address this issue before the end of the year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment waives existing law.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? Seeing none, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment explicitly supersedes existing law. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman and Members, I rise in opposition to this underlying bill, the Republican Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill for the coming fiscal year, commonly referred to as THUD. This bill drastically underfunds critical transportation, infrastructure, and housing programs.

First, on transportation, the American Society of Civil Engineers' 2009 report for America's infrastructure estimated that there is a $549.5 billion shortfall in investments in roads and bridges, and an additional $190.1 billion shortfall in investments in transit. Yet this bill provides no funds for the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery program, better known as TIGER.

Now, TIGER would finance a wide variety of innovative highway, bridge, and transit projects in urban and rural communities across the country, provided there is sufficient funding. One such project is the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor in Los Angeles County, a light-rail project that will run through my district. TIGER grants could be used to finance stations along this corridor in the communities of Leimert Park and Westchester, thereby ensuring that these communities have access to light-rail.

Last week, I introduced H.R. 5976, the TIGER Grants for Job Creation Act, which would provide a supplemental emergency appropriation of $1 billion over the next 2 years for the TIGER program, and 48 of my colleagues have already cosponsored the bill.

Last night, I offered an amendment to fully fund TIGER at the requested level, without cutting funding for other programs. Representatives BETTY MCCOLLUM, BARBARA LEE, EMANUEL CLEAVER, KAREN BASS, LAURA RICHARDSON, BOBBY RUSH, and DORIS MATSUI joined me in offering this amendment. The Republicans objected to this amendment to their appropriations bill because it was not in order under their rule. So this bill has no funding for this critical program to create jobs by rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure.

Why did we have so much support on this legislation? Why do we have so many people who are signing on to basically beg for TIGER funding? It is because TIGER funding will create millions of jobs. It's because jobs are needed so desperately in this economy. It is because not only will we create millions of jobs, our infrastructure is in great disrepair. We have bridges that have been designated as unsafe. We have roads, we have water projects, we have all kinds of infrastructure needs that are unmet. This is the least that the American public could expect.

This transportation bill has been waited on in many communities across this country. People thought when we passed this bill that we truly were going to expand job opportunities, that we truly were going to repair the infrastructure, but we find that this bill does not do this.

But in addition to the disappointment that we are all experiencing because of the objection to repair of the infrastructure and job creation, we find that the same thing is happening in housing. We bemoan the fact that our veterans are homeless and they are on the streets, and that our shelters are all full, and that when we go into many of these communities—not only in our inner cities, but in our rural areas also—we find that people are not only sleeping on the streets, but under these bridges that are in great disrepair.

This legislation cuts money from the homeless program. This will cut $231 million in homeless assistance grants compared to the President's budget request. At this level, HUD would be unable to fund all renewals of existing grants, jeopardizing assistance to approximately 25,000 of our most vulnerable citizens.

This bill provides less than $2 billion for the Public Housing Capital Fund, despite a $30 million backlog of needed repairs. This is a huge cut, even when compared to funding during the Bush administration. In fact, in fiscal year

2008, the capital account received $2.4 billion in funding. This underfunding means that we will continue to lose public housing units as they fall into disrepair and long-term capital needs are neglected.

The people who are serviced by this account are vulnerable, and so I would simply ask that this be given some real consideration and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, Americans need to know that Tea Party Republican obstructionism has brought us to the brink of yet another manufactured crisis.

We have less than 2 days to pass critical highway and student loan bills that will keep Americans on the job and prevent student loan rates from doubling. Yet Tea Party Republicans are wasting time on frivolous amendments and on a purely meritless, political, and partisan vote to hold the Attorney General in contempt.

Reports indicate that bipartisan Senate leadership has reached a deal on student loans and the highway bill as well, a deal which is now being blocked in the House by the Tea Party Republicans. This is not governing, ladies and gentlemen; it's Tea Party gridlock.

Americans long for a Congress that is capable of honest debate and compromise in solving the important issues of the day. That's what the Founders and the Framers intended of us.

It's been over 100 days since the Senate passed a bipartisan highway bill with 74 votes. While the House Tea Party Republicans quibble, they put 1.9 million jobs at risk.

□ 1520

Mr. Chairman, if the Tea Party Republicans prevent a deal on student loans, over 7.4 million students will see their interest rates double, costing students $6 billion.

They brought us to the brink of a government shut down in February of 2011. Last summer they brought the country to the brink of default and caused the first downgrade in the history of the United States of our credit rating. This year, they opposed the middle class tax cut, and they have successfully ignored and blocked the President's job act.

Mr. Chairman, we should listen to the American people, not the big-dollar corporate backers of the Tea Party. I, myself, never knew that any of the real Tea Partyers of 1776 were millionaires or even wealthy. They were people like the working people of today. We call them the middle class.

Today, we are debating cut after draconian cut to our Nation's transportation and housing programs, which impact and hurt the middle class. These cuts put good, middle class jobs at risk. They make it harder for small businesses to operate, and they cause harm to low-income Americans who are struggling to put food on the table and a roof over their heads.

The Tea Party-millionaire Republicans will spend all week circling the toilet bowl drain and debating these amendments that have no chance of becoming law, when we should be lowering student loan rates and passing a long-term highway bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great country, but how long can we withstand the best efforts of this millionaire Tea Party Republican Congress to bring America to its knees?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is no secret to anyone in this Chamber that the American people are unhappy with Congress. In fact, our approval ratings could only be described as terrible. As much as television personalities might like to analyze why, I don't think it's difficult to understand. Time and time again, Mr. Chairman, our work ignores their priorities.

Now, under Republican leadership, we have spent months arguing over eliminating regulations, shrinking government, and crippling the Obama administration. Yet since the lowest point of economic downturn in 2008, the American people have cared mostly about two things: good jobs and stable housing. These are issues that have hit the African American community especially hard, which is why I come to the floor today with several of my colleagues from the Congressional Black Caucus.

Today, Mr. Chairman, unemployment among African Americans is above 13 percent, much higher than the national average. Concerns about stable housing are really nothing new, but they have been especially difficult since the start of our recession. In fact, 42 percent of homeless families with children are African American. So we were all glad to see the House take up the Transportation-HUD bill this week. We hoped to see some relief for our struggling communities.

But sadly, this bill falls short. It fails to adequately fund project-based section 8 rental assistance for low-income families. That means over 1.2 million families, Mr. Chairman, would be at risk of losing their homes. These are primarily seniors, families with children, and people with disabilities, including many who are in the great Hoosier State in my district.

The bill cuts homeless assistance grants, leaving an estimated 25,000 people without the assistance they need to get back on their feet. It entirely eliminates the Choice Neighborhoods program. In Indianapolis, we need these funds to rebuild blighted public housing projects, improve economic development and job opportunities in surrounding neighborhoods for low-income families.

It also eliminates the Sustainable Communities, which coordinates Federal, State and local public housing investments, helping communities make the best with limited funding.

I also want to add that I plan to strongly oppose any amendment that makes it harder to enforce the Fair Housing Act. Congress should not restrict HUD's work to end housing discrimination, intentional or unintentional.

These cuts, Mr. Chairman, strike at the very heart of what my constituents care about, having a stable place for their families to live and stay.

Over the last several months, Mr. Chairman, there has been one topic we have all agreed on, transportation projects equal jobs. Now, sadly, this bill defunds some of our most important job-creating programs. It eliminates funding for TIGER grants, which have put thousands of people to work across this country. My district received one of these grants to construct our great cultural trail. Many of my constituents worked to construct this trail, and today it is absolutely revitalizing neighborhoods and growing businesses and creating long-term job opportunities.

This bill also eliminates funding for high-speed rail, which early estimates predict could have created thousands of jobs in the great Hoosier State. Now, of course, there are other issues; but there are too many to name at this time.

But in talking today, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to express my disappointment. This week we are finally considering the one bill each year that must address top priorities for all Americans, jobs and housing. Instead, we're cutting programs.

My question to these people is, Mr. Chairman, and those obstructionists, what are you expecting our communities to do?

These are programs that work. They employ our constituents, Mr. Chairman, and they also improve our society.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, here we are once again. We find ourselves debating a bill that is under veto threat due to the Republicans my-way-or-the-highway posture.

Mr. Chairman, last month saw the largest drop in construction jobs in 2 years, workers who joined the more than 2.2 million construction workers who are out of work.

However, instead of providing certainty to our Nation's construction workers by investing in the TIGER program and light-speed rail, the Republican majority has actually zeroed these programs out completely. Apparently, the majority seems to only believe in certainty when it means historically low tax rates for multi-millionaires and billionaires.

Mr. Chairman, the majority's lack of investment in our Nation's infrastructure is bad enough. Unfortunately, it gets even worse. At a time when the need for HUD programs is growing, this bill drastically undercuts homeless assistance grants, putting 25,000 Americans at risk of losing assistance. It jeopardizes assistance to homeowners attempting to stay in their homes and actually zeroes out the Choice Neighborhoods program. Why?

Mr. Chairman, why we would essentially eliminate a program that improves economic development and viability and job opportunities for our Nation's most vulnerable is beyond my ability to comprehend.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have made it abundantly clear that the number one priority of the 112th Congress ought to be job creation.

□ 1530

By bringing this bill to the floor, the majority is saying to the American people, not only doesn't their unemployed status or opinions matter, but don't expect any relief from this Republican-led Congress as our Nation struggles to cope with the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression.

Mr. Chairman, this is just totally unbelievable. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2013''.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

ACCESS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Access Board, as authorized by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, $7,400,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation funds received for publications and training expenses.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as authorized by section 201(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 307), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902, $25,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 135, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $900,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $900,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the proposed funding for salaries and expenses for the Federal Maritime Commission by $900,000. This is not a cut. This is just to keep those salaries at what they are, to cap it at the 2012 levels. This is one of 13 offices that would receive increases for salaries or administrative expenses in the underlying bill.

I urge the support of my amendment, which would just freeze these salaries.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Maritime Commission is responsible for resolving disputes between shippers—both foreign and domestic—and the public, protecting consumers from unfair business practices, and monitoring ocean transportation and trade.

The increase in this account has to do with the annualization of already onboard personnel and of the increases in the claims and the workload of the Federal Maritime Commission. To reduce this account, you will affect the backlog of cases and claims, thus costing businesses, exporters, and ports time and money while they wait for the FMC to adjudicate their claims.

Usually, we are in the business of trying to reduce backlogs and delays in doing business. With that, I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I will be very brief.

I merely want to concur in the position of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $25,000,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern the obtaining of such services within the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may select, appoint, and employ such officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Office of Inspector General, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern such selections, appointments, and employment within Amtrak: *Provided further*, That concurrent with the President's budget request for fiscal year 2014, the Inspector General shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2014 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS–15; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902), $102,400,000, of which not to exceed $2,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses. The amounts made available to the National Transportation Safety Board in this Act include amounts necessary to make lease payments on an obligation incurred in fiscal year 2001 for a capital lease.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101–8107), $145,300,000: *Provided*, That in addition, $80,000,000 shall be made available until expended to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for mortgage foreclosure mitigation activities, under the following terms and conditions:

(1) The Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (''NRC'') shall make grants to counseling intermediaries approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (with match to be determined by the NRC based on affordability and the economic conditions of an area; a match also may be waived by the NRC based on the aforementioned conditions) to provide mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance primarily to States and areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures to help eliminate the default and foreclosure of mortgages of owner-occupied single-family homes that are at risk of such foreclosure. Other than areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures, grants may also be provided to approved counseling intermediaries based on a geographic analysis of the Nation by the NRC which determines where there is a prevalence of mortgages that are risky and likely to fail, including any trends for mortgages that are likely to default and face foreclosure. A State Housing Finance Agency may also be eligible where the State Housing Finance Agency meets all the requirements under this paragraph. A HUD-approved counseling intermediary shall meet certain mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance counseling requirements, as determined by the

NRC, and shall be approved by HUD or the NRC as meeting these requirements.

(2) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance shall only be made available to homeowners of owner-occupied homes with mortgages in default or in danger of default. These mortgages shall likely be subject to a foreclosure action and homeowners will be provided such assistance that shall consist of activities that are likely to prevent foreclosures and result in the long-term affordability of the mortgage retained pursuant to such activity or another positive outcome for the homeowner. No funds made available under this paragraph may be provided directly to lenders or homeowners to discharge outstanding mortgage balances or for any other direct debt reduction payments.

(3) The use of Mortgage Foreclosure Mitigation Assistance by approved counseling intermediaries and State Housing Finance Agencies shall involve a reasonable analysis of the borrower's financial situation, an evaluation of the current value of the property that is subject to the mortgage, counseling regarding the assumption of the mortgage by another non-Federal party, counseling regarding the possible purchase of the mortgage by a non-Federal third party, counseling and advice of all likely restructuring and refinancing strategies or the approval of a work-out strategy by all interested parties.

(4) NRC may provide up to 15 percent of the total funds under this paragraph to its own charter members with expertise in foreclosure prevention counseling, subject to a certification by the NRC that the procedures for selection do not consist of any procedures or activities that could be construed as an unacceptable conflict of interest or have the appearance of impropriety.

(5) HUD-approved counseling entities and State Housing Finance Agencies receiving funds under this paragraph shall have demonstrated experience in successfully working with financial institutions as well as borrowers facing default, delinquency and foreclosure as well as documented counseling capacity, outreach capacity, past successful performance and positive outcomes with documented counseling plans (including post mortgage foreclosure mitigation counseling), loan workout agreements and loan modification agreements. NRC may use other criteria to demonstrate capacity in underserved areas.

(6) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to $3,000,000 may be made available to build the mortgage foreclosure and default mitigation counseling capacity of counseling intermediaries through NRC training courses with HUD-approved counseling intermediaries and their partners, except that private financial institutions that participate in NRC training shall pay market rates for such training.

(7) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to 5 percent may be used for associated administrative expenses for the NRC to carry out activities provided under this section.

(8) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance grants may include a budget for outreach and advertising, and training, as determined by the NRC.

(9) The NRC shall continue to report bi-annually to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations as well as the Senate Banking Committee and House Financial Services Committee on its efforts to mitigate mortgage default.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 137, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $12,300,000)''.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $12,300,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Funding for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation is over $12 million higher than what the President's budget request was. Now, the President and I don't typically see eye to eye on most spending issues, but I am proud to support his requested level of funding for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

By supporting my amendment, why don't we show the American people that we are serious about our Nation's fiscal crisis and that both parties are capable of working together by setting the funding back to the President's requested funding level for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, which would save the American taxpayers over $12 million.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. This is one of those cases in which we've gone back and forth here today with the gentleman from California. This must be the eighth or ninth of these, and it's hard to find ways of being very creative or original about what you're saying.

The interesting thing here is that, for some of the time, the gentleman has been going back to whatever we had done several years ago, going back arbitrarily to some point in the past. Here, of course, he is supporting the President's position. I was not aware that the gentleman from California supported the President's position in much of anything.

Mr. LATHAM. If the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is from Georgia.

Mr. OLVER. Excuse me. Thank you very much.

Please forgive me. You don't even look alike. I think I was mistaking you for a different member of the California delegation.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa for correcting me.

In any case, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The gentleman's amendment would take the position of this subcommittee down by $12.3 million. Basically, the position of the subcommittee has been that we are providing a little bit more for the NeighborWorks program than the President requested and that we are providing a little bit less for the HUD Counseling program than the President requested. Together, though, they would be about the same.

NeighborWorks, which is what the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation's common name is, is a major nonprofit organization that operates all over the country. It has affiliates in 50 States, and I'm sure it has an affiliate somewhere in the gentleman's district. The NeighborWorks program is a group that we relied on very heavily to do counseling during the very height of the foreclosure crisis 3 or 4 years ago. We relied on it to go out there and actually contract with and manage the process of providing counseling to hundreds of thousands of people who were engaged in or who were subject to foreclosure.

So we on our side, on this side—in this branch at least—have felt that NeighborWorks has been a very good organization, which is in large part why we have given them a little bit more and why we have given a little bit less to the HUD program.

We argued the HUD program last night. They leverage something close to $4 billion in direct investments to serve low- and moderate-income families through all of their affiliates in all the work that they do. It's a very, very good and reliable organization that we've come to value very highly.

They also administered this Foreclosure Mitigation Counseling program, which gives targeted assistance to families at risk of losing their homes. The gentleman seems to cut this account because it is above the President's request, but I think I have explained that we're slightly above on this one and slightly below on the other one.

Again, I would say I was not aware that the gentleman from Georgia—I went to California again, didn't I?—was such a fan of the President's request numbers, that he valued them so highly. I believe—and I think that my chairman believes—that NeighborWorks is deserving of this small increase, and I believe that Chairman LATHAM has thoughtfully targeted resources in this area. I hope the amendment will be defeated, and I urge the Members to vote ''no.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1540

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

NeighborWorks really is a program that has some metrics in place to make sure that the dollars are used correctly in a proper way. In Iowa and across the country, about every dollar that goes through NeighborWorks leverages $48 in non-Federal direct investment because of it.

I just want to reiterate that we've gone through every line in this appropriations bill, tried to make decisions that would increase growth, job creation, tried to do the very best job we could. We've looked at every area. There are some priorities of things

that actually work that we've tried to sustain funding for.

I just don't want folks to forget overall in this bill, we are nearly $4 billion below last year's funding level. That's a cut of $4 billion. It's $2 billion below the President's request. I think, as one gentleman here today stated, this is the largest percentage reduction of any appropriation bill yet to come to the floor. We're trying to be fiscally responsible, to actually prioritize spending in this bill to things that actually work.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in opposition to this amendment and to say to the gentleman from Georgia that I don't really know where you might live in Georgia, but imagine neighborhoods in our country where there is no private lender with competitive rates; imagine neighborhoods that are crammed at the edges with payday lenders who are more than willing to bilk people who have checks to cash, maybe even Social Security checks, and they charge them royally for that; imagine a neighborhood where there is no church-run credit union, maybe a multilingual neighborhood with no lending arm of any reputable institution. If there is somebody in the neighborhood willing to make a loan, such as a loan shark, they charge fees. Imagine the trouble that a family can get into. Imagine how difficult it is in those neighborhoods to accumulate capital to make a loan because everything is being taken out by predatory practices and nothing is put back in.

NeighborWorks is one of the few institutions in this country that has proven itself and works in exactly those kinds of neighborhood. NeighborWorks tries to save families and give them a chance to get on the ladder up to opportunity. Particularly during this time, when we know we've had the largest transfer of wealth in American history from Main Street to Wall Street. NeighborWorks is a lifeline. People have had their equity taken away, including in neighborhoods like I'm talking about, where people were beginning to own their own homes for the first time, where they needed financial counseling, mortgage counseling, advice on if you're going to buy a home, what a reasonable down payment is, based on how much do they earn. People need sound advice on mortgages—that you shouldn't pay more than this out of your check so you don't get in trouble. People need advice as they try to find reputable people to repair their homes so they get a decent price on their roof and gutters—it all seems so simple if you live in the suburbs, and you've got enough money, and the region is not disinvested, and you're not living at the edge.

NeighborWorks is one of those programs that is needed, particularly at this time in our country with the housing market being in the condition that it is. With the enormous challenges facing built communities in the built environment in city after city, NeighborWorks serves community after community, both urban and rural. It's amazing what's happened even to rural small towns in this country and their emptying out that is really historic in nature.

A program like NeighborWorks has proven itself time and again. It pays back to the American people their equity not being lost, in helping capital accumulate in some of the most forgotten corners of this country, and with their staff that are highly trained and highly reputable.

I would not want to be without NeighborWorks in Ohio, not in the housing situation that we're facing today. I'm not sure about Georgia. But I would bet in Atlanta they value NeighborWorks if they have one, and I assume that they do. But you have to imagine yourself living in a place like you may not know. And for the American Dream to happen, organizations like NeighborWorks are absolutely essential.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment. I think it may be well intentioned, but I think it's going to achieve exactly the wrong result. I think Chairman LATHAM of the full committee and Ranking Member OLVER have reached an accommodation here to help our housing market recover in some of the most forgotten places and not to have any more hemorrhaging of equity and investment capital across this country. I urge a no vote on the Broun Amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I was on the floor about a half an hour ago and went back to my office stunned by the defeat at the hands of Mr. LATHAM and his point of order and the ruling of the Parliamentarian and the Chair at the time and the interesting comments from my friend from western Ohio, who I trust, after she has the opportunity to meet with Mr. Rokakis and Mr. KILDEE in Michigan and Cleveland, will have a different view on whether or not the Neighborhood Stabilization fund, without additional resources to demolish homes, is working well.

When I got back to the office, I turned on the television and I saw—I like a good Republican bashing as much as other folks, but a string of speakers came to the microphone and just bashed the lack of a Republican plan on transportation.

I'm not going to go back to 1844, but I am going to go back to September of 2009, the last bill, SAFETEA–LU, expired in September of 2009. In September of 2009—people who know the answer, you can shout it out—the President of the United States was a Democrat, Barack Obama, who is currently the President today. The majority leader in the United States Senate—shout it out if you know it—was HARRY REID, a Democrat of Nevada. The Speaker of the House was the first woman-elected Speaker in the history of the United States, NANCY PELOSI of California.

The Democratic Party controlled all three levers of the Federal Government. They had in position as the chairman of the Transportation Infrastructure Committee a gentleman who has forgotten more about transportation than most of us will ever learn, Jim Oberstar of Minnesota. Mr. Oberstar prepared a 6-year fully funded, robust Federal transportation 6-year reauthorization. He was not allowed by the leadership within the Democratic Party to bring that bill forward.

So for people to come to the floor and say that Mr. LATHAM is not doing his job, this negotiation that is going on on the transportation authorization currently is somehow a failure of Republican leadership, I say get up and look in the mirror. You have to take a look at the fact that everybody is responsible for this mess, and everybody knows that you don't fix the Nation's infrastructure unless you provide the necessary resources to fund the trust fund. Both parties are guilty of being absent without leave, but to blame it and to hang it on the Republican Party is worse than nonsense. It completely ignores historical fact.

One other factoid about the President of the United States, President Obama. He has become the first President since Dwight Eisenhower to not send up his vision of a comprehensive transportation reauthorization bill. A lot of people in this House weren't even born when Dwight Eisenhower was the President of the United States, but he became the first President. And our good friend and former colleague, Mr. LaHood, who is the Secretary of Transportation, he would come before the subcommittee year after year after year and had no ideas, no gas tax, no vehicle miles traveled, no idea how we're going to replenish the highway trust fund until this year. Until this year, he came and said: I've got this

brainy idea. We're going to fund it with OCO, the overseas contingency account, that the United States has used to support our troops in conflicts around the world.

It was worse than fiction; it was a fantasy. And he knew it, but he delivered it with a straight face. I give him a lot of credit for that. But to come to the floor and attempt to hang this around the Republicans for failing to lead on transportation is laughable. Ours is the party of Teddy Roosevelt and the Panama Canal, Abraham Lincoln and the transcontinental railroad, Dwight Eisenhower and the interstate highway system. Ronald Reagan and George Bush all supported working wages to build our infrastructure.

□ 1550

We will not take a back seat, nor will we be criticized by a party that completely failed in its mandate given to them in the election of 2008 to do a single thing, to employ people in the transportation sector and to move this country forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness in carrying out the functions pursuant to title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, $3,300,000.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 401. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2013 pay raises for programs funded in this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act or previous appropriations Acts.

SEC. 402. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 403. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 404. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 405. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies or entities funded in this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2013, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury derived by the collection of fees and available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

(1) creates a new program;

(2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

(4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either the House or Senate Committees on Appropriations for a different purpose;

(5) augments existing programs, projects, or activities in excess of $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less;

(6) reduces existing programs, projects, or activities by $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or

(7) creates, reorganizes, or restructures a branch, division, office, bureau, board, commission, agency, administration, or department different from the budget justifications submitted to the Committees on Appropriations or the table accompanying the explanatory statement accompanying this Act, whichever is more detailed, unless prior approval is received from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency funded by this Act shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the report shall include:

(A) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(B) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by object class and program, project, and activity as detailed in the budget appendix for the respective appropriation; and

(C) an identification of items of special congressional interest: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated or limited for salaries and expenses for an agency shall be reduced by $100,000 per day for each day after the required date that the report has not been submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 406. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2013 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2013 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2014, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines under section 405 of this Act.

SEC. 407. All Federal agencies and departments that are funded under this Act shall issue a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on all sole-source contracts by no later than July 30, 2013. Such report shall include the contractor, the amount of the contract and the rationale for using a sole-source contract.

SEC. 408. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or ''new age'' belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N–915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

SEC. 409. No funds in this Act may be used to support any Federal, State, or local projects that seek to use the power of eminent domain, unless eminent domain is employed only for a public use: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, public use shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities: *Provided further*, That any use of funds for mass transit, railroad, airport, seaport or highway projects as well as utility projects which benefit or serve the general public (including energy-related, communication-related, water-related and wastewater-related infrastructure), other structures designated for use by the general public or which have other common-carrier or public-utility functions that serve the general public and are subject to regulation and oversight by the government, and projects for the removal of an immediate threat to public health and safety or brownfields as defined in the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (Public Law 107–118) shall be considered a public use for purposes of eminent domain.

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 411. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary for any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service, and has within 90 days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year, made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Office of Personnel Management as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 412. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 148, line 11, after ''entity will'', insert ''ensure that domestic content makes up 85 percent of all steel, iron, and manufactured goods, including rolling stock, and''.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, we just heard a rather strong plea from one of my Republican colleagues about the transportation program and whether Democrats and Republicans should continue to fight about who did what when or didn't do it.

This amendment is something that we all ought to agree to. This amendment is something that both Democrats and Republicans should be supporting. This amendment is about American jobs—not foreign jobs, not about shifting our jobs overseas, but rather about bringing those jobs back home. This amendment is about making it in America. This amendment is about no longer allowing our tax money to be spent on foreign-made equipment but, rather, to require that our tax money be spent on American-made equipment so that there will be American jobs.

This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. This is an all-American issue. This is about making it in America. It simply says that the current 60 percent requirement is insufficient and that we ought to have a higher requirement of 85 percent. And I will argue strongly—and I think correctly—that 85 percent is achievable.

I'll give two examples: In a recent contract for the new BART trains, the Bay Area Rapid Transit trains, one bidder—a French company, Alstom—said that they could build those trains at 95 percent. A second bidder—foreign, Bombardier—said they would do it at 66 percent. Unfortunately, BART decided to go with the 66 percent because it was a couple of percentage points cheaper. $1 billion in American jobs were lost.

Within a month after that, Los Angeles wanted to build some new transit cars. Siemens said they could build those transit cars at 85 percent American content. They lost that bid to a Korean company because there was a couple of percentage points difference. Again, millions of American jobs, millions of dollars spent overseas, and American jobs lost.

It's time for us to bring the jobs home. It's time for us to onshore. It's time for us to make it in America. And it's time for us, as Democrats and Republicans, to do just that. And that's what this amendment does.

I suspect it will be ruled out of order. What a shame. What a shame that we cannot stand here on the floor, amend a bill that's going to, over time, spend $60 billion, and not require that that money, our tax money, be spent in America.

What's wrong with making it in America? Oh, I suppose it has to do with some point of order. Do you think the American public really wants to hear a point of order? Or do they want to hear about American-made equipment and American jobs? No. We'll do a point of order, which I will appeal and probably lose. And thousands upon thousands of American jobs will be lost because of a point of order rather than for this House to stand up and say, We're going to make it in America. We're going to spend our tax money on American jobs, on American-made equipment.

So give me your point of order, and let's see what the American public has to say about your point of order.

I yield back the balance of my time

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, we had a markup this morning in Appropriations, and I supported an amendment about American content. And I believe that this is probably a very, very good amendment.

To be consistent—and I have raised points of order against some things that I support today, one offered by my good friend from Ohio, and other amendments that I would otherwise be supportive of if they were not breaking precedent to the rules of the House.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to speak on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. On the point of order, I thank the chairman for his thoughts on the issue. But for his consistency, I cannot thank him. I think I understand that we seem to operate on rules, unless we don't want to operate on those rules.

I understand that the chairman is interested in this issue and has worked, as chairman of the subcommittee, to try to raise the level of American-made, and I thank him for that.

We have an opportunity here to really take this issue up and put aside the rules and do what's good for America. This is about billions and billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of jobs. We ought to put it aside, put aside the consistency and deal with American jobs.

I don't know what my opportunity will be to overrule the point of order. But I'm going to do everything I possibly can to see that we have American-made jobs and that we spend our tax money on American-made equipment.

I do understand the chairman's position and the bind that he's in. But sometimes consistency doesn't lead to the right result.

□ 1600

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

As recorded in Deschler's Precedents, volume 8, chapter 26, section 3, language in an appropriation bill that is subject to a point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI but is permitted to remain, such as by waiver in House Resolution 697, may be modified by germane amendment that does not contain additional legislation.

Section 412 of the bill constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI that has been permitted to remain. The amendment by the gentleman from California would expand section 412 by imposing on entities by the bill an additional restriction on expenditure of funds in the bill, to wit: that 85 percent of a certain class of goods be procured domestically. That expansion constitutes additional legislation.

The point of order is sustained.

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

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I have an amendment that would prohibit funds from being used to enforce congressionally mandated Temporary Flight Restrictions, or TFRs, for sports stadiums. These permanent TFRs, to be quite honest with you, are impractical, they're ineffective, and they create serious problems for hundreds of thousands of pilots, countless air shows, aerial surveyors, and a whole lot of other small businesses and individuals that utilize aviation.

In 2004, Congress mandated the FAA to impose permanent TFRs in the airspace above and around sports stadiums with a seating capacity greater than 30,000. Think of these as restricted airspace bubbles that basically extend 3,000 feet high and they have a 3½ mile-wide radius that is in effect 1 hour prior to the event to 1 hour just after the event. And in any given year, there are roughly 3,000 of these stadium TFRs.

Now, proponents of these claim that they bolster national security and mitigate an aerial threat. I can't help but absolutely laugh at that assertion. First, there's absolutely no realtime mechanism or capability to prevent an aerial attack originating within or outside the 3½ miles at 3,000 feet above ground level, and the logic would apply even if the restrictions were expanded exponentially. In fact, if you take a jet traveling at 500 miles an hour, it's just going to take a few seconds to penetrate that TFR to reach that stadium.

It's also very convenient that the proponents of these TFRs are exempt from the restrictions that they successfully sought after.

The bottom line is the FAA doesn't want or need these congressionally mandated TFRs. In fact, the FAA publicly stated they would not issue these TFRs absent the congressional mandate, but, rather, they would use their existing authority to coordinate with local law enforcement to issue them on a case-by-case basis. That's what we're trying to get at.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to reiterate these stadium TFRs do nothing to improve security. And I would yield time to anybody out there, any Member, that would like to try and make the argument while keeping a straight face that they do improve security.

These TFRs are about banner towers, which is to prevent what sports groups call ''guerilla advertisers,'' from operating within the airspace around these stadiums. That's all this is about. And what was Congress's solution? We simply gave complete control of the airspace to sports teams and exempted them from their own restrictions. And I think that's wrong.

In light of the fact that I would like to solve this issue eventually instead of trying to ram an issue through or try to push something through that could fail or be passed, I'd rather come up with a good piece of legislation that actually solves the problem and addresses some of the concerns. That's basically what I was trying to do.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman for his comments today. He has been a tremendous advocate for this position. We have talked on many occasions about this particular subject. He is working very hard to resolve the issue.

I would hope that we could have some public hearings and actually get input to make sure that we make the right decisions, and I certainly would want to work with the gentleman to make sure that we do get a full hearing on this issue, that everything can be brought to light, and we're all concerned about homeland security, safety issues, all those things. I think the gentleman makes a very, very good point, and would just offer to do everything we can to work with him.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I want to thank the chairman for the comments and look forward to working on this. I think this is an issue that we can solve and an issue that we can fix ultimately for all those pilots out there and the folks that are concerned.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 413. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c).

SEC. 414. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class airline accommodations in contravention of sections 301–10.122 and 301–10.123 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 415. None of the funds made available under this Act or any prior Act may be provided to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, or allied organizations.

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to any corporation that was convicted (or had an officer or agent of such corporation acting on behalf of the corporation convicted) of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation, or such officer or agent, and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 417. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 418. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Sixth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Seventh amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Eighth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Ninth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Tenth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Eleventh amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Twelfth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Thirteenth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Fourteenth amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. CHAFFETZ of Utah.

Second amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 256, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

AYES—168

Adams
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—256

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews

Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Engel
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1636

Ms. SEWELL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. CARTER, CRENSHAW, COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Messrs. ELLISON and HUNTER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. TERRY and ISSA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 240, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

AYES—178

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—240

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews
Bass (CA)
Cantor
Engel
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Pence
Schrader
Stivers
Sullivan
Thompson (MS)

□ 1640

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 248, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

AYES—174

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—248

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews
Conyers
Gohmert
Hall
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1644

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 229, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

AYES—193

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—229

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)

Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Burton (IN)
Gohmert
Hall
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Schmidt
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1648

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 247, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

AYES—178

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—247

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—7

Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1652

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 250, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—169

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—250

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—13

Bass (CA)
Conyers
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Meeks
Schakowsky
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Waters

□ 1655

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 429, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 264, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

AYES—160

Adams
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—264

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul

Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Gohmert
Harris
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1658

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 249, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

AYES—172

Adams
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—249

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Akin
Carson (IN)
DeFazio
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
McCarthy (NY)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1702

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—172

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Barrow
Bartlett
Benishek
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais

Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—250

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Bilirakis
Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1705

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 267, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

AYES—157

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Upton
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—267

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1710

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 80, noes 342, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

AYES—80

Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Bartlett
Black
Blackburn
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Harris
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Long
Lummis
Manzullo
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Royce
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder

NOES—342

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
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
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Gutierrez
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1713

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 434, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 300, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

AYES—123

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Culberson
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emerson
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Long
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paul
Pence
Petri
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Stearns
Stutzman
Thornberry

Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—300

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
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
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Bass (CA)
Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

□ 1717

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 242, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

AYES—178

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lipinski
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—242

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Berg	Jackson (IL)	Paul
Bucshon	Johnson, E. B.	Rehberg
Frank (MA)	Lewis (CA)	Stivers
Gohmert	Mack	Thompson (MS)

□ 1720

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2015

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEST) at 8 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE REPORT 112–546 AND ACCOMPANYING RESOLUTION, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 706, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM TO INITIATE OR INTERVENE IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS TO ENFORCE CERTAIN SUBPOENAS

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–553) on the resolution (H. Res. 708) relating to the consideration of House Report 112–546 and an accompanying resolution, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 706) authorizing the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT). Pursuant to House Resolution 697 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5972.

Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST) kindly take the chair.

□ 2017

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEST (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 11 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 150, line 9.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I want to begin by thanking the committee for its extraordinarily hard work in identifying ways to cut spending.

All of us hear from our constituents. They want us to reduce what the Federal Government spends, to be wise and proper stewards of the Federal taxpayer dollar. All too often, they look at Washington and they see a monument to waste of the American taxpayer dollar.

Mr. Chairman, for the legislation that is in front of us, the fiscal year 2013 proposed funding level is $51.6 billion, which is $1.9 billion below the President's request. I think it is admirable that we have saved nearly $2 billion below the President's request. However, we know that there is much more work that can be done, that should be done, that must be done. Therefore, my 1 percent across-the-board spending reduction amendment will save taxpayers an additional $516 million.

□ 2020

That is $516 million that our children and our grandchildren will not have to pay back with interest.

I'm fully aware of the strong opposition that many appropriators have for these across-the-board spending cuts. When I've offered these cuts, I have been told that ''the cuts of this magnitude, quite honestly, go too deep.'' I've also heard that these 1 percent spending reductions would be ''very damaging to our national security and to things that are important to life and property.''

However, the taxpayers are demanding that the bureaucracy do what they are doing and save a penny on a dollar. Our Governors are quite active in this arena. Of course, we have heard from former Governor Mitt Romney, Governor Chris Christie, Governor Rick Perry, Governor Mitch Daniels, Governor Brian Schweitzer, Governor Chris Gregoire, just to name a few of our State executives. In the chairman's home State of Iowa, former Democratic Governor Chet Culver issued a 10 percent across-the-board spending reduction.

These across-the-board spending cuts are used around our country in a bipartisan fashion, and the reason they are is because they work. They work. This is how you get results, by actually cutting into the baseline and reducing the outlays of government. They are effective because they cut spending within each agency and force each agency to do a review and find the waste and find ways to preserve those precious dollars that are coming from the taxpayers.

Admiral Mullen made the statement that ''the greatest risk to our Nation's security is our Nation's debt.'' Mr. Chairman, we all know that. The American people know this. They have grown ill and fatigued with what they see as waste of their money here in Washington because this government never satisfies its appetite for the taxpayers' dollar. Because of that, because they think they can go to the well and ask for more, because they think they can go to the presses and print those dollars, they don't do the hard work of prioritizing. That is what we're to do here in this House.

In that spirit of forcing the actions of prioritizing, forcing the actions of the bureaucracy, having to save one penny on a dollar so that our children and grandchildren are not paying that back with interest, that is the reason that I bring these amendments. It's important because right now we're borrowing 40 cents of every dollar that we spend. We cannot afford this. It is incumbent upon us to make certain that we do the hard work, that we cut a little more, that we make the demands on the bureaucracy that our constituents are making on their businesses and on their family budgets. It is time for us to save just a penny on a dollar, make the cut, do it for our children and future generations.

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment indiscriminately cuts programs in transportation and housing without any thought to the relevant merits of the programs contained in this bill. For instance, they would result in fewer air traffic controllers, fewer pipeline safety inspectors that ensure that accidents do not occur, fewer vouchers for homeless veterans. It would reduce salaries and expense accounts for all the departments. In some of the agencies, salaries and expenses are almost everything in the agency. You would do the same thing for all the capital accounts, the construction accounts, since this is basically an infrastructure bill that has a lot of capital expenditures. All of this would be done across the board.

More generally, investments in our transportation and housing infrastructure will be reduced and the associated jobs will be lost. From the amendment itself, there will be public jobs lost. Also, there will be jobs lost because of the loss in infrastructure, which is important to this country and very critical.

I want to point out that the sponsor of this legislation is again reneging on her word. She voted for last summer's Budget Control Act that set this year's spending limits. The Ryan budget broke that agreement and lowered spending levels. The sponsor's amendment breaks the agreement again by reducing discretionary funding even further.

I strongly urge Members to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, please.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her persistence and for all of her work as far as trying to get a handle on the spending.

I would just like to make a couple of points.

She mentioned that we're $2 billion below the President's request. We're actually almost $4 billion below last year's spending in this bill. We have the largest decrease, percentage-wise, of any of the appropriation bills. We have worked very hard to craft a bill that actually enacted those types of spending cuts but also funded the high-priority items that are in this bill. It's with reluctance I oppose her amendment.

I will just say that we're within the 302(b) allocations that were in the Ryan budget. That was really the debate then as to what funding levels to be at.

There are some very important infrastructure issues that would be harmed by this when we look at the highway trust fund funding that would be cut. Of course, that would also include transit programs, veterans homeless vouchers. We have done everything we could to try to have a balanced bill that actually created priorities after having many hearings and working through this bill on a line-by-line basis. I'm not sure that an across-the-board cut that cuts everything arbitrarily is the way to go.

Certainly, we're all very concerned about the budget, but with reluctance, I oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield some time to the gentlelady.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the chairman for yielding, and as I said at the beginning, I applaud the committee for the good work they have done.

I think when you're broke, though, that what we have to do is say now is the time to make further cuts. And to the ranking member, it's not indiscriminate. This is the way our Governors have found to arrive at balancing a budget. It's looking at every agency and saying get in there, do the heavy lift and find this. The result we want is to preserve the foundation of this great Nation for our children and grandchildren.

Are you saying that salaries and expenses are more important than the future of these children who are going to have to pay this debt back with interest, $16 trillion worth of debt and growing, and you've got to pay it back?

□ 2030

My two grandchildren, my children, is it fair to look at them and say, You're going to spend over half of what you earn? I know that it is tough.

As the gentleman inferred, I'm at it again. Yes, you're right, Mr. Chairman. I am at it again. And let me tell you something. I am going to be at it again and again and again, just as I have every single year that I have been a Member of this House because preserving the firm financial footing of this Nation is work, coming at it again and again and again until we get the job done.

It has worked for our cities. It has worked for our counties. It has worked for our States. It will work for this Nation that is so richly blessed. It means that we have to have titanium backbones to get the job done.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. LATHAM. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used for the Third Street Light Rail Phase 2 Central Subway project in San Francisco, California.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment forbids further Federal expenditures for the Central Subway project in San Francisco. This project is a 1.7-mile subway that is estimated to cost $1.6 billion. And these cost estimates continue to rise. In fact, its baseline budget has more than doubled in 9 years and shows no sign of slowing. The current estimate brings the cost to nearly $1 billion per mile. That's about five times the cost per lane-mile of Boston's scandalous Big Dig.

Now, it was supposed to link local light rail and bus lines with CalTrain and Bay Area Rapid Transit, but it's so badly designed that it bypasses 25 of the 30 light-rail and bus lines that it crosses. To add insult to insanity, it dismantles the seamless light rail to BART connection currently available to passengers at Market Street, requiring them, instead, to walk nearly a quarter mile to make the new connection. Experts estimate it will cost commuters between 5 and 10 minutes of additional commuting time on every segment of the route.

The Wall Street Journal calls it ''a case study in government incompetence and wasted taxpayer money.'' And they're not alone. The civil grand jury in San Francisco has vigorously recommended the project be scrapped, warning that maintenance costs alone could ultimately bankrupt San Francisco's Muni. The former chairman of the San Francisco Transportation Agency has called it ''one of the costliest mistakes in the city's history.'' Even the sponsors estimate that it will increase ridership by less than 1 percent, and there is vigorous debate that this project is far too optimistic.

I think Margaret Okuzumi, the executive director of the Bay Rail Alliance, put it best when she said:

Too many times, we've seen money for public transit used to primarily benefit people who would profit financially, while making transit less convenient for actual transit riders. Voters approve money for public transit because they want transit to be more convenient and available. It would be tragic if billions of dollars were spent on something that made Muni more time consuming, costly, and unable to sustain its overall transit service.

Mr. Chairman, this administration is attempting to put Federal taxpayers—that's our constituents—on the hook for nearly $1 billion of the cost of this folly through the New Starts program. That's more than 60 percent of the entire project. We have already squandered $123 million on it that we don't have. This amendment forbids another

dime of our constituents' money being wasted on this boondoggle.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you may be wondering, well, why should your constituents pay nearly $1 billion for a purely local transportation project in San Francisco that is opposed by a broad bipartisan coalition of San Franciscans, including the Sierra Club, Save Muni—which is a grassroots organization of Muni riders—the Coalition of San Francisco Neighborhoods, and three of the four local newspapers serving San Francisco. Why, indeed. Excuse me, I don't have an answer to that question.

But those who vote against this amendment had better have one when their constituents ask what in the world were you thinking.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, from the looks of it, the gentleman from California has quite a fight going on with the Sierra Club, with three of the four major newspapers—I don't know which ones they are exactly. I didn't know there were four major newspapers in San Francisco. Most places these days, if they have one, they're doing very well—and with the State legislature in California as well.

I strongly oppose this amendment. And, frankly, I am disappointed by what it represents. This project, I think, is a perfect—well, maybe not perfect—is a very good example of the types of infrastructure projects our major urban areas need to remain economically strong, provide job creation now, and critical access to jobs in the future.

Six of the 50 largest metropolitan areas in this country—those with a population over 1 million—exist in the State of California. California also happens to have five additional ones which have 500,000 to 1 million in population. Seven of those 11 are growing by more than 25 percent per year. And these are exactly the sort of places—all of them—they are places that need investment, continued investment, and continued assistance from the Federal Government.

They are putting a major amount of money into our authorization plans, which we extend and are still under extension. And I think most people here hope and understand that we need to have a reauthorization sometime within the next few days, probably, and that the program in California is one that is fully authorized and ready to go.

Population density in the area that is involved in this particular program is over 50,000 people per square mile. Ultimately, the project will tie together one of the fastest-growing sections of San Francisco with one of the densest neighborhoods in the Nation and will provide key regional connections with other transit systems, including commuter rail and future high-speed rail programs.

The project has been thoroughly reviewed by the FTA and the State of California. Local authorities determined that it was of high value. In addition, the chairman included $100 million in the underlying bill as an acknowledgement that this project is moving and will improve transportation and create construction jobs in the Bay Area. The Bay Area needs construction jobs as well as we need construction jobs in every part of this Nation in order to have a robust economy.

I have a press release, which arrived today, just to add to the game. The California Transportation Commission unanimously approved the commitment of $61 million in State high-speed rail connectivity funds for the Central Subway Project, this very project, this very day.

□ 2040

I also have here with me the editorial from the San Francisco Examiner—I'm not sure whether that's one of your major newspapers in the area or not—in support of this program.

I understand that the sponsor might not support public transportation, but when he singles out one project of many that received a high rating, it's hard not to wonder if his opposition is not based on some kind of internal politics and not on sound policy.

I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the Examiner, June 14, 2012]

CENTRAL SUBWAY NEEDS MONEY TO FULFILL POTENTIAL

It is time for everyone to get onboard with the Central Subway project—the largest Muni project in recent years.

This week, the excavation of nearly a full block in San Francisco began as construction workers started ripping up the streets around Fourth and Bryant. The project is for a launch box,'' the staging ground for next year, when two massive hole-boring machines will ultimately serve as the tunnel for the new Central Subway line.

If you believe the naysayers, this tunneling is the beginning of a train to nowhere or a multimillion-dollar project that utterly lacks funding and will result in a train line without riders.

None of this is true.

The Central Subway is the second phase of the T-Third Street route, a 5.1-mile light-rail line that has done much good by connecting downtown with the southeastern neighborhoods of The City. The entire project germinated from the Embarcadero Freeway teardown after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. The compromise for not rebuilding the freeway was to plan for this new transit line.

The Central Subway project will extend the T-Third Street line 1.7 miles through the South of Market neighborhood, with stops at Moscone Center and Union Square, and end in Chinatown. The project will tie together one of the fastest-growing sections of The City with one of the densest neighborhoods in the nation. The ridership projections for the project, which opponents say are too low to justify the 81.6 billion cost, are for the small section of line itself. The opponents point to one number—35,000 riders in 2020. But the true ridership number is for the entire T-Third Street line, which is projected to be about 65,000 by 2030.

It is true that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency is moving ahead with this project without full federal funding. The work has been going on for some time, such as the moving of utilities that are in the way of tunneling. In these days of tight federal funding, when the present Congress is in the hands of tea party ideologues who want to kill public works projects that aren't car-oriented, the only way to prove a project is worthy of federal funding is having it shovel ready—or in this case, bore-ready.

But since the SFMTA has done so much to prove it is fully invested in this project, we are confident that the subway line is going to be fully financed. The Federal Transit Administration is expected to provide the final $942 million by the end of the month. This funding will be enough to complete the tunnel bore.

The SFMTA does not exactly have a proactive reputation. But in this case, it should be applauded for continuing to push ahead with a major construction project, even if the last bit of money is not quite yet secured. This money has been crawling through the pipeline for years.

The Central Subway line will be a major asset to San Francisco, and local and federal officials need to present a united front to finalize the funding as soon as possible.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAVAACK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Transportation to research or implement a distance-based fee system, commonly referred to as Vehicle Miles Traveled, that would levy a fee on a vehicle user based on the distance traveled.

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

Mr. CRAVAACK. I rise today in support of my amendment, which would prohibit the utilization of funds by the Secretary of Transportation to research or implement a distance-based fee system, commonly referred to as vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, that would levy a fee on a surface transportation vehicle user based on the distance traveled.

Mr. Chair, it is no secret that our current highway trust fund system is going bankrupt. The Federal gas tax designed to support this fund finds itself increasingly unable to pay for better roads, bridges, and rail due to several factors:

People are driving less due to a weak economy and high gas prices;

The creation of more fuel-efficient cars allows people to fill up less frequently at the pump;

And let's not forget about how Congress has been raiding the gas tax proceeds for decades to fund alternative transportation activities that in no way help maintain and improve roads and bridges we drive, such as building bike paths and planting flowers.

There is an important need to come up with new, better ideas on how to appropriately fund our highway trust fund system. However, I am here to tell you today that the concept of using a vehicle miles traveled fee system is not one of those better ideas.

Requiring people to pay for the miles they travel each year is not acceptable on a number of levels:

A VMT tax would be expensive to implement because every car would need to be fitted with a device that both records the miles driven and transmits the information to a government database. This complicated system would cost millions of dollars to install these devices in new vehicles, and it would cost many millions more if older vehicles and motorcycles are expected to be retrofitted with these devices;

The cost required to administer this taxation is expensive and inefficient, especially compared to the Federal gas tax, which provides an inexpensive form of taxation that is collected directly from refineries and importers;

Further, the requirement of an electronic mileage-tracking device to be installed in all cars also poses a significant privacy concern and a severe threat to our private information should one of these systems be hacked or corrupted. The potential for privacy abuse is a hazard waiting to happen. Government databases have already been compromised in the past, and this government system would be no exception;

Finally, the VMT tax would impose a ''regressive tax'' that would hit constituents in rural districts like Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District, the district that I represent, harder than any others. My constituents often have to drive many miles more than urban counterparts to perform the same daily tasks, like going to work, grocery shopping, dropping the kids off at school, and making deliveries for their small businesses. My constituents are already struggling to make ends meet with the current gas prices. Penalizing them for nothing more than living in a rural area will put them over the edge.

In sum, the VMT tax would produce a strongly negative reaction from the public—and for good reason. Americans don't like paying for the gas tax, and they are sure going to be even more unhappy about having to deal with an administrative and privacy nightmare that VMT promises. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of my amendment, which would prevent the Secretary of Transportation from using funds to research or implement this harmful fee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I would like to join with the gentleman here in support of this amendment. I would like to make a couple of points.

If you represent a rural district, this is an enormous issue. Oftentimes, on average, jobs will pay less in urban areas to begin with. On average, a lot of these folks have to drive long distances to work. We've got people in my district today that drive 50 and 60 miles one way to their job every day, and this would be an enormous hardship on these folks.

I would also add that the Secretary of Transportation and the administration, 2 years ago when we were trying to get a highway bill done, the administration took this off the table. They said, We're not going to do this. And so I don't see why the Secretary would need to do research or any kind of means of implementation if, in fact, they so strongly oppose this type of taxation.

So for several different reasons, I commend this gentleman on this amendment and rise in its support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. I oppose this amendment strongly, but not because I like a VMT, particularly, and not that I do not understand that in rural areas this can be very burdensome. However, we have to have additional revenue. The reason our infrastructure is in decline is simple: We're simply not raising enough revenue.

We haven't decided how to raise revenue to fund our infrastructure needs. Yet we have report after report from the American Society of Civil Engineers with an infrastructure report card that gives us a D, estimating that more than $2 trillion in investment is needed in our system, a gap of at least $27 billion each year, from the DOT's own most recent conditions and performance report. There is a $27 billion per year gap just to maintain the current system of highways and bridges in a state of good repair.

□ 2050

The gas tax has not been raised since 1993. The total amount of revenue that was raised 10 years ago is only a couple of billion dollars lower than it is now 10–11 years later. We know that the vehicles that are being produced now, correctly, and we must do this, are more efficient than they were earlier and so gasoline tax doesn't bring in as much money. That's fine, but you still have to have the revenue to build a transportation infrastructure program that is going to be good that will keep the economy of the country strong. Every good and every product of this country has to move along an efficient transportation system covering all of our modes of transportation and has to be kept up, in good repair.

And for the major population growth which continues at 10 percent every decade with all these major metropolitan areas going up and up and up in population, you have to have a lot of new infrastructure built and you have to maintain the old infrastructure in the older communities or everybody is going to be behind. Even the rural areas, even though many of them, and in the gentleman's poor part of the country, there are States where more than half, several States, at least 10 States that have more than half of all of their counties losing population. But to allow the infrastructure, the highway system to fall apart in those places, means you doom those areas to an economic future which is going to be very bleak, indeed.

So the amendment, it's unfortunate because we are probably going to have to use different kinds of money-raising mechanisms in different parts of the country. This one makes it not possible for the administration to even think about using the vehicle miles tax even in the urban, major urban areas of the country.

In any case, I oppose the amendment. I know quite well what the result of my opposition is going to be, but I think ultimately, we somehow have to gain the courage and the will to raise the revenue that is necessary in order to keep our economy strong.

The transportation system in its totality represents close to 25 percent of the whole economy in this country. You cannot have a viable, robust economy with the jobs that we need if we do not figure out how to do what's needed in all parts of the country. So I oppose the amendment.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. And I appreciate what the gentleman, my good friend from Massachusetts, is talking about. I think you clearly remember the testimony from Secretary LaHood before the subcommittee.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I yield to Chairman LATHAM.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman very much. I just want to talk about the subject that the gentleman from Massachusetts brought up.

The Secretary of Transportation came before the subcommittee. We were talking about the difficulty we

were having as far as trying to write an appropriation bill with no new authorization. The Secretary on several different occasions said he would not entertain and they would strongly oppose both an increase in the gas tax and vehicle miles driven, and I'm sure that the gentleman from Massachusetts remembers that testimony very clearly.

I would just suggest that maybe someone should talk to the administration about finding sources for funding because the Secretary has taken every possibility off of the table to fund a new highway bill. And now we're apparently looking at a reauthorization that's finding other unique ways of funding rather than user fees or gas tax or miles driven or registration fees, whatever, they have taken off the table. So I would suggest the gentleman from Massachusetts would maybe visit with Mr. LaHood at the Transportation Department.

Mr. OLVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. I would like to continue this conversation for another moment or two, and that will save me time rather than having to figure out how to get my own time, Mr. Chairman. Somewhere along the way, it will come back to me. But in the midst of the discussion, I'm not likely to come up with it very easily.

In any case, I recognize exactly what the chairman of the committee is saying. It will be interesting to see what the authorizers come up with. I hope you had some ideas as to what they are going to do because the position that I am taking of the need for the infrastructure development in this country, both state of good repair, just repairing it, keeping it going, and then the additional infrastructure that is needed because of growth of populations, that is there and we must solve the problem. And it's not just the executive's problem, it's not just our problem, it's a problem for all of us, and this takes one piece, one possible piece out of the mix that could be part of the mix, simply takes it off the table, and that I object to. As somebody that is not going to be here next year when you may have to come up with a solution, I object to that being taken off the table. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Sir, I can give you my commitment that I believe in a robust transportation system within the United States. We need it for economy and commerce, we understand that. But definitely, the VMT is a toxic part of this puzzle that we just can't use. I look forward to finding other alternatives to be able to fund the robust transportation system that I believe the United States needs. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments.

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I will be brief. I wish the gentleman from Minnesota great luck in solving this one. I am so happy for the people on that side of the aisle who must be just ecstatic—ecstatic—that they have a President who will take all of these things off the table. But what are you going to do when you have to have jobs and a robust economy in this largest economy in the world?

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. LATHAM. You will remember also, during the hearings with the Secretary, I asked that very question of the Secretary. You're taking gas tax, vehicle miles traveled off the table, let's find a way to do this.

He said: Well, we need to sit down at the table and discuss this.

I said: Mr. Secretary, you're at a table. I'll be glad to come around and sit with you, and we'll discuss it. You come up with some ideas. And he came up with zero ideas, if you'll remember that.

Mr. OLVER. Reclaiming my time, at my age, I can't remember what happened several days ago, and that is quite some time ago. But, you know, it will slowly come back. Eventually, it slowly comes back.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2100

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAVAACK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in furtherance of the implementation of the European Union greenhouse gas emissions trading scheme for aviation activities established by European Union Directive 2008/101/EC.

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

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment.

This amendment is a simple one. It prohibits the use of taxpayer funds in furtherance of the implementation of the European Union's Emissions Trading Scheme.

Starting in January, the European Union began to unilaterally apply the Emissions Trading Scheme, ETS, to civil aviation operators landing or departing from one of the EU member states.

Under the Emissions Trading Scheme, EU member states will require international carriers and operators to pay emission allowances—and in some cases penalties—for carbon emissions resulting from their operations. The EU's Emissions Trading Scheme will apply to the entire length of the flight, including those flights outside the European airspace.

For instance, for a flight leaving Los Angeles for London, taxes would be levied not only for the portion of the flight over the United Kingdom, but also for portions of the flight over the United States and international waters.

Despite serious legal issues and objections by a majority of the international community, including the United States, India, Russia, China, and the International Civil Aviation Organization, the EU is pressing ahead with its plans. Russia, China, and India are taking very clear actions in opposition of EU's emission scheme. China and India have directed their air carriers not to comply with the EU's ETS requirements. China has delayed Airbus orders, India is threatening in-kind retaliation, and Russia is threatening to deny airspace access to European air carriers.

The European Union's unilateral application of the Emissions Trading Scheme onto U.S. operators without the consent of the United States Government raises significant legal concerns under international law, including violations of the Chicago Convention and the U.S.-EU Air Transport Agreement.

The Emissions Trading Scheme will actually harm efforts to reduce global aviation emissions. By taking money away from the airline industry that would otherwise be invested in NextGen technologies and the purchase of new aircraft—two proven methods for improving environmental performance—the EU is siphoning scarce money to be used as each member state sees fit.

A better approach to address aviation's impact on global emissions is to work with the international civil aviation community through the U.N. International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO, to establish consensus-driven initiatives to reduce emissions. However, because the EU has made no effort to delay or retract the illegal Emissions Trading Scheme, this amendment is necessary to ensure that American taxpayer dollars will not be used to further the Europeans' unilateral and questionable scheme.

Last October, the House passed H.R. 2954, which directs the Secretary of Transportation to prohibit U.S. carriers from participating in the Europeans' illegal scheme. A companion bill has been introduced in the Senate. It is my hope that the Senate will move

quickly towards its passage. That legislation, along with this amendment to the Transportation appropriations for fiscal year 2013, will send a very strong message to our European friends that an illegal and unilateral action to address aviation emissions is not the proper course of action to deal with this issue. This must be a consensus-driven solution, not an international mandate.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the distinguished gentleman, the Chairman, for the time, and let me just rise in strong support of this amendment.

This, I think, is one of the most outrageous, offensive taxes that I've ever heard of. The idea of taxing U.S. travelers from any point in the United States just because they're traveling to a destination in Europe is simply outrageous. It's going to be devastating to U.S. carriers, and it's something that we have got to put a stop to.

Like the gentleman talked about the international community's strong opposition, I think on a bipartisan basis everyone is opposed to this. It is, again, a far overreach. It is something that is unnecessary. It is simply wrong.

I really appreciate the gentleman's work on this to have this amendment brought forward as at least a first step in stopping this very, very, I think, egregious new tax.

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the European Union has implemented an emissions trading regimen as a means of reducing greenhouse gas emissions 20 percent below 1990 levels. They are not succeeding very much. They are putting in a fairly hard effort to do that, but the greenhouse gas emissions continue to go up. The CO_2 percentage in the atmosphere is now, in the year 2012, about 50 percent higher than it has been at any time in the last 500,000 years and going up, continuing to go up. But we're not going to settle climate change issues tonight.

I understand that this amendment will be adopted, but the effort is going to have to eventually go on to deal with our climate change.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to support this amendment which would simply prohibit the use of any of the funds provided in the bill from being used to further the implementation of the illegal European Union's Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS).

The EU ETS has been a source of great concern of the Aviation Subcommittee, this House, the Administration, and the aviation community. The U.S. is joined in its opposition to the EU ETS by countries around the world.

Under the ETS, EU Member States will require international air carriers to pay emissions allowances, and perhaps penalties, for carbon emissions. A major objection is that the Emissions Scheme will apply to the entire length of the flight—including flight outside the European airspace.

The EU has no jurisdiction over airspace outside its boundaries and no legal basis to impose this Scheme on our air carriers. The unilateral application of ETS to our carriers in this way without our consent is a violation of international law—including the Chicago Convention and the U.S.–EU Air Transport Agreement.

There are other more productive ways to address the issue of carbon emissions, and the U.S. stands ready to work with our world partners through the International Civil Aviation Organization to do so—that is how you resolve global aviation issues.

Last year, this House passed H.R. 2954 which would direct the Secretary of Transportation to prohibit U.S. carriers from participating in this illegal Scheme. The Senate Commerce Committee held a hearing recently on a companion bill that has been introduced in the Senate.

This amendment is in line with the actions that the House has taken previously and reiterates the message that we will not stand for this unilateral, illegal scheme to be perpetrated against our carriers.

I urge Members to take a stand against this power grab and support this amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the amounts made available by this Act may be used by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to require the placement of line markers under section 195.410(a)(1) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, other than at public road crossings and railroad crossings.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we've all heard about many regulations that come from this town that seem to be ridiculous; sometimes they're innocuous, sometimes they're even humorous. These are regulations oftentimes that don't help anybody at all. Sometimes, however, they harm real people's lives and their homes and their businesses.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, along a half-mile stretch of Remington Road in Chamblee, Georgia, Plantation and Colonial Pipelines, under a requirement from the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration, was forced to place 17 new hazard markers on the front lawns of homes—in a subdivision. That brought the total number of hazard markers to 47–47 within a half-mile stretch, a half-mile stretch of road in a residential subdivision where there's no new construction and the pipeline has been there for decades. You talk about ridiculous.

The regulation states:

Markers must be located at each public road crossing, at each railroad crossing, and in sufficient number along the remainder of each buried line so that its location is accurately known.

Now, though this particular regulation hasn't changed for many years, its interpretation clearly has. So, last month, my office sent a letter to the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration for clarification, and in response they said:

While the regulations specify the minimum requirements for line markers, they do not specify a maximum number of line markers. A pipeline operator is allowed to exceed the minimum regulatory requirements.

Well, Mr. Chairman, they certainly have exceeded the minimum number of markers. Look at this front lawn here, five or six markers in the front lawn of a residential area. Now, clearly this is absurd. I'm certain there are other communities across this great country that are similarly affected by an overzealous regulator. This doesn't help a soul, but what it does is likely depress property values at a very challenging time for homeowners. So let's put some common sense back in government.

This amendment that I have offered today is designed to stop the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration from broadly interpreting these regulations in the future by ensuring that no funds from the bill shall be used to require the placement of line markers other than at public road crossings and railroad crossings.

Now, we have struggled to find the right avenue to address this issue, and hopefully we will be able to get the attention of these wonderful folks and bring some sense to all of this. And though not possible to have this amendment brought to conclusion on this legislation, I do know that the chairman is as interested as I am in ending the overbearing regulatory scheme that seems to have overtaken every single department in this town.

□ 2110

If the chairman would be desirous, I would be happy to yield to him for a comment.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Obviously, we all want pipeline safety. That is the number one issue, but what you're talking about here is truly beyond the pale as far as any kind of common sense. We've got to find a balance, like you've talked about. The overreach that we're seeing in so many areas of the Federal Government causes things like this that are just simply nonsensical.

I appreciate the gentleman for bringing the issue forward and would want to work with him in the future to find a resolution to your concerns.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the chairman, and I appreciate that.

Again, this is simply ridiculous. If that's your front lawn, Mr. Chairman, that's the last place that you want to see those signs in your neighborhood and in your residential area.

So I appreciate the opportunity to bring this amendment. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the international highway technology scanning program, a program within the international highway transportation outreach program under section 506 of title 23, United States Code.

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It prohibits taxpayer dollars from being used for the Department of Transportation's International Highway Technology Scanning Program. According to the Department of Transportation, this program enables the Department's officials to access innovative technologies and practices in other countries that could significantly improve our Nation's highways.

I, and most taxpayers, really don't have any problem with that. If someone else has a good idea, we can and we should learn from that. But most taxpayers were outraged when ABC News and Citizens Against Government Waste highlighted that this program was bankrolling globe-trotting junkets across the world.

One such trip featured a 17-day ordeal to Australia, Sweden, the Netherlands, and Great Britain to look at billboards, all the while, racking up taxpayer bills at five-star hotels and restaurants. Among the important research conducted by the team was a trip to Scotland to evaluate ''road furniture along rural roads.'' And in the Netherlands they took a serious look at ''examples of outdoor advertising.''

When the Federal Government is up to its neck in debt, such expenditures truly are an abuse of the taxpayers. As a result, Citizens Against Government Waste was able to apply enough pressure to the agency to suspend the $1.2 million annual program. We're not really sure what ''suspend'' means, if it's for a day, a week, or a month.

ABC News reported that upwards of $12 million has been spent on the program since the year 2000. I see the suspension of the program by Transportation Secretary LaHood as a really good start, but there is still no guarantee that such waste will not resume, as nothing in law would prevent the program from being resurrected in the future. This amendment, very simply, will ensure that the program will not come back to life during the fiscal year 2013.

Mr. Chairman, Washington is approaching another trillion-plus deficit. We simply cannot afford five-star junkets.

I urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in support of this amendment.

I appreciate very much the gentleman from Florida bringing this issue to the attention of the House and, again, very strongly support his proposal to do away with this wasteful spending.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to a possible attempt for a Member to bring forward an amendment which would prohibit any funds in H.R. 5972 from being used towards the California High-Speed Rail Project.

As a member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and a cochair of the California High-Speed Rail Congressional Caucus, this project is a priority of my State and the voters who agreed to move our State into the 21st century and to be able to be competitive globally.

Our Nation's ability to move goods and people is essential to develop and maintain a strong economy, and this project is critical to meeting the State's growing transportation needs. In fact, traffic congestion in California is increasing by 10 percent each year, and it's estimated that the State's airports will reach capacity by 2030. As California's population continues to boom, we must invest in alternative systems that will remedy this constant congestion and will help to protect the health and environment of local communities.

Now, as a member of the Transportation Committee, I happened to have the opportunity to participate with Chairman MICA when we went to the Central Valley to talk about the possibility of moving forward on high-speed rail. And admittedly, there were some concerns that were brought forward, but there were far more supporters who wanted to see high-speed rail move forward than those who were opposed.

And again, I want to stress that the voters in California took it upon themselves to tax themselves as an independent State body, to tax themselves to move forward on high-speed rail. So who are we, or the Federal Government, to prohibit providing funds that might match to enable that project to move forward?

Also, given the inherent speed limitations in the Northeast corridor, it seems to me that it would be ill-advised to deny California—and this country, more importantly—the efficient transportation options that many of us so richly need, especially knowing that California is one of the most traveled areas in this country.

As a result, even the earliest investments would be helpful before this project is completed. Now is the time to make smart and long-sighted investments for alternatives to congested highways and, simultaneously, to create jobs.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us an opportunity to support American workers for today by putting America on the road to recovery while, more importantly, developing a world-class rail system that we could compete with our competitors like China. Proper funding for the California High-Speed Rail project is a necessity for the success of California and the success of the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH OF VIRGINIA

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any new grant under the livable communities program of the Department of Transportation or the sustainable communities program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development or to implement any transfer of funds for any such new grant.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment that would prohibit the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development from issuing any new livable or sustainable community grants. While the Appropriations Committee did not include any new funds for these grants, my amendment goes a step further to ensure that neither the Department of Transportation nor the Housing Secretary can attempt to transfer any of their Department's discretionary funding.

In 2009, under the direction of President Obama, EPA, Department of Transportation, and HUD began the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, a joint venture to provide millions of dollars to local communities to entice them to buy into the President's sustainable development agenda.

Over 2010 and 2011, DOT and HUD awarded approximately $96 million in

grant funding for sustainable and livable community initiatives; however, these programs were never authorized by Congress. In fact, the Financial Services Committee, who has authority over HUD programs, said that the:

Sustainable Communities Initiative, which has yet to be authorized by the Committee, should not be funded at the expense of other critical affordable housing programs.

This opinion of the sustainable communities program by the Financial Services Committee, was bipartisan and unanimous.

Last year, thankfully, no new funding was provided for sustainable community grants, but the conference committee reminded the Secretary that these efforts were eligible activities under other programs, meaning funding for the sustainable community grants could have been obtained by shifting funding. This amendment would prevent that shifting.

I do not believe the Federal Government should be enticing our local and State governments with this money to get them to buy into the President's sustainable development agenda that cedes some local or State authority to Federal or international bureaucracies and governing boards.

□ 2120

I commend the Appropriations Committee for not giving any new funds to these unauthorized grants. This amendment makes it clear that these activities should not be continued at DOT or at HUD under any circumstances.

As Robert Frost wrote, ''Good fences make good neighbors.''

This amendment will put up a fence to prevent shifting funding to a program this Congress has not approved, and it sends a message that our various States and local communities should be in control of their housing, transportation and zoning policies.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Let me just say that this has been a subject of great discussion with the ranking member and me over time. I hope the people of the House understand and the American people understand what an outright waste of money these projects have oftentimes become.

Everybody here is talking about our needing more money for infrastructure, transportation; let's get the trust fund built up; we're trying to find new ways of funding. I hope everyone understands that, 2 years ago, before we got control of this committee, they took $150 million out of the highway trust fund to pay for sustainability projects and grants.

That's rather interesting.

When it's an unauthorized program, no one even has a definition of what a ''sustainable community'' is. There is no definition of where this money could go. This is $150 million, and people talk about all their projects at home—of their highways in disrepair, of the bridges falling down—and we're spending $150 million out of that trust fund for things that aren't even defined and that are not authorized.

Mr. Chairman, it is outrageous.

I just spoke with the Secretary of HUD a few weeks ago on this issue because I have zeroed it out in this bill. There is no money for sustainable communities, whatever that is. Do you know the example the Secretary gave me of a good project? It would be to take millions of dollars from the Federal Government and give it to the area in North Dakota where they're having the expansion of the oil boom.

The State of North Dakota has billions of dollars in surplus. It has more money than it knows what to do with. Yet the Secretary says we should take sustainable community dollars from the Federal Government, of which we're borrowing 40 cents on the dollar from China, and give it to North Dakota to find out where it should put up its buildings in the oil boom area. I'm sorry, but I think they can afford to do that themselves.

So I would very strongly support the gentleman's amendment. Again, this is money that is coming out of the trust fund. Everybody here talks about roads in disrepair, bridges falling down, all that we need to do in the way of help for infrastructure, for jobs—and we're giving it to places like North Dakota. I'm sorry, but this is a waste of money, ill-defined, unauthorized. I very strongly support the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Again, I understand my very limited position here on this one, but I do rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am a strong supporter of the Sustainable Communities Program, and I am disappointed that there is no funding in this bill for sustainable communities. I have heard complaints that the Sustainable Communities Program isn't authorized. Well, neither is the CDBG program authorized, yet we include funding for that program in the bill and have for many years. It has not been individually authorized in quite some period of time.

The program actually has some good purposes. It integrates Federal, State and local investment activity in housing, land use, economic and workforce development, and transportation. At a time when we're under budget constraints, it's fairly important, if not critical, that the support for regional and local planning is available to help localities invest limited resources strategically in order to achieve the greatest short- and long-term benefits for citizens.

In the first 2 years, which is the 2 years that the program has been used—and it is a pilot program, basically, a demonstration program—it has been used in both urban and rural areas and in areas that are a little more than a city or a metropolitan area or that are a small group of counties up to a broader group that might cross State lines, where there are interests across those State lines and where the people have wanted to do it.

It was always one purely of applications from groups of people at the local level as well as from organizations at the local and regional levels that would put forward proposals to do that kind of integration and joint planning with the Federal Government, the State governments, and the local governments as to how they wanted to see their areas grow.

So I think it is an activity that we ought to have some opportunity for, but I know that that's not going to happen tonight. I simply regret that that is the way things are. I do oppose the amendment, but know that it will be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

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

Mr. FLORES. I rise to offer an amendment which addresses another misguided and restrictive Federal regulation.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prevents Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of fuels unless their life cycles of greenhouse gas emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources. In summary, my amendment would stop the government from enforcing this ban on all Federal agencies funded by the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stop the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based and/or coal-to-liquids jet fuel. This restriction was based on the opinion of some environmentalists that coal-based jet fuel might produce more greenhouse gas emissions than traditional petroleum-derived fuels.

Unfortunately, the ban on the fuel choices of section 526 has been expanded to include all Federal agencies,

not just the Defense Department. This is why I am offering this amendment to the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

Federal agencies should not be burdened with wasting their time in studying fuel restrictions when there is a simple fix. That fix is to not restrict our fuel choices based on extreme environmental views, bad policies and misguided regulations like those in section 526. Placing limits on Federal agencies' fuel choices is an unacceptable precedent to set in regard to America's energy independence and our national security.

Mr. Chairman, section 526 restrictions make our Nation more dependent on Middle Eastern oil. Stopping the impact of section 526 will help us to promote American energy, to improve the American economy, and to create American jobs. In addition, we must ensure that our military has adequate fuel resources so that it can rely on domestic and more stable sources of fuel.

With the increasing competition for energy and fuel resources and with the continued volatility and instability in the Middle East, it is now more important than ever for our country to become more energy independent and to develop and produce all of our domestic energy resources.

□ 2130

Mr. Chairman, in some circles there is a misconception that my amendment somehow prevents the Federal Government and our military from being able to procure and use alternative fuels such as biofuels. Mr. Chairman, this viewpoint is categorically false. All my amendment does is allow the Federal purchasers of fuels, particularly our military, to be able to acquire the fuels that best and most efficiently meet their needs.

I offered a similar amendment to the CJS appropriations bill, and it passed with bipartisan support. My identical amendments to the three other FY13 appropriations bills also passed by voice vote. My friend, Mr. CONAWAY, also had language added to the Defense authorization bill to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation.

Let's summarize the problems with section 526. Number one, it increases our reliance on Middle Eastern oil. Number two, it hurts our military readiness, our national security, and our energy security. Number three, it also prevents the potential increased uses of some sources of safe, clean, and efficient American oil and gas. Number four, it hurts American jobs and the American economy. And five, last but not least, it costs our taxpayers more of their hard-earned dollars.

My amendment fixes these problems, and I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this commonsense amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman, and I rise in support of this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Transportation to authorize a person—

(1) to operate an unmanned aircraft system in the national airspace system for the purpose, in whole or in part, of using the unmanned aircraft system as a weapon or to deliver a weapon against a person or property; or

(2) to manufacture, sell, or distribute an unmanned aircraft system, or a component thereof, for use in the national airspace system as a weapon or to deliver a weapon against a person or property.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of discussion about the use of unmanned aircraft, commonly referred to as drones, in United States airspace, and rightfully so.

Beginning with the FAA reauthorization bill which passed this House earlier in the year, the expansion of the use of unmanned aerial vehicles in the continental United States was expanded. Arguably, this was a useful expansion because we have vast areas of our border which are difficult to monitor. Sometimes there are search and rescue occurrences that happen in rough terrain where an unmanned aerial vehicle may be indispensable. But since that time, there has been a growing body of people who have been concerned about the effect of allowing these unmanned aerial vehicles the ability to surveil citizens. There has also been talk about the EPA using it to monitor herd size and the grazing habits of farmers. These are questions that are going to need to be answered. But in recent weeks, I have become aware of some discussion that in certain police jurisdictions they were talking about an army of unmanned aerial vehicles to assist in law enforcement.

Maybe that's something that's worthwhile to consider, but I can't help but feel that a step taken that far is something that this body should consider. While I appreciate the subcommittee chairman's concern about legislating on an appropriations bill, we're in new territory. We're in uncharted territory, and this amendment is a first-aid maneuver. It is to place a bandage, if you will, on a growing problem to see if we can't stop and have the discussion before the Secretary spends money authorizing the use of armed unmanned aerial vehicles.

No one disputes in war zones and in battle space the use of an unmanned aerial vehicle. An armed unmanned aerial vehicle is incredibly useful. No one argues the utility of these unmanned aircraft in that situation. All I would say is that before we allow that to be occurring in our backyards, on our highways and byways, we need to consider the effects of that. Are we, in fact, ensuring the constitutional rights of the people who not just are being surveilled, but who may be being controlled by the armaments that would be present in these weaponized vehicles?

My amendment would prevent the Secretary of Transportation, the head of the FAA, from approving any application to use an unmanned aircraft in the United States airspace for the purpose of arming or weaponizing that aircraft. It does not affect the surveillance question. So surveillance drone applications certainly, if they are authorized, may go forward. Nor does it affect weaponized drones that are operating outside the United States airspace.

The amendment that I offer today is preemptive. As to my knowledge, no actual applications have been filed with the FAA to use armed drones in U.S. airspace. But I believe it is necessary, as there has been some discussion in the public media about the ability to arm unmanned aerial vehicles. I personally believe this is a road down which we should not travel. It is the old argument of sacrificing safety for security, and ultimately achieving neither objective.

I think this is an amendment that would be well advised by this body to consider this evening. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it if it is allowed to stand, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I continue on my reservation, and I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. I want to thank the gentleman. Unfortunately, for consistency, we're going to have to pursue the point of order.

This issue has been brought to my attention. I've expressed concerns myself as to how information is used. Certainly, we want to make sure that we're very careful as far as privacy issues in this country, the way that these things may be used for purposes that no one quite understands or intended to have happen.

While I share your concerns, for consistency reasons here, I must insist on my point of order.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member.

Mr. OLVER. I will be very brief.

I serve on the Homeland Security Subcommittee for Appropriations, and I don't think that the Homeland Security authorizers have done anything along these lines, and that's where it really ought to be dealt with, I would think.

So I will agree with what you're doing.

Mr. BURGESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I would be more than happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Here is the problem.

It was a simple line in the FAA reauthorization bill. We were all happy when we reauthorized the FAA. It hadn't been done in some 26 attempts—''the dog ate my homework,'' we got IOUs and extensions on the FAA. But then here was this very simple language allowing for the expansion of unmanned aerial vehicles in the national airspace. None of us really thought that was much of a problem, but our constituents are bringing it back to us. They are concerned about privacy, and they're concerned about Federal agencies surveilling normal activities of commerce in which people may be engaged. But then we have gone one step further.

If these drones are weaponized, you can—if you've been surveilled unfairly, you can go to court and perhaps seek a remedy. But if a bullet is fired from one of these platforms, you don't have any remedy if you're the recipient of that bullet.

All I'm asking is that we take all due care and caution, and exercise all due care and caution. We are entering a Brave New World here, and it is incumbent upon every one of us to be certain we do so with all care and caution before we proceed.

I appreciate the gentleman allowing me to express my thoughts on this amendment. I wish it could stand. I wish we could vote on it this evening. I understand for consistency why he is insisting on his point of order. But we're going to have to revisit this.

H.R. 5950 is standalone legislation that would prohibit this activity. I encourage Members of Congress to look into cosponsoring that.

□ 2140

Mr. LATHAM. Reclaiming my time, let me just say, in the authorization of the FAA, their specific role was air traffic concerns that they may have safety concerns, collisions with other aircraft. I agree with the gentleman, it should probably be a Homeland Security issue. I also serve on the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations. It has not been brought up in that.

I do share your concerns. But unfortunately, I must insist on my point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' The amendment imposes additional duties and requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination regarding the end use of certain aircraft systems and their components. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to establish, issue, implement, administer, or enforce any prohibition or restriction on the establishment or effectiveness of any occupancy preference for veterans in supportive housing for the elderly that (1) is provided assistance by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and (2)(A) is or would be located on property of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or (B) is subject to an enhanced use lease with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

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

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we must ensure that the men and women who bravely served our country have access to affordable housing. My amendment seeks to make sure that conflicting government regulations do not pose an impediment to achieving this important goal.

Currently, the VA requires a veteran's preference for housing built on VA property. However, HUD requires that HUD-assisted projects contain no preferences. These conflicting rules and regulations make it nearly impossible to help low-income senior veterans access affordable housing on VA property with HUD assistance.

My amendment prohibits HUD from using funds to enforce the restriction against a veteran's preference for housing projects built on a VA campus or that use a VA-enhanced use lease. The language is identical to an amendment that I authored which the House unanimously approved twice and was included in H.R. 3288, the Fiscal Year 2010 Consolidated Appropriations Act.

As a result, in my southwest Ohio community, St. Mary Development Corporation is currently building housing for senior veterans on the campus of the Dayton VA, which will help provide veterans close access to the services they need.

Mr. Chairman, this project can be a model in that it can be used across the country to help homeless veterans, provide low-income housing for veterans, and respond to the needs of seniors in the community. I urge all my colleagues to support this important amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I would just like to lend my support for this amendment. It's something where clarification needs to be done, and the rules need to work for veterans for these processes. This has been one of the hang-ups for veterans being able to get into assisted living or houses. And any backlog that there has been has been basically a bureaucratic backlog, rather than a funding issue in the past. So it's a good amendment, and I would urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Very briefly, I would just like to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for being watchful of this sort of thing. This is the sort of thing that, it seems to me, ought to be really very logical. And I have supported it in the past, as he has already referenced. So I'm happy to see that it's working in your community.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to promulgate, issue, establish, implement, administer, finalize, or enforce the proposed rule issued by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and published in the Federal Register on September 16, 2011 (76 F.R. 70921; relating to Implementation of the Fair Housing Act's Discriminatory Effects Standard).

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that attempts to restore some sanity, fairness, and certainty to mortgage and insurance companies. My amendment would undo harmful economic actions taken by the administration that will, if carried out, continue to weaken credit availability and job creation.

You see, earlier this year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development proposed a rule to establish

regulatory standards regarding the use of the legal theory known as ''disparate impact.'' Disparate impact liability allows for plaintiffs and government agencies to bring suit charging discriminatory practices based solely on statistics. If statistics indicate, for instance, that disparity exists between the number of loans made in a specific area to a certain preferred minority class versus the number of preferred minorities that live in that area, a lender could be charged with discriminatory practices, even if there was no intent whatsoever.

Now, we all agree that discrimination is terrible and that when there is intent, we must prosecute to the fullest extent of the law. But under the example I laid out, the lender could even have specific anti-discriminatory practices in his company in place, but still be found liable under this legal theory. You see, accurate risk identification and classification is essential to the lending and insurance business, but the HUD rule ignores that.

Risk-based lending and insurance underwriting and pricing that unintentionally results in a statistically disparate outcome, that is not discrimination.

The proposed HUD rule would create a presumption of discriminatory disparate impact that could basically undermine the basic purposes of risk-based pricing, which ensures persons with different risk characteristics have to make payments commensurate with the risk they pose. So protected-class characteristics, including race, are actually prohibited from consideration in this assessment. State law already prohibits insurers from recording race, for example. But this HUD rule requiring race consideration would be impossible, then, under State law.

Looking specifically at homeowners insurance, commonly considered factors—including applicant's claim history, construction materials, the presence or absence of a security system, and the distance from a firehouse—could be barred if they were found to result in creating a statistical disparity for a class defined by race, ethnicity, or gender.

You see, all 50 States have anti-discrimination provisions in their housing insurance regulations already, and there is no claim that these regulations have been insufficient. So the process that HUD proposes for the disparate impact rule is, therefore, unworkable and economically impractical.

The process HUD proposes for defending against a charge of unlawful discrimination based upon disparate impact would then require a defendant to prove a ridiculously high standard, that the challenged practice is necessary to its very survival, and that its business would basically collapse if it didn't do it.

You see, the process HUD proposes would find the defendant company liable if a court could find another practice that is simply less discriminatory, not, instead, a reasonable, economical, practical, workable, state-authorized, or known practice. Simply, all they have to come up with is another practice.

□ 2150

Extending disparate impact analysis to facially-neutral practices exceeds HUD's authority under the FHA and it is contrary to law. Extending disparate impact analysis to facially-neutral practices therefore is arbitrary and it is capricious. Therefore, the application of this HUD rule on the insurance industry should be precluded, and it should preclude it also because of McCarran-Ferguson. Recognizing disparate impact analysis under the FHA exceeds HUD's authority under the FHA and therefore is contrary to law.

The Supreme Court recently agreed to hear a challenge on this. I think it was just last year. Unfortunately, you may know that that case was withdrawn. Why? Because of pressure from this administration. The administration rightly, I believe, was concerned that the Court would strike down the whole theory as being unconstitutional.

Now recently a new case had been submitted to the Supreme Court for consideration on the very same issue. I hope the Court takes that case up soon. The Justice Department knows it has a weak case, and I do not believe that this administration should try to front-run the Supreme Court and attempt to push through this failed legal theory.

My amendment would prohibit HUD from finalizing this rule that harms credit availability and job creation. It is supported by the Mortgage Bankers Association, the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, along with a couple other institutions as well—the American Insurance Association and the Property Casualty Insurance Association of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. The issue here seems to be—and I don't know this very well. The issue seems to be that there have been cases where discrimination has occurred, and it has been adjudicated as having occurred when there was no intent to do so in the first place.

In a recent HUD action, this impact was used to protect the rights of women who were evicted because they were victims of domestic violence. Well, there was no intent to discriminate against the victims of the domestic violence, but that's what it was that has been adjudicated in this particular case.

Cases of this sort have been brought before 11, I think, of the 13 appeals courts at this point, and the rule which HUD has put forward, the so-called disparate impact rule, comes out of their understanding of the cases before the appeals courts where discrimination was determined legally in the appeals courts to have occurred.

So the idea that the gentleman is putting forward of prohibiting the finalization of the disparate impact rule which rises out of these cases before the appeals court seems to me to be exactly the opposite thing that should be done. Unless you get to a point where the appeals court gets to a higher court, which I guess the higher court is the Supreme Court of the United States, and they overturn the positions that have been taken by these several appeals courts in rather similar cases, then HUD is doing exactly what they need to do.

So I must rise in opposition to this. All of the people in the authorizing side of this are saying—at least on my side of the authorization process, which means the ranking member of the authorizing committee here—is opposed to this amendment. Mr. FRANK, the ranking member of the Housing Subcommittee, also opposes, I think, for roughly the reason that I have articulated here. So the gentleman is trying to stop the process.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. And that's just my point. I'm not trying to stop any process. What I'm trying to do is prevent this administration from doing an end-run on the process.

You set up the record almost completely straight. There were court cases on this. It was going to the Supreme Court. It was about to go to the Supreme Court and be heard, and then this administration put pressure on the city that was involved in it to stop it, and they withdrew the case. We would have had the decision by the Supreme Court in that matter, but the administration basically said no, because they wanted to go ahead with their actions here without interference of the Supreme Court.

Fortunately, though, there is now another case that's been filed, and it's from my home State of New Jersey. This will give us all exactly what we need, just what you were saying: lower court, and now it's being appealed up to the Supreme Court.

Mr. OLVER. Reclaiming my time, we have no idea whether the Supreme Court will take this case. In the meantime, until such time it is taken and they do it, and we can't assume that, then the actions of HUD are proper in reaching a disparate impact rule that adheres to the findings in the several appeals courts. My staff tells me it is 11 of the appeals courts have reached similar decisions which are adhered to by the HUD impact rule proposed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognize for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Let me just stand up in support of the amendment. I think it's a good amendment. Insurance companies are not able to determine risk, and that oftentimes means much greater cost.

I think it's a good amendment going forward, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Transportation to make any transfer under the last proviso under the heading ''Department of Transportation—Office of the Secretary—Payments to Air Carriers''.

Mr. CASSIDY. As that reading suggests, this amendment addresses accountability for the Essential Air Service.

Earlier this year, the House and Senate agreed upon an FAA authorization after a fairly contentious debate. Chief among the issues which were resolved was a dispute over the Essential Air Service program, which provides Federal subsidies for airlines which provide flights to rural or otherwise remote airports.

While the work done by Chairman MICA and his colleagues adds several important reforms to the EAS program, a number of issues have since surfaced. Tonight, I'm offering an amendment to hopefully resolve one of those.

As currently written, the T-HUD bill funds the Essential Air Service program through a $114 million appropriation from the Airway Trust Fund and via what are called overflight fees, which are charged by the FAA to foreign aircraft using American airspace and navigation assets. In 2011, as a result of an annual increase of 17 percent to the overflight fee, the Department of Transportation estimated that the fee would bring in around $69 million in revenue for fiscal year 2013, which, when paired with the annual appropriation from the Airway Trust Fund, would provide all the money needed to operate the EAS program.

□ 2200

DOT, however, was wrong about their original $69 million projection. According to the President's budget and report language in this bill, the projected revenues from the overflight fees are actually $100 million. That means that when you combine $114 million appropriated in this bill plus the $100 million in revenues from the overflight fees, the EAS program has $214 million.

Now, you could ask, Is this adequate to fund the program? It certainly should be. In fiscal year 2011, before the plan began to start scaling back the program, expenditures were around $195 million. Put differently, as we've scaled back the program, we have actually increased funding by about $19 million. Only in Washington would that be a scale. I shouldn't laugh.

But that's not the only source of funding that the bill provides. It also allows the Secretary of Transportation, at his discretion, to provide more funds in case the $214 million in revenue does not cover all obligations. How is this possible? Through the authorizing language tacked onto the end of the EAS section at the bottom of page 7:

Provided further: That if the funds under this heading are insufficient to meet the costs of the essential air service program in the current fiscal year, the Secretary shall transfer such sums as may be necessary to carry out the essential air service program from any available amounts appropriated to or directly administered by the Office of the Secretary for such fiscal year.

Let me repeat: ''such sums as may be necessary to carry out the essential air service program.''

In other words, this is a blank check for the Secretary to redirect to EAS if they overrun their $214 million allowance.

I have introduced this amendment to correct this issue and enforce the fiscal discipline that I think even the strongest proponents of the program hope to see. The amendment preserves the EAS program, but forces it to live within its mean and prioritize spending to where it is most necessary and cost effective.

My amendment nullifies the Secretary's authorization language from the bill and allows the FAA to spend only the money appropriated to it through both the Airways Trust Fund and the overflight fees.

Some may oppose this and point out that the section in question does not deal with any new spending or funding, only with allowing the Secretary to direct unobligated balances. However, this perpetuates the ''use it or lose it'' mentality in the Federal Government. It should be a principle that agencies ask for and receive only the funds they absolutely need for their programs and that any unnecessary overpaid funds be returned unspent to the taxpayers. Empowering the Secretary to use unspent money on more EAS flights is a step in the wrong direction.

Under the bill as written, there will be no impetus for FAA to prioritize funds or substantially cut back on unnecessary flights if too much is spent. Any gaps in funding can simply be filled in by the Secretary at his discretion without congressional approval.

I voted last night for the McClintock amendment to phase out the EAS program, but I respect the decision of the House and the Members who voted to keep it in place. The program is going to stay; my amendment doesn't change that. However, just because someone voted not to eliminate the program does not mean they cannot vote to impose reasonable rules and limits. Simply put, spending $214 million for EAS is enough. Please keep it from going any higher and preserve the congressional power of the purse.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. We are pleased to accept the amendment.

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana for his solution, but I have to admit that I cannot identify what the problem is that this solution solves.

This language that you are excluding has been in the legislation for years, before I think I was—the earliest time I was in the ranking membership of the Transportation Subcommittee, and that of course was several years before I chaired the Transportation Subcommittee. I think it has been in the language all that time and never come up. So there has been no problem that we solved where it has never been used. That flexibility has never been used to transfer money from some place in order to put money into the EAS program.

So, yes, you have a solution, but I don't know what the problem is.

Mr. CASSIDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. It may be that in practice it has not resulted in a problem. It certainly is a loophole that evades the congressional power of the purse.

Now, if in some way we could look into the future and know it was never going to be an issue, you're right, it would not be an issue. On the other hand, without that kind of prescience, it seems to be the better part of valor to reclaim our power.

Mr. OLVER. In any case, I don't object to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to design, construct, or operate a fixed guideway project located in Cincinnati, Ohio.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, this Nation cannot continue spending money it doesn't have. It is imperative that Congress end the borrow-and-spend mentality that created our staggering national debt and that we put our Nation on a sustainable path to a balanced budget. Now, more than ever, we need to be pragmatic in our approach to transportation, ensuring that every dollar spent represents a long-term investment that will improve the flow of commerce and create American jobs.

My amendment this evening is about priorities. The city of Cincinnati has been in the planning process of constructing a streetcar for years now. The primary funding for this project came in the form of an urban circulator grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation in the amount of $25 million. Earlier this year, city of Cincinnati officials came to my office looking for even more funds for the Cincinnati streetcar project. The total cost is expected to be well over $120 million for a 4-mile loop connecting only two Cincinnati neighborhoods with little-to-no positive impact on traffic congestion, freight, or our aging infrastructure. Far from a necessity, the Cincinnati streetcar is a luxury project that our Nation and our region simply cannot afford.

Imprudent and irresponsible spending of taxpayer dollars on discretionary projects like this must stop. For too long, taxpayers have been footing the bill for frivolous projects that reap little to no benefit. Much like the ''bridge to nowhere,'' this ''streetcar to nowhere'' is yet another instance of wasteful government spending.

My amendment simply says, no more—no more funding for this streetcar in my own district. Unlike the Cincinnati streetcar, however, there are a number of other infrastructure projects that are of high priority and far more worthy of Federal infrastructure investment. In particular, there are two ready-to-begin projects that would have a direct impact on Cincinnati's economy and create permanent jobs, and those are replacing the Brent Spence Bridge and completing the I–71 Martin Luther King interchange.

The Brent Spence Bridge carries two major interstate highways that connect Ohio and Kentucky and serves as a major thoroughfare not just for Cincinnatians, but for the entire Midwest region, and in fact the Nation at large. Furthermore, this bridge rests on one of the busiest freight routes in North America and is estimated to carry 4 percent of the Nation's gross domestic product annually.

The Federal Highway Administration has declared the Brent Spence Bridge functionally obsolete, indicating that the current state of the bridge does not meet today's standards. Currently, this bridge carries 170,000 vehicles on average per day, which is more than double the 80,000 it was designed to carry. Replacing the bridge would save an estimated $748 million in congestion costs annually, savings that would grow in real dollars to $1.3 billion annually by 2030.

The other worthy project I mentioned, the Martin Luther King interchange plan, has long been on the minds of businesses and citizens in our region, so much so that stakeholders have their own money in this plan. Unlike the streetcar to nowhere, the completion of this much-needed project would have a direct impact on one of Cincinnati's most important economic hubs. The Martin Luther King interchange would free up traffic congestion around the University of Cincinnati, Children's Hospital, and the uptown region of Cincinnati.

□ 2210

This proposed interchange would directly impact 60,000 people who work in the area and allow far greater highway access, generating an additional 2,000-plus permanent jobs.

We need to focus our limited resources on projects that are practical, impactful, and that will deliver results. Those of us in Congress must make responsible choices and invest in projects on their merits and nothing else. We owe it to the American people to invest only in those projects that will produce real results, keep us competitive, and, most importantly, create American jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member rise in opposition to the amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to share my concerns over the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's recent regulatory guidance on the ''oilfield exception'' to the agency's ''Hours of Service'' requirements for drivers.

Under the Administration's regulations, specially trained drivers of specially constructed vehicles used to service oil wells do not have to count waiting time at the well site toward their hours of service limit. The new regulatory guidance, however, provides that drivers of support vehicles, such as those used to transport materials and supplies, used directly in the delivery of oil and gas services do not qualify for that same exception. The administration issued this guidance without prior comment, making it effective immediately and requesting comments after the fact.

Support drivers generally work under the exact same conditions as drivers of specially constructed vehicles, including the same periods of idleness while their vehicles are in use at the well site. Many drivers operate specially constructed vehicles one day and other support vehicles the next.

The new guidance creates a different standard for these exact same drivers. When operating a support vehicle, the driver's waiting time counts toward his or her hours of service limit, but when operating a specially constructed vehicle, that idle time does not count.

This double standard will create needless confusion among drivers and dispatchers who will now need to juggle competing rules for drivers depending on the vehicles they're driving on a particular day. In addition, while not applying the waiting time exception to drivers of support vehicles means that it will require more trucks and drivers to be dispatched while others are out of service, increasing truck traffic, especially on rural roads.

Many of our rural roads, particularly in the most active producing areas such as the Marcellus and the Bakken shale, are already struggling under the burden of heavy truck traffic. Adding more heavy vehicles to the roads will not enhance safety no matter how rested the drivers might otherwise be.

When I dealt with this issue with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration in 2006, I thought we had reached an understanding of the industry's oilfield equipment vehicle operations and safety protocols. Unfortunately, the agency's new interpretation undoes this careful compromise.

It is important for the administration to document why it is pursuing this new interpretation and provide that data—if it actually has any—that it is using to support this change. I believe that, at a minimum, the agency should not put this revised guidance into effect until after the public has had a chance to comment and for the agency to consider those comments. The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration should not implement the new administrative interpretation until it provides adequate and complete justification for the changes that it's seeking to make.

Mr. Chairman, I call this regulatory overreach to the attention of the requisite committee so that, while they're doing their oversight of this agency, they can review this interpretation and perhaps add their influence to undoing this overreach.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the salary of any officer or employee of the Federal Highway Administration to implement, administer, or enforce the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.) or Executive Order No. 13186 of January 10, 2001, with respect to, or to determine any action of the Administration to have a significant impact under section 102(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(C))

based on the effect of such action on, the cliff swallow or barn swallow (as listed in section 10.13(c)(1) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations).

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, this may seem like a very simple, straightforward amendment, but we do have an issue in construction.

In the summer all across America, the cliff swallow and the barn swallow, which is a very common migratory bird—this is not an endangered species; it's not even a threatened species; it is a common migratory bird in almost every State in America—they travel back and forth, move around, and they love to nest around man-made objects.

The law states now, currently, that you can't touch a bridge or any kind of construction if that barn swallow or cliff swallow is present there. So during the prime construction time, from early June through September, you can't do construction on many bridges, or construction companies have to hire people to go out and stand around the construction site to wave off the birds to keep them from nesting there to be able to fight this off during the earliest part of the season. There are numerous cases of this.

In my own State of Oklahoma, let me just give you one example of that.

In Ellis County, State Highway 46, they were painting a bridge. Just painting it; no construction, no anything else. The total project was estimated to cost $185,000. Because in the process of going out to check and verify they found a barn swallow there, they had to halt that until after September to come back and paint it. It increased the price of the project $27,000 to set up, realize it's there, tear down, come back, and do it all over again—a 15 percent increase for a painting job.

Now, I say this to say this is not an issue that is going to shape the future of America, but this is one of those issues that does increase the cost of construction over a bird that is not endangered, that is not threatened, that is incredibly common.

Should we honor wildlife? Absolutely. But this dramatically drives up the cost and decreases the amount of construction that we can do in America during prime construction season. I would just suggest that we take just these two species and set them out just for transportation purposes here.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I understand the gentleman's concern, and I'm prepared to accept the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. This is a peculiar amendment, it seems to me.

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act is administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior, so there's no enforcement power in the Department of Transportation. Are there agreements by which the DOT and the Department of the Interior are bound?

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes. Actually, in 2001, the President did Executive Order 13586. That executive order extended that out to all agencies dealing with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. So it does extend this out to the Department of Transportation as well, as well as all their agencies.

Now, if they're going to prosecute, obviously it's going to be the Department of Justice, and the rules are going to be promulgated out of Fish and Wildlife, but all agencies are affected by it based on the executive order from 2001. So we're just trying to take this for transportation only because it is such an issue for much of the transportation across the entire country.

Mr. OLVER. And this was an executive order promulgated by President Clinton or by President Bush?

Mr. LANKFORD. By President Clinton at the very end, in early January of 2001—January 10, actually.

Mr. OLVER. Well, I don't know how this amendment is going to solve the problem that you have exactly, but the chairman has agreed to adopt it. So I will state an objection because I really don't understand how this is going to solve your problem, but I will not go beyond that.

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

□ 2220

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, you have hit the gavel.

I would like to ask unanimous consent to call for a recorded vote on that.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts was on his feet. The request is timely and does not require unanimous consent.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for high-speed rail in the State of California or for the California High-Speed Rail Authority.

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It just basically says, at the end of this bill none of the funds may be used for high-speed rail in California.

California has a project that was supposed to cost $33 billion. The voters in California voted for bonds of $9.9 billion. The Federal Government was supposed to come up with $10 billion, and a private company was supposed to come up with $10 billion. The problem is there is no private investor for the $10 billion; the Federal Government is broke with $16 trillion worth of debt and can't come up with $10 billion; and the State of California can no longer float the bond because their credit rating is so bad.

To compound the matter, it's no longer a $33 million project. It ballooned to $68 billion, then on up to $98 billion. And when talking to Secretary LaHood, he said there's no end in sight, that this is a project that could continue to change as we move forward. In fact, that's what we're actually seeing in California, an initiative that bounces back and forth, $10 billion here or $10 billion there.

So again, this amendment is very simple. It just says none of these funds can be used for high-speed rail.

In California we've got highways that are falling apart, bridges that are falling apart. We need to make sure that our gas tax dollars get used for their intended purpose of actually improving our roads and highways.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, there are no funds made available in this Act for high-speed rail. None. And so, since this is a 1-year bill, I don't think this amendment does very much.

The gentleman from California has a problem with a process that has been going on now for at least a decade in the development of a high-speed rail process program, and the people of California have spoken on this by referendum. They have passed the bond bill by referendum. I think bond bills usually take an extraordinary vote, two-thirds vote or something like that. Am I correct?

Would the gentleman from California confirm that it was a two-thirds vote by which the referendum was passed?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENHAM. Sir, you are correct. And now the voters are two-thirds against the bill by several different polls.

Mr. OLVER. Well, that can be established if they actually have a referendum that repeals what they have done. But there has been—as we know, California has received about $4 billion of moneys from the Federal Government from earlier funds in earlier bills which have already been obligated or are about to be obligated. And actions on this bill would not have anything to do with the obligation of those funds, would not be in effect at any time that could affect the obligation of those funds because they have to be obligated before the end of this fiscal year, where this bill is certainly not going to be in place in before the end of the fiscal year. But there are processes also going on. Unfortunately, we have, at the moment, no one here who is really knowledgeable precisely about what it is that's going on in California.

But let me just comment here that the proposal for the starting use of these funds has been controversial. There are people who say, well, why are we building this in the Central Valley of California? Because the first intended construction of the project has been in the Bakersfield to Fresno corridor, and then if it is extended it is then likely to be extended to the Modesto metropolitan area, or the Stockton—and/or, I think it is at Modesto that there is a bifurcation. The one link of it going then to Stockton and to Sacramento, and the other going to San Jose and San Francisco. And in either case, you have to start somewhere.

When we started to build the interstate highway system, we didn't start in the center of the cities, which would have been very complicated. We started in building those legs of the interstate highway system where it was easy to build them. And that is possible. The right of way, I think, has already been acquired by the California DOT to build the high-speed rail system in that first corridor, in the Bakersfield-Fresno and maybe on to Modesto, as I have understood the developments in the last few weeks as they go on.

So the gentleman's problem is, it seems to me, with what's already been agreed to by California and what is already going forward, moneys that have, some of them been obligated and in place to go, and some of them yet to be obligated, but about to be obligated.

Mr. DENHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. No dispute here on whether or not this bill has any mention of high-speed rail. I would agree. There is no mention of it. And I won't even dispute here tonight whether the President wants to spend more on high-speed rail or whether the Governor wants to spend more money on high-speed rail. That is a different debate.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chair, I will then move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. OLVER. I think I'm doing the correct thing there. And I'll yield, again, for the continuation of what the gentleman from California is saying.

Mr. DENHAM. Thank you sir. Thank you for yielding.

I would agree that the President can come up with more money if he feels that he wants to transfer more stimulus dollars, or we may have another vote, depending on another allocation or appropriation that may want to spend money on high-speed rail.

This amendment says that our gas tax dollars will go back to California to be used for our highways and roads. That's all this amendment does. That's all I intend to do is to make sure that the Governor of California does not take money out of the block grant from the Federal Government that goes into the STF fund to use it for other things such as high-speed rail. The Governor has to use the money where this Federal Government intends it to be used, very simple.

Mr. OLVER. Reclaiming my time, the language of the amendment, as I have it before me, says none of the funds made available by this Act may be used for high-speed rail in the State of California, or for the California High-Speed Rail Authority.

Mr. DENHAM. Correct.

□ 2230

Mr. OLVER. How does that guarantee that California's gas tax moneys will not be used for high-speed rail?

Mr. DENHAM. As Congress, if in this bill we stipulate that none of the funds can be used for high-speed rail, then none of the funds can be used for high-speed rail. I mean, it's a very simple mandate for the Governor: Use the money where it was intended to be used but not for high-speed rail. The language is very simple. That's why we wrote it as one sentence: that none of the funds may be used for high-speed rail.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Is it your impression that what the gentleman is saying is that they can't take highway trust fund money and put it into high-speed rail and that they can't take transit dollars and put it into high-speed rail?

It would be my understanding, since there is no money in the bill for high-speed rail, that he is talking about other pots of money that would go to California and about just trying to wall that off from being used. That's my understanding. Maybe the gentleman has a different interpretation.

Mr. OLVER. At this point, I really don't know whether your understanding is anywhere close to mine. I think this is an amendment deserving of opposition, so I am opposing the amendment. I think this amendment should not be adopted, and you can do as you wish.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANDRY

Mr. LANDRY. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate or implement any regulations that would mandate global positioning system (GPS) tracking, electronic on-board recording devices, or event data recorders in passenger or commercial motor vehicles.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANDRY. I am honored to join my distinguished colleagues, Ranking Member RAHALL, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. TOM GRAVES, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, on this amendment.

Our bipartisan amendment prohibits any funds under this act to be used to implement any administration mandate for global positioning systems, electronic onboard recorders, or event data recording devices on both passenger and commercial vehicles.

Madam Chairman, the Department of Transportation has become obsessed with electronically monitoring vehicle movements. Right now, the DOT is working on a mandate which would require that every car have a device which is very similar to an airplane's black box. Additionally, they are working on another mandate which would require that trucks carry an electronic onboard recorder. Even the name sounds scary. These devices would record and transmit data when the truck is in use.

This regulation is so costly that even President Obama has singled it out as a regulation which needs more study. He did so because it is estimated that the mandate will cost the trucking industry at least $1 billion to implement.

Madam Chairman, the truckers in my district cannot afford this cost. I know some companies like these devices. That's great. They can put them in their trucks voluntarily. However, just because a few companies like the devices, we should not mandate that everyone use them. For this reason, I

hope the House will adopt this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I withdraw my reservation of the point of order, and I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I appreciate very much the gentleman's concern on this amendment. I think his timing is, maybe, unfortunate. This is a major issue in the reauthorization bill that, hopefully, is going to be filed tonight. This issue will be dealt with. It truly is an authorizing issue that should not be on this bill.

So, while I may share some concerns with the gentleman, I certainly don't think it's appropriate on this bill, especially at this moment when the highway bill is being filed and when, hopefully, this issue will be resolved in that bill.

With that and with some reservation, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, unfortunately.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I think that what the chairman has said is probably about as good as it gets.

What we have now is a slightly amended version of the proposal. My understanding is that the major long-distance trucking companies are against this language and that most of the safety advocates are against this language but that there are other trucking interests that favor this language or that are happy with this language. So you have a real controversy among people.

Of the long-distance truckers and safety advocates, I would generally think that that is something we should worry about; but as the chairman has said, this is an issue that really ought to be in the hands of the authorizers and worked out by the authorizers. That may or may not be dealt with in the authorization legislation, but in any case, the limitation on funds is effective only for this 1-year appropriations bill.

Mr. LANDRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LANDRY. I have heard from some of my colleagues and outside groups, and they would argue that this is not the time to have this debate.

But if not now, when? When will we publicly debate the issue? We are waiting on a conference report of which we know not what's in it. So this is the time. I would argue that this is the time for us to have that debate.

To be clear, just because a few big companies in this country want these types of devices, what about the small business owners out there that everyone on both sides of the aisle continually come to this mic and propose that they support when our actions of opposing this amendment would say to the big corporations, ''I'm with you,'' and to the little guys, ''I'm not''?

Mr. OLVER. In reclaiming my time, maybe the gentleman understands and I simply do not.

Who is about to promulgate regulations in this area of mandating global positioning systems, electronic on-board recording devices and so forth? Where is the action to do that? Where is the problem here?

Mr. LANDRY. In the Department of Transportation, is my understanding.

□ 2240

Mr. OLVER. My very competent staff tells me that we have been requiring this in the Mexican trucking controversy over the past few years.

We've been fighting over that one back and forth for years and years now, and I can't remember whether there was or wasn't that sort of thing there. I don't remember it having come up before at any point.

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairwoman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to implement any rule or regulation that expressly prohibits an owner or landlord of housing from using a criminal conviction to deny housing to an applicant for such housing.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, this amendment is very limited and straightforward to deal with a problem that we've started getting a lot of calls from Realtors in our district, as I'm sure many of my colleagues across the country are receiving, as well as property owners who own apartment units and other types of housing that are rented out.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has recently come out with a rule called the ''disparity impact rule,'' and it's not a final rule that has been issued yet. We're just trying to make a narrow clarification that would allow property owners to be able to check and make sure that if somebody has a criminal conviction that that person could be prevented from moving into an apartment complex, for example, where you've got single mothers with young children.

Every single day in this country, property owners use background checks to check on criminal records of people that are applying for housing. This has nothing to do with violations of the Fair Housing Act. It's just a basic common practice that property owners use every day to make sure that somebody that's looking to move into housing doesn't have a criminal record. Some property owners can look at that, and some property owners can choose not to be concerned about that. But many millions of property owners across the country do look at whether or not somebody has got a criminal conviction in determining whether or not they will rent them housing. It's not only to protect the property owner who has in many cases hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions of dollars, invested in that property, but also to protect the other residents who are renting property at that apartment.

So this new rule that's come out jeopardizes the ability of those property owners to look and make sure that somebody doesn't have a criminal conviction on their record. What this amendment would do would just ensure that if the Department of Housing and Urban Development goes forward with this rule, that the rule won't prevent somebody from using a tool that has been in the hands of property owners for generations just to make sure that somebody doesn't have a criminal conviction when they're moving into this housing unit that they own.

Again, I will use the example of a sex offender. There are sex offenders in most States, including my State of Louisiana. There are strict requirements of what somebody has to comply with if they're a convicted sex offender. They have to register, and they have to do a lot of other things. But if somebody doesn't comply with that law—and there are always cases we find of people who don't comply with that law—you don't know if when you're renting property to somebody whether or not they are a sex offender. But if you choose to do that background check and see if they've got that criminal conviction on their record, then you can say: Wait a minute, you're not coming into my apartment complex and jeopardizing the safety of those young children that already rent from me because we're going to make sure that if you've got that background check that shows that you're a sex offender, you're going to be denied.

Yet this new rule jeopardizes their ability to carry out what is a basic enforcement mechanism that property owners all across the country use every day to protect their properties. We just want to make sure that as it relates to

criminal convictions, that property owners can continue to look at that and make sure that that is something that they're not going to be found in violation of a law if they use that mechanism.

This is a simple amendment. I would urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HERRERA BEUTLER

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to build flood protection walls for Interstate 5 between mile posts 72-82 in Lewis County, Washington.

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Chairman, the reason I bring this amendment to the desk is because there are families, there are businesses, moms and dads in Lewis County on I–5 that have experienced devastating flooding. In fact, at one of my meetings back there, I met a wonderful older woman who has lived in that county for decades, and she said to me, Honey, when it starts to rain outside, I get terrified. I don't know if I should put all my valuables in the attic and I should leave the house. That's because in 2007, Madam Chairman, this county experienced devastating flooding. And every time it rains, the residents wonder if this is going to be the next catastrophic flood that they lose their businesses, lose their homes, and that devastates families.

Our State legislature and locals in the community in Lewis County have been seeking a basin-wide solution to flood protection. The Army Corps of Engineers has spent decades studying this issue, and the time of the study is over. We also need a solution that isn't going to wall off the twin cities in Lewis County by erecting an 11-mile levee that basically turns those cities into a bathtub.

With this amendment, I was seeking to prohibit that bathtub effect, so to speak, so as to protect the businesses and the families and the commerce that take place. We can come up with a better solution. However, Madam Chairman, because this is such an important issue, and I want to make sure that we do this right, I'm going to withdraw my amendment at this time.

Actually before I do so, Madam Chairman, would it be possible to ask a question of the subcommittee chairman?

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. LATHAM. I understand the concerns you have, and I would look forward to working with you as we get towards conference to try and address your concerns on this very important issue, obviously, for your constituents and would be pleased to be of any kind of assistance we possibly could.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With that, I withdraw my amendment, Madam Chairman, and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

□ 2250

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I believe we are coming to the end here, and I just want to make a couple of comments.

As far as the gentleman from Massachusetts, once again, this will be his last appropriation bill on the floor as the ranking member and a former chairman of this subcommittee. Mr. OLVER has done an outstanding job over the years. We don't always agree on everything. Do we, JOHN? But we work very, very well together. And I just want to wish you and your wife the best.

You are a great partner and someone who I admire very, very much—your intelligence, your ability to look in detail at programs. And we kid each other—or I kid Mr. OLVER a lot about maybe having debates inside his mind sometimes in committee. But he's always extraordinarily thoughtful and someone, again, that I admire very, very much.

Madam Chairman, we've been through a 2-day process here. We have gone through a lot of amendments. I believe that we are to the point where we can bring this effort to a conclusion.

And I would, again, thank Mr. OLVER, thank the staff, the professional staff on both sides, on the majority and on the minority side, for doing such an outstanding job. Working together is very difficult sometimes on these bills. Also, in my office, Doug Bobbitt does such a fabulous job working on this bill for me. But I just want to say thank you to everyone.

Madam Chairwoman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

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

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1380.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Hahn moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to agree to the freight policy provisions in Sec. 1115, Sec. 33002, Sec. 33003, and Sec. 33005 of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

My motion to instruct the conferees would be in favor of the Senate language as it relates to freight and goods movement. It would authorize a national freight plan, national surface transportation and freight policy, and a port infrastructure development initiative.

We have all heard that the conference report is close to being filed. I have also heard that the Senate freight provisions are not in the final agreement. I want to come to the floor tonight and make one last attempt to ensure that our country has a national freight policy.

Madam Speaker, the Port of Los Angeles is in my backyard; and when I was on the city council in Los Angeles, I focused on transporting the goods that arrive in the port to the rest of the Nation. When I came to Congress almost a year ago, I was surprised that there was not enough attention on our ports, and I was surprised that we didn't even have a ports caucus. So I cofounded the bipartisan Ports Caucus with my good friend, TED POE from Texas, to educate the rest of our Members on the importance of our ports and goods movement to our Nation's economy. So first, for those who don't know what ''goods movement'' is, I would like to talk about why it's crucial for our Nation.

We are a consumer economy. Whether it is a mom-and-pop store on the corner or a large retailer like Target, we don't think twice when we go to these store to purchase groceries, toys for our children or clothing. When we go to the store, we expect that the milk and the Barbie dolls are on the shelf.

Simply, goods movement is transporting products, whether they are made in America or imported through our Nation's ports to retail stores. The goods that are transported throughout the country are transported by freight rail, trucks and, in some cases, waterways. The efficient transportation of these goods is crucial for our economy. We need to invest in all modes of transportation for freight, including roads, rail, and grade crossings to reduce bottlenecks.

But, Madam Speaker, this Nation does not focus enough resources on freight policy and goods movement. We don't have a national freight plan to guide us. According to Robert Puentes at the Brookings Institute:

> The Nation has no comprehensive strategy or plan for the maintenance and development of transportation assets related to international freight movement. The country's freight transportation industry is highly decentralized, with private operators owning almost all of the trucks and rails, and the public sector owning the roads, airports, and waterway rights. And unlike our international peers, such as Germany, Canada, and Australia, the United States doesn't have a unified strategy that aligns disparate owners and interests around national economic objectives.

Madam Speaker, without a national plan, we have bottlenecks transporting our goods. For example, goods that leave the Port of Los Angeles take 48 hours to arrive in Chicago and take another 30 hours to travel across the city. What does this bottleneck and others like it mean? It means higher costs for consumers, more congestion, more pollution, and fewer jobs.

□ 2300

We need to stop this piecemeal system and develop a national plan. It's so crucial that we develop this plan now because the amount of freight will increase drastically in the next 20 years. In southern California, it is expected to triple.

In addition, this administration wants to double the exports by 2014. And I think we need to have an efficient system to export our products overseas. This will provide opportunities for our small businesses. And we need to prepare for that increase. According to the Federal Highway Administration, the U.S. surface transportation network, which includes rail and highway, is reaching or has reached capacity in many areas. The congestion largely stems from the lack of capacity to meet traffic demand and lack of infrastructure.

A U.S. Department of Transportation report, ''Freight Transportation Improvements and the Economy,'' estimates the cost of carrying freight on the highway system at between $25 and $200 an hour. Unexpected delays can increase the cost of transporting goods by 50 to 250 percent. Because the supply chain is a ''network of retailers, distributors, transporters, storage facilities, and suppliers that participate in the sale, delivery, and production of a particular product,'' congestion resulting in unreliable trip times and missed deliveries can have major business implications, which adds cost at every link of the supply chain.

If the transportation function is efficient, manufacturing and retail firms can carry less inventory because they can rely on goods being delivered when and where they are needed. If the transportation system is congested and unreliable, a firm must carry more inventory to ensure production processes are uninterrupted and the availability of goods is maintained.

Carrying inventory is not free. Not only is a firm's capital tied up in the inventory, but it must be stored and insured. This model of business carrying more inventories to buffer transportation unreliability costs money to the companies and ultimately to the consumer.

One of the reasons that I like working on ports and freight policy is because it's a bipartisan issue. It's something we can find common middle ground on. For example, Bob Poole of the libertarian Reason Foundation stated:

> Goods-movement infrastructure has not gotten enough attention in recent decades, either at the Federal level or in the transportation plans of urban area Metropolitan Planning Organizations. The larger question before us is what the Federal Government's direct role should be.

Mr. Poole continues:

> Despite my general decentralist leanings, I agree that facilitating free flow of commerce—with the world and among States—is one of the tasks the Constitution gives to the Federal Government. I'm favorable to the idea of the Federal Government making strategic investments in critical corridors and key nodes in the goods-movement system. And obviously, this needs to involve all the modes that make economic sense for shippers to move cargo.

What organizations support a national freight plan? In addition to many transportation and port organizations, a national freight plan is supported by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Retail Federation. The Chamber of Commerce recently sent a letter this month to the conference committee stating:

> The reliable and timely movement of goods is critical to U.S. economic health. Unfortunately, the condition and capacity of the transportation system has failed to keep up with the growth in trade volume and freight movement. Congestion caused by bottlenecks threaten to choke future economic growth. The Chamber believes the Senate-passed bill includes strong provisions to establish a freight program that would improve regional and national freight movement by targeting investments and improvements that would demonstrably facilitate the movement of freight, such as truck-only lanes, railway-highway grade separations, and improvements to freight intermodal connectors.

As part of the Freight Stakeholders Coalition, the retailers stated:

> Substantial investment in the Nation's freight transportation system must be given a high priority. Without the ability to quickly and cost-effectively move goods into, out of, and through the United States, America will not be able to maintain our high standard of living and high employment levels.

I also have letters of support from the American Trucking Association and the American Association of Port Authorities in support of this motion, as well as many other supporters.

We all know that congestion—especially truck congestion on our highways—causes air pollution. In my part of the country, South Coast Air Quality Management District said that diesel emissions are responsible for 71 percent of the major pollutants in the region. This means more asthma in our children and more cancer. Eliminating congestion will help improve air quality and our Nation's health.

Also, America's farmers would benefit from a national freight policy. Not only do America's farmers provide food in our grocery stores and on our table, but they feed the world as well. America is the world's bread basket. The U.S. is the world's top wheat exporter. And all that grain needs to be transported from America's heartland to our ports. It is crucial that we have the infrastructure to transport our goods from California or the Midwest to export them.

In conclusion, last week, the PORTS Caucus met with Transportation Secretary LaHood. He said the Department was beginning to plan a national freight policy but that Congress needed to prioritize goods movement. This is our chance. The last transportation bill was passed 7 years ago. We cannot wait another 7 years before we make a national commitment and a priority for a freight policy in this country.

I urge my colleagues to vote for my motion, and I reserve the balance of my time.

AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS,
Arlington, VA, June 27, 2012.

Hon. JANICE HAHN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN HAHN: The American Trucking Associations would like to express our strong support for your motion to instruct conferees to support MAP–21's freight provisions. In particular, ATA believes that full funding for the National Freight Program in Sec. 1115 is an essential step toward addressing the nation's most critical freight transportation bottlenecks. Approximately 60% of the U.S. economy moves on the back of trucks, and inefficiencies in major truck routes will negatively affect economic output and job creation. We are pleased that MAP–21 recognizes the critical importance of efficient freight networks by focusing a portion of available funding on highway freight projects, and we join you in urging the conference committee to retain the Sec. 1115 program and other important freight-related elements of MAP–21.

Thank you for your support of these provisions. We hope to be of continuing assistance throughout the reauthorization process.

Sincerely,

Bill Graves.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PORT AUTHORITIES,
Alexandria, VA, June 27, 2012.

Hon. JANICE HAHN,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: We write this letter today to voice the American Association of Port Authorities' (AAPA) strong support for your motion to instruct the conferees to agree to the freight policy provisions in MAP 21. AAPA promotes the common interests of the port community and provides leadership on trade, transportation, environmental and other issues related to port development and operations. The creation of a national freight policy is one of AAPA's top policy goals for surface transportation authorization. These provisions are important to seaports' ability to efficiently connect America to the global economy and help our nation plan for future freight growth. A recent Corps of Engineers study noted that over the next 30 years, the U.S. population is expected to increase 32 percent, while imports should increase fourfold and exports (so critical to our economic growth) are projected to see a sevenfold increase. These freight provisions are important to our ability to plan for this increased trade and avoid gridlock.

AAPA urges Congress to support the provisions in MAP 21 which provide for a national freight program and policy in the surface transportation authorization bill. Freight and goods movement often cross state lines and are best planned for in more comprehensive ways. This transportation bill aims to reform our transportation programs and including freight is critical to developing a system focused on the needs of the future.

Now more than ever, the needs of our goods movement network must be addressed as system use continues to grow in lockstep with America's recovering economy. The inclusion of a national freight plan with supporting policies, strategy and funding will help ensure America's international competitiveness, create jobs and bolster the U.S. economic recovery.

Thank you for your consideration of these important issues.

Sincerely,

KURT J. NAGLE.

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

This motion instructs conferees to the surface transportation reauthorization conference to agree to several provisions in the Senate bill relating to freight policy. As I'm sure you're aware, the conferees and their staffs have been working around the clock, and it is our hope to file a bipartisan, bicameral agreement as soon as possible. This agreement is aimed to tackle serious issues facing the infrastructure of the United States, which is the utmost importance to the stability and future growth of the American economy.

As soon as it's filed, I encourage the gentlewoman from California to review the conference report and take special note of the freight policy language that a majority of the House and majority of the Senate conferees chose to include.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAHN. I appreciate my colleague from California saying that. But, again, I have letters of support from major organizations who felt like the freight policy language was not as good as the Senate bill. Just to make clear, the freight policy in the Senate bill does not increase the total cost of the bill. And by leaving the provisions that I talked about out of the final bill, we're not reducing the cost of the bill, and we're not reducing the deficit.

I just think the Senate language really sets forth something that I think we've never done in this country, and that's really to prioritize and to understand the importance of moving forward and being competitive in this global economy and establishing once and for all a comprehensive freight policy that will put goods-movement at a level that I think it should be.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. I am prepared to close if the gentlelady is prepared to yield back.

Ms. HAHN. I am ready to close, too. The hour is late. For those of you watching C–SPAN, it's nearing the final hour of the day. It's past 11 p.m. But I really did feel like one of the reasons I did come to Congress was to raise the level of importance of our ports, of goods movement, of cargo, what it means to this economy, what it means to jobs, and I just wanted to give it one last shot that we might instruct the conferees to include what I think is the better language in the final transportation bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2310

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I will just close by saying that I can appreciate the gentlewoman from California's passion on this issue. I, too, see the great ports of California and throughout the Nation and the need to have an overall freight policy, and I look forward to working with her in the future on this very important issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 33. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act.

H.R. 2297. An act to promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3187. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs nd biosimilars, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 28, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first and second quarters of 2012 pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO QATAR, AFGHANISTAN, AND HUNGARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 10 AND MAY 15, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/11	5/12	Qatar		233.74		(3)				233.74
Hon. Jean Schmidt	5/11	5/12	Qatar		339.74		(3)				339.74
Hon. Anna Eshoo	5/11	5/12	Qatar		339.74		(3)				339.74
Hon. Carolyn Maloney	5/11	5/12	Qatar		339.74		(3)				339.74
Hon. Terri Sewell	5/11	5/12	Qatar		339.74		(3)				339.74
Dr. Brian Monahan	5/11	5/12	Qatar		220.74		(3)				220.74
Wyndee Parker	5/11	5/12	Qatar		309.74		(3)				309.74
Drew Hammill	5/11	5/12	Qatar		339.74		(3)				339.74
Bridget Fallon	5/11	5/13	Qatar		679.48		1,341.55				2,021.03
Bina Surgeon	5/11	5/13	Qatar		679.48		1,341.55				2,021.03
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan				(3)				
Hon. Jean Schmidt	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(3)				28.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(3)				28.00
Hon. Carolyn Maloney	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(3)				28.00
Hon. Terri Sewell	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(3)				28.00
Dr. Brian Monahan	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(3)				28.00
Wyndee Parker	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(3)				28.00
Drew Hammill	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(3)				28.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/13	5/15	Hungary		389.10		(3)				389.10
Hon. Jean Schmidt	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(3)				506.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(3)				506.00
Hon. Carolyn Maloney	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(3)				506.00
Hon. Terri Sewell	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(3)				506.00
Dr. Brian Monahan	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(3)				506.00
Wyndee Parker	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(3)				506.00
Drew Hammill	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(3)				506.00
Bridget Fallon	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(3)				506.00
Bina Surgeon	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(3)				506.00
Committee total											11,644.08

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, June 9, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate, and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SAM GRAVES, Chairman, June 7, 2012.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6658. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Killed, nonviable Streptomyces acidiscabies strain RL-110T; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0078; FRL-9348-7] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6659. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Richard K. Gallagher, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6660. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirements of Rear Admiral (lower half) Craig S. Faller and Captain Dwight D. Shepherd, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral and rear admiral (lower half), respectively; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6661. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''2010 Impact and Effectiveness of Administration for Native Americans (ANA) Projects Report''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6662. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting annual financial report as required by the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act of 2008 for FY 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6663. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting fiscal year 2011 Performance Report to Congress for the Animal Drug User Fee Act, as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6664. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to Federal Implementation Plans to Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0491; FRL-9672-4] (RIN: 2060-AR35) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6665. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Regional Haze [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0080; FRL-9638-3] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6666. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Permit to Construct Exemptions [EPA-R03-2010-0394; FRL-9684-9] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6667. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Regional Haze [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0037; FRL-9683-5] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6668. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0091, EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0584; FRL-9685-2] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6669. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Illinois; Redesignation of the Illinois Portion of the St. Louis, MO-IL Area to Attainment for the 1997 8-hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0523; FRL-9683-7] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6670. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arizona; Update to Stage II Gasoline Vapor Recovery Program; Change in the Definition of ''Gasoline'' to Exclude ''E85'' [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0717; FRL-9661-3] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6671. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Minor New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Rule for Cotton Gins [EPA-R06-OAR-2005-NM-0008; FRL-9684-5] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6672. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Arizona; Attainment Plan for 1997 8-hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0253; FRL-9682-5] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6673. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Control of Air Pollution From Aircraft and Aircraft Engines; Emission Standards and Test Procedures [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0687; FRL-9678-1] (RIN: 2060-AO70) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6674. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Failure to Attain by 2005 and Determination of Current Attainment of the 1-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards in the Baltimore Nonattainment Area in Maryland [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0680; FRL-9685-5] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6675. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Arizona; Pinal County; PM10 [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0491; FRL-9679-7] received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6676. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Direct Final Negative Declaration and Withdrawal of Large Municipal Waste Combustors State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Illinois [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0312; FRL-9679-6] received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6677. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Elemental Mercury Used in Barometers, Manometers, Hygrometers, and Psychrometers; Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2010-0630; FRL-9345-9] (RIN: 2070-AJ71) received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6678. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Heavy-Duty Highway Program: Revisions for Emergency Vehicles [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-1032; FRL-9673-1] (RIN: A2060-AR54) received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6679. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Alternative for the Motor Vehicle Air Conditioning Sector under the Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP) Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0488; FRL-9668-8] (RIN: 2060-AM54) received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6680. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule on a Certain Chemical Substance; Withdrawal of Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-0942; FRL-9350-3] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6681. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Safety Evaluation for Topical Report WCAP-17236-NP, Revision 0, ''Risk-Informed Extension of the Reactor Vessel Nozzle Inservice Inspection Interval'' received June 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6682. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 12-25, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6683. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 12-23, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6684. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 5 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6685. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a declaration of a national emergency with respect to blocking the property of the Government of the Russian Federation, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(b); (H. Doc. No. 112—119); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6686. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-380, ''District Department of Transportation Grant Authority Temporary Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6687. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-384, ''Youth Bulling Prevention Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6688. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2011 to March 1, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6689. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6690. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting pursuant to Title II, Section 203, of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act (No FEAR Act), the Department's annual report for FY 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6691. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2011, through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6692. A letter from the General Counsel and Acting Executive Director, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6693. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General of the Federal Labor Relations Board for the period beginning October 1, 2011 and ending March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6694. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6695. A letter from the Executive Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, transmitting the Commission's audited Seventy-First Financial Statement for the period of October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2011 pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6696. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6697. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Award Fee for Service and End-Item Contracts (RIN: 2700-AD70) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Legislative Review and Oversight Activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs During the 112th Congress (Rept. 112–552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NUGENT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 708. Resolution relating to the consideration of House Report 112–546 and an accompanying resolution, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 706) authorizing the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas. (Rept. 112–553). 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. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr.

WATT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 6029. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for increased penalties for foreign and economic espionage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 6030. A bill to provide a temporary tax credit for increased payroll, to eliminate certain tax benefits for major integrated oil companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 6031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the production and investment tax credits for wind facilities and to modify the foreign tax credit rules applicable to major integrated oil companies which are dual capacity taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 6032. A bill to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 6033. A bill to provide for research and education to improve screening, detection and diagnosis of prostate cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. STARK, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 6034. A bill to provide for the establishment of a task force to conduct a study to analyze the challenges faced by agricultural areas and rural communities designated as an area having special flood hazards for purposes of the National Flood Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. RICHARDSON (for herself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 6035. A bill to promote permanent families for children, privacy and safety for unwed mothers, responsible fatherhood, and security for adoptive parents by establishing a National Responsible Father Registry and encouraging States to enter into agreements to contribute the information contained in the State's Responsible Father Registry to the National Responsible Father Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 6036. A bill to require a report by the Secretary of State on whether the Haqqani Network meets the criteria for designation as a foreign terrorist organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado (for himself and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 6037. A bill to include focusing on credit availability in the mission of each Federal banking regulator, to provide insured depository institutions with certain amortization authority and authority to include allowances for loan and lease losses when calculating the institution's capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. CHU, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. DICKS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FARR, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KISSELL, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 6038. A bill to strengthen the role of the United States in the international community of nations in conserving natural resources to further global prosperity and security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 6039. A bill to preserve the Green Mountain Lookout in the Glacier Peak Wilderness of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KELLY, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RIVERA, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 6040. A bill to approve the Agreement providing terms for a continuation of the free association between the United States and Palau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 6041. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall require the disclosure of political contributions as a condition of accepting bids for oil and gas leases of Federal onshore and offshore lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 6042. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to reform the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 6043. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Social Security Act to extend health information technology assistance eligibility to behavioral health, mental health, and substance abuse professionals and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 6044. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to accept voluntary services from veterans and veterans service organizations at national cemeteries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 6045. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to reauthorize the juvenile accountability block grants program through fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 6046. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, 37, and 38 of the United States Code, to add a definition of spouse for purposes of military personnel policies and military and veteran benefits that recognizes new State definitions of spouse; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DENT, Ms. CHU, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 709. A resolution welcoming His Holiness, Hadhrat Mirza Masroor Ahmad, the worldwide spiritual and administrative head of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, to Washington, DC, and recognizing his commitment to world peace, justice, nonviolence, human rights, religious freedom, and democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H. Res. 710. A resolution congratulating Ichiro Suzuki, outfielder for the Seattle Mariners, for becoming the third fastest player in the history of Major League Baseball to amass 2,500 hits; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 6029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 6030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 6031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 6032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power of Congress to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress and the Executive Branch), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States) of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 6033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 6034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 6035.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 6036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill relates to matters concerning the foreign policy and national security of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in pertinent part, that ''Congress shall have power ... to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States''; ''. . . to raise and support armies. . .''; ''To provide and maintain a Navy''; ''To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces''; and ''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 6037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authorities on which this bill rests is:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution

This states that ''Congress shall have power to . . . regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.'' The power to regulate commerce among the several states is the power to define conditions and rules for commercial transactions, and the regulation of the prices and terms of sale. Establishing regulations which govern the monetary policies federal banking regulators dictate financial institutions must follow, and the interactions between those regulators and institutions, affects the ability of these institutions to conduct business transactions with clients among the several states, and thus falls under the commerce clause.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 6038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 6039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.''

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 6040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 6041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 6042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 18, Clause 8;

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, commonly referred to for this purpose as the Commerce Clause, which states the following: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 6044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1; Section 8; Clauses 12, 13, 14, 18.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 6045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution; and

Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 6046.

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 of the United States Constitution and in pursuit of the Equal Protection Clause found in section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 32: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 94: Mr. PITTS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 192: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 265: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 273: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 303: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 345: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 350: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 459: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PITTS, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 547: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 733: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BUERKLE, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 860: Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 890: Mr. BONNER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 894: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 904: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 905: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 997: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1048: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 1054: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1111: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1244: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1325: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1394: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1404: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1416: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1464: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1475: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1519: Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1546: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1621: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1639: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1733: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1755: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1792: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1860: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1903: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2032: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 2082: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2139: Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 2194: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 2198: Mr. PAUL and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 2200: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2299: Mr. HURT.

H.R. 2304: Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 2418: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 2479: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2492: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2505: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2655: Mr. GUTHRIE and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2672: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2758: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2812: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2861: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2962: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2963: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2980: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2997: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 3000: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3086: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3187: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. REED, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 3192: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 3364: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3395: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3423: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 3458: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3522: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3586: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 3605: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 3612: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3618: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 3619: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3658: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 3682: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 3762: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3767: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3798: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 3803: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 3816: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 3832: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 3984: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4004: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 4062: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4066: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 4155: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 4192: Mr. COHEN and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4236: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4238: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4296: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4306: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 4318: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4321: Mr. PETERS .
H.R. 4323: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 4326: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4342: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 4345: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 4367: Mr. KLINE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4373: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4405: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 4470: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4643: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4740: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4972: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5129: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5542: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 5646: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 5684: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 5707: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 5717: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 5741: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 5796: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 5799: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 5822: Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 5864: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5873: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 5879: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 5881: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 5893: Mr. LANCE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 5910: Mr. OWENS and Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 5916: Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 5924: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 5939: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 5942: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 5943: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 5951: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 5953: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 5957: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 5959: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 5960: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5976: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5978: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 5998: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 6009: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 6016: Mr. SCHILLING.
H.R. 6019: Mr. REYES and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 6028: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.J. Res. 69: Mr. CARNEY.
H.J. Res. 90: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. REYES.
H.J. Res. 110: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. AKIN.
H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. TURNER of New York.
H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. OLSON.
H. Res. 134: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 298: Mr. REYES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GUINTA, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 351: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 397: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H. Res. 475: Mr. SCALISE.
H. Res. 662: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 672: Mr. WELCH.
H. Res. 689: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BACA, Mr. HIMES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BOREN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WATT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
H. Res. 694: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. HAHN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Res. 701: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H. Res. 702: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 1380: Mr. LANDRY.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 2012 No. 98

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.

Father in Heaven, we proclaim Your greatness for what You have done, are doing, and will do. Thank You for Your generosity to us. Lord, we are grateful to live in a nation where we can worship You in spirit and truth according to the dictates of our conscience. Thank You for protecting this land we love, for guiding its leadership, and for abiding in us by Your Holy Spirit.

Give our Senators this day the wisdom to take advantage of the opportunities You give to make a substantive difference in a needy world. Use them to alleviate the suffering of the marginalized and to cause justice to roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream. Give our lawmakers today a deeper reverence for You.

We pray in Your sacred 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, June 27, 2012.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SMALL BUSINESS JOBS AND TAX RELIEF ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 341, S. 2237.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 341, S. 2237, a bill to provide a temporary income tax credit for increased payroll and extend bonus depreciation for an additional year, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, the next hour will be equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and Republicans controlling the final half. We will continue to debate flood insurance. I hope we can reach an agreement to complete action on this bill. We also need to consider the transportation and the student loan extensions before the end of this week.

There are a lot of things going on on Capitol Hill today. We have been in touch with the Speaker's office. Our staffs have been meeting. When we come to these kinds of bills, the Finance Committee is extremely important. And Senator BAUCUS and I have had many meetings with him and conversations with him. The Senator is key to getting everything done. He is needed on the highway bill, he is needed on the flood insurance bill, and he is needed in student loans. He realizes that and has a tremendous obligation and burden to bear, but he always comes through. He has a good relationship with his counterpart in the House, DAVID CAMP.

I am cautiously optimistic we can end this week tomorrow even, with a little bit of luck, but we may not be able to. We have to see what happens in the next 24 hours, which will be key.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Monday's U.S. Supreme Court decision striking most of the unconstitutional Arizona immigration law reaffirms something most of us already knew: the onus is on Congress to repair our broken system. No one denies that the system is broken. But in the 40 hours since the Supreme Court's ruling, Republicans have engaged in revisionist history to explain why it has taken so long to fix it.

Here are the facts. When Democrats brought a comprehensive immigration reform bill to the floor in 2007, Republicans filibustered the legislation. This legislation was led by Senator MCCAIN and Senator Kennedy, among others. The Republicans filibustered this legislation even though Republican President Bush supported it. They twice filibustered the DREAM Act, which would allow children brought to the United States by their parents to go to college, serve in the military, and work toward citizenship.

Democrats have done everything that is humanly possible to pass comprehensive immigration reform. We have been trying to do it for years. Two Congresses ago, we spent more time on immigration on the floor than any other issue, and we were spending that time because we were being slow-walked by the Republicans.

● 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 Republicans are divided on this issue; we are not. Ninety percent of Democrats support comprehensive immigration reform and, of course, the DREAM Act. Everytime Democrats offer to work together on comprehensive immigration reform, even bringing to the floor bipartisan ideas originally proposed by Republicans, the other side finds an excuse not to support the change.

On the floor today is the senior Senator from Illinois, the assistant majority leader. He was one of the pushers of the DREAM Act. He had with him two Republican Senators who were pushing just as hard, but those two Senators have disappeared in supporting the legislation. Yet Republicans blame Democrats for inaction. Well, they cannot have it both ways—they cannot blame Democrats for not passing a bipartisan immigration bill when they are the ones who blocked the bill.

Moving forward, Congress has two things in its favor. Thanks to President Obama's decisive action, the specter of deportation no longer hangs over the heads of 800,000 young men and women brought to the country as children. And the Supreme Court offered yet another affirmation that a long-term fix for a broken immigration system must come from Congress and not from the States.

Now is not the time for Republicans to continue this harangue that they have had: It is not our fault. It is time for them to work with us for a reasonable solution, one that continues to secure our borders, punishes unscrupulous employers who exploit immigrants and undercut American wages, improves our dysfunctional legal immigration system, and finally requires the 11 million people who are undocumented to register with the government, pay fines, taxes, learn English, and then they do not go to the front of the line, they go to the back of the line. They do this in order to change their status. If my Republican colleagues truly care about changing the status quo, they should step forward now and work with Democrats, not criticize from the sidelines. Unfortunately, Republicans who once favored a permanent solution for America's broken immigration system are deserting efforts to find common ground.

The only decisive Republican voice on this issue today seems to be from Mitt Romney, who has called the unconstitutional Arizona law the ''model for the Nation.'' That is what he said. He has also promised to veto the DREAM Act. He said that, I didn't. Democrats believe that the kind of institutionalized racism in the Arizona law is hardly the ''model for reform'' in a country that stands for liberty and justice for all. We believe upstanding young people who have never known any home but the United States of America should be able to go to college, fight for their country, and contribute to society, not face deportation. But at least we know where Mitt Romney stands on those issues, even if we disagree with him. He is for vetoing the DREAM Act, and he believes the Arizona law is the ''model'' for our country. That is really too bad.

As long as Republicans remain unwilling to vote for comprehensive, bipartisan immigration reform, we will remain at an impasse. I want my Republican colleagues to know this: As soon as they are willing to join us to craft a commonsense legislative solution that is tough, fair, and practical, we are ready to join them.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the following hour will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. DURBIN. Let me follow up on what the majority leader spoke to on the issue of immigration because this is the right time to bring it up.

I had several meetings yesterday that were as touching emotionally as anything I have witnessed as a Senator. They were students who came from all over the United States of America to walk peacefully in front of the Supreme Court. They were DREAMers, undocumented students who have attended schools or are attending colleges and schools in America. They are not asking for special treatment, they are asking for a chance—a chance to earn their way into the only country they have ever called home.

These poor kids out there literally have no country. They were brought here to the United States as babies and infants. They did not have a choice in the matter. They were packed into a car or onto a bus. They grew up in America. As Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey often says—he comes to the floor and reminds us that these kids put their hands on their hearts and they pledge allegiance to flags every day. They only know one national anthem: America's. They are just asking for a chance to be part of this country.

Eleven years ago, I introduced a bill called the DREAM Act. It was a bipartisan bill, as Senator REID said. Senator ORRIN HATCH of Utah was my cosponsor. In fact, we had words over who would be the lead sponsor. I bowed in his direction because he was the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I felt, well, that will help us pass the bill. Sadly, today there are only a handful of Republican Senators who will even vote for it and virtually none who openly sponsor it at this moment. What has happened in 11 years? These kids have not changed. Their problems are the same. The country has not changed; it is still a nation of immigrants. Yet the Republican Party has decided it has no use for this approach. There are exceptions. I thank those exceptions.

Senator DICK LUGAR of Indiana, a courageous man, 2 years ago wrote a letter with me to President Obama asking him to give temporary protected status to the DREAM Act students. I called Senator LUGAR the morning of that announcement, on June 15, to thank him for his courage. It is rare, and it should be recognized. In his case, I believe it will be recognized by many.

Senator LISA MURKOWSKI of Alaska voted with me on the DREAM Act. That was a courageous move on her part. I thanked her for it. She is a very independent person. She said that there are Hispanics in Alaska—though you may not think it—and they are watching this carefully and closely.

Let me also salute Senator MARCO RUBIO. Some of my colleagues have criticized him for what he said about the DREAM Act. I have not. I am glad he is trying. I need Republican votes to break the Republican filibuster on the DREAM Act. MARCO RUBIO came to my office and offered a good-faith effort to do it. I told him: I will stand by you. I think what you are trying to achieve is not what I want completely, but it is on the path to that goal. Let's work on it together.

He tried. I salute him for trying. I hope he will try again.

I look at the situation in this country today on immigration and wonder, can this Congress come together on a bipartisan basis and even honestly debate the issue? That is a challenge we should face because the problem is out there.

The other day my friend—and he is my friend—Senator MCCAIN of Arizona came to the floor and talked about border problems in Arizona. It is a legitimate concern in his State and the border States. But I also would call to his attention an article I read this morning in the National Journal Daily that was written by Major Garrett. It talks about what we have done on the borders of America. Now, I was one of those who thought we were going overboard—too many agents, too much money, too many different ideas.

But I bought into it and said if we have to do this first, let's do it. Even if it is more than I think is necessary, let's do it to prove our bona fides in terms of wanting to stop illegal immigration. Here is what Major Garrett wrote in the National Journal Daily:

After President George W. Bush's attempt at comprehensive immigration reform failed, Congress adopted a default presumption in favor of spending more every year on border

control. From 2008 to 2012, Congress devoted $17.8 billion for U.S. Border Patrol agents and equipment. From 2006 to 2012, the number of Border Patrol agents has increased 73 percent (from 12,350 agents to 21,370). The number of agents assigned to the nation's Southwest border increased 67 percent (from 11,032 to 18,415).

The House Homeland Security spending bill for fiscal 2013 devotes $11.7 billion to Customs and Border Patrol, $77 million more than President Obama requested. It also pegs spending for ICE (Immigration Control Agency) at $5.8 billion, a $142 million increase over Obama's budget request.

The nation now has more Border Patrol agents and ICE detention beds (34,000) than at any time in history. For context, Border Patrol apprehensions totaled 340,252 in fiscal 2011. That's down 53 percent from 2008 (due in part to the recession and lack of available work). But that number of apprehensions was one-fifth the 2000 total.

Criminal and noncriminal deportations are also up. Way up. This, too, is a bipartisan achievement.

He goes on to cite numbers showing that the Obama administration has deported more in the name of prioritizing deportations than even the Bush administration.

So to those who say we need to get tough at the border and tough in terms of deportation, I say the evidence is there. In fact, it is overwhelming that we have done that. My challenge back to them is: Now can we talk about what to do about the 10 million or 11 million Americans living here who are in questionable status or undocumented? Can we come up with a reasonable approach that is fair to them, to their families, to the Nation, and to the workers of this country? I think we can and we should. Why else are we elected if we don't face an issue like that?

The State of Arizona basically lost in the U.S. Supreme Court this week. Out of four major provisions in the law, three were stricken, and one was put on probation. The Supreme Court said we are going to watch you, Arizona, and if you do this wrong, we will be back. In fairness to Arizona, their argument is that until there is a national immigration law, we are going to take matters in our own hands. The Supreme Court said: Not so fast. And that doesn't absolve us from our responsibility to Arizona and other States.

We have to move together to get this done. I have been listening carefully, and I know where President Obama is on this issue. I sat a few feet away from him in this Chamber working on comprehensive immigration reform with Senators Obama, MCCAIN, and Specter, trying to get this done. I know it was a genuine effort. I don't know where Governor Romney stands. He said he would veto the DREAM Act. Is that the starting point of his immigration policy? I hope not. I hope he will reconsider that. I hope he will say—as I hope others will say—what the President did in granting temporary renewable protected status to these DREAM students is going to be the standard until we pass a permanent law. That is only fair. Looking in the eyes of those students yesterday, I have to tell you that is our responsibility—to do the humane, just thing.

I will close because I see my colleague from Rhode Island on the floor, and he wants to speak in morning business. I got started in this journey because of a young lady named Theresa Lee. She was a Korean living in Chicago, who was from a very poor family and decided that her only ticket to a future was the piano. She became an accomplished pianist, to the point where she was seeking admission to Juilliard in the State of New York, and the Manhattan Conservatory, and only when it called for a Social Security number did she realize she had a problem.

She had been brought here at the age of 2 from Brazil, where she was born, by her Korean parents, and they never filed a paper. She called our office and we found out there was no recourse for her, no place to turn. The law said leave the country for 10 years and apply to come back in. That isn't fair. So she went on to school at Manhattan Conservatory of Music to study piano. Two families—the Foreman family and the Harris family—in Chicago paid for her education because they believed in this young girl.

There is a happy ending to her story. She not only graduated from the Manhattan Conservatory of Music, she played in Carnegie Hall. She had her debut concert there and is now studying for a PhD in music at the Manhattan Conservatory. She married a young man, and she is now a citizen. She could have been lost. Her talents could have been lost to this country if the law had been followed 11 years ago as it was written. She was given a chance and proved she was a person of quality who had something to give back to this great Nation with her musical skills and, ultimately, her talents in writing and teaching music.

It is a great story and a lesson for all of us about the DREAM Act and what it needs to be. I urge my colleagues, many of whom have turned a blind eye to this, to meet these young people, look them in the eye, and they will come to know this isn't just a legal issue, this is a human issue that will define us not only as a Congress but as a Nation.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, before I embark on my own remarks, let me say how pleased I am to have a chance to follow the Senator from Illinois. I have had the chance to preside in the Senate, as the Senator from New York is doing now, on several occasions, and to be present on the floor on other occasions when Senator DURBIN has come to the floor to speak about the DREAM Act and his passion for the opportunity it provides to young people who are in this country through no fault of their own, who know no other home in the world, and who will one day be great Americans—people who will be leaders and performers and experts and scientists and provide great value to our country—I am delighted he is doing it again. His persistence matches his passion. And, finally, with the President's decision the other day, it is beginning to reap some rewards. I hope there is more to come in the future.

Madam President, I ask to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I will speak on carbon pollution and the damage we are doing to our world. As I try to point out every week—and last week I was not able to, but Senator KERRY made a wonderful, marvelous, very compelling speech on this subject. We have kept the floor busy every week between the two of us. I hope other Senators will join us more and more.

This is an issue we have to address. It is a disgrace, frankly, that this is one of the very few buildings in this country in which climate denial is still happening wholesale. Here and the boardroom of ExxonMobil are probably the two holdout locations.

I want to address a few things that happened this week. I want to begin by correcting an error I made in remarks last week when I came to the floor and spoke in favor of EPA's mercury and air toxic standards for powerplants.

This is very important to Rhode Island, as we are a downwind State—as is a good deal of New York—and we are bombarded by Midwestern powerplants that, frankly, deliberately send polluted air into the atmosphere through high smokestacks so that it will land elsewhere. Guess what. We are the elsewhere.

We were about to vote on a resolution that would have avoided these standards and put Rhode Island at considerable peril. It would have gone so far as to bar the EPA from ever issuing a similar rule. It would have had a lasting, as well as damaging, effect. It was a reckless proposal. I am pleased we defeated it in the Senate.

During my remarks about this rule, I discussed the health hazards that mercury pollution poses for the people of my Rhode Island, the pollution that comes out of these tall smokestacks, very often with no scrubbers of any kind, and which spews right out and comes to Rhode Island in the form of ozone, which causes us to have ''bad air days,'' where children, people with breathing difficulties, and old folks have to stay indoors. They are basically kept prisoners indoors because of out-of-State polluters who won't clean up their act. The other thing is mercury and mercury poisoning, which is serious in my State.

The Rhode Island Department of Health warns that ''high-risk'' populations—pregnant women, women who

may become pregnant, and small children—should not eat any freshwater fish in Rhode Island because of the danger of mercury poison and mercury contamination. That is sadly correct. I also said that the health department warns that no one should ever eat any of the fish caught in three bodies of water in Rhode Island—the Quidnick Reservoir, Wincheck Pond, and Yawgoog Pond. That sadly is also true.

Finally, I said the health department suggests that anyone who catches freshwater fish in Rhode Island should limit their intake to one serving of this fish a month to protect their health from mercury contamination. In fact, it is more nuanced than that. The health department has issued different warnings for the general population depending on the body of water. So it is not always true that anybody who catches freshwater fish should limit it to one serving a month. I suggest Rhode Islanders consider consulting the health department's Web site, where the agency lists fish advisories by pond and river. That way they can make an informed decision for themselves and their families as to where and when fish are safe to eat.

It doesn't obviously change the larger point that mercury contamination is a continuing public health problem in Rhode Island, and one we can do little about without EPA defending us, because in these other States it is a great deal for them to be able to poison our State's water but get cheaper power in their States because they don't force their utilities to put scrubbers on and to keep themselves operating at appropriate levels of pollution control.

On that same front, this was a good news week from the EPA. They have fought hard to show that carbon dioxide is in fact a pollutant under the Clean Air Act. That case was taken all the way to the Supreme Court, and the Court agreed that could be the case if the EPA determined those greenhouse gases might ''reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.'' The EPA went forward and, in 2009, they made this endangerment finding. There have been delays along the way, but I won't get into the history of that rule under the Bush administration now.

The EPA made that endangerment finding and promulgated three additional rules, which are the tailpipe rule, which sets greenhouse gas emissions for motor vehicles; the timing rule, which clarifies when the stationary sources are required to meet pollution standards for greenhouse gases; third is the tailoring rule, which limits the application of this rule to the big polluters so that you are not going after small or inconsequential sources, you are targeting the folks who are putting out tons of pollution.

That was a very good day. The DC Circuit decision was quite strong. I will take a moment to read some of it into the RECORD:

> Industry Petitioners also assert that the scientific evidence does not adequately support the Endangerment Finding. As we have stated before in reviewing the science-based decisions of agencies such as EPA, ''[a]lthough we perform a searching and careful inquiry into the facts underlying the agency's decisions, we will presume the validity of agency action as long as a rational basis for it is presented.''

They went on to say this:

> The body of scientific evidence marshaled by EPA in support of the Endangerment Finding is substantial. EPA's scientific evidence of record included support for the proposition that greenhouse gases trap heat on earth that would otherwise dissipate into space; that this ''greenhouse effect'' warms the climate; that human activity is contributing to increased atmospheric levels of greenhouse gases; and that the climate system is warming.
>
> Based on this scientific record, EPA made the linchpin finding: in its judgment, the ''root cause'' of the recently observed climate changes is ''very likely'' the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions.

And they continue below:

> Relying again upon substantial scientific evidence, EPA determined that anthropogenically induced climate change threatens both public health and public welfare. It found extreme weather events, changes in air quality, increases in food-borne and waterborne pathogens, and increases in temperature are likely to have adverse health effects. The record also supports EPA's conclusion that climate change endangers human welfare by creating risk to food production and agriculture, forestry, energy, infrastructure, ecosystems, and wildlife. Substantial evidence further supported EPA's conclusion that the warming resulting from the greenhouse gas emissions could be expected to create risks to water resources and in general to coastal areas—

Such as my home State of Rhode Island, I will interject—

> as a result of expected increase in sea level.
>
> Industry Petitioners do not find fault with much of the substantial record EPA amassed in support of the Endangerment Finding—

Nor could they, I would interject—

> rather, they contend that the record evidences too much uncertainty to support that judgment. But the existence of some uncertainty does not, without more, warrant invalidation of an endangerment finding.
>
> As we have stated before, ''Awaiting certainty will often allow for only reactive, not preventive, regulation. This language [in the Clean Air Act describing endangerment findings] requires a precautionary, forward-looking scientific judgment about the risks of a particular air pollutant, consistent with the Clean Air Act's ''precautionary and preventive orientation.''

So here we have three judges of the rather conservative District of Columbia Court of Appeals throwing out all of the challenges to the endangerment findings—the ''tailpipe'' rule, the ''timing'' rule, and the ''tailoring'' rule—and recognizing that although there may be some doubt on the fringes, there is plenty of evidence for reasonable people to take sensible precautions and to do what is right.

As I have said before in other speeches, there is a strategy that is being pursued by the polluting industries, and it is to create enough doubt not to affect what is really happening out there but to affect public judgment; to put enough propaganda into the system that people think: Oh, maybe we shouldn't be so sure about this.

The context I put that doubt in is how prudent a parent would be for the care of a child. The statistics are that 97 percent of practicing climate scientists acknowledge climate change is happening, that we are causing it with carbon pollution, and we have to get serious about it—97 percent.

So translate that to your own life as a parent. Your child has symptoms, doesn't look right, and you go to the doctor. The doctors says: I am pretty sure she has this condition and she needs treatment.

The treatments may be a little unpleasant, a little expensive, so you want to be careful and you decide to get a second opinion. You go to another doctor, and the doctor says the exact same thing. But you have a friend who is a doctor, and so you decide to get a third opinion. You go to your friend and you get a third opinion. At that point most prudent parents would probably act.

What the polluting industry and the people who support them in this Chamber expect us to do is to act like that parent except go to 100 doctors, get 99 second opinions, and then, when only three of them say your kid is OK, don't worry about it, you don't need to do a thing, or there is some doubt about what the disease is, even though 97 percent of those doctors say, yes, she is sick, you better get her this treatment—and ignore the 97 percent. Listen to the 3 percent. No decent parent would do that. In fact, you would probably lose your right to continue to be a parent for your child in those circumstances if the child welfare agency became aware of the kind of risk you were putting your child in in those circumstances. But that is the way they want us to behave in this institution.

I am at a loss for a word to describe what kind of logic it is that would be appropriate to the dignity and decorum of this particular Chamber.

There is a magazine—a rather conservative magazine—called The Economist. It is hardly associated with liberal or environmental causes. It is a world magazine. They have just done a special that is called ''The Vanishing North,'' about what is happening in the Arctic. In the summary of the report, they say:

> The Arctic's glaciers, including those of Greenland's vast ice cap, are retreating. The land is thawing: the area covered by snow in June is roughly a fifth less than in the 1960s. The permafrost is shrinking. Alien plants, birds, fish and animals are creeping north: Atlantic mackerel, haddock and cod are coming up in Arctic nets. Some Arctic species will probably die out.
>
> It is a stunning illustration of global warming, the cause of the melt. It also contains grave warnings of its dangers. The world would be mad to ignore them.

It is printed in England, so ''mad'' has the English sense of the word ''insane.''

The report continues:

The main reason appears to be a catalytic warming effect, triggered by global warning. When snow or ice melt, they are replaced by darker melt-water pools, land or sea. As a result, the Arctic surface absorbs more solar heat. This causes local warming, therefore more melting, which causes more warming, and so on. This positive feedback shows how even a small change to the Earth's systems can trigger much greater ones.

The report continues:

The worry that needs to be taken most seriously is climate change itself. The impact of the melting Arctic may have a calamitous effect on the planet. It is likely to disrupt oceanic circulation—the mixing of warm tropical and cold polar waters, of which the gulf stream is a part—and thawing permafrost will lead to the emission of masses of carbon dioxide and methane, and thus further warming. It is also raising sea levels. The Greenland ice sheet has recently shed around 200 gigatonnes of ice a year, a fourfold increase on a decade ago. If the warming continues, it could eventually disintegrate, raising the sea level by seven meters.

The ocean State of Rhode Island could ill-afford a sea-level rise of 7 meters.

Many of the world's biggest cities—

And the Senator from New York, who is presiding, represents one of the worlds's biggest—

would be inundated long before that happened.

That is from the summary of The Economist report. If I go into the actual report itself, there are a few other compelling parts, speaking to the Arctic.

The summer sea ice is at its lowest level for at least 2,000 years. Six of the hottest years on record—going back to 1880—have occurred since 2004. . . . The last time the polar regions were significantly warmer was about 125,000 years ago. This transformation is in fact happening faster than anyone had predicted. According to an authoritative 2011 assessment for the Arctic Council, ''it is now becoming very clear that the cryosphere—

That is the frozen part of the Arctic—

is changing rapidly and that neither observations nor models are able to tell the full story.''

This is not without cost. Further quoting from The Economist:

The World Bank estimates the cost of adapting to climate change between 2010 and 2050 at $75 billion-$100 billion a year; other estimates are higher.

Here is what they conclude:

Sooner or later such arithmetic is going to force governments to get serious about dealing with climate change. It is already clear what is required; policies to put an appropriate price on carbon emissions through a tax or market-based system, that is sufficient to persuade polluters to develop and adopt cleaner technologies. These are already available, and so is the ingenuity needed to force down their costs and bring them to market.

But then, in a sentimental closing, the article concludes:

But the Arctic will nonetheless be radically changed. . . . This much is already inevitable.

So the denial that continues in this body continues to have a high price. As I have pointed out, the science on this is neither new nor questionable. The scientist Tyndall, back at the time of the Civil War, first determined that a carbon CO_2 blanket creates a warming effect. That was nearly 150 years ago. So there is nothing new about this.

The fringe scientists who are used by the polluters to create this doubt for propaganda purposes are indeed a fringe, as this resounding decision from the U.S. District Court shows. The perils our planet is facing are manifesting themselves now in the Arctic. As one of the scientists said in The Economist report—and I will have to paraphrase because I don't have the quote in front of me—when you get up here, Greenland, Norway, the Arctic, climate change is not a theory, it is an observation. It is what is happening around us. It is happening in the polar regions because they are more vulnerable, but we are seeing it everywhere.

Wildfires tear through the West, Florida is beaten under unprecedented levels of rainstorms, and insurance companies across the country are predicting even worse storms. The biggest insurers and reinsurers came to Washington to join with environmental Senators to say: You have to do something about this. This is really coming.

These aren't liberals, these aren't environmentalists, these aren't people from the Sierra Club. These are the flinty-eyed accountants of the major international insurance and reinsurance companies, and their warnings deserve listening to.

My time has expired, Madam President. I yield the floor at this point, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. 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.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about our economy, the threat of the pending fiscal cliff, and the need to address the challenges we face.

Two years ago last week, the Obama administration hailed the advent of the ''Summer of Economic Recovery.'' The President claimed, ''The economy is headed in the right direction.'' Vice President BIDEN confidently predicted the creation of 250,000 to 500,000 new jobs a month. Meanwhile, Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner published an op-ed in the New York Times boldly entitled, ''Welcome to the Recovery.''

Well, 2 years later, Madam President, Americans are still waiting for the recovery. Today's jobs figures are well below the 250,000 to 500,000 jobs per month Vice President BIDEN forecasted.

This year, the economy created a dismal 77,000 jobs in April and just 69,000 jobs in May—less than half the 150,000 jobs that are needed each month just to keep up with population growth.

Unemployment—which the White House predicted would shrink below 6 percent by April of 2012—has remained at or above 8 percent for 40 straight months.

Looking at the facts, it is clear the private sector is not doing fine. In fact, the President's economic policies have made the economic situation in this country worse. The President seems to prefer more stimulus spending from Washington, DC, but the President's $831 billion in stimulus money has not led to the job creation he claimed it would. Under this administration, there has been a record 4 years with deficits over $1 trillion. The Federal Government now borrows roughly 40 cents out of every $1 it spends.

The fact is we do not need more government spending that explodes the national debt. Instead, we need to cut reckless government spending and tackle the mounting debt crisis through tax entitlement reform.

If we don't take action soon, our country could end up in the kind of financial disaster that Greece and Spain are now facing. The economic situation in Europe is a clear warning sign for our country that if we don't get on a sustainable fiscal path, we will face a similar fiscal crisis.

Our children and grandchildren should not have to pay for Washington's inability to stick to a budget. We owe it to the next generation to leave the country better than we found it. Yet it has now been over 3 years since the Senate last passed a real budget.

In part because of the Senate's failure to pass a balanced budget, we face a pending fiscal cliff that must be addressed before the end of the year. Financial markets and job creators are going to react to the uncertainty coming out of Washington. We need to act now, rather than kick the can down the road to a lameduck session of Congress at a time when it will be very difficult to make these types of decisions, where things are going to be rushed and Members are not going to have an opportunity to focus in a thoughtful way on the right solutions for this country's future.

One aspect of the fiscal cliff we are talking about is the pending $1.2 trillion sequestration scheduled to go into effect on January 2, 2013. I, along with Senator SESSIONS and others, have pushed for more transparency from the administration as to how they plan to implement sequestration, a provision that was adopted just last week as part of the farm bill. This information is critical so Congress and the American people have a full understanding of sequestration's impact. If Congress is going to consider delaying or replacing the defense sequester, we need this information in order to make those decisions.

House Republicans passed a bill last month that replaces the defense sequester scheduled to go into effect next

year, and it does so by finding savings elsewhere in the Federal Government. Yet the administration continues to stonewall requests by Congress to help us better understand where the planned sequester cuts will take place.

On the tax side, a family of four earning $50,000 per year would see their tax bill increase by $2,200 next year, according to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Joint Committee on Taxation.

The Joint Committee on Taxation also estimates that nearly 1 million business owners would face higher taxes if the top two tax rates increase. Yet not one vote has been scheduled in the Senate to prevent this ''taxmageddon.''

In contrast, House Republican leaders have a different view, and it is expected the House will consider an extension of the current tax rates next month which will then come to the Senate.

The economy continues to grow at a very slow rate. Unemployment remains above 8 percent. Congress must get to work to jump-start our economy and put this country on a sustainable fiscal path. We need to act now rather than to kick the can down the road.

To put a fine point on that, we already know the fiscal cliff we will run into at the end of the year is going to have a profound impact on the economy next year because the Congressional Budget Office and other analysts have looked at it and determined it could cost us as much as 1.3 percent of economic growth in the first half of next year—which, translated into actual jobs numbers, is about 1.3 million jobs that would be lost—because of this fiscal cliff, if it is not dealt with.

But there is also a more immediate concern. That is the uncertainty created by the fiscal cliff. Decisions that are being made right now by people across this country, by job creators, small businesses, and investors are shaped by and based upon the fiscal cliff that is going to occur at the end of the year. The Congressional Budget Office has also suggested this is not only something that is going to have an impact down the road, but it also could have an impact right now as the economy contracts as a result of that uncertainty and investors and small businesses and job creators take their capital and keep it on the sidelines as opposed to putting it to work creating jobs and growing their businesses. The Congressional Budget Office has suggested it could cost us one-half percent of economic growth, not next year but this year.

That is why it is so important we work together to address the fundamental issues that are going to impact this economy before the end of this year. As I said, we have to address the rates. The rates that are going to expire at the end of the year include the marginal income tax rates, the dividend rates, the capital gains rate, estate taxes, and all kinds of other provisions in tax law that expire at the end of this year. If one is a small business or an investor and they are thinking that starting January 1 of next year they are going to be facing a massive tax increase, obviously, they are going to think long and hard about putting their capital to work now to create jobs and grow the economy.

In fact, I think for many small businesses, as they look at the circumstances they find themselves in, they are faced not only with the fiscal cliff, the potential tax increases, but also a massive amount of regulation that makes it more difficult and more expensive for them to create jobs.

Those are the issues we should be focused on because the most important thing we could be doing right now is getting the economy growing and expanding again and creating jobs for American workers. That is not going to happen if we don't take steps to avert what is clearly a terrible disaster waiting in the future with the fiscal cliff and all the tax increases that are going to occur at the end of the year.

The Joint Committee on Taxation has said 53 percent of passthrough income would face higher taxes on January 1 of next year. That is all the S corporations, all the small businesses, all the folks out there in our economy, the entrepreneurs, who are the people we rely upon to get our economy going again and to put people back to work. They are looking at those types of tax increases, starting January 1 of next year, that are going to make it very difficult for them to make the investments that are necessary to get this economy growing at a rate that will generate the kind of job creation that will get Americans back to work, that will get this unemployment rate back down, and start creating confidence in the American public about the future of our economy.

I would close by again saying this is not something we can afford to kick down the road. We have done that for way too long. We have a massive problem ahead of us with regard to entitlement spending which has to be addressed in the form of entitlement reform. We need to reform our Tax Code to make it more simple, more clear and more fair and to create a more competitive Tax Code with the countries around the world with which we have to compete. We need to do something about this burden of regulation being placed upon our businesses, which is making it more difficult for them to compete in the world marketplace and certainly making it more difficult for them in the near term to do what is necessary to get jobs created in this country and get Americans back to work.

I hope we can do that. It would be my expectation that the Senate, if and when the House passes legislation to extend the tax rates—which I am told they are going to do sometime next month. I hope the Democratic majority in the Senate will take that up and that we will put a bill on the President's desk that will provide the kind of certainty that is necessary for our small businesses and our job creators as they look at the future that will enable them to move forward with those investments, put their capital to work, and put American workers back to work.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

A SECOND OPINION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to compliment my colleague from South Dakota for his commitment and continuing focus on jobs and the economy and the impact it has on our Nation and our future.

I come, as I have week after week, with a doctor's second opinion about the health care law—which is, in many ways, directly tied to the economy and the economic situation that my colleague from South Dakota was commenting on.

We have seen continual unemployment of over 8 percent—now 8.2 percent—with people graduating from college who can't find work are going back to live with their parents. It is because the President focused on a health care law—and the Supreme Court will rule on it tomorrow, but he focused on that instead of focusing on what people at home are concerned about: jobs and the economy, getting the economy moving again and bringing the economy back to health. A healthy economy is what people were looking for.

I come to the floor to talk a bit about things that have happened since the health care law was passed, because President Obama and Democrats repeatedly promised the health care law would do several things.

One, they said it would make health insurance more affordable, and they also said it would help create jobs for millions of Americans—millions of Americans, they said.

In fact, after the Senate completed passage of the health care law, Majority Leader REID said: ''This of course is a health bill.'' He said, ''It's also a jobs bill.'' He went on. He said it was also an economic recovery bill. He said it was a deficit-reduction bill. He said it was an antidiscrimination bill. He said it was truly a bill of rights. He went on to say: ''And now it is the law of the land.'' An economic recovery bill, he said; a jobs bill, he said.

Former Speaker NANCY PELOSI added: ''It's about jobs.'' She said: ''In its life, health care reform would create 4 million jobs—400,000 jobs almost immediately.'' That has not happened—another broken promise to the American people.

That is why I have come to the floor week after week to point out issues with this health care law, which I continue to believe is bad for patients, bad for the providers, the nurses and the doctors who take care of those patients, and terrible for taxpayers.

One of the key components of the health care law that the President

promised would help create jobs was what he referred to as the small employer health insurance tax credit. Back in April of 2010, the President said: ''This health care tax credit is pro-jobs, it is pro-business, and it starts this year.'' In essence, the credit was supposed to offset the cost of health insurance for small businesses so they could provide insurance to their employees.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers made some estimates. They estimated that about 4 million—4 million—small businesses, they said, would be eligible for the credit. The administration was so proud of the initiative that they sent out millions of postcards to small businesses. I believe they actually never read it, didn't understand it, didn't understand how it worked, because SUSAN COLLINS, the Senator from Maine, stood on the floor of the Senate and said:

> Look at how it really works. It is not going to work the way you have described it.

But, no, this administration that knows better than anyone, they were so proud of the initiative, they sent out millions of postcards. According to the IRS, 4.4 million postcards were sent out. Who paid for it? The taxpayers. Do you remember them? They are the people at home, where only one in three of them thinks the country is heading in the right direction, and so many of them believe the tax dollars they send to Washington are not being used well.

The White House ignored them and urged small businesses to look at the tax credit criteria and to take advantage, they said, of the credit that would be available.

So what has been the response across the country of the over 4 million small businesses that received the postcards saying, Hey, look what we are doing for you.

According to the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office, only about 170,300 employers were able to claim the credit, not 4 million. No. Of these 4 million that got the postcards, how many were able to take full advantage of the credit? Only 28,000. In other words, the credit only benefited about 4 percent of the businesses that the President promised to help. Ninety-six percent of the businesses that the President promised to help got nothing. Only 4 percent of the businesses were able to benefit at all, and even a smaller number than that were able to take full advantage.

The Wall Street Journal analyzed this issue in a recent article. The article featured Michael Griffin, the owner of a small advertising agency in St. Louis, MO. Michael had this to say about the tax credit the President promised and held up as some wonderful thing he was doing:

> You're penalized for giving people a higher wage and more professional opportunity.

Is that what the Democrat's believe, that we should penalize businesses for giving people a higher wage and more professional opportunity?

Michael went on to say:

> I appreciate any kind of tax reduction, but I can certainly not applaud a reduction that limits growth and the opportunity for employers to pay more to their employees. But that is exactly what this tax credit did. It limits the growth of a company, and it limits the opportunity for employers to pay more to their employees.

Mr. Griffin is not the only small business owner who has had problems with this tax credit, this big promise by the President. Jeffrey Berdahl, an accountant from Allentown, PA, spoke to the Associated Press about this very issue. He described the calculations required for the tax credit as ''mind-numbing.''

People pass laws here. I wonder if they read them or understand the implications. I believe they do not. He described what this Congress passed, what the President touts, as mind-numbing and also pointed out that for many of his clients—this accountant's clients—he said the money they received from the tax credit was offset by the money they had to pay their accountants to try to figure out if they could receive any of these credits.

In this same AP article, Terry Gutierrez from Raleigh, NC, stated, ''In some cases, it's [the tax credit] more hassle than it's worth.''

The GAO—the Government Accountability Office—confirmed these experiences in their report. They found that many small businesses are deterred from claiming the credit. Why? Because, like so much that has come out as part of this health care law, it is so complex. The report highlighted the fact that it requires 15 separate calculations. The President sends out a postcard to 4.4 million people, paid for by the taxpayers, to say: You may get a tax credit. Ninety-six percent of the people who get the postcard end up with nothing. Why? Did anybody look at this? There are 15 separate calculations and 7 separate worksheets just to calculate the amount of the credit.

The GAO was told by tax preparers that it would take their clients anywhere from 2 to 8 hours or possibly longer to gather the necessary information to just start to calculate the credit. On top of this, they found that tax preparers spent in general 3 to 5 hours calculating the credit. This from a postcard from the President that says he is going to do things for you? This is not the kind of help from Washington that small businesses are looking for or want or deserve. The American people deserve better.

For all of this trouble, GAO determined that the average amount claimed per small business across the country is less than $3,000—$2,700 is the average amount claimed. It is clear that this policy is just another broken promise of the President's health care law.

Since the President recently said that the private sector is doing fine—we remember it; we have seen him from the White House giving a speech saying the private sector is doing fine—the ineffectiveness of his small business tax credits may not bother him one bit but it does bother most Americans. As I speak with my neighbors across Wyoming, I know the truth of their lives is very much different from what the President may believe.

Many Americans are also concerned about the fact that bureaucrats at the Internal Revenue Service seem to benefit the most from the tax provisions in the law. According to the Inspector General for Tax Administration, the IRS will need nearly 1,300 new Federal employees in 2012 to implement the President's health care law. That is what they are asking for—1,300 new Federal employees for the IRS.

In a report issued on June 14 of this year, just a week or two ago, the inspector general pointed out that enforcing the small business health insurance tax credit, he said, is one of the reasons why the Agency must expand. They need 1,300 new Federal employees so they can put forward and deal with this so-called tax credit that only 4 percent of the people whom the President said it would help have actually received any credit. And the amount they received is so very low that for most of them it was not worth even doing the paperwork.

While the President and Washington Democrats may believe that adding employees to the IRS is the key to job creation, I respectfully disagree. The private sector is not fine, and the government does not need to get any bigger. This is why I have fought and will continue to fight to replace the President's health care law with real reforms that will improve competition, increase consumer choice, and lower the cost of care for all Americans. That is what this was all supposed to be about in the first place—patient-centered care; giving people the care they need from a doctor they choose, not that the government chooses, not that the insurance company chooses, but that they choose, at lower cost.

That is why I come to the floor week after week with a doctor's second opinion about a health care law at a time that I still believe the health care law that the Supreme Court will rule on tomorrow is one that is bad for patients, bad for providers—the nurses and doctors who take care of those patients—and it is terrible for our taxpayers.

I yield the floor. 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.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. 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.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3342

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3342) to improve information security, and for other purposes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read by title for a second time on the next legislative day.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I rise today because we have introduced a new version of the Strengthening and Enhancing Cybersecurity by Using Research, Education, Information and Technology Act of 2012, a bill known as the SECURE IT Act.

Senator MCCAIN and I, along with Senators CHAMBLISS, GRASSLEY, MURKOWSKI, COATS, BURR, and JOHNSON, are reintroducing the SECURE IT Act after making improvements and clarifications in response to constructive feedback we received from the first bill we introduced.

We are employing rule XIV on this bill because it is clear it will not receive the benefit of the traditional committee process, and the majority leader has indicated he intends to debate this issue on the Senate floor in July. What those of us who are cosponsors of this bill are trying to do is have our version of a cybersecurity bill on the floor, introduced, so that everyone will be able to see it. Then, when the Senate turns to this issue, we will be able to see the differences between the bills.

The sponsors of our bill include eight ranking members of committees and subcommittees that have jurisdiction over cybersecurity. We have combined our expertise to develop a balanced piece of legislation that we believe will greatly enhance our country's cybersecurity of the infrastructure that could be affected. We believe it is now time for Congress to act. The Nation faces an evolving array of threats from hackers, criminal groups, and terrorists who seek to sabotage networks, gain access to sensitive government information, and steal valuable intellectual property.

SECURE IT is centered on consensus items. It sets aside controversial provisions that are of questionable value at this time, and we believe our bill can pass both Chambers. It offers a balanced approach that will significantly advance cybersecurity in both the public and private sectors by focusing on four issues and areas on which we believe everyone can agree: first, to facilitate sharing of cyber-threat information among private sector entities, and to and from the government; second, to better secure Federal networks, including requiring Federal contractors to notify the Federal agencies of cyber attacks that would threaten government networks; third, to strengthen the ability to prosecute cyber crime; and fourth, to prioritize cybersecurity research and development so that our Nation will continue to lead the world in this area.

Let me start with No. 1, facilitate sharing of cyber-threat information.

SECURE IT helps the private sector combat cyber attacks by breaking down barriers to sharing information about threats and vulnerabilities. Currently, antitrust laws and liability concerns inhibit private companies from exchanging information that we believe is necessary to defend against and respond to cyber threats.

I was talking to someone last night who is in the high-tech Internet field. There are great concerns about their company calling a competitor and saying: We are seeing signs of a possible threat here, and we wanted to share what the type of red flag we are seeing is so that you would be able to check your networks to see if you are getting the same thing.

These are two competitors, but this is not an anticompetitive situation. It is not something that should not be, we believe, subject to antitrust. They are still competitors, but everybody wants security for all of our networks in this country against any kind of intervention, whether it is criminal or foreign intelligence.

Our bill's liability protection and limited antitrust exemptions will allow these companies to rapidly respond so that they do not have to go to a lawyer and say: Would it be anticompetitive if we called our competitor and started sharing this information right away?

So it needs to be timely, fast, and safe. Those are the criteria.

Sharing should be a two-way street. Our bill sets up a framework that promotes timely sharing of classified, declassified, and unclassified information by the Federal Government with trusted private sector entities, while allowing private sector companies to share cyber-threat information with the government.

Since the introduction of SECURE IT, we have been working with stakeholders in all of the areas of infrastructure and Internet access to make a number of improvements and clarifications to the bill. I am pleased that we introduced the bill early, that we got the feedback from the different stakeholders and we have now been able to make adjustments to provisions that would help the bill but also protect privacy and preserve the issue we are trying to address, which, of course, is safety and cybersecurity.

We tightened the definition of what information is shared. We refined the process for sharing it. This will ensure that only essential information is shared and that it is handled appropriately. For example, it is vital that Federal agencies be informed if their systems are compromised. Our bill requires Federal contractors to coordinate with their supervisory agencies and to notify them of significant cyber incidents that would impede their mission. We have added explicit and strong privacy protections and increased oversight throughout our revised bill. At every stage of information sharing, there are statutory safeguards that will ensure cyber-threat information is handled in a manner that will protect the privacy and civil liberties of all Americans while preserving the ability to address cyber threats that could affect them as well as other members of the public.

No. 2, secure Federal networks. The government needs to do a much better job of securing its own networks. To address this problem, SECURE IT provides necessary reforms to the Federal Information Security Management Act by modernizing the way the government monitors and mitigates its own cyber-risks. SECURE IT requires agencies to use automated realtime network monitoring by upgrading their current primarily paper-based reporting. Our revisions also ensure that agencies will be continuously updating their technologies to prevent and remediate significant cyber incidents.

No. 3, we facilitate the prosecution of cyber crime. We update the Federal criminal statutes and streamline existing confusing penalties to facilitate the prosecution of cyber criminals. No. 4, cybersecurity research and development is essential to harness innovation and to train IT professionals to counter future attacks.

If we focus on these four areas, we believe we can significantly improve the cybersecurity of our country by facilitating the sharing of cyber-threat information in the private sector, securing Federal networks, strengthening criminal penalties for cyber crimes and prioritizing cybersecurity research and development.

Equally important is what our bill does not do. Secure IT does not give the Department of Homeland Security open-ended power to regulate networks for infrastructure that it deems to be critical. It does not give them the power to determine what is critical infrastructure. Instead, we take a different approach that is not heavy-handed and regulatory. It sets up a true partnership between the public and private sector to combat these cyber threats.

We will not improve this country's cybersecurity by creating an adversarial system based on a regulatory compliance structure. We believe subjecting industry to more regulation from an agency that is ill-equipped to understand the private sector system will ultimately erode the ability of business to provide effective, nimble, and innovative responses to cyber threats.

Diverting precious resources from security and innovation to regulatory compliance could ultimately harm security, not improve it, which is why we are taking the different approach from the more heavy-handed regulatory approach of the other bill sponsored by

my colleagues. We do not want Americans to be fooled into a false sense of security by imposing an unproven prescriptive regulatory framework that no agency could effectively implement, and that we do not think that the Department of Homeland Security could implement. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in supporting the SECURE IT Act of 2012. I will just reiterate again that our bill is sponsored by Senator MCCAIN and myself, Senator CHAMBLISS, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator COATS, Senator BURR, and Senator JOHNSON of Wisconsin, all of whom are either ranking members of full committees or subcommittees that have a jurisdiction in this area. We have worked very hard with all of the different interest groups, including privacy groups, the groups that handle the private sector networks, and the groups that are Federal contractors to assure we are doing the best balanced approach that can possibly be done to take the next step with a bill we believe we can pass not only in the Senate, but also the House and then to the President. I believe he will sign it because it is a major first step forward.

I thank the chair.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I want to indicate, while listening to the remarks of the Senator from Texas about the introduction of a bill apparently on cybersecurity, how critically important that is to the country. I am a relatively new member of the Intelligence Committee, but if there is anything I have learned, it is what a major threat this is to our country and how critically important it is we address it. So I commend the Senator from Texas for her leadership and I appreciate that she and her colleagues have taken this step of actually introducing legislation.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I appreciate very much that the Senator is on the Intelligence Committee and that he knows the sensitivities and all of the stakeholders we must work with in order to do the right thing for our country, both in the private sector as well in our government infrastructure. As always, the Senator from North Dakota is a person who is a visionary and one who looks out for the best interest of our country, and I hope we come together on this bill.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator. I look forward to reviewing her proposal and, hopefully, together we can find a way to get something passed that will further protect our country.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about the state of our economy, where we have come from, where we are headed, and the critical challenges facing our Nation. I want to go back and remind people of where we have come from. I think it is very important to put in context the circumstances we now confront.

First of all, the economic crisis of 2008 and 2009 was the worst recession since the Great Depression. By the way, this was not the creation of Barack Obama. He inherited this mess, and he has done quite a good job of getting us moving in a better direction, but more of that later.

In the fourth quarter of 2008—that is the last quarter before this President took office—the economy was actually shrinking at a rate of almost 9 percent. In the first month of 2009, we lost 800,000 jobs. The housing market was in crisis, home building and sales were plummeting, we faced record foreclosures, and the financial market crisis was threatening global economic collapse.

In fact, I will never forget being called to a meeting in the Capitol in the fall of 2008, and I was the last one to arrive. It was the leaders of the House and the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, and there was the Chairman of the Federal Reserve and the Secretary of the Treasury in the Bush administration telling us they were going to take over AIG the next morning. They told us if they did not, there would be a financial collapse in this country within days. I have to say, that gets your attention. But those were the circumstances that were being confronted in late 2008.

Since that time, we have seen a dramatic improvement. Here is the economy in the fourth quarter of 2008 before President Obama took office, shrinking at a rate of almost 9 percent. In the subsequent quarters it continued to shrink until it began to get better in late 2009, frankly, because of the stimulus and TARP that helped start to turn our country around.

Since that time we have had consistent growth in the economy—not as robust as we would like but nonetheless consistent growth. It was a rather remarkable turnaround given how serious the economic downturn was. We also see the same pattern with respect to the private sector jobs picture.

Again in January 2009, in 1 month alone we lost more than 800,000 jobs, and those were private sector jobs—more than 800,000 jobs in a month. Again, in 2009 things began to turn and we got back to growing jobs. In fact, we have had over 4½ million jobs in the private sector created since the turnaround began. Again, job growth was not as robust as we would like, but nonetheless it was quite a remarkable turnaround from where it was.

What we have seen in looking at previous crises is that economic recovery is shallower and takes much longer after a financial crisis. So we can't compare this to the garden variety of recessions we faced since World War II. I think we have had nine recessions since World War II, but this went far beyond a typical recession. This was enormous damage to the financial sector. In looking back, historically, here is what Dr. Reinhart of the Peter Peterson Institute for International Economics and Dr. Vincent Reinhart of the American Enterprise Institute have found in their research:

> Real per capita GDP growth rates are significantly lower during the decade following severe financial crises . . . In the ten-year window following severe financial crises, unemployment rates are significantly higher than in the decade that presided the crisis. . . .

That is the circumstance we are in. That is not the fault of President Obama. He inherited this mess. The fact is after a financial crisis, if we look back historically, it takes up to 10 years to recover. For those who say, well, the Federal Government response didn't work or that it hasn't made any difference, I don't think that is true. I don't think that will stand up to scrutiny.

Two of the most distinguished economists in the country, Alan Blinder, who was a former Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve, and Mark Zandi, who was actually one of the economic advisers to the JOHN MCCAIN campaign, said:

> We find that its effects—

Talking about the Federal Government's actions to deal with the crisis—

> on real GDP, jobs, and inflation are huge, and probably averted what could have been called Great Depression 2.0.

They went on to say:

> . . . When all is said and done, the financial and fiscal policies will have cost taxpayers a substantial sum, but not nearly as much as most had feared and not nearly as much as if policymakers had not acted at all. If the comprehensive policy responses saved the economy from another depression, as we estimate, they were well worth their cost.

Madam President, here are two of the most distinguished economists in the country telling us that had we not taken the actions that the Federal Government did, we would have had a depression. They also looked at what would have happened without the Federal response on the jobs front.

Here is what they found running their econometric models. The green line is the response with the Federal response, the red line is what they estimate would have happened without the Federal response. We can see they find a difference of 8 million jobs. In other words, we have 8 million more jobs than we would have otherwise had had the Federal Government done nothing.

I just say this to my colleagues who say, well, the stimulus and TARP didn't work because we are not growing as rapidly as we would like. Let's think back. What was happening when those steps were taken? The economy wasn't growing; the economy was shrinking. We weren't getting more jobs; we were losing jobs at a record rate. So to those who say none of these Federal actions were successful, I say I don't think that is what the record shows.

I think what the record shows is they didn't accomplish all we would like,

but they really led to quite a dramatic turnaround from the worst recession since the Great Depression. Here are the positive signs we see now that are facts. They are not projections; they are facts. We have had 27 consecutive months of private sector job growth. We have had 11 consecutive quarters of real GDP growth. The unemployment rate is down from the 2009 peak. Manufacturing has expanded for 34 consecutive months. The U.S. auto manufacturers have returned to profitability. And State revenues are now showing signs of improvement.

So, again, this isn't political talk. These are facts, and facts matter. The facts demonstrate there has been quite a remarkable turnaround. Again, these aren't projections; these are facts. These are things that have occurred.

If we then compare the U.S. performance to other countries with which we compete, we can see the United States has done the best in terms of the comparisons here. Some developing nations have certainly done better than we have, but if we look at the developed world, the United States is doing the best. This chart shows our economic performance, the top line, which is far better than the eurozone, all the European countries, which is the green line. Japan is the red line and we are doing much better than them. We are doing much better than the United Kingdom. If we look at how well we have done compared to the rest of the world, we are doing much better, at least in terms of the developed nations.

We know Europe has gone in a somewhat different direction. They have imposed austerity without regard to growth policies. Here are the headlines from the International Herald Tribune: ''Austerity Is Strangling Europe.'' I pulled out a paragraph because I think it speaks very well of what has been the effect of the European strategy:

> The direction of European economic and financial policy must change, away from pure austerity toward growth. Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Italy and Spain have made substantial progress in stabilizing their finances. But the economic and political situation in these countries shows that austerity alone is not the way to resolve the crisis. On the contrary, there is a danger of half-strangling national economies with a strict policy of austerity. We would therefore be well advised to cushion harsh austerity measures with programs for growth.

I believe there is a lesson in that for us as well. I am an unvarnished deficit hawk. I have been my entire career. I have called repeatedly for us to get our fiscal house in order. I believe it is imperative that we do that, but it is also imperative to recognize that we don't impose austerity on a weak and struggling economy. We would only make things worse. Getting back on a more sustainable financial path has to be done in a measured way. Absolutely, we need a long-term plan to take on our deficits and debt. I have made that speech 500 times. Absolutely, that has to be done. But that has to be done in a phased way, and the austerity should not be imposed until we are on a stronger growth path. I think economic history tells us that, and that is a lesson we need to learn.

What is holding back the U.S. economy from a stronger recovery? Well, we have identified these elements: No. 1, the European debt/financial crisis has thrown a cloud over global markets, and they are still our biggest trading partners. So a chilling of economic activity in Europe has had an adverse effect on our own economic performance.

No. 2, the Iran/Middle East situation has threatened to disrupt oil supplies. That creates uncertainty, because we know the Straits of Hormuz would close, prices would jump, economic activity would weaken, and we would be hurting. That has led companies, even though they have $2 trillion on their balance sheets, to be very cautious about expanding their investment and expanding their hiring.

Federal, State, and local government cutbacks have also created economic drag. I will go to that issue in a moment.

The political deadlock on fiscal issues here in Congress has also created uncertainty, and we face, of course, the threat from the fiscal cliff. The fiscal cliff is the fact that at the end of this year, all of the Bush tax cuts are going to expire, which means an automatic tax increase for virtually every American. We also face additional spending cuts, including $1.2 trillion from the so-called sequester, evenly shared between defense and nondefense. That would reduce demand. That would further reduce economic growth. Also, of course, the housing market continues to pose a threat, at least in many parts of the country. Certainly in Nevada, Arizona, Florida, and in parts of California, the housing market crisis still leaves an overhang.

I thought this article in the New York Times on Saturday, May 5, was very interesting. I think if we gave a quiz to the American people listening to the debates here, they would conclude that government has gotten bigger and bigger during the Obama administration, but that is not true. A previous President said ''facts are stubborn things,'' and these are facts. If we take State, local, and Federal Government and we combine them, the government is getting smaller in the United States. In fact, again, I pulled out a paragraph:

> For the first time in 40 years, the government sector of the American economy has shrunk during the first three years of a presidential administration. Spending by the Federal Government, adjusted for inflation, has risen at a slow rate under President Obama. But that increase has been more than offset by a fall in spending by State and local governments, which have been squeezed by weak tax receipts.

In the first quarter of this year, the real gross domestic product for the government—including State and local governments as well as Federal—was 2 percent lower than it was 3 years earlier, when Barack Obama took office, in early 2009.

All the talk we hear on this floor about the exploding size of government is bloviation. It is bloviation. Let's get real. The government in the United States is shrinking. Facts are stubborn things.

This is what is happening to the U.S. Government workforce under this President. Obama took office in January of 2009. This chart shows millions of Federal, State, and local employees. We had more than 22.5 million Federal, State, and local employees. Look what has happened. Do we have more employees in government today than when President Obama took office or do we have less? We have less, and we have a lot less. This chart shows very clearly the number of employees has gone down dramatically—dramatically—during the years of this administration. Facts are stubborn things.

What is underlying our current weakness? Well, before the Budget Committee, we had Dr. Joel Prakken, the chairman of Macroeconomic Advisers. This is the testimony he gave earlier this year:

> The No. 1 problem that [small businesses] say they have to deal with right now is lack of demand.

Are my colleagues paying attention? Can we pass a quiz? What is the problem? The problem is a lack of demand. Further tax increases or further spending cuts will only weaken demand in the short term. So we have to be paying attention to what we do here.

Some of our colleagues say, Let's slash spending some more, make government even smaller. Guess what that will do to demand? It will weaken it. That will make the economic recovery even more tepid, even weaker. That is not the answer. Yes, it is absolutely the case over the longer term. We have to be aggressive at reducing spending and reforming entitlements and reforming the tax system. I have been part of virtually every effort here to do that. I was part of Bowles-Simpson and part of the group of six. I am actually actively engaged in that effort now. We have to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. What we need to understand is we need a two-step strategy: strengthen growth in the short term, and then pivot and deal with our deficits and debt over the longer term. We cannot get confused about this and think the answer is to impose immediate austerity now. We have already imposed a fair amount of austerity, which I will get into in a minute, with the budget cuts that were included in the Budget Control Act passed last year.

I want to repeat the testimony of Dr. Prakken:

> The No. 1 problem that [small businesses] say they have to deal with right now is lack of demand. They do not say access to capital. They do not say burden of regulation. They say their order books are thin.

I say to my colleagues, let's pay attention to what the problem is: weak

demand. We have to take steps to strengthen demand in the short term while at the same time putting in place a longer term plan to get us back on track with our Nation's finances.

One reason we have a weak demand is we have made weak investments in infrastructure. Look at where we are compared to our global competitors. China is investing 9 percent of their GDP on infrastructure. Europe is spending 5 percent, and here we are at 2.4 percent. One of the reasons we have a weak recovery is we are not investing sufficiently in roads, bridges, airports, rail, and, as a result, our infrastructure across America is becoming second rate. That is about as clear as it can be.

I hear my colleagues say: Well, our problem is the Senate has not passed a budget in over 1,000 days. Sometimes I wonder if our colleagues pay very close attention to what they are voting on here, because last year, instead of a budget resolution we passed the Budget Control Act—a law. What is the difference between a resolution and a law? I think any high school student could tell us a resolution is weaker than a law. Yet our colleagues continue to come to the floor and complain and say we have not passed a resolution in more than 1,000 days. That is true. What we did do is pass a law called the Budget Control Act. We passed it last year with an overwhelming vote here in the U.S. Senate—a bipartisan vote. It also passed in the House of Representatives and was signed into law by the President.

A budget resolution never even goes to the President. A budget resolution is purely a congressional document. So a law is stronger than any resolution, and it is true, we didn't pass a budget resolution last year, we passed a law called the Budget Control Act. That law, in part, said:

> The allocations, aggregates, and spending levels set in subsection (b)(1) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget.

That is about as clear as it can be. The Budget Control Act says that the spending levels will apply in the same manner as a budget resolution.

So all these speeches that have been given—oh, we have not had a budget resolution in a thousand days—is not telling people the rest of the story. Instead of a budget resolution, we passed a budget law called the Budget Control Act.

What did that law do? One of the things it did was cut spending $900 billion over the next 10 years. I can tell you, it put in place 10 years of spending caps—10 years of spending caps. A typical budget resolution only deals with 1 year. The Budget Control Act—the law we passed last year—put in place 10 years of spending caps, saving $900 billion.

In addition, it said: We are going to create a special committee to deal with the entitlement programs and the tax system. We are going to say to that special committee: If you can come to an agreement, you will not face a filibuster. You will not face delays, you will be able to bring that proposal right to the floor of the Senate and get a vote.

They further said: But if you do not agree, there will be another $1.2 trillion of spending cuts imposed. Of course, we all know now the special committee could not agree. So that additional $1.2 trillion of spending cuts is now the law of the land, on top of the $900 billion of spending cuts that was in the Budget Control Act as well.

So let's do the math: $900 billion of discretionary savings in the Budget Control Act, plus this sequester—the $1.2 trillion of additional spending cuts focused on defense and nondefense spending—for a total of $2.1 trillion of spending cuts that were in the Budget Control Act passed last year that is now the law of the land. That is the biggest spending cut package in the history of the United States.

I think facts are stubborn things, and we need to remind our colleagues of what the facts are.

Here is another unfortunate fact: We are borrowing almost 40 cents of every $1 we spend. We can do that for a while. We cannot do it endlessly. We are borrowing almost 40 cents of every $1 we spend, so we have to deal with that.

What does it mean in terms of our debt? This is what is happening to our debt: Gross debt as a percentage of our gross domestic product under what is called the CBO alternative fiscal scenario—that is their prediction of what we might do here—shows the gross debt of the United States is going to be 104 percent of our gross domestic product at the end of this year—104 percent of our gross domestic product. It shows, if we do not do anything, that is going to go up to 119 percent. Our gross debt will be 119 percent of the size of our economy by 2022 if we do not do anything.

That is not a path we should allow to be followed. Why not? Because the best economic analysis that has been done, by Reinhart and Rogoff, ''Growth in a Time of Debt,'' found that once we get a gross debt of more than 90 percent of our GDP, our future economic prospects are diminished. It does not happen all at once. It is not like falling off a cliff when we get to gross debt that is 90 percent of our GDP. It is more like a long, slow decline in terms of our future economic prospects.

So here is what they concluded after studying 200 years' of economic history, 44 different countries:

> We examine the experience of 44 countries spanning up to two centuries of data on central government debt, inflation and growth. Our main finding is that across both advanced countries and emerging markets, high debt/GDP levels (90 percent and above)—

Again, this is gross debt, when we get to a gross debt of 90 percent or more.

> are associated with notably lower growth outcomes.

So this is not just about numbers on a page. This is about future economic prospects, future economic opportunity, future job prospects, that the future wealth of a nation is hurt when they get to a gross debt of more than 90 percent of their GDP.

The previous chart I showed is that we will be at 104 percent of GDP at the end of this year. So absolutely we have to focus on deficits and debt. But we should not lose sight of the fact that we cannot pivot and do that when the economy is weak or we will make the economy even weaker. So the initial steps we need to take are to strengthen growth. At the same time, we ought to put in place a plan that gets us back on track fiscally that deals with this debt problem for the longer term because this is not a matter of we get to this point and fall off the cliff. It does not work that way.

What is critically important is that we adopt the right economic policies now to strengthen the economy, to lift growth, but at the same time to put in place a longer term plan that deals with deficits and debt.

As shown on this chart here is where we are headed if we fail to act. This is according to the Congressional Budget Office. It is nonpartisan. We have gross debt that I was referencing before: 104 percent. Look at this and you will say: Gee, it is not 104 percent on this chart. That is because this is not gross debt. This is debt held by the public, which most economists like to talk about. I talk about the gross debt because gross debt includes what we owe to the trust funds, and the work of Reinhart and Rogoff focused on gross debt. So if we are going to compare ourselves to the research they did, we have to be talking about gross debt.

This is debt held by the public, and this is what CBO says is going to happen to debt held by the public if we fail to act: We are going to have a debt more than 200 percent of GDP. That is the track we are on. So, hey, we have to sober up. We need a plan that gets us back on track.

When we analyze how we got in this situation, what is critical is that we look at spending and revenue because it is that mismatch which leads to deficits. It is when we are spending more than we are taking in. It is when our outlays are greater than our revenues that we have deficits. It is the accumulation of deficits that is the debt. Right. The debt is adding up all the deficits over all these years.

The red line on this chart shows the spending of the United States. The green line shows the revenue. What jumps out at you is that spending is near a 60-year high. That is not surprising because we just had the biggest economic downturn since the Great Depression.

What happens when we have a strong economic downturn? What we call the automatic stabilizers kick in to prevent us from going into a depression. What are the automatic stabilizers?

Things such as unemployment insurance, spending on food stamps, other things that are done to prevent going from a recession into a depression. Those things kicked in, and the result is—and, of course, we had TARP and we had stimulus, which I have already demonstrated worked actually quite effectively. Without them, the best economists in the country tell us we would have been in a depression.

Spending is near a 60-year high. But look at revenue. Revenue is near a 60-year low. Low revenue, high spending, big deficits, big additions to debt. That is what is happening to us. We can see, the spending has come back somewhat now. Revenue has improved somewhat. So things are starting to get better, but we still have a big gap and a deficit of $1.2 trillion for this year—staggering. That over time has to be addressed.

The Budget Control Act we passed last year—the law our friends over there say: Oh, you have not passed a budget resolution for a thousand days. Wow. Did they forget they voted on a law called the Budget Control Act that cut spending by the biggest amount in the history of the United States?

Look what has happened to discretionary spending. Under the Budget Control Act, discretionary spending is going to go to a historic low. So all this talk about the runaway spending around here—yes, spending went up when we had a deep economic decline in order to prevent that decline from becoming even worse and becoming a depression. But do you know what. We have already taken steps to rein that spending back in in the future in the Budget Control Act.

Look how it is going to do it. We saw, back in 1968, discretionary spending—in Federal spending there are two kinds of spending. There is mandatory spending—things such as Social Security, Medicare, that is mandatory spending. Then there is discretionary spending; that is things such as education, law enforcement, parks. And back in 1968, 13.6 percent of budget outlays went to discretionary spending.

In 2012, even after this uptick, we are still far below where we were in 1968. Only 8.4 percent of budget outlays are going to discretionary spending. But look what happens under the Budget Control Act. Discretionary spending, as a share of the total budget, will drop to less than 5 percent. We have not been there going way back. That is a historic low.

So those who say, well, we have runaway spending, nothing has been done about it, they have not done their homework, and they, obviously, have not paid attention to the laws that have been passed. The Budget Control Act that passed last year is taking us to spending for discretionary programs that is a historic low.

Where is the spending going up? Well, it is those mandatory accounts. That is where the spending is going up. Of course, as shown on this chart, this is the picture on Social Security. Again, this goes back to 1972. Social Security was 3.3 percent of GDP. Here we are in 2012 and it is up to well over 5 percent of GDP. It is headed for over 6 percent of GDP as the baby boomers retire. That is not a projection. The baby boomers have been born. They are alive today. They are going to retire. I am a baby boomer. I see a number of others in front of me in the Chamber. That is not a projection. That is baked in the cake. So we know we have gone in 1972 from Social Security being 3.3 percent of GDP to being 6 percent of GDP. That is not because we have had increases in the program; it is because we have increases in the number of people who are eligible for the program.

The same is true in other mandatory parts of the budget.

Here is Medicare. Medicare, Medicaid, and other Federal health spending—if we added it all up in 1972—was 1.1 percent of GDP. In 2050, we expect that to increase to 12.4 percent of GDP. So if we are looking for where the spending is really increasing, it is certainly not in the domestic accounts. That has gone down as a share of GDP.

For Social Security, we have seen an increase because of increased people eligible because of the baby boom generation. But the big place we have seen an explosion is in the health care accounts.

Now, that is not because of the law that was passed—what some people call ObamaCare. That has nothing to do with this. This is long-term trends because of the increase in the cost of medicine and because of the baby boom generation.

That is where we see a large increase in Federal spending. We are seeing Medicare enrollment soaring. Back in 1970, there were 20 million people eligible for Medicare. In 2085, it is going to be 115 million. So a key reason we are seeing increases in costs in the so-called mandatory programs is a dramatic increase in the number of people who are eligible. That is no fault of the program. That is a demographic reality, and we have to cope with this reality.

If we are going to have a Medicare Program that gives an assurance that people in their senior years have medical treatment available to them, we have to deal with this reality of a dramatic increase in the number of people who are eligible for Medicare.

An aging population is the primary driver of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security cost growth—an aging population. The world is changing. As a population, we have a much bigger group that is eligible for these programs—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid. It is absolutely essential that those programs be maintained in order for our seniors to have a comfortable retirement and in their aging years to have security.

That is the genius of Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid. They have transformed lives for people in their senior years. But we also have this reality to confront that because we have a growing number—because of the baby boom generation the costs to the Federal Government are swelling. Again, it is not on discretionary spending. That part of the budget, as I have demonstrated, is going down as a share of the economy. It is in these areas where our budget is sensitive to the growing number of people eligible for Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Interestingly enough, the Medicare trustees say the health care reform law passed has reduced long-term Medicare costs. I hear people, especially our friends on the other side, say the law we have passed has increased these costs. That is not what the Medicare trustees have found. The Medicare trustees have said the ''projected Medicare costs over 75 years are substantially lower than they otherwise would be because of provisions in the 'Affordable Care Act' or ACA.

Our colleagues say they want to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They are talking about making the situation worse, not according to KENT CONRAD but according to the Medicare trustees. The Medicare trustees—I wish to repeat this—said the ''projected Medicare costs over 75 years are substantially lower than they otherwise would be because of provisions in the Affordable Care Act. . . . ''

So our colleagues who are lining up to say they want to repeal the affordable care act are lining up to increase Medicare costs. By the way, they are lining up to increase the debt because the Congressional Budget Office has told us that in the first 10 years of the affordable care act, it saves more than a hundred billion dollars in the deficit, but in the second 10 years, it saves well over $1 trillion on deficits and debt.

Let me repeat that. The Congressional Budget Office tells us the affordable care act, which some of our colleagues are lining up to repeal, will reduce deficits and debt in the second 10 years by well over $1 trillion. So my friends who are lining up—they want to repeal the affordable care act—they are lining up to increase Medicare costs. They are lining up to increase the debt of the United States, according to the Congressional Budget Office, which is nonpartisan.

This is what the Medicare trustees project in terms of reduction in Medicare costs. The percent change in average per beneficiary cost from 2001 to 2011 was up 94 percent. From 2011 to 2021, they predict it will go up 37 percent, a dramatic slowing of the rise in costs because of the affordable care act.

We also hear colleagues on the other side say the answer to this deficit and debt situation is to have further tax cuts that primarily benefit the wealthiest among us. Really? I have just shown a chart that showed our revenue is near a 60-year low. So does digging the hole deeper make much sense before we start to fill it in? I do not think so.

We hear our colleagues say: If we look in the last 40 years, revenue has been about 18 percent of GDP. That is true. But you know what, the five times we have balanced the budget since 1969 the revenue has not been at 18 percent of GDP. The revenue has been at 19.7 percent of GDP, 19.9 percent, 19.8 percent, 20.6 percent, 19.5 percent of GDP. So these friends who say they want to balance the budget, let's study their numbers. It does not add up. It does not add up.

They want to cut the revenue, which already is near a 60-year low—cut it some more. They say: Sometimes it is going to get back toward historic average. That is not going to cut it, because we can see the times we have balanced the budget, the revenue has not been at 18 percent of GDP. Right now, it is at less than 16 percent. Revenue has been about 20 percent of GDP. I do not know what could be more clear; that we need tax reform in this country. The Tax Code is out of date. It is inefficient. It is hurting U.S. global competitiveness. Complexity imposes a significant burden on individuals and businesses. The expiring provisions create uncertainty and confusion. We are hemorrhaging revenue to the tax gap, the tax havens, to abusive tax shelters.

I have shown on this floor many times a picture of a little five-story house called Ugland House. Ugland House—I am going to put it up in just 1 minute—claims to be the home to 8,000 companies. They all say they are doing business out of this little five-story building. Really? Is that what they are doing? We will talk about that in a moment.

But we are hemorrhaging revenue to the tax gap, the tax havens, to abusive tax shelters. We need to restore fairness. The current system is contributing to growing income inequality. I do not know how anybody can deny this. We have seen a dramatic growth in income inequality in our country.

One of the reasons is we have a Tax Code which favors those at the very top, at least some of them. Very interesting because not all people at the top pay a lot of taxes. Some people at the top and some companies pay nothing, even though they are highly profitable. That is not fair. It is not right. It is hurting the country.

Our long-term fiscal imbalance must be addressed. Revenue must be part of the solution. Martin Feldstein, a distinguished conservative economist—nobody ever accused Martin Feldstein of being a liberal—said this:

> Cutting tax expenditures is really the best way to reduce government spending. . . . [E]liminating tax expenditures does not increase marginal tax rates or reduce the reward for saving, investment or risk-taking. It would also increase the overall economic efficiency by removing incentives that distort private spending decisions. And eliminating or consolidating the large number of overlapping tax-based subsidies would also greatly simplify tax filing. In short, cutting tax expenditures is not at all like other ways of raising revenue.

In this case, I think Martin Feldstein has it about right. One way we can raise additional revenue is to reform the current tax system, making our system more competitive and at the same time raising additional revenue that can be used to help reduce the deficit, along with reform of entitlement programs, along with additional spending restraint.

These tax expenditures go overwhelmingly to the top 1 percent. Here is the increase in aftertax income from tax expenditures. We can see the middle quintile. They get $3,200 a year of value. But look at the top 1 percent. The top 1 percent get over $¼ million a year in benefits from tax expenditures. Overwhelmingly, those tax expenditures that are now costing us $1.2 trillion a year are going to the wealthiest among us.

I have nothing against wealth or people who succeed—all for it. I am for there being a fair distribution of the burden of raising the revenue necessary to support the country, and this is not fair. It is not fair when the top 1 percent get $¼ million in value every year from these tax expenditures. That gets almost no attention.

This is the picture I was talking about. This is a little building in the Cayman Islands, a five-story building called Ugland House. Now, 18,857 companies call this building home. Truly. That is the most efficient building in the world. Can you imagine all these companies doing business out of that little building, 18,857 companies? Are they truly doing business out of that little building? The only business they are doing out of there is monkey business, and the monkey business they are doing is to avoid the taxes they legitimately owe in this country. That is what is going on in this building in the Cayman Islands, the avoidance of taxes, legitimate taxes in this country. There is a reason there are some very large companies that even though they are hugely profitable pay absolutely nothing in taxes. That is not right. That is not fair. It should be stopped. Our colleagues on the other side, they do not want to stop it. They are against it. In fact, they have taken a pledge that they will not increase tax revenues by closing down this kind of tax dodge. They have taken a pledge not to do anything about it. Virtually every Republican has taken a pledge that this would be a tax increase to shut down this kind of tax dodge. That is not right.

When we look at the longer term deficit and debt problem—I have tried to be clear—what we need to do is a two-step approach. The first step, we need more economic growth. We need things to support this economic recovery. We need more investment certainly in infrastructure where we are falling badly behind. But we also need a comprehensive long-term plan to get us back on track, to face up to these deficits and debt. What is the best way to do that? Here is what the American people say: We need a balanced approach.

Some people say cut spending. That is where 17 percent of the American people are. Some say increase taxes. That is where 8 percent of the American people are. But 62 percent of the American people say we have to do some of both. We have to cut spending. We have to raise revenue. We ought to have a balanced plan.

So that is what the American people are telling us. Interestingly enough, that is what the President's fiscal commission concluded, the Bowles-Simpson Commission. I was a member of it. There were 18 members, and 11 supported the recommendations of the commission—5 Democrats, 5 Republicans, and 1 Independent. That is as bipartisan as you can get. We took that balanced approach.

We reformed the revenue system to have a more fair tax system and shut down abusive tax havens and loopholes but also had further savings on the spending side of the equation.

On this chart is an overview of the budget plan I developed based on the fiscal commission's plan: $5.4 trillion in deficit reduction over 10 years; lowers deficit to 1.4 percent of GDP in 2022, which is around 10 percent of GDP; stabilizes gross debt by 2015; reduces discretionary spending to 4.8 percent of GDP by 2022, which has already been done; builds on health care reform savings; calls for Social Security reform, with the savings to be used only to extend the life of Social Security itself.

Social Security was not part of the deficit reduction plan because Social Security has not been a contributor to building the deficit and debt. We also know Social Security is in trouble. Its solvency is in question. We recommended that any changes to Social Security be purely for the purpose of extending the life of Social Security itself given the incredibly important role it plays in our country.

We also included fundamental tax reform to raise revenue and to go after these tax havens, these abusive tax shelters, and, yes, to ask the wealthiest among us, some of whom—not all—have gotten away with paying very little, to pay their fair share.

This is what would happen to the deficit as a percentage of GDP under that plan. You can see on this chart that it would be reduced dramatically—from 7.6 percent of GDP this year to 1.4 percent of GDP by 2021, really dramatic reductions as a percentage of GDP by 2016. This chart is what would happen to the debt. Instead of it continuing to grow to more than 119 percent of GDP by 2022, that debt would be at 93 percent of GDP by 2022. In the near term, debt would go up some more, absolutely, because we have to deal with this economic weakness, but over the full 10 years of the plan, the debt would be brought under control and be brought down somewhat.

Those are the elements of the plan. I say to my colleagues that we have to find a way to come together. It is important to the country that we do. I am

retiring at the end of this year, but I hope we can find a way to reform the tax system and make it more fair, reform entitlements in recognition that the baby boom generation is upon us. They are going to retire, and they are putting stress on these programs. These programs are critically important to life in America—certainly the lives of our senior citizens. And we are going to have to do more about the discretionary accounts because, as I have indicated, they have already been hit repeatedly, and we are headed for a share of our budget going to the discretionary accounts that are a record low. I personally don't believe going back and cutting them more, beyond what has already been done in the Budget Control Act passed last year, is a winning strategy.

I think this is an important and defining moment in this country's history. These are problems that are real. Certainly, to the millions of people who are without a job, we have an absolute obligation to do everything we can to strengthen this economy. We also have an absolute obligation to take on this debt threat because that hangs over the country as well.

We can do this. We have done it before. In the Clinton administration, we got back to balanced budgets and strong economic growth, with the creation of more than 20 million jobs, and a country that was prospering and doing better than any competitor on the face of the globe. We can do it. I believe we will.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, the American people are angry because they are living through the worst recession since the Great Depression. Unemployment is not 8.2 percent; real unemployment is closer to 15 percent. Young people who are graduating from high school and college are going out into the world, and they want to become independent and create jobs. There are no jobs. There are workers out there—and I am sure you know them—who are 50, 55 years old who intended to work out the remainder of their work lives, and suddenly they got pink slips and their self-esteem was destroyed. They will never have another job again, and they are worried about retirement security.

What the American people are angry about is that they understand they did not cause this recession. Teachers did not cause this recession. Firefighters and police officers, who are being attacked daily by Governors all over this country, did not cause this recession. Construction workers did not cause this recession. This recession was caused by the greed, recklessness, and illegal behavior of the people on Wall Street.

What these people on Wall Street did was spend billions of dollars trying to deregulate Wall Street, and they got their way. Five billion dollars in 10 years is what they spent. And then they were able to merge investment banks with commercial banks with insurance companies, and they got everything they wanted. They said: Get the government off the backs of Wall Street. They got it. The end result was that they plunged this country into the worst recession since the Great Depression.

Four years after the financial crisis caused by JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, Goldman Sachs, and the other huge financial institutions, one might have thought that perhaps they learned something, that maybe the lesson of the great financial crisis was that you cannot continue to maintain the largest gambling casino in the history of the world. But apparently they have not learned that lesson. They are back at it again. We have recently seen the $2 billion or $3 billion gambling losses at JPMorgan Chase.

What we need from Wall Street if we are going to put people back to work is investment in the productive economy. Small and medium-sized businesses all over this country need affordable loans, and that is what financial institutions should be doing. They should be helping us create jobs, expand businesses, not continuing to engage in their wild and exotic gambling schemes.

When we talk about why the American people are angry, they are angry because they understand that Wall Street received the largest taxpayer bailout in the history of the world. But it was not just the $700 billion that Congress approved through TARP. As a result of an independent audit that some of us helped to bring about in the Dodd-Frank bill, we learned that the Federal Reserve provided a jaw-dropping $16 trillion in virtually zero-interest loans to every major financial institution in this country, the central banks all over the world, to large corporations in America and, in fact, even wealthy individuals. What the American people are saying is that if the Fed can provide $16 trillion to large financial institutions, why can't they begin to move to protect homeowners, unemployed workers, and the middle class of this country?

The American people are looking around them. They are angry not just because unemployment is high, they are angry not just because millions of people have lost their homes and life savings, they are angry because they understand that the middle class of this country is collapsing, poverty is increasing, while at the same time the people on top are doing phenomenally well. The taxpayers bailed out Wall Street, and Wall Street recovers, Wall Street does well, but now we have kids in this country graduating college deeply in debt, can't find a job, and we have older workers losing their jobs, and people are saying: What is going on in America?

I believe the American people ultimately are angry because they are looking at this great country—a country for which many of our veterans fought and died—and what they are seeing is this Nation is losing its middle class, losing its democratic values, and, in fact, is moving toward an oligarchic form of government, where a handful of billionaires control the economic and political life of this Nation.

In the United States today, we have the most unequal distribution of wealth and income since the 1920s. You are not going to see what I am talking about now on Fox or NBC or CBS, but it is important that we discuss this issue because it is one of the most important issues facing America.

Today, the wealthiest 400 individuals in America own more wealth than the bottom half of America, 150 million people—400 to 150 million. Today—and this is really quite amazing—the six heirs to the Walmart fortune—the Walmart company started by Sam Walton, his children—one family now owns more wealth than do the bottom 30 percent of the American people. One family owns more wealth than the bottom 30 percent or 90 million Americans. Today, the top 1 percent owns 40 percent of all of the wealth in America. The top 1 percent owns 40 percent of all the wealth in America.

What do we think the bottom 60 percent of the American people own? I ask this question a lot around Vermont. I have a lot of meetings. I say that the top 1 percent owns 40 percent, and people say: That is not good, but we understand that.

Then I ask: What about the bottom 60 percent?

Maybe they own 15 or 20 percent, they say.

The answer is that they own less than 2 percent—less than 2 percent. So you have the bottom 60 percent of the American people owning less than 2 percent of the wealth, and the top 1 percent owns 40 percent of the wealth.

Here is another astounding fact. We don't see it much in the media and many colleagues don't talk about it too often, but, incredibly, the bottom 40 percent of the American people own three-tenths of 1 percent of the wealth in this country.

I know we have some of my colleagues coming up and saying: Look, not everybody in America is paying taxes. You have millions of people not paying any taxes.

No kidding. Well, they don't have any money. All of the money is on the top.

According to a new study from the Federal Reserve, the medium net worth for middle-class families dropped by nearly 40 percent from 2007 to 2010, primarily because of the plummeting value of homes. That is the equivalent of wiping out 18 years of savings for the average middle-class family.

I have talked about distribution of wealth. That is what you accumulate in your lifetime. Let me say a word about income, which is what we earn in a year. The last study that was done on

income distribution was done recently. This is what it told us, and this is literally quite hard to believe. The last study on income distribution showed us that between the years 2009 and 2010, 93 percent of all new income created in the previous year went to the top 1 percent. Ninety-three percent of all the new income created between 2009, 2010—the last information we had—went to the top 1 percent, while the bottom 99 percent had the privilege of enjoying the remaining 7 percent. In other words, the wealthiest people in this country are becoming phenomenally wealthier, the middle class is disappearing, and poverty is increasing.

When we talk about an oligarchic form of government, what we are talking about is not just a handful of families owning entire nations, we are also talking about the politics of the nation. As a result of this disastrous Citizens United decision, which is now 2 years of age—one of the worst decisions ever brought about by the Supreme Court of this country and a decision they just reaffirmed a few days ago with regard to Montana—what the Supreme Court has done is to say to the wealthiest people in this country: OK. You own almost all the wealth of this Nation. That is great. Now we are going to give you an opportunity to own the political life of this Nation, and if you are getting bored by just owning coal companies and casinos and manufacturing plants, you now have the opportunity to own the U.S. Government.

So we have people such as the Koch brothers and Sheldon Adelson—the Koch brothers are worth $50 billion. That is what they are worth. They are worth $50 billion and they have said they are prepared to put $400 million into this campaign to defeat Obama, to defeat candidates who are representing working families. Sheldon Adelson, who is only worth $20 billion—he is kind of a pauper—is willing to spend what it takes to buy the government. If we look at it, that ain't a bad deal. If someone is worth $50 billion and they spend $1 billion or $2 billion, they can buy the U.S. Government. That is a pretty good investment, and that is what they are about to do.

On the one hand, we have a grossly unequal distribution of wealth in income. These guys control the economy. We have the six largest financial institutions in this country that have assets equivalent to two-thirds of the GDP of America—over $9 trillion—and these six financial institutions write half the mortgages and two-thirds of the credit cards in America. That is a huge impact on the economy. But that is not enough for these guys. The top 1 percent own 40 percent of the wealth—not enough for these guys. Now they have the opportunity to buy the U.S. Government.

So that is where we are. In my view, working families all over this country are saying enough is enough. They want this Congress to start standing for them and not just the millionaires and the billionaires who are spending unbelievable sums of money in this campaign. It seems to me what we have to do is start listening to the needs of working families—the vast majority of our people—and not just the people who make campaign contributions.

I know that is a very radical idea. I do know that. But it might be a good idea to try a little bit to reaffirm the faith of the American people in their Democratic form of government. We could let them know just a little bit that maybe we are hearing their pain—their unemployment, their debt, the fact they are losing their houses, the fact they do not have any health care, the fact they can't afford to send their kids to college. Maybe, just maybe, we ought to listen to them before we go out running to another fundraising event with millionaires and billionaires.

I do know, however, that is a radical idea. So let's talk about what we can actually do for the American people. In the midst of this terrible recession, where real unemployment is closer to 15 percent if you include those folks who have given up looking for work and those people working part-time when they want to work full time, we know the fastest way to create decent-paying jobs is to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure.

I see the Senator from Minnesota has taken the chair and is now presiding, and I don't know about Minnesota, but I do know in Vermont many of our bridges are in desperate need of repair, our roads are in need of repair, and our rail system is falling further and further behind Europe and China. We have water systems that desperately need repair, wastewater plants, and we have schools that need repair. We can put millions of people back to work making our country more competitive and more efficient by addressing our infrastructure crisis. Let's do it.

It is beyond my comprehension why we can't even get a modest transportation bill. I know Chairwoman BOXER and Senator INHOFE are working on a modest transportation bill, but we can't even get that through the House. In fact, we have to do a lot more than that, but at least they are making the effort.

At a time when we spend some $300 billion a year importing oil from Saudi Arabia and other foreign countries, at a time when this planet is struggling with global warming and all the extreme weather disturbances we see, and the billions of dollars we are spending in response to these extreme weather disturbances, we need to move toward energy independence. We need to reverse greenhouse gas emissions. In other words, we need to transform our energy system away from fossil fuel into energy efficiency and into sustainable energies, such as wind, solar, geothermal, and biomass. When we do that, we also create a substantial number of decent-paying jobs.

By the way, in the midst of a very competitive global economy, what we should not be doing is laying off teachers and childcare workers. We should be investing in education, not laying off those people who are educating our kids.

I know there is a lot of discussion on the floor with regard to the national debt—almost $16 trillion—and the deficit—over $1 trillion. That is a serious issue and we have to deal with it. But my view is a little different than many of my colleagues in terms of how we deal with it.

I think most Americans understand the causation of the deficit crisis; that is, President Bush went to war in Iraq and he went to war in Afghanistan, and he just forgot something. We all have memory lapses, don't we? We go shopping and we forget to buy the milk or the bread. He had a memory lapse. He forgot to pay for those wars—a couple trillion dollars' worth. He forgot to pay for them. To all of our deficit hawks out here, all those folks who say we have to cut food stamps, we have to cut education, we have to cut health care—oh, two wars, $2 trillion, $3 trillion, $4 trillion? Hey, no problem, no problem at all.

For the first time, as I understand it, in the history of this country, we went to war—which is an expensive proposition—and at the same time not only did we not raise the money to pay for the war, we went the other way and decided to give huge tax breaks, including to the wealthiest people in this country. We spent trillions going to war and we gave tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country. That begins to add up. That is called creating a deficit.

Then, on top of that, because of the greed and the recklessness and illegal behavior on Wall Street, which drove us into this recession—and when you are in a recession and people are unemployed and small businesses go under, less revenue is coming into the Federal Treasury. If we are spending a whole lot, less revenue is coming in, so you have a deficit crisis.

Some of my Republican friends say—and some Democrats say—maybe we should have paid for the war. Yes, you are right. Maybe we shouldn't have given those tax breaks to the rich. Maybe you are right. But be that as it may, we are where we are and we need deficit reduction and we know how to do it. We are going to cut Social Security.

My friends back home, when you hear folks talking about Social Security reform, hold on to your wallets because they are talking about cuts in Social Security—nothing more, nothing less. I don't know about Minnesota, Mr. President, but in Vermont no one has heard of the concept of chained CPI. I have asked them, and they do not know what chained CPI is, which is what they are trying to pass here. It is this belief—and senior citizens back home will start laughing when I say

this—that COLAs for Social Security are too high. Seniors back home are scratching their heads, saying: Wait. We just went through 2 years when my prescription drug costs went up, my health care costs went up and I got zero in COLA and there are people in Washington—Republicans, some Democrats—who think I got too much in COLA? What world are these people living in? That is the reality.

So some of the folks here want to pass something called a chained CPI, which, if it were imposed—and I will do everything I can to see it does not get imposed—would mean seniors between the ages of 65 and 75 would lose about $550 a year. Then, when they are 85 and they are trying to get by on $13,000 or $14,000 a year, it will cost them about 1,000 bucks a year. That is what some of our colleagues want to do—virtually all the Republicans want to do it and some Democrats want to do it as well. I am going to, as chairman of the Defend Social Security Caucus, do everything I can to prevent that.

They also want to cut Medicare and Medicaid. We have 50 million people without any health insurance at all, we have people paying huge deductibles, Medicaid covering nursing home care, and they want to cut Medicare and Medicaid. They have the brilliant idea, some of them, that maybe we should raise the retirement age for Medicare from 65 to 67. Tell me about somebody in Minnesota who is 66 and is diagnosed with cancer, and if we do what the Republicans want us to do in the House, which is to create a voucher plan for Medicare, we would give that person a check for, I don't know, $7,000, I think, or $8,000, and we would say: Go out to the private insurance market, anyone you want, here is your $7,000 or $8,000—remember, they are suffering with cancer—and go get your insurance. I guess that would last them maybe 1 or 2 days in the hospital is what it would do. But that is the Republican plan.

I agree that deficit reduction is a real issue, and I think we have to deal with it. But we are not, if I have anything to say about it, going to deal with it on the backs of the elderly, the children, the sick, the poor, and the hungry. The way we deal with deficit reduction in a responsible way, in a fair way, is to look to the billionaires in this country who are doing phenomenally well and make the point that Warren Buffett made, that there is something a little absurd about millionaires and billionaires today, in the midst of the deficit crisis, paying the lowest tax rates they have paid in decades. Yes, we are going to have to ask the wealthiest people in this country to start paying their fair share of taxes.

I saw a piece in the paper the other day which was quite incredible. Rich people, apparently, are giving up their citizenship. They are leaving America and going abroad. These great lovers of America who made their money in this country, when we ask them to start paying their fair share of taxes, start running abroad. We have 19-year-old kids who have died in Iraq and Afghanistan who went abroad not to escape taxes; they are working-class kids who died in wars. Now the billionaires want to run abroad in order to avoid paying their fair share of taxes. What patriotism; what love of country.

We have to deal with deficit reduction, but we don't have to cut Social Security, we don't have to cut Medicare, we don't have to cut Medicaid, and we don't have to cut education. We can ask the wealthiest people, the millionaires and billionaires, to start paying their fair share of taxes. We can end these outrageous corporate loopholes Senator CONRAD talked about. He showed a picture of a building in the Cayman Islands where there are 18,000 corporations using the same postal address in order to avoid paying their taxes. We are losing about $100 billion a year. We have large corporations making billions, and paying, in some cases, nothing in taxes. That is the way to get to deficit reduction, not on the backs of people who are already hurting.

We are at a very difficult moment in American history. We are in the process of losing the great middle class. We are seeing more of our people being poor. We are seeing savage attacks being waged against the elderly in terms of cuts in Social Security and Medicare, attacks against those who get sick in terms of going after Medicaid and Medicare.

I think what the American people are saying is enough is enough. This great country belongs to all of us. It cannot continue to be controlled by a handful of billionaires who apparently want it all.

I cannot understand why people who have billions of dollars are compulsively driven for more and more. When is enough enough? How many children in this country have got to go hungry? How many people have got to die because they don't go to a doctor because you want to avoid paying your taxes? That is not what America is about. That is not what people fought and died to create.

We have a fight on our hands. The job of the Senate is to represent the middle-class working families of this country, all of the people, and not just the superrich. I hope we can begin to do that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WESTERN WILDFIRE POLICY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today to make sure that Congress is aware of what is happening across the American West. Some 32,000 people were just evacuated from their homes in Colorado. In Utah and New Mexico, hundreds of homes have been destroyed or are under threat. In my State of Montana, five counties are in states of emergency as seven major fires rage across the State. We have evacuated over 200 homes in Helena alone, with plumes of smoke billowing behind the State capitol. The Signal Peak coal mine in eastern Montana has been evacuated and fires that threaten it have burned nearly 60,000 acres in less than a day. Experts on the ground are saying they have never seen conditions like these so early in the fire season, with wildfires burning through beetle-killed areas with increasing speed. These beetle-killed areas are areas that are dead due to pine bark beetle infestations. The trees are dead and dry and they explode when they catch on fire.

Yesterday, wind gusted up to 55 miles per hour, grounding aircraft and preventing them from attacking the fires early. But the conditions for these wildfires did not happen overnight. The problem is the dry climate, the lack of preparation, and lack of resources available to contain these fires.

I first want to express my sincerest appreciation to the brave firefighters battling these blazes. On behalf of Montanans and folks across the West, I want to thank you for all you do. Firefighters risk their lives every day for folks they have never met. We owe you our respect and our gratitude, and my thoughts and prayers are with you.

We also owe them the resources they need to efficiently fight these fires and we owe them the policies that will best benefit the landscape they are working so hard to protect. Forest Service fire officials say there are three parts to preventing and controlling wildfires. The first is reducing hazardous fuels, especially in the wildland-urban interface. The second is protecting towns with community wildfire plans and implementing defensible space around structures. And the third is we must provide and be ready with the resources to fight fires once they have started.

Yet Congress has consistently reduced the resources set aside for the Forest Service to proactively reduce the risk presented by fires. Hazardous fuels reduction funding has declined over the past few years, and this year the administration proposed to continue reducing these funds. The House of Representatives is also failing to give the Forest Service the tools it needs to address this growing problem by playing politics that will prevent solutions that will improve the health of the exact forests where these fires are raging in Montana and Colorado.

For 4 years I have worked to pass a forest management bill that would reduce these trees that are providing

dangerous fuel for two of these fires in Montana. Additionally, the Senate created the FLAME wildfire account to specifically put money aside for this exact kind of emergency situation. Yet this year the President's budget reduces the FLAME account by nearly $½ billion.

We have been robbing this account to keep the Forest Service afloat, but the Forest Service has still lost nearly 40 percent of its purchasing power over the last 20 years as the number, cost, and frequency of these fires increased. Back in 2000, not that long ago, there were more than 40 forest firefighting planes. Today there are 10, and 9 of them are from a fleet of planes used during the Korean war.

This spring I asked the Chief of the Forest Service if we were ready in case of a bad fire season this year. He admitted that the Forest Service did not have the resources to deal with an above-average fire year.

This issue will not go away when the fire season comes to an end. With large parts of the West getting hotter and drier over the past few decades, our efforts to improve forest health and give the firefighters the resources they need cannot stop when the weather gets cold. We need to commit to providing proper resources to the firefighters who are protecting our communities, and we also need to provide the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management with the tools and resources they need to prevent catastrophic wildfires in the first place.

Some of us have been talking about hazardous fuel reduction in western forests before today, but it has fallen on deaf ears. Now I ask you to heed the call on you to provide the necessary resources. Montanans and folks all across the West are evacuating their homes. Firefighters are risking their lives. We need to step up and help them today and we need to responsibly invest in resources and land management policies that will make a difference in the future.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRYOR. 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.

The Senator from Arkansas.

FLOOD INSURANCE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the National Flood Insurance Program and the status of the bill that is in the Senate today. This is a bill the Banking Committee has been working on, and we certainly appreciate the chairman and ranking member and all of the members of the Banking Committee for working on this very important piece of legislation.

I will note that when the bill came through the Banking Committee, the chairman and ranking member asked that no amendments be offered and that these be handled on the Senate floor at a later time. Here we are today, and it is time for us to handle those amendments and those changes to this very important piece of legislation. Unfortunately, we hear rumors that in the House and the various negotiations going on with the Transportation bill—as well as the student loan bill—they are trying to include the flood insurance bill with those. I think that is a tragic mistake. I think that endangers the very high chances of those two bills passing the Senate.

In fact, what endangers the passage is the national flood insurance bill needs work. We need to let the Senate work on it. We need to let the Senate be the Senate and offer amendments and debate, and we need to bring this bill to a final vote. But we also need the opportunity, as Senators, to offer amendments to this very important piece of legislation.

I just want to say the fundamental problem—and it is not only me—many of us have with this very important legislation deals with flood insurance. Insurance is a concept that should be based on risk. Flood insurance has always been based on risk. In fact, if you talk to any private insurance company, that is what they are doing. They manage risk, they assess risk, and they look at risk. They are looking at the chances of something going wrong and some damages occurring, and the third party, the insurance company, pays for those damages and makes people whole.

Well, flood insurance is no different. It has never been any different. For years and years the private sector offered flood insurance. Now I think the Federal Government is the only one offering it in the whole country. There may be a few isolated areas where they do offer it, but I think the private sector has gotten out of the flood insurance business because of the enormous costs when there is a flood. They basically priced themselves out of the market because the premiums don't cover the payouts now. Nonetheless, the risk has always been fundamental to the whole concept of insurance.

This bill changes that. This bill says if someone lives behind a levee or near a dam or some other flood-control structure, then they are going to have a requirement to purchase flood insurance regardless of the risk. If they live behind a levee, near a dam, or some other flood-control structure and they are in the 100-year floodplain, they are going to be required to purchase flood insurance. It is not based on risk. It is a per se mandatory requirement based on location. I am not sure if we can find anything in the insurance world equivalent to this.

Certainly, I think it is bad public policy. There are many reasons it is bad public policy. But the most important reason is we are going to be requiring millions and millions of Americans to purchase flood insurance in areas that will never flood. They will never need it. The reason they will never need it is because they are protected by levees and dams and other flood-control structures. Those structures work.

I will give an example in a minute of the Mississippi River and tributary system. Before I give that example, let me say those structures work. When floods happen, those areas that would otherwise flood don't flood. This bill treats those areas as if there are no levees at all or infrastructure there to protect people.

Senator DURBIN has told me the story of an area on the St. Louis side of Illinois—down in the southern area of Illinois, southwest of where they have had flooding. The people locally raised their taxes so they could build levees and design those levees and maintain those levees so that flooding will never happen again. They have done this. They have taken responsibility.

Unfortunately, this bill would say they are going to have to pay twice. They are going to have to pay their taxes to build and maintain those levees, and their people are going to be required to purchase flood insurance. This is flood insurance they will never need or ever use. If they live behind a certified levee—and there are ways for levees to be decertified. If a levee is not safe or up to standards, it should be decertified. But when someone lives behind a certified levee or dam or some other flood structure that will prevent flooding, the Congress should recognize that fact and not require people to purchase flood insurance.

Let me go to this map. Some people may not realize they have levees in their State. This map shows there are levees in basically every State of the Union. For our visual purposes, we did not put Hawaii and Alaska on this map because it would take up so much space. But they have levees as well. Every dark green area shows counties where there are levees. That doesn't mean, obviously, that every single person in that county is protected by that levee, but there are levees in that county. We can see there are levees coast to coast in this country. I don't know if all 50 States have one. There may be one or two that don't, but basically they are everywhere. They are all over the country. These levees work.

Let me talk for a moment about the Corps of Engineers. Everybody here knows I have had occasions where I have criticized the Corps of Engineers when I didn't agree with what they did or when they didn't do something right or they did something I thought was dumb or whatever the case may be. But on this issue, none of us should have any criticism of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers because they know how to do a lot of things, and one of the things they know how to do is how to design, build, and maintain levees.

This map shows they have something called the Mississippi River and tributary system, and that is up and down the Mississippi with some of the tributaries going up and down the Mississippi. The Corps of Engineers, which designs and builds and maintains those MR&T levees—and this is a very important point—have never failed. They have been around since 1928 with zero failure. Not one time have they failed.

Nonetheless, this legislation that may be included in this package that is coming over from the House is going to require millions and millions of Americans who live behind the safest levees in the world to buy flood insurance for no reason. They are never going to flood. As long as we have the MR&T and as long as the Corps of Engineers is designing and maintaining these, we are going to get a big return on our investment.

In fact, the return on our investment for the MR&T is something like $35 to $1. We get a huge return. For every dollar we put in, we save $35 based on that investment. The MR&T has prevented $478 billion—with a ''b''—worth of property damage in this country. That is $478 billion in savings, and we are going to require all those people to buy flood insurance. The Congress is going to enter into a legal fiction. They are going to pretend as if those levees are not even there. If people are in the 100-mile flood zone, they don't get any benefit from the fact that they live behind this levee system.

Let me say one more thing about the MR&T levee; that is, it not only is the safest in the world, it is the envy of the world. The Corps of Engineers travels around the world, and the world travels to the United States of America to see the levee system and the locks and dams and the other flood-control structures the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has built on our rivers. They are the model that other countries are trying to follow. Why are they the model? Because they work. They design them right, build them right, and maintain them right.

Again, we get $35 to $1. For every $1 we put in, we get a $35 return on that investment. There are over 4.1 million people protected just by the MR&T. That is a small fraction of what the Corps of Engineers does. Again, there are 4.1 million people protected by the MR&T.

Over half the U.S. population lives somewhere near a levee. We don't know exactly how FEMA will administer this law because we don't know exactly what is going to come out of the House, if it does pass. But I can guarantee what is going to happen is very simple. As soon as this takes effect, we are going to have thousands and thousands of people calling us, e-mailing us, and writing us. They will be saying: Why is the Congress making my mortgage payment go up? Because that is how this is going to work. Those lenders and the Federal Government are going to require that people purchase flood insurance.

Again, we don't know the exact numbers because we don't know how this is going to be structured or how it is going to be applied just yet. Our best guesstimate is the average homeowner in this country is going to owe somewhere between $1,000 to $2,000 a year. It is not a one-time deal, but $1,000 to $2,000 a year in flood insurance that they will never need and they will never use. For some people that will be $100 or more a month. Of course, it depends on their house and on a lot of other circumstances, but that is serious money for people especially if we are requiring them to spend that for no good reason at all.

Let me just talk about the Mississippi River and tributary system again for a moment.

Everybody remembers that last year we had the potential of horrendously bad flooding in the midsection of the country. There is no doubt that our levees in Arkansas were stressed. Even the Mississippi River and tributary system levee was stressed last year; there is no question about it. There is a reason for that. In 2011, we saw the flood of record on the Mississippi River. Some people are saying it is actually the 500-year flood. These levees can be built to withstand up to 500-year floods. Some people are saying this was the 500-year flood. That hasn't been certified yet, but certainly there was a huge amount of water flowing through the Mississippi River. It was in every station on the Mississippi from Cairo, IL, to Natchez, MS. They broke the record last year—every single station. And here is the key: Not one levee broke. The biggest flood we have ever had, and not one levee broke.

The Senate bill will say that even though those levees don't break, even though they are the best in the world, even though they can withstand the 500-year flood, we are going to make those people buy flood insurance. I don't think that is right. I don't think that is fair. I think the people should be outraged if we make that requirement on them. That infrastructure last year prevented $110 billion in damages—in one flood, in one spring, $110 billion worth of damages. It protected 10 million acres of land up and down the Mississippi River. So 10 million acres and nearly 1 million structures were spared because of MR&T. We did not lose one life, no flooding where it was not supposed to flood.

My colleagues will remember last year they blew the levee at Birds Point, by design. That is part of the levee system. When the water gets so high and so enormous, we start to get these 500-year levels, they build these safety valves up and down the river. They had to use one last year. They blew the levee at Birds Point in Missouri. It worked exactly as it was supposed to work. I know the farmers up there weren't real happy, but they understood the risks of where they live and how that works. That has been the deal up there for a long time. They blew that levee. The water spilled into there. It took pressure off the river and off the levees. That is what happened, and it works.

Let me show my colleagues this chart. This is sort of an artist's rendering, if you will, of the levee. There is a lot of science and engineering that goes into these levees. The flood of 1927 is so famous because it did change everything in this country. For the first time ever, the Federal Government took responsibility for levees up and down the Mississippi River and took it in a national way and created a national system.

By the way, there is a great book by John Barry called ''Rising Tide.'' If my colleagues haven't read it, it is worth reading. It is a good book about the flooding of 1927. That is the flood everybody talks about because back then we had a very inadequate levee system. There were floods all up and down the whole Mississippi River Valley, the whole watershed. I think it started raining that year on Christmas Eve of 1926, or somewhere in there, and it basically rained every day through Easter. It rained and rained and rained and rained through that area, and we didn't have the flood control to protect it. We had some levees, but they weren't scientifically done and they weren't engineered properly. They weren't big enough or strong enough. After that flood, the U.S. Government took over. So the levee system on the MR&T goes back to 1928, the year after this 1927 flood.

Anyway, the way a levee works is they design most levees—kind of the standard design—for a 100-year flood. That means there is a 1-percent chance every year that we are going to get to a certain level. Once every 100 years, that is what it is going to do, a 1-percent chance. We can see the way the MR&T is built, that isn't the half of it, because they actually built beyond the 500-year flood. In 1937, we saw a much bigger flood than the 1927 flood, but guess what. The levee system worked. They had it built and completed and it worked. It did great.

Levees are very important. We may not think they are very exciting, we may not think they make a lot of headlines, but they work. We can see an example right here. Here is a rural area, a farmland area, protected by a levee, right there. We see a lot of water down here, but there is no water over here, and that is exactly the way they are supposed to work, and they do work.

The point is the Senate bill would say even though we have this levee, these people living over here are going to have to buy flood insurance. It is not going to flood. It is never going to flood there. We have it protected. But they are going to have to buy flood insurance. It is generally unfair and it is not right and we should not do that to our people.

Let me say a few other words here before I move on. This map right here I think says a lot. This is the one I

started with. We really do have levees everywhere, all around the country. There are 881 counties that have levees. Those counties contain more than 50 percent of the population of the United States. So, again, this legislation that is now trying to be attached to whatever vehicle is coming back through is going to adversely affect about half of the U.S. population in one way or the other.

Also, if someone lives in an area that has levees, they can forget about economic development—just forget about it. Once they start doing this and saying everybody has to have flood insurance living in this flood plain—even though it is not going to flood, we are still going to require that—forget about economic development. It is going to be extremely difficult for people to stay there and to have insurance in those areas.

This bill that came out of the Banking Committee I think is a good bill. I think we need to do it. We need to pass it. I am not trying to slow it down at all. In fact, I started this week thinking that we would have a chance to vote on the bill this week, that we would have a chance to debate the bill and offer amendments to the bill. I understand now there are some nongermane, nonrelevant amendments to the legislation. I think that is unfortunate. Hopefully, we can work through that. But I have an amendment that is very germane. In fact, at one point we had to change the language because the Senator from Alabama wanted to do a substitute, so we have changed our language. We still think we have anywhere from 13 to 15 cosponsors on my amendment. Senator HOEVEN and many others have joined me—again, about 13 to 15 Senators. In addition, after checking with Senate offices, we have about 50 votes that we know of. I am counting 51. We have about 20 offices that are looking at it that may be leaning toward voting for it, but they haven't committed to saying yes.

I think it is very likely, if we allow the Senate to be the Senate, we will take care of the problem in this Banking Committee bill. I think we can do that. I think we can have that vote. I think the Pryor-Hoeven amendment carries the day. I don't know that. We don't know until we debate and get in here and have a vote and see how it goes. I think right now what we need to do is let the Senate be the Senate and let the Senate debate, let the Senate argue. We fuss with each other sometimes, I know that, but let's have a vote on this amendment. I think there are well over 50 votes in this Chamber right now to take these provisions—it is section 107—out of this legislation and leave in a couple of studies. We think it is fine to have studies. We think we should study this. That is good. Again, we are not trying to slow this down. We are not trying to bury our head in the sand saying we don't think there is any risk at all. So let's study it, let's look at it, and let's see what makes sense.

I will tell my colleagues what doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense to ignore the best levee system in the world.

Let me also say this: There are several levees around the country that are not done by the Corps of Engineers. They don't have the kind of resources and expertise the Corps brings to building levees and flood control. We need to acknowledge that. There are levees in this country that should be decertified; they don't meet the standards; they maybe weren't built correctly and/or they haven't been maintained correctly. We have to maintain these levees carefully. We have to trim the vegetation. We have to be watching for things such as sand boils and structural defects. We need to go in and make adjustments from time to time. It is the reality of operating a system of levees. Honestly, there are places around the country where that hasn't been done. Those levees should not be certified unless they are repaired and brought up to standards. And the people behind those levees don't have real flood protection, so maybe they should pay for insurance. I am not opposed to that. I think they probably should. I think that is what these studies will help us sort out: How do we draw that line? How do we make that decision? Why don't we take a little time to study this and try to make sure we get this policy right so we are not charging the people for insurance they will never need?

Let me also say we do have several others here in the Senate who are for this. They have been very supportive from the very beginning. I have several colleagues I wish to thank publicly. I think some do want to come over and talk about this development today, where we may not get a chance to vote on the amendment. Pretty much everybody, almost without exception, maybe one or two exceptions, but almost without exception, pretty much everybody who was with the original amendment is going to stick with this amendment, even though it is structured a little differently because it amends the substitute and it also leaves in these two studies, but that is fine. We have never had a problem with the two studies. Again, if we adopt the Senate bill, the Senate proposal, if it comes over from the House without us having a chance to even offer our amendment, I think we are negating a very wise investment we have made around the country in the levees that the Corps of Engineers has built for us.

It is not logical that we would not consider the actual risks involved and where people live. It is not logical that we would pretend these levees aren't even there. It doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense in any way, shape, or form, and that is what we are being denied today as Senators. We should have a chance to look at this legislation, open it and read it, to pick at it, to find things we don't agree with, ask questions about it. Certainly I have gone through here. My colleagues can see that I have highlighted this bill and I have written on it and made notes in the margin and have questions about it. I am trying to do what Senators should do. We should work on legislation, be very constructive, if we have problems with it, try to get it amended, try to convince our colleagues that our arguments should carry the day and that we should prevail and that we should amend legislation.

We all recognize the Banking Committee has worked very hard on this issue. We appreciate the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work and the hard work of all their staff. They have been great. But since the bill did not get amended in the committee, it ought to at least have a chance to be amended on the Senate floor, especially when there is at least one amendment where it looks as though well over 50 Senators support that amendment. It would be an injustice if this provision was not included in what is coming over from the House. As I said before, it also endangers the passage of the surface transportation bill as well as the student loan provisions that are very popular with people. I think we have plenty of votes to pass both of those, but if the cost of that means—if the tradeoff for that means we are going to be charging people for flood insurance they don't need—it is mandatory now. This is not an option. It is mandatory. They have to buy flood insurance. I do not think that is a tradeoff we should make.

Also, I was talking to someone earlier, and they said: We need student loans. I agree with that. I am all for lowering the rate of student loans. But I can guarantee it is going to be less money out of pocket for people on the student loans than it is to be buying this flood insurance every year—no doubt about that—because this stuff is very expensive and the difference in the student loans is not going to be $1,000 or $2,000 a year. The difference in student loans is maybe going to be a few hundred dollars a year. It is significant and it helps and we want people to go to college—and I am all for that—but this is the pocketbook issue: the fact that we are going to be requiring people to purchase insurance they do not need.

So what my amendment does is remove the mandatory language in section 107. It basically says people are not going to be required to purchase flood insurance just merely because they live behind a levee or near a dam or some other flood control structure.

As I said, right now the way the banking bill is drafted, it is a per se requirement based on location, not based on risk. It is based on location.

Let me also say something about the Senator from Alabama. He reached an agreement with one of the Senators from Mississippi, and I appreciate that. That amendment does make the bill a little better—it does—because the way the bill was originally structured, it

did not matter if someone lived in a 100-year floodplain or a 500-year floodplain, it did not matter; they were going to buy that insurance.

What Senator COCHRAN of Mississippi was able to work out was to at least restrict it to a 100-year floodplain. That is good. It is an improvement. But the fundamental principle still applies: We are requiring people to purchase insurance they are never going to need because they are protected by the levees.

With that, I know we have some other Members who want to come over and speak. I think what I will do right now is yield the floor and await my colleagues to come over.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program may be included in a package we will consider tomorrow—the package of bills that might include the Transportation bill and the student loan bill as well.

The National Flood Insurance Program needs to be addressed, and part of the new reauthorization makes significant changes and necessary improvements in the program.

I do want to join my colleague Senator PRYOR from Arkansas in raising concerns about one particular section in the bill. It creates a burden for many people across the United States—in Illinois, in Arkansas, in Pennsylvania, in California, and other places. It is called section 107. It deals with mandatory insurance coverage areas. It redefines special flood hazard areas.

Under section 107(B), everyone in the United States living behind a levee, near a dam or near any other flood control structure—a so-called residual risk area—will be required to purchase flood insurance—everyone. FEMA estimates that well over 50 percent of America's population lives near a levee. Senator PRYOR has a very revealing map of the United States. We have a lot of waterways and a lot of levees. There are levees in 881 counties throughout the United States. As many as 800,000 people in my State of about 12.5 million live in these areas.

Many people living near a levee do not even realize it because the levees work. They have never had a flood. But under this provision, they are still required to buy insurance.

The same holds true for people living near dams. There are nearly 1,400 dams in Illinois alone. Think of how many people live near those dams nationwide. Those people would also be required to purchase flood insurance under this provision.

Under this section of the bill, the mandatory purchase requirement would apply to people living in residual risk areas regardless of the status of the flood control structure. That is where I take exception to this approach. So even in communities where levees and dams have been certified safe—in many cases by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—the people living behind those levees would have to purchase flood insurance.

Let me give one specific example that I think is illustrative of the unfairness. The people in these so-called residual risk areas already pay for their flood control structures in one way or another.

Take the Metro East area, where I grew up, across the river from St. Louis on the Mississippi River—St. Claire, Monroe, and Madison Counties. The community agreed in that area to raise taxes on themselves to pay for improvements to the levees. In other words, they were not pointing to Washington, saying: Come in and fix our levees. They said: We will take on the responsibility, and we will pay for it.

Thanks to the leadership of the Metro East levee district and people such as Les Sterman, with the Southwestern Illinois Flood Prevention District Council; Alan Dunstan, board chairman of Madison County; Mark Kern, board chairman of St. Claire County; and, of course, my friend, Congressman JERRY COSTELLO in the House of Representatives, Metro East raised the money to improve its levees to ensure they would be recertified as safe by FEMA.

They are doing the right thing. They are accepting responsibility, and they are paying for it. People in communities across the country are paying to make sure their levees are sound and they will not have to worry about a flood.

Yet under this bill's mandatory purchase requirement, as it is written and as I understand it, they also will be forced to pay for flood insurance. If they had done nothing, they would face the flood insurance premium. They did the responsible thing, and they are still being charged.

Not only are they paying higher taxes to strengthen their levees, they will pay for flood insurance for floods that are not likely to ever happen—precisely because of the improvements they are making to those levees which protect them.

To add insult to injury, if these areas are mapped into a special flood hazard area, the communities will have to pass an ordinance that FEMA requires for participation in the flood insurance program. This ordinance will restrict land use. In many cases, these ordinances diminish property values and reduce the number of jobs in the area.

My colleague Senator COCHRAN of Mississippi worked with Senator SHELBY of Alabama in the Banking Committee to develop a compromise to this section. The compromise is a move in the right direction, I will concede, but it does not go far enough to help the people living near flood control structures.

The new section 107 strikes the language restricting land use in residual risk areas, but it does not remove the mandatory flood insurance purchase requirement. The new language only delays that requirement until FEMA can develop a new way to measure each levee's and dam's strength and efficiency—but then the people who live in these areas will be forced to buy insurance.

Adding up to 50 percent of the U.S. population into the National Flood Insurance Program, simply because they live near a flood control structure, I think does not take into account the actual reality on the ground what is being done, what has been done to keep the area safe. I support my colleague, Senator PRYOR of Arkansas. He wanted to strike section 107 to this bill. It is unreasonable to expand flood hazard areas to include communities in which people are already paying to prevent flooding.

Chairman TIM JOHNSON of the Senate Banking Committee and ranking Republican Senator DICK SHELBY put together a strong bill with many important reforms. But the residual risk title is bad for communities such as Metro East in Illinois, and I hope the committee will either modify or drop this provision.

Let me close my remarks by saying that Senator PRYOR has been an extraordinary leader on this issue. We have talked about it. I have been happy to join him. I don't know if, when the final bill package comes before us, we will have our chance to vote up or down or offer the Pryor amendment, which I support. But at the end of day, this is fundamentally unfair, although it will not take place, if it goes unchanged, for several years. In the meantime, if the bill passes with this provision, I can assure my colleagues—and I think Senator PRYOR would agree with me—we are not going to quit on this issue. We are going to demand basic fairness for those people across America who are struggling in this economy and now face the prospect of dramatically increasing flood insurance premiums.

I think there is a way to do this that is responsible, that recognizes when people do what is right and families and communities step up to their responsibility, and I do not believe the Shelby-Cochran amendment does that. I hope we will have a chance to revisit this soon.

I thank Senator PRYOR for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. First, let me thank my colleague and friend from Illinois for his comments and his insights. He is fighting hard for his people in Illinois. We have similar stories in our State, and my guess is that virtually every

Senator who is a Member of this body has a similar story where the people in these areas with levees are taxing themselves. They are taking on the responsibility to protect their property and their communities from floods.

There is no doubt at all that these folks who live behind levees are in a better position than folks who are not behind levees, and the Flood Insurance Program should recognize that fact. In listening to Senator DURBIN a few moments ago, I had a thought, and that is, if we are going to do this, if we are going to select the people in these darker areas on this map and we are going to say: Hey, just because you live in an area that has a levee, you are going to have to pay more, is not fair.

I would prefer that we just make everybody pay. Why don't we make every mortgage owner in the country pay for this? Why don't we just say: Look, if you have a mortgage, you are going to have to pay $5 a month, or whatever the number is, just to help subsidize everybody else.

That is a fairer way to do it. Why are we singling out people who live behind levees and dams and have other flood-control infrastructure there? It makes no sense. In fact, those people are more protected than other people.

I know that in the Banking Committee the Presiding Officer had an amendment he was interested in that dealt with the people who have existing mortgages. In effect, when you sign a mortgage, it is maybe a 30-year contract, 15-year contract—however long your mortgage is—and pretty much what you bargain for is what you bargain for. And it changes the equation right now if suddenly, because you live in a certain area, you are going to have to now pay an additional $100, $200 a month for flood insurance. That totally changes the equation for people. We shouldn't do that.

I know the Senator from Oregon offered or talked about an amendment in the committee to say that these new laws, these new regs should not apply to folks with existing mortgages because it is not what they bargained for. I think there is value in that. I think we ought to talk about that. But there again, if some of these folks get their way around here, we are not going to have a chance to have that discussion and offer that amendment.

But the Pryor amendment actually covers that situation the Senator from Oregon has been concerned about because what we do is we say: Do these studies. There are two studies that we include. They are also in section 107 of the bill. Do those two studies. Give this some time. And let's analyze it and look at it and figure out the best way forward. But in the meantime, we are not going to charge people with existing mortgages or people who are trying to get mortgages today—we are not going to charge them unfairly, we are not going to single them out merely because they happen to live in a place that has a levee or a dam or some other flood-control structure.

I know we have others who are coming over soon to discuss this. I yield the floor and 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. HOEVEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I rise to discuss national flood insurance today.

Flood insurance is vitally important to our Nation. It is vitally important to my home State of North Dakota, and I know it is vitally important to our sister State of Minnesota, which the Presiding Officer represents.

Last year, in 2011, flooding in North Dakota included flooding in the Red River Valley, which is the Red River of the north. That included both sides of the border, North Dakota and Minnesota as well.

We also had flooding in the James River Valley, in the Cheyenne River Valley, and in the Missouri River Valley. Also, the Little Missouri River flooded in the very western part of our State. We had ongoing flooding in Devil's Lake, and we had flooding in the Souris River Valley.

In fact, when the Souris River flooded, one of the communities that was flooded was Minot and the surrounding area. Minot is a community of about 40,000 people. It is growing rapidly. I think it is the eighth fastest growing community under 50,000 in the country now. So it is a rapidly growing, dynamic community of 45,000 people, and last year we had to evacuate 12,000 people from their homes. More than 4,000 homes were destroyed or severely damaged. FEMA, of course, has been in there helping. It is FEMA's third largest housing effort in its history. The largest housing effort was after Hurricane Katrina. The second largest housing effort was after Hurricane Ike. And the third largest housing effort for FEMA in history is in response to the flooding in Minot, ND.

So in my State we understand flooding, we understand the challenge, and we strongly support reauthorizing the national flood insurance legislation. There is no question. However, we need to get it right. We need to get it right, and there are some important policy implications in the bill that are being put forward in the package that we likely will be voting on, along with the highway bill, as well as student loans.

So we are looking at a package that includes reauthorization of national flood insurance, a package that addresses the interest rate on student loans—something I absolutely believe we need to do—and also a package that includes the highway legislation.

But there is policy that is being inserted into the flood insurance bill that involves something called residual risk. It is a new policy, and we haven't carefully considered it. We haven't voted on it, and we need to. We need to vote on this policy provision.

In fact, the flood insurance bill that was passed in the House did not include this residual risk provision. It was not included in the House package, but now we are looking at a package including all three of these large pieces of legislation—the highway bill, student loans, and national flood reauthorization—and we have this new residual risk policy in there. That is not the approach we should take, and that is what I am here to address along with my esteemed colleague Senator PRYOR from Arkansas.

I want to thank him for his leadership on this issue. In fact, Senator PRYOR and myself have an amendment which would specifically address this issue. This issue is in section 107 of the national flood insurance legislation, and that is exactly what we address, and I think we address it the right way. So it is very important that we have an opportunity to vote on this important issue.

So let me talk about it in just basic, straightforward, commonsense terms.

The concept is residual risk. What we are saying is we need to have a separate vote on residual risk. That needs to be struck from the flood insurance reauthorization. We can study it and evaluate it. Then once we have had an opportunity to adequately both understand it and debate it, we can make a determination about how best to proceed. But it should not be included as part of this comprehensive legislation along with the other legislation in the package.

So residual risk. Let's say we have two individual homeowners: one who lives just outside the 100-year flood plain, thanks to natural geography, and a second individual who lives within the flood plain but behind dikes, levees, or other infrastructure that is federally certified and constructed to protect residents against a 100-year flood event. Let me repeat that: That is federally certified by the court and constructed to protect residents against a 100-year flood event.

Under the flood insurance legislation as it is currently written, the resident behind the certified flood protection will be required by Federal law to buy flood insurance. But the one living outside the 100-year flood plain would not, even though they have essentially identical risk. So in short form the individual behind the certified dike or levee is required to buy flood insurance. The other individual, who is in essentially the same situation but by natural topography or natural geography rather than certified protection, that individual is not required to purchase flood insurance. One is protected by the natural landscape, the other is protected by good, solid engineering and an understanding of the risk involved and what it takes to protect

against flooding, but only one of them has to buy flood insurance. That is not fair.

Homeowners and businesses are already paying for flood protection through the infrastructure they have elected to build to protect themselves and their property. So they are already paying for it when they build that certified infrastructure. Nobody is more aware of their flood risk than individuals in those situations, whether it is their home or their business.

Communities that have already invested in flood protection infrastructure now in essence are going to be in a situation where they are paying twice for flood protection. Yet the Johnson-Shelby substitute would force those communities to pay essentially every year for that flood protection. They would first pay for the infrastructure they have already paid for through their local taxes and again, then, each year through a government-mandated insurance purchase of flood insurance.

Further, Federal, State, and local governments invest billions of dollars nationwide in flood protection infrastructure. In my home State of North Dakota, communities such as Minot, Fargo, Bismarck, Mandan, Jamestown, and others are all working with the local, State, and Federal Government to build and/or fortify literally hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of flood protection. This substitute amendment will ignore that. In essence, this is not a good return on investment for the American taxpayer.

The mandatory flood insurance purchase will have a harmful effect economically on communities already contending with flood risk or, worse, communities already in a flood recovery mode. A mandate to buy flood insurance will discourage businesses from building or rebuilding in an area certifiably protected with flood protection. That will reduce a community's revenue base and impede new opportunities to create jobs and economic activity often in a community already struggling to recover its economic base.

Additionally, the substitute amendment requires both mandatory insurance purchased for people behind certified flood control infrastructure and, at the same time, a study on the very same policy it intends to implement. We shouldn't be enacting a provision into law until we understand its implications and its consequences.

The Pryor-Hoeven amendment allows the study to move forward, but it removes the mandatory insurance purchase requirement. We should determine more about how it impacts individuals and communities before this new mandate is considered. We have to keep in mind that we are talking about a policy change that affects millions of people across the country.

If we look at this chart, all these dark green areas represent counties throughout this country with levees. So we are talking about millions of people who are currently protected with levees. In the case that they have certified levees right now, they are not required to purchase flood insurance. But with this vote on the whole package, if we don't address residual risk in the way that I have put forward, that changes. All of them then become subject to purchasing flood insurance.

I submit that there are a lot of mayors, city council members, and county commission members who would like to know if there is going to be a policy change where they are now going to be required to purchase flood insurance before that happens. Keep in mind, working with the Federal Government at the State and local level, they have built flood protection. That flood protection has been certified. Whether they made special assessments to do it or whether they have a tax base to do it or however they do it, they have gone out and told the people in their communities: Look, we are going to build this flood protection. You are going to pay to build that flood protection. And we are going to do that so once constructed, you are, A, protected, and, B, you will not have to buy flood insurance along with your home mortgage.

That is what people expected. That is what is in place. My simple point is, before we change that, we better go out and talk to them. We better go out and tell them. We better go out and say: You know the way flood insurance works? It is going to change. When you were told that if you built that flood protection, you would not have to buy flood policies, that is now going to change; in fact, you will have to buy a policy under this residual risk, under this new approach.

My point is that we have to make sure people understand that, and we have to understand the ramifications and how it is going to work before we make this change. That is why it is so important that we get a chance to vote on this amendment and address it. Again, as I have said, our amendment makes sure we study the issue. We make sure that FEMA and the Corps are in a position to actually do the analysis and determine whether it works or what the ramifications are, at least, of putting it into place before we put a mandate like that into effect.

Again, as we go forward with this package that will include national flood insurance, that will include the highway bill, that will include reducing the rate on student loans, we have to make sure we have an opportunity to address this issue. It is not only basic fairness in terms of how the Senate works, but it is also a fundamental issue of making sure we are letting our constituents know—the mayors out there, the county commissioners, the city commissioners, and the citizens themselves who have counted on flood insurance working a certain way and who have built flood protection, certified flood protection, paid to build certified flood protection—that there may be a change coming and give them a chance to weigh in.

We have to make sure what we do is not only something we have communicated to the citizens we represent but that it is absolutely fair, that it makes sense, and that it is consistent, that it treats individual who are in like circumstances, whether it is true natural topography or whether through certified flood protection—if they are in a similar or same circumstance, they need to be treated consistently in order for the legislation to be fair.

I urge my colleagues to support our effort to get a vote on the Pryor-Hoeven amendment so we can properly address this issue.

I yield the floor. I note that my colleague from the great State of Pennsylvania, Senator TOOMEY, is here. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I rise to address the same topic that has been under discussion this afternoon by Senator PRYOR, Senator HOEVEN, and others. I strongly share the concern they have registered. I believe we have seriously flawed legislation in the form of this flood insurance reauthorization bill, and I think we are kind of compounding our problem by apparently inserting this into a transportation conference report rather than doing what we ought to do in the Senate, which is to have a debate about flood insurance.

This easily qualifies as a sufficiently important and substantive topic that we ought to bring it to the floor under regular order and consider the underlying policy, including the profound change in policy that is contemplated by the underlying bill and a very important amendment on which Senators PRYOR and HOEVEN have provided the leadership and of which I am a cosponsor, which I think absolutely deserves a vigorous debate and I would like to see passed.

One of the many concerns I have about what we are doing now is we are taking this flood insurance bill and apparently some are considering this bill to be at least a partial offset to some of the expenditures contemplated in the Transportation bill. For the life of me, I can't understand how this could possibly be a legitimate offset for spending. If it is a legitimate offset for spending, then that means it is net new revenue. But we are told this bill is supposed to be actuarially sound. It is supposed to be revenue neutral. The premiums being charged for this flood insurance are supposed to just equal out the payments that will have to be made in honoring claims against this fund. So I don't understand how that nets out to a source of net revenue that can be spent somewhere else. How many times can we spend the same money? The insurance premiums that are collected are supposed to be collected to honor the liabilities the Federal Government is taking on by virtue

of this program, so how can it also go to pay for transportation projects? I don't understand that.

I also think there is a real fundamental problem that Senators PRYOR and HOEVEN have addressed, and that is the huge expansion of this mandate. We have in this underlying bill a Federal mandate that forces people to buy homeowner's insurance, and it forces a new category of people to buy homeowner's flood insurance, and the new category is those people who live behind a levee or a dam.

A lot of folks have contributed a lot of money over many years to building levees and dams precisely so that they would be protected from the risk of floods. In fact, that works every day all across America. Yet we are going to ask those people to also pay as though there were no levee there. This strikes me as a profoundly flawed approach. It completely ignores the investments these communities have made for years, and in the process it discourages future flood-mitigation measures. It discourages the maintenance of existing levees and dams. It discourages the building of additional ones. I think this is a bad idea. It is bad to create these kinds of incentives.

I will say candidly that this disproportionately has an adverse effect on States that have over the years a long history of building levees and dams. Pennsylvania would certainly be among those States. If you look at this map, it shows the counties in which there are levees and dams, and almost the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is shaded in because we have levees and dams all across the Commonwealth. They work and they hold and people have invested to have that security, that protection.

Frankly, there are a lot of communities that would like to have additional levees and dams to have more protection than they have today. What this measure would do is it would say: Don't do that. What good does it do? You are still going to have to pay for flood insurance. I think this is a badly flawed approach.

Let me say once again that there is something very wrong with this process. This is a big deal. To ask 1 million to 2 million additional new Pennsylvanians—not to ask, to force them into a program where they would be forced to buy an insurance product whether they want it or not—by the way, nothing stops them from voluntarily choosing to purchase flood insurance, but that is not what this bill is about; the bill is about forcing them to buy this product. To think we are going to create this huge new mandate on what could be 2 million Pennsylvanians alone and many more millions across the country, to do it without a full debate on the Senate floor, without the opportunity to consider this legislation, without the opportunity to consider and debate and vote on amendments, I think is a big mistake.

I urge my colleagues to take a look at this map and to consider strongly insisting that the transportation conference report not include this legislation and that we proceed under regular order to debate a very important measure, which would be the reauthorization of the Flood Insurance Program.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, let me thank all my colleagues who have come here today to talk about this issue. It turns out we have had two Democrats and two Republicans. We may have more on the way. I know of at least one or two others who may be on the way.

I would like to say thank you to them for their assistance here, but also, more importantly, I thank them for doing a great job representing their States well. When you look at their States and the number of levees they have in their States, the number of people who will be adversely impacted by this, this is a very significant piece of legislation. It deserves debate.

I do not like the fact that somewhere in this building, behind closed doors, people are trying to negotiate this legislation into a larger package. We should let the Senate be the Senate. We should bring the National Flood Insurance Program bill to the floor by regular order, we should debate it, we should offer amendments, and we should vote on those amendments and vote on final passage. We should not have any funny business. This is an important piece of legislation, but right now the funny business with this legislation is not the fact that there may be an extraneous amendment or two that are totally unrelated to the subject matter; the funny business right now is that they are trying to jam this down the throats of other Senators, especially when they know that there is an amendment that is relevant, that is germane, that is in order, and that amendment would probably get well over 50 votes. They are thwarting the will of the Senate if they include this in the legislation.

I implore my colleagues who are involved in this conference effort to try to bring the surface transportation bill, which I support, and try to bring the student loan bill, which I support—try to bring those bills to the floor. I implore them to not include the offending language of section 107. If they do, I want to state my intention to object to that language when it comes here to the Senate. That is not a very pleasant prospect because that means the House may have to stay longer, and the Senate may have to stay longer. This is completely avoidable.

I think if we have a mechanism in place where we can either take this legislation, the flood insurance legislation, up tomorrow and dispense with it—and pass it, I hope; amend it and pass it, I hope—and/or if we could file cloture if there are problems with extraneous amendments—we could file cloture more or less, say, tomorrow, and then after the Fourth of July recess where we will be back home in our home States, we could take it up the first day or two when we get back.

There are ways to do this. We have to remember that this legislation—excuse me—this law does not expire until the end of July. We have 2 or 3 extra weeks here. It is not going to expire this weekend. We have another month that we can do this, and sometimes things in the Congress take time, we understand that. I would rather do it sooner rather than later. I would rather get it all done tomorrow. But I do not want this included in some larger package where we do not have a chance to offer the Pryor-Hoeven amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I would like to join with Senator PRYOR in this objection. He clearly laid out a path to resolve the situation, and that is to have a vote on the amendment we put forward. There are other ways to resolve it as well. We have made that very clear.

Look, this is a clear case where, in order to make a policy change of that magnitude, it needs to be properly discussed, properly debated, and certainly voted on.

This is a situation where we clearly laid out any number of ways to resolve the issue, but this legislation, section 107 that Senator PRYOR referred to, should not be included in this legislation. If it is, then I will seek to join Senator PRYOR in his objection.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, politicians are used to waiting in nervous anticipation for certain events; specifically, their own elections and the elections of their friends. But it is an interesting feeling in this town today—in Washington, DC—awaiting the nervous anticipation of the Supreme Court decision tomorrow. It is a decision which will address the affordable care act. And this affordable health care act may be one of the most significant measures I have ever been asked to vote on as a Member of Congress.

Tomorrow the U.S. Supreme Court will hand down its decision on the affordable care act. It could be one of the most consequential decisions handed down by the Court in my tenure in Congress, and maybe even longer. It is consequential not just because of the politics of Washington. No, the decision will have consequences which will affect the lives of millions of Americans across the country.

First, some basic facts. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the affordable care act will reduce the deficit over the next 10 years by over $200 billion; then, another $1 trillion in the second decade. This is an important measure to reduce health care costs, reduce government outlays, and reduce the deficit. So the decision of the Court will have an impact on that particular element.

The law does a number of specific things to reduce health care costs while saving lives. Because of the affordable care act, preventive services for many Americans are now free. In my home State of Illinois, last year 1.3 million people on Medicare—that is about 10 percent of our population—and 2.4 million people with private health insurance received preventive care at no cost. This is important, because preventive services such as mammograms and cholesterol screenings can help lower costs, prevent illness, and save lives. On the subject of prevention, the law provides help for States with their prevention programs—programs, for example, that try to discourage kids from smoking; programs that detect and treat diabetes at an early stage; heart disease, arthritis, and so many other areas that can be treated successfully if there are preventive efforts.

Another reason this law is important is because of lifetime limits. Before this law was enacted, insurance companies routinely told families: Sorry, you hit your limit. We are not going to pay for any more of your chemotherapy or your premature baby's illness. People did not know there was a limit until it was too late. The law changed that.

Because of this law, 4.6 million people in my State, Illinois—4.6 million—got the care they needed last year without having to worry about the insurance companies cutting them off, saying they reached their limit.

In these tough economic times many young adults are having trouble finding work. Another thing this bill did was to extend the coverage of family health insurance to cover those through the age of 25. Because of the affordable care act, parents can keep their kids under their policy until the young people reach the age of 26. Across the country 2.5 million young adults, including 102,000 in my State of Illinois, have been able to stay on their parents' insurance plan.

The law also requires companies to spend more of their money on actual health care. One might think that is obvious, but it turns out it is not. The law says insurance companies have to spend at least 85 percent of their premiums on health care rather than spend it on advertising, overhead, or executive compensation.

Mr. President, $61 million has been returned in my State to over 300,000 people in the form of rebates because of this ''medical loss ratio''—85 percent to be spent on health care. That is money that flows back to families and individuals and businesses.

The affordable care act has had a profound impact on seniors and those living with disabilities. Because of this law, seniors and those living with disabilities on the Medicare Program in Illinois have saved more than $155 million on prescription drugs. Seniors taking their medicine as they are supposed to are likely to stay healthy longer and be less of a cost to the system and lead more independent and stronger lives.

We have talked and talked in this Senate about how we need to help seniors afford to buy prescription drugs. We know this bill that will be decided by the Supreme Court tomorrow has been closing the doughnut hole that was created by Medicare Part D. When we passed the affordable care act, we did something about it.

Illinois seniors saved $155 million because the affordable care act was signed into law. By 2020—if the Supreme Court does not strike this law or this provision—the doughnut hole will be fully closed and seniors will not have to worry anymore about that gap in coverage that eats into their savings.

I have been working for years to help small businesses find ways to afford health care for their employees. I introduced a bill in 2009 with the help of the small business community and the insurance industry that would allow small businesses to work together in a health care exchange. The affordable care act built on that principle and improved it dramatically.

The new health care law provides a tax break for small businesses that are doing the right thing and buying health insurance for their employees. So far, across the country, more than 228,000 businesses have taken advantage of this new tax credit and saved $278 million.

For those who say the affordable care act really has not helped small business, here is proof otherwise.

Another 30 million people who have no health care coverage today will be covered when the affordable care act is implemented. By 2019, 15 million of those will be able to participate in Medicaid, and the States will not be left on the hook. The affordable care act provides help to the States for the first several years.

The affordable care act provides much needed assistance to community health centers—centers such as the Erie Family Health Center in Chicago. In fact, because of a $650,000 grant from the Department of Health and Human Services, Erie is going to open a new health center in Evanston—one that is desperately needed.

So these are but a few of the reasons the Supreme Court, I hope, will uphold this law to continue to help move us toward a day when the rate of growth in the cost of health care is brought under control. We have a long way to go, but this bill is a step forward. For those who have campaigned from one side of America to the other, saying they would eliminate the affordable care act, which they derisively call ObamaCare, let me tell them: There are real people in Illinois and across the Nation who have benefited from this act and will in the future.

Now is the time for us to work together to improve the act where it needs improvement but to use it as the basis for building a future of security and quality health care for all Americans.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to 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.

INTENTION TO OBJECT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I intend to object to proceeding to the nominations of Mark J. Mazur, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and Matthew S. Rutherford to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

My support for the final confirmation of these nominees will depend on both Treasury and Internal Revenue Service responses to questions I have posed regarding their implementation of the tax whistleblower program. I rewrote the statute in 2006 to encourage whistleblowing on big-dollar tax cheats. However, nearly six years since those changes were enacted, Treasury has yet to issue much needed regulations and IRS has paid less than a half dozen awards under the new program.

I have sent several letters to Secretary Geithner and Commissioner Shulman to get to the bottom of this. Our staffs have been meeting, including most recently on June 26, 2012. I understand that Secretary Geithner and Commissioner Shulman intend to provide written responses to my questions. Until I receive those responses, I will object to proceeding with the nominations of Mr. Rutherford and Dr. Mazur.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I fully support the passage of S. 3187, the Food and Drug Administration, FDA, Safety and Innovation Act. This important piece of legislation reauthorizes and establishes important user fee agreements for drugs, devices, generic drugs and biosimilar biological products. Furthermore, the bill improves the medical device approval process and modernizes FDA's global drug supply chain authority to ensure that the drug manufacturing process is safer.

The legislation also contains provisions to incentivize development of pediatric drugs and devices, spur innovation of new drug therapies for life-threatening medical conditions, mitigate drug shortages, and improve agency accountability and transparency in the drug and device approval process.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, I was necessarily absent from the Senate and, therefore, unable to cast my vote in support of this bill.

TRIBUTE TO MONTFORD POINT MARINES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, it is my privilege to honor the Montford Point Marines, who today will be collectively decorated with the Congressional Gold Medal.

The Montford Point Marines served our country bravely during World War II, despite being segregated from their fellow servicemembers. In 1942, President Roosevelt directed that African Americans be recruited into the Marine Corps. These men were not sent to the traditional Marine recruit depots of Parris Island or San Diego. Instead, they were segregated and trained at Montford Point in Camp Lejeune, NC. Collectively, these Marines—who became known as the ''Montford Point Marines''—served in the Pacific Theater as part of the 51st and 52nd Marine Defense Battalions, and with various Depot and Ammunition Companies.

The Defense Battalions saw action against surviving Japanese troops on the captured island of Guam, while the Depot and Ammunition Companies participated in the fighting at Saipan, Tinian, Guam, Peleliu, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa. Their jobs consisted of loading and unloading supplies, resupplying frontline units, and evacuating the dead and wounded—sometimes under heavy enemy fire. All together, the Depot and Ammunition Companies suffered seven killed and 78 wounded. Of the nearly 20,000 African-American Marines in World War II, about 13,000 served overseas. In July 1948, President Harry S. Truman issued his executive order ending military segregation. In September 1949, Montford Marine Camp was deactivated, ending 7 years of segregation.

The commitment and sacrifice of African-American servicemembers during World War II is embodied in the lives of two cousins, Howard and Kenneth Tibbs. Howard served this Nation as one of the Tuskegee Airmen. I had the privilege of honoring him in 2007 when the Congressional Gold Medal was awarded to the Tuskegee Airmen. Today, I am able to honor his cousin, Kenneth Tibbs, who served as a Montford Point Marine. Kenneth was born on May 30, 1925, in Lancaster, OH, and served from 1943 to 1944 as part of the 20th Marine Depot Company. Ultimately, PFC Kenneth Tibbs was killed in action during the invasion of Saipan. He was his unit's only fatality.

Private Tibbs and all of the Montford Point Marines exemplified the qualities for which the Montford Point Marines are so admired. Our Nation is indebted to him and his fellow Marines for their sacrifice. Not only did they contribute to the America's victory in the Pacific, but they did so within a highly segregated military. Many went on to serve in Korea and Vietnam, alongside their white counterparts. Montford Point Marine Edgar Huff became the first African-American in the United States Marine Corps to be promoted to the rank of Sergeant Major. His brother-in-law, Gilbert ''Hashmark'' Johnson, also served at Montford Point and earned the rank of Sergeant Major. Today, Montford Point's Camp Johnson at Camp Lejeune is named after him. I am proud to have been an original cosponsor of the 2006 House Resolution 80 to honor these Marines, and it is my privilege to recount their legacy today in the United States Senate.

I proudly celebrate the life and sacrifice of PFC Kenneth J. Tibbs, and all Montford Point Marines, on the occasion of this award of the Congressional Gold Medal.

MORRILL ACT 150TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, this year marks the 150 anniversary of the Morrill Act of 1862, which led to the creation of our Nation's land-grant universities. In 1862, there were only six engineering or agricultural colleges in the entire United States. By 1880, there were 85, and by 1917 the total number had grown to 126. Two outstanding universities from Virginia are the beneficiaries of this legislation and carry on important traditions as land-grant universities: Virginia Tech and Virginia State University.

Founded in 1872 as an agricultural and mechanical land-grant college, Virginia Tech is the oldest land-grant college in the Commonwealth. Today, the school has the largest full-time student population in Virginia and the largest number of degree offerings of any Virginia university. As a leading research institution, Virginia Tech prepares its students to make an impact in the fields of technology and agriculture, among many others. Virginia Tech graduates have a positive impact everyday on the Commonwealth and on our country.

Virginia State University, founded in 1882, is the country's first fully State-supported 4-year historically black college and also a Virginia land-grant institution. Throughout the school's history, it has enriched the lives of its students and faculty as well as its surrounding community and indeed the entire Commonwealth. Virginia State University's leadership in providing an expansive academic program, a variety of student organizations, and a devotion to community service makes the school a model for historically black colleges across the nation.

Both of these superb academic institutions demonstrate exceptional leadership in the agricultural and mechanical arts in line with the original intent of the Morrill Act. As we remember the creation of this landmark legislation, Virginia Tech and Virginia State University stand as shining examples of its continued legacy. I am pleased to join my colleagues in celebrating the sesquicentennial of the Morrill Act.

TRIBUTE TO POET LAUREATE NATASHA TRETHEWEY

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the accomplishments of an extraordinary Mississippian. Natasha Trethewey, a native of Gulfport, Mississippi, has been named the United States Poet Laureate. I join my fellow Mississippians and fellow Americans in celebrating Ms. Trethewey, a Pulitzer Prize-winning poet, for receiving our country's highest distinction in the field of poetry.

This honor is the first of its kind for my State, but literary excellence is not new to Mississippi. Our great State has a rich literary history because of Mississippians like William Faulkner, Eudora Welty, and Tennessee Williams, who have paved the way for Ms. Trethewey's success in literature.

At the young age of 46, Ms. Trethewey has proven herself to be a talented and accomplished American writer. A prolific artist, she explored the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina in her nonfiction work, ''Beyond Katrina: A Meditation on the Mississippi Gulf Coast.''

Our incoming Poet Laureate has captured the hearts and minds of her colleagues and peers, earning her a fan base across our State and Nation. Librarian of Congress James Billington is among those captivated by Ms. Trethewey's brilliance. In 2004, at the National Book Festival, Dr. Billington described Ms. Tretheway as an American who is ''absolutely unique.'' Today, I am proud to repeat Dr. Billington's praise for this gifted Mississippian.

Natasha Trethewey is not only a leader in her field but also a teacher for this Nation's future leaders. She is a professor and Phillis Wheatley Distinguished Chair in Poetry at Emory University and is the Louis D. Rubin Writer-in-Residence for 2012 at Hollins University. She received her Pulitzer Prize in Poetry in 2007 for her 2006 work, Native Guard. In the past year, Ms. Trethewey was named the Poet Laureate of Mississippi, an esteemed position my State is proud for her to hold.

Mr. President, I have the highest admiration for this accomplished poet, author, and Mississippian. I know that my fellow Mississippians share this pride in Ms. Trethewey's work and national recognition. I am honored to congratulate Natasha Trethewey on her appointment as the 2012 United States Poet Laureate.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO L.L.BEAN

• Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate the men and

women of L.L.Bean as they celebrate their 100th anniversary. This legendary Maine company is one of America's most inspiring family business success stories and one of my State's most cherished institutions.

Many L.L.Bean customers know the story of the company's origin. Leon Leonwood Bean was an avid Maine outdoorsman who was tired of cold, wet feet while hunting or fishing. In 1912, he invented the Maine Hunting Shoe, a boot with leather uppers and a thick rubber sole. His fellow outdoorsmen liked the boot and a business was born.

The second, less-known part of the story really tells the tale. The rubber bottoms of those shoes separated from the leather tops and 90 of the first 100 pairs were returned. Although it nearly put him out of business, L.L. kept his word and refunded the purchase price. He borrowed more money, corrected the problem and, with undiminished confidence, mailed more brochures. L.L. had learned the value of personally testing his products, of honest advertising based on firm convictions and of keeping the customer satisfied at any cost.

Leon Leonwood Bean founded his business on his personal guarantee of ''100 percent satisfaction in every way.'' In all the years since, that promise has been kept. Whether seeking expert advice, making a purchase, or exchanging or returning a product, generations of customers have found L.L.Bean to be a place where that first commitment to customer satisfaction still resonates.

Today, L.L.Bean is one of the world's most respected retailers, with sales exceeding $1.5 billion. From the flagship store in Freeport, ME, to dozens of stores and outlets throughout the United States, more than 11 million people visit L.L.Bean stores each year. The company's famous catalogues are sent to 160 countries, and its Internet presence leads the industry. In its first century, the company has grown from a one-room operation selling a single product to a global enterprise providing some 4,900 year-round jobs, and that figure typically doubles during peak holiday season.

In addition to its remarkable retail success, L.L.Bean remains true to its origins as a manufacturer. In Brunswick and Lewiston, ME, more than 435 skilled workers craft such iconic products as the Maine Hunting Shoe, the L.L.Bean Boot and the Boat and Tote Bag. Leon Leonwood Bean made 100 pairs of boots in his first production run in 1912. Last year, Maine workers produced more than 400,000 pairs.

When the man TIME magazine called ''The Merchant of the Maine Woods'' passed away in 1967, leadership of the company was passed on to his grandson, Leon Gorman.

Soon after becoming president, Leon introduced the stakeholder concept, which clearly linked L.L.Bean's success as a business to key stakeholders—customers, employees, shareholders, vendors, communities and the natural environment. In his 30 years as president, Leon Gorman led L.L.Bean from a $4.75 million catalog company to an over-one-billion-dollar multichannel enterprise. Leon firmly established L.L.Bean as a leader in the outdoors industry, offering high-quality equipment and apparel, backed by world-class service and products guaranteed to last.

It is fitting that L.L.Bean is celebrating its centennial with special projects that advance the company's guiding principles. These include the Million Moment Mission, in which L.L.Bean will contribute $1 to the National Park Foundation for every outdoor moment shared by customers up to a total of $1 million, and a commitment of an additional $1.5 million at the local and State levels to encourage our young people to discover the outdoors.

I am often asked what L.L.Bean means to our State. As one of Maine's largest employers, the company certainly means a great deal to the thousands who work there. L.L.Bean offers careers with opportunities for advancement in a respectful, positive environment. The spin-off benefits to other Maine industries, including product vendors and business suppliers, are enormous. The continued commitment to Maine-made products—wreaths, maple syrup, mustard, furniture, running shoes, slippers, in addition to the company's famous tote bags and boots—sustains a great many businesses and households throughout our State.

Certainly, the sales, revenue, and growth numbers are impressive. Even more impressive is the fact that this family company succeeds in a modern, global economy with the timeless values that foster dedicated employees and loyal customers. It is a pleasure to congratulate the people of L.L.Bean on this centennial and to thank them for their contributions to our Nation and to the great State of Maine.●

TRIBUTE TO ALEXANDER PAGOULATOS

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Alexander Pagoulatos, an impressive young New Jerseyan who recently graduated West Point as the class of 2012's valedictorian. Hailing from Basking Ridge, NJ and a 2008 graduate of Ridge High School, Alex has strong roots in the Garden State. As a young man, he was well known for excelling on Ridge High's Varsity fencing team, as well as his dedicated service to his church and greater community. And when Alex applied through my office for a nomination to the United States Military Academy at West Point during his senior year, his outstanding record and bright future made it an easy choice.

At West Point, Alex continued to make us proud. As an economics major, he achieved the highest grade point average possible, the result of earning numerous A-pluses. This accomplishment is all the more impressive when one considers that he also minored in environmental engineering. For his success both in and out of the classroom, Alex earned awards of all kinds. This May, Alex graduated at the top of his class academically, physically, and overall, receiving his diploma as the class of 2012's valedictorian.

Alex's service to his Nation didn't end that Saturday at Michie Stadium. Upon graduation, Alex received his commission as a 2nd Lieutenant in the United States Army. Following his training at Fort Benning, he will deploy to Vicenza, Italy as a member of the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team.

As a former soldier and a veteran of World War II, I commend Alex for his service to our Nation and recognize the sacrifices he is making in the name of that service. He has made my State of New Jersey extremely proud and I know he will continue his commitment to excellence in the Army. We all owe Alex an incredible debt of gratitude and I know that the people of New Jersey, and indeed Americans across our country are thankful for his dedicated service to our country and look forward to his future achievements.●

RECOGNIZING MAINE DAYBOAT SCALLOPS

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, throughout the 112th Congress, I have consistently implored my colleagues to remember the value of our Nation's small businesses. These firms are uniquely equipped to devise and implement innovative business plans and strategies that are needed to strengthen challenged industries, and do so regularly. Nowhere is this more prevalent than in my home state of Maine. Today I rise to recognize and commend a newly founded small business, Maine Dayboat Scallops located in Bath, ME, and its owner Togue Brawn.

Ms. Brawn has more than two decades of rich and varied experience working in Maine's fishing and service sectors. She has, among other things, sold Bait Cups invented by her father; worked at Portland's Harbor fish market; sold space at domestic and international commercial fishing trade shows; served at the Portland Old Port's Fore Street and J's Oyster restaurants; worked on a number of fisheries research projects; served at the Maine Department of Marine Resources; and founded her own business.

During her tenure with the Department of Marine Resources, Ms. Brawn took a special interest in working to address the serious challenges facing Maine's scallop fisheries, which had become significantly depleted. By virtue of her knowledge, experience, and close ties with those involved in the industry, Ms. Brawn was keenly aware of the nature of the challenge facing the State: in order to advance the long-

term health of the industry, scallop fishing had to be further curtailed, but doing so would impose significant additional burdens on hardworking Maine fishermen. Like many entrepreneurs, Ms. Brawn developed a creative plan to help address a serious problem, and acted upon it.

In order to help smaller scale scallop fishermen support themselves and their families as industry output declined, she founded a company to sell their scallops at more lucrative prices by leveraging the unique quality of their freshly caught product. Many dining establishments purchase scallops harvested by large vessels that spend significant periods of time at sea before returning to port. These scallops are certainly of high quality, but they are not as fresh as those harvested by smaller boats that return to port daily. By marketing the scallops caught by fishermen who conduct day-long trips, and delivering them within 24 hours of their being harvested, Maine Dayboat Scallops has succeeded in providing local establishments with a fresher product, and increasing the profit margins of the fishermen with whom it does business.

Maine Dayboat Scallops and Ms. Brawn exemplify the unique effects that small businesses have on Maine's economy. At a time when our Nation faces significant economic challenges, it is inspiring to know that entrepreneurs such as Ms. Brawn continue to draw upon their experience, ingenuity, and energy to develop new businesses that operate to increase the profitability of some of our most crucial and challenged industries. I applaud Ms. Brawn and offer Maine Dayboat Scallops my best regards for their future success.●

PIERPONT, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Pierpont, SD. The town of Pierpont will commemorate the 125th anniversary of its founding this year.

The town was founded in 1887 when the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railroad Company was persuaded by area farmers to build a side track to what is now Pierpont. Though much has changed since 1887, Pierpont still relies heavily on agriculture, and area farmers remain a driving force in the community and economy.

Located in Day County, Pierpont has a very proud history and heritage. However, Pierpont residents are also always looking forward and trying to better their community for future generations. They have a reputation for organizing new events to draw visitors to the Pierpont area. This creative and hard-working spirit is certainly something that should make the entire town proud.

The citizens of Pierpont are also incredibly dedicated and devoted to their families, friends, neighbors, and anyone just passing through. They are always ready to lend a hand, a welcome smile, and help out whenever a need arises. This spirit of stewardship makes it easy to see why so many will be attending Pierpont's 125th anniversary celebration this July.

Pierpont has been a tight-knit community for the past 125 years, and I am confident that it will continue to serve as an example of South Dakota values and traditions. I would like to offer my congratulations to the citizens of Pierpont on this landmark occasion and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF REPTILE GARDENS

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Reptile Gardens in Rapid City, SD and congratulate the men and women who have educated the public about wildlife in the State for 75 years with the world's largest reptile zoo. Reptile Gardens was founded in 1937 by Earl Brockelsby, a man renowned for his love and passion for reptiles.

Since its inception, Reptile Gardens has drawn tourists from across the Midwest and the Nation and entertained many with alligator wrestling, exotic bird shows, and snake shows. Reptile Gardens houses many rare species of reptiles and amphibians. Through 75 years of business, Reptile Gardens has seen its Sky Dome set on fire, a flood in 1977 and dwindling numbers due to World War II, and has overcome these obstacles through the strength and determination of its employees.

I would like to commend the men and women at Reptile Gardens for providing the State with 75 years of education and entertainment.●

RECOGNIZING MICHAEL P. JOLIN

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, earlier this month the Rhode Island Bar Association honored CPT Michael P. Jolin, Esq., with its Victoria M. Almeida Servant Leader Award. I am proud to join in congratulating Mike for this well-deserved distinction.

Mike Jolin has served his country and the people of Rhode Island with competence, courage, and compassion throughout his career. When I was Rhode Island attorney general, I appointed Mike as special assistant attorney general. He went on to serve as the deputy chief of Legal Services for the Rhode Island Department of Business Regulation. In both roles he performed admirably, upholding the laws of our State and protecting our citizens.

Meanwhile, Mike worked with neighbors and local officials in Pawtucket to maintain standards in the city's rental properties and protect tenants' rights as chair of the Pawtucket Nuisance Task Force, and to promote broadly shared economic empowerment for the residents of the Woodlawn neighborhood as a member of the board of the Woodlawn Community Development Corporation. He also served ably on the board of City Arts, helping to bring art education to the children of Providence.

In the U.S. Army Reserve and Rhode Island National Guard, Mike served as a judge advocate, performing critical legal, administrative, ethical, and regulatory operations and analysis. He was responsible for the creation of the Rhode Island National Guard's first full-time legal assistance program as well as the Rhode Island Bar Association's U.S. Armed Forces Legal Project. These two programs have provided high-quality and often free legal services to hundreds of Rhode Island service men and women, veterans and their families.

Even after deploying to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom with Combined Joint Interagency Task Force 435, Mike remained closely involved with the Armed Forces Legal Project, working from abroad to help address the unmet legal needs of Rhode Island's military women and men.

Now back on American soil, Mike continues to serve Rhode Island, conducting outreach to the veteran and military communities in my Rhode Island office and helping constituents connect with resources of the federal government.

The creed of one of our Armed Forces' special operations units says, ''I do not advertise the nature of my work, nor seek recognition for my actions.'' Mike's work exemplifies this spirit, demonstrating the understanding that mission success absolutely depends on the individual successes of those around him.

On behalf of all the staff in my Providence and Washington offices, I commend CPT Michael P. Jolin, Esq.—in the words of the Victoria M. Almeida Servant Leader Award citation—for his clear demonstration of ''the principles and values of servant leadership'' and for being ''a beacon of light and hope to others by illuminating the path to greater justice for all.'' We are lucky to have him as part of our team—as are the people of Rhode Island.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mrs. Cole, one of its clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2297) to promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4223. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit theft of medical products, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4850. An act to allow for innovations and alternative technologies that meet or exceed desired energy efficiency goals.

H.R. 5625. An act to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3342. A bill to improve information security, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6651. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0993)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6652. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1066)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6653. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0184)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6654. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0042)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6655. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–1100)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6656. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0251)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6657. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1416)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6658. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0105)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6659. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1321)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6660. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1327)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6661. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0218)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6662. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 767–200, –300, –300F, and –400ER Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0044)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6663. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Burkhart GROB Luft- und Raumfahrt GmbH Powered Sailplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0324)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6664. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sicma Aero Seat Passenger Seat Assemblies, Installed on, but not Limited to, ATR–GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0334)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6665. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1095)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6666. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1323)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6667. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0041)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6668. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0036)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6669. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1413)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6670. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0250)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6671. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1410)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6672. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Canada Turboprop Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0417)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6673. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route Q–130; UT'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0438)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6674. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Restricted Area R–2502E; Fort Irwin, CA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0461)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6675. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Restricted Area R–2917, De Funiak Springs, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0226)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6676. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Amdt. No. 500'' (RIN2120–AA63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6677. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drivers of CMVs: Restricting the Use of Cellular Phones'' (RIN2126–AB29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6678. A communication from the Associate Division Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Parts 12 and 90 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Redundancy of Communications Systems: Backup Power Private Land Mobile Radio Services: Selection and Assignment of Frequencies, and Transition of the Upper 200 Channels in the 800 MHz Band to EA Licensing'' (DA 11–1838) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 25, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6679. A communication from the Associate Division Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Review of the Emergency Alert System: Independent Spanish Broadcasters Association, the Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ, Inc., and the Minority Media and Telecommunications Council, Petition for Immediate Relief Randy Gehman Petition for Rulemaking'' (FCC 12–41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 25, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6680. A joint communication from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joints Chiefs of Staff, transmitting a request relative to limiting the size of Congressional delegations visiting Afghanistan for the period of July through September 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6681. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Updates to Wide Area Workflow'' ((RIN0750–AH40) (DFARS Case 2011–D027)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6682. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; New Qualifying Country—Czech Republic'' ((RIN0750–AH75) (DFARS Case 2012–DO43)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6683. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Shipping Instructions'' ((RIN0750–AH53) (DFARS Case 2011–D052)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6684. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Customer Clearing Documentation, Timing of Acceptance for Clearing, and Clearing Member Risk Management; Core Principles and Other Requirements for Designated Contract Markets; Correction'' (RIN3038–0092, –0094) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6685. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the declaration of a national emergency relative to the threat posed to the United States by the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation in the Russian Federation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6686. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, with respect to the Western Balkans; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6687. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6688. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13348 relative to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6689. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Lending Limits'' (RIN1557–AD59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6690. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Listing Standards for Compensation Committees'' (RIN3235–AK95) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6691. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the competitiveness of the export financing services for the period from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6692. A communication from the Senior Vice President and Chief Accounting Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's management report for fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6693. A communication from the Chairman of the Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Appraisal Subcommittee's 2011 Annual Report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6694. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Alternatives to the Use of External Credit Ratings in the Regulations of the OCC'' (RIN1557–AD36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6695. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Ireland; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6696. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports relative to a vacancy in the Department in the position of Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6697. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2012–0003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6698. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2011 Annual Report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6699. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''NRC Enforcement Policy Revision'' (NRC–2011–0176) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6700. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual report relative to the status of the Commission's licensing and regulatory duties; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6701. A communication from the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the financial condition of The American Legion as of December 31, 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. 2165. A bill to enhance strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 112–179).

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. MCCAIN (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COATS, Mr. BURR, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin):

S. 3342. A bill to improve information security, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 3343. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to require residential carbon monoxide detectors to meet the applicable ANSI/UL standard by treating that standard as a consumer product safety rule, to encourage States to require the installation of such detectors in homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3344. A bill to increase immunization rates; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 3345. A bill to provide for research and education to improve screening, detection and diagnosis of prostate cancer; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 3346. A bill to provide for certain land conveyances in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

S. 3347. A bill to require reports on countries with which the United States negotiates trade agreements, to establish terms for future trade agreements, and to enhance the promotion of exports of United States goods and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 3348. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the multifamily transitional housing loan program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED:

S. 3349. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, and the United States Housing Act of 1937 to enhance and expand the assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to homeless veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3350. A bill to make improvements to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 3351. A bill to amend the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act with respect to the privacy of protected health information; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 511. A resolution commending the Pacific Lutheran University Lutes Softball Team for winning the 2012 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III Softball Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. Res. 512. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Rice University; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. Con. Res. 50. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding actions to preserve and advance the multistakeholder governance model under which the Internet has thrived; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 17

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 17, a bill to repeal the job-killing tax on medical devices to ensure continued access to life-saving medical devices for patients and maintain the standing of United States as the world leader in medical device innovation.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a Pancreatic Cancer Initiative, and for other purposes.

S. 387

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 387, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide flexible spending arrangements for members of uniformed services, and for other purposes.

S. 434

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 434, a bill to improve and expand geographic literacy among kindergarten through grade 12 students in the United States by improving professional development programs for kindergarten through grade 12 teachers offered through institutions of higher education.

S. 693

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 693, a bill to establish a term certain for the conservatorships of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, to provide conditions for continued operation of such enterprises, and to provide for the wind down of such operations and dissolution of such enterprises.

S. 1096

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1096, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under the Medicare part B program by extending the minimum payment amount for bone mass measurement under such program through 2013.

S. 1269

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1269, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to collect information from coeducational secondary schools on such schools' athletic programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1301

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1301, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2012 through 2015 for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, to enhance measures to combat trafficking in persons, and for other purposes.

S. 1591

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1591, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Raoul Wallenberg, in recognition of his achievements and heroic actions during the Holocaust.

S. 1809

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1809, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program for viral hepatitis surveillance, education, and testing in order to prevent deaths from liver cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1872

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1872, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the

care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1880

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1880, a bill to repeal the health care law's job-killing health insurance tax.

S. 2050

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2050, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain provisions of the Creating Small Business Jobs Act of 2010, and for other purposes.

S. 2065

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2065, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to modify the discretionary spending limits to take into account savings resulting from the reduction in the number of Federal employees and extending the pay freeze for Federal employees.

S. 2085

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2085, a bill to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

S. 2165

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2165, a bill to enhance strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2205

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2205, a bill to prohibit funding to negotiate a United Nations Arms Trade Treaty that restricts the Second Amendment rights of United States citizens.

S. 2239

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2239, a bill to direct the head of each agency to treat relevant military training as sufficient to satisfy training or certification requirements for Federal licenses.

S. 2320

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2320, a bill to direct the American Battle Monuments Commission to provide for the ongoing maintenance of Clark Veterans Cemetery in the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

S. 3049

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3049, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

S. 3202

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3202, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that deceased veterans with no known next of kin can receive a dignified burial, and for other purposes.

S. 3204

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3204, a bill to address fee disclosure requirements under the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3237

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3237, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 3274

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3274, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to produce a report on enhancing the competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment, and for other purposes.

S. 3320

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3320, a bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to waive the 30-day waiting period for flood insurance policies purchased for private properties affected by wildfire on Federal lands.

S. 3340

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3340, a bill to improve and enhance the programs and activities of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs regarding suicide prevention and resilience and behavioral health disorders for members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 48

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 48, a concurrent resolution recognizing 375 years of service of the National Guard and affirming congressional support for a permanent Operational Reserve as a component of the Armed Forces.

S. RES. 490

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 490, a resolution designating the week of September 16, 2012, as ''Mitochondrial Disease Awareness Week'', reaffirming the importance of an enhanced and coordinated research effort on mitochondrial diseases, and commending the National Institutes of Health for its efforts to improve the understanding of mitochondrial diseases.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3344. A bill to increase immunization rates; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senators DURBIN, TIM JOHNSON, WHITEHOUSE, and BLUMENTHAL in the introduction of the Immunization Improvements Act. This legislation builds on my longstanding work, including several provisions I authored in the Affordable Care Act, to improve vaccination rates and population-based immunity.

Our introduction of this legislation is particularly timely given a recent report cited in yesterday's Wall Street Journal revealing the number of deaths globally as a result of the H1N1 flu pandemic in 2009 and 2010. The analysis found that the number of deaths from H1N1 to be 15 times the original reports, up from 18,500 to 280,000 cases. In the United States, the estimates are more than triple the original cases, from 8,500 to nearly 30,000.

Two provisions of the legislation we are introducing today are based on efforts underway in Rhode Island to improve vaccination rates against seasonal influenza and pneumonia. Specifically, it would authorize a five-state demonstration project that allows the state to purchase certain vaccines and distribute them free of charge to physicians for administration in seniors, who are at the highest risk of death from these preventable diseases. In addition to increasing vaccination rates, this model has limited the cost and administrative burden for providers and reduced the cost of vaccines to the Federal government.

The legislation would also require hospitals and long-term care facilities to report on influenza vaccination rates of health care workers with direct patient contact, the population most likely to spread the flu to ill patients that may be too weak to fight it. In Rhode Island, simply requiring health care facilities to report on health care worker influenza vaccinations has resulted in improved rates.

The Immunization Improvements Act would also update the allowable vaccine administration fees to providers

who vaccinate uninsured and underinsured children, as well as include a recommendation made by both the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and the Government Accountability Office to shift vaccine coverage in Medicare from Part D to Part B.

While there are many diseases and conditions that we have yet to prevent, there are those for which we already have vaccines. We must do more to ensure that these vaccines are available and accessed to protect the health of Americans.

This legislation has been endorsed by Every Child By Two, the Immunization Action Coalition, Partnership for Prevention, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, the National Association of County and City Health Officials, and Trust for America's Health. I look forward to working with my colleagues to see these provisions enacted.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 3345. A bill to provide for research and education to improve screening, detection and diagnosis of prostate cancer; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Prostate Cancer Detection Research and Education Act. This important legislation addresses the urgent need for the development of new technologies to detect and diagnose prostate cancer, and for the education of our fathers, brothers, and sons about the dangers of this deadly disease.

Prostate cancer is the second most common cancer in men, and is the second leading cause of cancer related deaths in men, with 240,000 new cases and 28,000 prostate cancer related deaths predicted in 2012.

Unfortunately, current screening techniques for prostate cancer result in some false-negative reassurances and false-positive alarms. In addition, the prostate is one of the last organs in a human body where biopsies are performed blindly, which can miss cancer even when multiple samples are taken.

Prostate Cancer Detection Research and Education Act brings together a Advisory Council of experts to evaluate the current science and outline a path forward to the ultimate goal—developing a reliable test or tests that can detect prostate cancer and diagnose how severe the cancer is.

The Prostate Cancer Detection Research and Education Act will mirror the investment the Federal government made in advanced imaging technologies, which led to life-saving breakthroughs in detection, diagnosis and treatment of breast cancer. This bill directs the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, to use the plan developed by the Advisory Council to coordinate and intensify federal research to develop and validate an accurate test for prostate cancer.

The Prostate Cancer Detection Research and Education Act would also create a national campaign conducted through HHS to increase awareness about the need for prostate cancer screening, and the development of better screening techniques. Since African American men are 56 percent more likely to develop prostate cancer compared with Caucasian men and nearly 2.5 times as likely to die from the disease, this campaign will work with the Offices of Minority Health at HHS and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to ensure that this effort will reach the men most at risk from this disease.

Government investment in coordinating research and education could be key to diagnosing prostate cancer earlier and more accurately. We need to strengthen our efforts to bring the tools doctors use to fight this disease into the 21st century. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this effort, and cosponsoring this legislation.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 3346. A bill to provide for certain land conveyances in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today I rise with my colleague Senator HELLER to introduce the Las Vegas Valley Public Lands and Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Act of 2012. This legislation will designate the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument in southern Nevada, expand the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area, set aside lands for the expansion of Nevada institutions of higher education, and make thousands of acres available for private development and job creation in the Las Vegas valley.

I am proud to lead the introduction of this important bill, which has been years in the making. The hallmark component of this legislation is the establishment of the Tule Springs Fossil Bed National Monument. The proposed monument is supported by the cities of Las Vegas and North Las Vegas, Clark County, the Governor of Nevada, the State of Nevada's Division of State Parks, the National Parks Conservation Association, Protectors of Tule Springs, and thousands of Nevadans.

By designating the Tule Springs area a national monument managed by the National Park Service, we will conserve, protect and enhance this unique and nationally important resource. Nevadans, tourists, scientists, and school children will visit the monument to enjoy its scientific, educational, scenic and recreational values for decades to come.

The proposed monument is located in the northern part of the Las Vegas Valley, bounded by the Desert National Wildlife Refuge, the Red Rock National Conservation Area, and the Spring Mountain National Recreation Area. The Tule Springs area is recognized as having the largest assemblage of Ice Age fossils in the Southwest.

Over 400 paleontological sites have been discovered, providing a record of human activity dating back 11,000 years ago. Scientists have uncovered fossils of the giant Columbian mammoth, ground sloths the size of small cars, the American lion, and camelops. These great prehistoric mammals called North Las Vegas home for thousands of years.

Efforts to protect the paleontological treasures contained within the Las Vegas Wash began early last century. In 1933, the first fossil expedition in Tule Springs unearthed prehistoric bones that became known as ''Tule the Baby Mammoth.'' In 1962, scientists conducted the famous ''big dig,'' employing radiocarbon dating for the first time in the United States, which in turn dated Ice Age fossils from 23,800 to 28,000 years old. Despite this significant concentration of important fossil resources in the proposed monument, only a fraction of the area has been studied. Many more prehistoric treasures will be found in the decades to come.

The proposed Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument is the product of many years of work. Recognizing the threats to the area from off-road vehicles, vandalism, and dumping, a coalition of environmentalists, tribes, academics, and retired Park Service employees formed in the mid-2000s to seek federal protection for Tule Springs.

The Protectors of Tule Springs collected over 10,000 signatures, and local and national conservation groups launched a campaign to garner public support for adding the site to the National Parks System. In 2010, a Park Service reconnaissance report commissioned at the request of members of the Nevada congressional delegation found the site suitable for inclusion in the Park System.

The monument will also benefit the local economy. Proponents of the monument estimate that it will generate tens of millions of dollars for the regional economy within the early years of operation, bringing tourists and researchers from around the world to visit this one-of-a-kind place to explore fascinating natural history.

The stakeholder agreement to establish the proposed monument includes making a modest amount of public lands available for private development in the Las Vegas Valley, and the designation of two 640 acre job creation zones for the cities of Las Vegas and North Las Vegas for master planned commercial development.

Furthermore, the legislation makes land available for the future expansion of campuses within the Nevada System of Higher Education, while increasing the size of the Red Rock National Conservation Area. It conveys land to Clark County for flood control for the

future Ivanpah Valley Airport, it expands the Metro Police Training Facility by 80 acres to enhance public safety and the facility's security, and allows the U.S. Forest Service to remedy mistaken trespass situations in the Spring Mountains area. Finally, it conveys 1,200 acres to Clark County to establish an off-highway vehicle recreation park, and designates public lands surrounding the park as an off-highway vehicle recreation area to help keep riders off of sensitive lands and habitat.

The Las Vegas Valley Lands and Fossil Beds National Monument Act is an ambitious piece of legislation, built on years of stakeholder input. It provides for balanced development and job creation within the Las Vegas Valley, while protecting vital natural and scientific resources that should be made more accessible for the public's enjoyment and education.

By making long-term and forward-looking improvements to public land management and stewardship in the Las Vegas Valley, I believe we have crafted a bill that will serve the best interests of Nevadans.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to move this important legislation through the legislative process.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3346

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Las Vegas Valley Public Land and Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Act of 2012''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument.
Sec. 3. Transfer of land to Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area.
Sec. 4. Conveyance of Bureau of Land Management land to North Las Vegas.
Sec. 5. Conveyance of Bureau of Land Management land to Las Vegas.
Sec. 6. Expansion of conveyance to Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.
Sec. 7. Spring Mountains National Recreation Area withdrawal.
Sec. 8. Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 amendments.
Sec. 9. Conveyance of land to the Nevada System of Higher Education.
Sec. 10. Land conveyance for Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport.
Sec. 11. Sunrise Mountain Instant Study Area release.
Sec. 12. Nellis Dunes Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area.

SEC. 2. TULE SPRINGS FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) since 1933, the Upper Las Vegas Wash has been valued by scientists because of the significant paleontological fossils demonstrative of the Pleistocene Ice Age that are located in the area;

(2) in 2004, during the preparation of the Las Vegas Valley Disposal Boundary Final Environmental Impact Statement, the Bureau of Land Management identified sensitive biological, cultural, and paleontological resources determined to be worthy of more evaluation with respect to the protective status of the resources;

(3) the Upper Las Vegas Wash contains thousands of Pleistocene mammal fossils of national importance, including Columbian mammoth, ground sloth, American lion, camels, and horse fossils;

(4) in addition to Joshua trees and several species of cacti, the Las Vegas buckwheat, Merriam's bearpoppy, Las Vegas bearpoppy, and the halfring milkvetch are 4 unique and imperiled plants that are supported in the harsh desert environment of Tule Springs;

(5) the area provides important habitat for threatened desert tortoise, endemic poppy bees, kit foxes, burrowing owls, phainopepla, and a variety of reptiles;

(6) in 2010, a National Park Service reconnaissance survey of the area determined that the area likely contains the longest continuous section of Pleistocene strata in the desert southwest, which span multiple important global climate cooling and warming episodes;

(7) the Upper Las Vegas Wash is significant to the culture and history of the native and indigenous people of the area, including the Southern Paiute Tribe;

(8) despite the findings of the studies and recommendations for further assessment of the resources for appropriate methods of protection—

(A) the area remains inadequately protected; and

(B) many irreplaceable fossil specimens in the area have been lost to vandalism or theft; and

(9) designation of the Upper Las Vegas Wash site as a National Monument would protect the unique fossil resources of the area for present and future generations while allowing for public education and continued scientific research opportunities.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNCIL.—The term ''Council'' means the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Advisory Council established by subsection (f)(1).

(2) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Clark County, Nevada.

(3) LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ''local government'' means the City of Las Vegas, City of North Las Vegas, or the County.

(4) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ''management plan'' means the management plan for the Monument developed under subsection (d)(3).

(5) MAP.—The term ''Map'' means the map entitled ''North Las Vegas Valley Overview'' and dated June 26, 2012.

(6) MONUMENT.—The term ''Monument'' means the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument established by subsection (c)(1).

(7) PUBLIC LAND.—The term ''public land'' has the meaning given the term ''public lands'' in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(8) QUALIFIED ELECTRIC UTILITY.—The term ''qualified electric utility'' means any public or private utility determined by the Secretary to be technically and financially capable of developing the transmission line.

(9) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(10) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Nevada.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to conserve, protect, interpret, and enhance for the benefit of present and future generations the unique and nationally important paleontological, scientific, educational, and recreational resources and values of the land described in this subsection, there is established in the State the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument.

(2) BOUNDARIES.—The Monument shall consist of approximately 22,650 acres of public land in the County within the boundaries generally depicted on the Map.

(3) MAP; LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare an official map and legal description of the boundaries of the Monument.

(B) LEGAL EFFECT.—The map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this section, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the legal description or the map.

(C) AVAILABILITY OF MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service.

(4) MINOR BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary may make minor boundary adjustments to the Monument to include additional public land adjacent to the Monument, if, after the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) additional paleontological resources are discovered on the adjacent public land; and

(B) a Federal agency, State agency, and local government requests that the adjacent public land be included in the Monument to promote the consistent management of resources.

(5) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may acquire land or interests in land within or adjacent to the boundaries of the Monument by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer from another Federal agency.

(B) LIMITATION.—Land or interests in land that are owned by the State or a political subdivision of the State may be acquired under subparagraph (A) only by donation or exchange.

(6) WITHDRAWALS.—Subject to valid existing rights and subsection (e), any land within the Monument or any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States for inclusion in the Monument after the date of enactment of this Act is withdrawn from—

(A) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) operation of the mineral leasing laws, geothermal leasing laws, and minerals materials laws.

(7) EFFECT ON OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act or the management plan developed for the Monument restricts or precludes—

(A) overflights (including low-level military and law enforcement overflights) over land in the Monument, including military, law enforcement, commercial, and general aviation overflights that can be seen or heard in the Monument; or

(B) the designation or creation of new units of special use airspace or the establishment of military flight training routes over the Monument.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 22,650 acres of public land depicted on the Map as ''Tule Springs Fossil Bed National Monument'' is transferred from

the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to the Director of the National Park Service.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall—

(A) allow only such uses of the Monument that—

(i) are consistent with this section; and

(ii) the Secretary determines would further the purposes of the Monument; and

(B) manage the Monument—

(i) in a manner that conserves, protects, interprets, and enhances the resources and values of the Monument; and

(ii) in accordance with—

(I) this section;

(II) the provisions of laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System (including the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.)); and

(III) any other applicable laws.

(3) BUFFER ZONES.—The establishment of the Monument shall not—

(A) lead to the creation of express or implied protective perimeters or buffer zones around or over the Monument;

(B) preclude disposal of public land adjacent to the boundaries of the Monument, if the disposal is consistent with other applicable law;

(C) preclude an activity on, or use of, private land adjacent to the boundaries of the Monument, if the activity or use is consistent with other applicable law; or

(D) directly or indirectly subject an activity on, or use of, private land, to additional regulation, if the activity or use is consistent with other applicable law.

(4) AIR AND WATER QUALITY.—Nothing in this Act alters the standards governing air or water quality outside the boundary of the Monument.

(5) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a management plan that provides for the long-term protection and management of the Monument.

(B) COMPONENTS.—The management plan—

(i) shall, consistent with this section and the purposes of the Monument—

(I) describe the resources at the Monument that are to be protected;

(II) describe the appropriate uses and management of the Monument;

(III) allow for continued scientific research at the Monument; and

(IV) include a travel management plan that may include existing public transit; and

(ii) may—

(I) incorporate any appropriate decisions contained in an existing management or activity plan for the land designated as the Monument under subsection (c)(1); and

(II) use information developed in any study of land within, or adjacent to, the boundary of the Monument that was conducted before the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) PUBLIC PROCESS.—In preparing the management plan, the Secretary shall—

(i) consult with, and take into account the comments and recommendations of, the Council;

(ii) provide an opportunity for public involvement in the preparation and review of the management plan, including holding public meetings; and

(iii) consider public comments received as part of the public review and comment process of the management plan.

(6) INTERPRETATION, EDUCATION, AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for public interpretation of, and education and scientific research on, the paleontological resources of the Monument, with priority given to exhibiting and curating the resources.

(B) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the State, political subdivisions of the State, nonprofit organizations, and appropriate public and private entities to carry out subparagraph (A).

(e) RENEWABLE ENERGY TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of a complete application from a qualified electric utility, the Secretary, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), shall issue to the qualified electric utility a 400-foot right-of-way for the construction and maintenance of high-voltage transmission facilities depicted on the Map as ''Renewable Energy Transmission Corridor''.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The high-voltage transmission facilities shall—

(i) be used—

(I) primarily, to the maximum extent practicable, for renewable energy resources; and

(II) to meet reliability standards set by the North American Reliability Electric Corporation, the Western Electricity Coordinating Council, or the public utilities regulator of the State; and

(ii) employ best management practices identified as part of the compliance of the Secretary with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to limit impacts on the Monument, including impacts to the viewshed.

(B) CAPACITY.—The Secretary shall consult with the qualified electric utility that is issued the right-of-way under paragraph (1) and the public utilities regulator of the State to seek to maximize the capacity of the high-voltage transmission facilities.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The issuance of a notice to proceed on the construction of the high-voltage transmission facilities within the right-of-way under paragraph (1) shall be subject to terms and conditions that the Secretary (in consultation with the qualified electric utility), as part of the compliance of the Secretary with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), determines appropriate to protect and conserve the resources for which the Monument is managed.

(4) EXPIRATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY.—The right-of-way issued under paragraph (1) shall expire on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act if construction of the high-voltage transmission facilities described in paragraph (1) has not been initiated by that date, unless the Secretary determines that it is in the public interest to continue the right-of-way.

(f) TULE SPRINGS FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—To provide guidance for the management of the Monument, there is established the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Advisory Council.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall consist of 13 members, to be appointed by the Secretary, of whom—

(i) 1 member shall be a member of, or be nominated by, the County Commission;

(ii) 1 member shall be a member of, or be nominated by, the city council of Las Vegas, Nevada;

(iii) 1 member shall be a member of, or be nominated by, the city council of North Las Vegas, Nevada;

(iv) 1 member shall be a member of, or be nominated by, the tribal council of the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe;

(v) 1 member shall be a representative of the conservation community in southern Nevada;

(vi) 1 member shall be a representative of, or be nominated by, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management;

(vii) 1 member shall be a representative of, or be nominated by, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

(viii) 1 member shall be a representative of, or be nominated by, the Director of the National Park Service;

(ix) 1 member shall be a representative of Nellis Air Force Base;

(x) 1 member shall be nominated by the State;

(xi) 1 member shall reside in the County and have a background that reflects the purposes for which the Monument was established; and

(xii) 2 members shall reside in the County, both of whom shall have experience in the field of paleontology, obtained through higher education, experience, or both.

(B) INITIAL APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint the initial members of the Council in accordance with subparagraph (A).

(3) DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL.—The Council shall advise the Secretary with respect to—

(A) the preparation and implementation of the management plan; and

(B) other issues related to the management of the Monument (including budgetary matters).

(4) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Council shall receive no compensation for serving on the Council.

(5) CHAIRPERSON.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Council shall elect a Chairperson from among the members of the Council.

(B) LIMITATION.—The Chairperson shall not be a member of a Federal or State agency.

(C) TERM.—The term of the Chairperson shall be 3 years.

(6) TERM OF MEMBERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term of a member of the Council shall be 3 years.

(B) SUCCESSORS.—Notwithstanding the expiration of a 3-year term of a member of the Council, a member may continue to serve on the Council until—

(i) the member is reappointed by the Secretary; or

(ii) a successor is appointed.

(7) VACANCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A vacancy on the Council shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(B) APPOINTMENT FOR REMAINDER OF TERM.—A member appointed to fill a vacancy on the Council—

(i) shall serve for the remainder of the term for which the predecessor was appointed; and

(ii) may be nominated for a subsequent term.

(8) TERMINATION.—Unless an extension is jointly recommended by the Director of the National Park Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, the Council shall terminate on the date that is 6 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 3. TRANSFER OF LAND TO RED ROCK CANYON NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONSERVATION AREA.—The term ''Conservation Area'' means the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area established by the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area Establishment Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 460ccc et seq.).

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''North Las Vegas Valley Overview'' and dated June 26, 2012.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) TRANSFER OF LAND TO CONSERVATION AREA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights, and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall add to, and administer as part of, the Conservation Area, in accordance with the laws (including regulations) applicable to the Conservation Area, the land described in paragraph (2).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (1) consists of approximately 1,530 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management described on the map as ''Additions to Red Rock NCA''.

(3) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the land is acquired, the Secretary shall update the management plan for the Conservation Area to reflect the management requirements of the acquired land.

(4) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(B) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(i) the map; or

(ii) the legal description.

(C) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 4. CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND TO NORTH LAS VEGAS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''North Las Vegas Valley Overview'' and dated June 26, 2012.

(2) NORTH LAS VEGAS.—The term ''North Las Vegas'' means the city of North Las Vegas, Nevada.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) CONVEYANCE.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights, and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to North Las Vegas, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (c).

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (b) consists of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management described on the map as the ''North Las Vegas Job Creation Zone''.

(d) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(2) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(A) the map; or

(B) the legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(e) USE OF LAND FOR NONRESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—North Las Vegas may sell, lease, or otherwise convey any portion of the land described in subsection (c) for nonresidential development.

(2) METHOD OF SALE.—The sale, lease, or conveyance of land under paragraph (1) shall be carried out—

(A) through a competitive bidding process; and

(B) for not less than fair market value.

(3) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—The gross proceeds from the sale, lease, or conveyance of land under paragraph (1) shall be distributed in accordance with section 4(e) of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-263; 112 Stat. 2345; 116 Stat. 2007; 117 Stat. 1317; 118 Stat. 2414; 120 Stat. 3045).

(f) USE OF LAND FOR RECREATION OR OTHER PUBLIC PURPOSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—North Las Vegas may retain a portion of the land described in subsection (c) for public recreation or other public purposes consistent with the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the ''Recreation and Public Purposes Act'') (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.) by providing written notice of the election to the Secretary.

(2) REVOCATION.—If North Las Vegas retains land for public recreation or other public purposes under paragraph (1), North Las Vegas may—

(A) revoke that election; and

(B) sell, lease, or convey the land in accordance with subsection (e).

(g) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Secretary shall require North Las Vegas to pay all survey costs and other administrative costs necessary for the preparation and completion of any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in subsection (c).

(h) REVERSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If any parcel of land described in subsection (c) is not conveyed for nonresidential development under this section or reserved for recreation or other public purposes under subparagraph (f) by the date that is 30 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the parcel of land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(2) INCONSISTENT USE.—If North Las Vegas uses any parcel of land described in subsection (c) in a manner that is inconsistent with this section—

(A) at the discretion of the Secretary, the parcel shall revert to the United States; or

(B) if the Secretary does not make an election under subparagraph (A), North Las Vegas shall sell the parcel of land in accordance with this section.

SEC. 5. CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND TO LAS VEGAS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LAS VEGAS.—The term ''Las Vegas'' means the city of Las Vegas, Nevada.

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''North Las Vegas Valley Overview'' and dated June 26, 2012.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights, and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to Las Vegas, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (c).

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (b) consists of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management described on the map as ''Las Vegas Job Creation Zone''.

(d) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(2) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(A) the map; or

(B) the legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(e) USE OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Las Vegas may sell, lease, or otherwise convey any portion of the land described in subsection (c) for nonresidential development.

(2) METHOD OF SALE.—The sale, lease, or conveyance of land under paragraph (1) shall be carried out, after consultation with the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe—

(A) through a competitive bidding process; and

(B) for not less than fair market value.

(3) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—The gross proceeds from the sale, lease, or conveyance of land under paragraph (1) shall be distributed in accordance with section 4(e) of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-263; 112 Stat. 2345; 116 Stat. 2007; 117 Stat. 1317; 118 Stat. 2414; 120 Stat. 3045).

(f) USE OF LAND FOR RECREATION OR OTHER PUBLIC PURPOSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Las Vegas may retain a portion of the land described in subsection (c) for public recreation or other public purposes consistent with the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the ''Recreation and Public Purposes Act'') (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.) by providing written notice of the election to the Secretary.

(2) REVOCATION.—If Las Vegas retains land for public recreation or other public purposes under paragraph (1), Las Vegas may—

(A) revoke that election; and

(B) sell, lease, or convey the land in accordance with subsection (e).

(g) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Secretary shall require Las Vegas to pay all survey costs and other administrative costs necessary for the preparation and completion of any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in subsection (c).

(h) REVERSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If any parcel of land described in subsection (c) is not conveyed for nonresidential development under this section or reserved for recreation or other public purposes under subsection (f) by the date that is 30 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the parcel of land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(2) INCONSISTENT USE.—If Las Vegas uses any parcel of land described in subsection (c) in a manner that is inconsistent with this section—

(A) at the discretion of the Secretary, the parcel shall revert to the United States; or

(B) if the Secretary does not make an election under subparagraph (A), Las Vegas shall sell the parcel of land in accordance with this section.

SEC. 6. EXPANSION OF CONVEYANCE TO LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Section 703 of the Clark County Conservation of Public Land and Natural Resources Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–282; 116 Stat. 2013) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and the parcel of land identified as 'Conveyance to Las Vegas for Police Shooting Range Access' on the map entitled 'North Las Vegas Valley Overview', and dated June 26, 2012, for the development of an access road and parking facilities''.

SEC. 7. SPRING MOUNTAINS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA WITHDRAWAL.

Section 8 of the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area Act (16 U.S.C. 460hhh–6) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''for lands described'' and inserting ''as provided''; and

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

''(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), W½ E ½ and W ½ sec. 27, T. 23 S., R. 58 E., Mt. Diablo Meridian is not subject to withdrawal under that subsection.

''(2) EFFECT OF ENTRY UNDER PUBLIC LAND LAWS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of subsection (a), the following are not subject to withdrawal under that paragraph:

''(A) Any Federal land in the Recreation Area that qualifies for conveyance under Public Law 97–465 (commonly known as the ''Small Tracts Act'') (16 U.S.C. 521c et seq.), which, notwithstanding section 7 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 521i), may be conveyed under that Act.

''(B) Any Federal land in the Recreation Area that the Secretary determines to be appropriate for conveyance by exchange for non-Federal land within the Recreation Area under authorities generally providing for the exchange of National Forest System land.''.

SEC. 8. SOUTHERN NEVADA PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1998 AMENDMENTS.

Section 4 of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–263; 112 Stat. 2344; 116 Stat. 2007) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a), by striking ''dated October 1, 2002'' and inserting ''dated June 26, 2012''; and

(2) in subsection (g), by adding at the end the following:

''(5) Notwithstanding paragraph (4), subject to paragraphs (1) through (3), Clark County may convey to a unit of local government or regional governmental entity, without consideration, land located within the Airport Environs Overlay District (as of the date of enactment of [this paragraph]) if the land is used for a public purpose consistent with uses allowed under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the 'Recreation and Public Purposes Act') (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.), provided that if the conveyed land is used for a purpose other than a public purpose, paragraph (4) would apply to the conveyance.''.

SEC. 9. CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BOARD OF REGENTS.—The term ''Board of Regents'' means the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education.

(2) CAMPUSES.—The term ''Campuses'' means the Great Basin College, College of Southern Nevada, and University of Las Vegas, Nevada, campuses.

(3) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means each of the 3 parcels of Bureau of Land Management land identified on the maps as ''Parcel to be Conveyed'', of which—

(A) approximately 40 acres is to be conveyed for the College of Southern Nevada;

(B) approximately 2,085 acres is to be conveyed for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas; and

(C) approximately 285 acres is to be conveyed for the Great Basin College.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Nevada.

(6) SYSTEM.—The term ''System'' means the Nevada System of Higher Education.

(b) CONVEYANCES OF FEDERAL LAND TO THE SYSTEM.—

(1) CONVEYANCES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712) and section 1(c) of the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the ''Recreation and Public Purposes Act'') (43 U.S.C. 869(c)) and subject to all valid existing rights, the Secretary shall—

(i) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, convey to the System, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to—

(I) the Federal land identified on the map entitled ''Great Basin College Land Conveyance'' and dated June 26, 2012, for the Great Basin College; and

(II) the Federal land identified on the map entitled ''College of Southern Nevada Land Conveyance'' and dated June 26, 2012, for the College of Southern Nevada, subject to the requirement that, as a precondition of the conveyance, the Board of Regents shall, by mutual assent, enter into a binding development agreement with the City of Las Vegas that—

(aa) provides for the orderly development of the Federal land to be conveyed under this subclause; and

(bb) complies with State law; and

(ii) not later than 180 days after the receipt of certification of acceptable remediation of environmental conditions existing on the parcel to be conveyed for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, convey to the System, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land identified on the map entitled ''North Las Vegas Valley Overview'' and dated June 26, 2012 for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, if the area identified as ''Potential Utility Schedule'' on the map is reserved for use for a potential future 400-foot utility corridor of certain rights-of-way for transportation and public utilities.

(B) PHASES.—The Secretary may phase the conveyance of the Federal land under subparagraph (A)(ii) as remediation is completed.

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of the conveyance under paragraph (1)(A), the Board of Regents shall agree in writing—

(i) to pay any administrative costs associated with the conveyance, including the costs of any environmental, wildlife, cultural, or historical resources studies;

(ii) to use the Federal land conveyed for educational and recreational purposes;

(iii) to release and indemnify the United States from any claims or liabilities that may arise from uses carried out on the Federal land on or before the date of enactment of this Act by the United States or any person; and

(iv) to assist the Bureau of Land Management in providing information to the students of the System and the citizens of the State on—

(I) public land (including the management of public land) in the Nation; and

(II) the role of the Bureau of Land Management in managing, preserving, and protecting the public land in the State.

(B) AGREEMENT WITH NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Federal land conveyed to the System under [paragraph (1)(A)(ii)] shall be used in accordance with the agreement entitled the ''Cooperative Interlocal Agreement between the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education, on Behalf of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and the 99th Air Base Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada'' and dated June 19, 2009.

(ii) MODIFICATIONS.—Any modifications to the agreement described in clause (i) or any related master plan shall require the mutual assent of the parties to the agreement.

(iii) LIMITATION.—In no case shall the use of the Federal land conveyed under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) compromise the national security mission or avigation rights of Nellis Air Force Base.

(3) USE OF FEDERAL LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The System may use the Federal land conveyed under paragraph (1)(A) for—

(i) any purpose relating to the establishment, operation, growth, and maintenance of the System; and

(ii) any uses relating to the purposes, including residential and commercial development that would generally be associated with an institution of higher education.

(B) OTHER ENTITIES.—The System may—

(i) consistent with Federal and State law, lease, or otherwise provide property or space at, the Campuses, with or without consideration, to religious, public interest, community, or other groups for services and events that are of interest to the System or to any community located in southern Nevada;

(ii) allow any other communities in southern Nevada to use facilities of the Campuses for educational and recreational programs of the community; and

(iii) in conjunction with the city of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, or Pahrump or Clark or Nye County plan, finance (including through the provision of cost-share assistance), construct, and operate facilities for the city of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, or Pahrump or Clark or Nye County on the Federal land conveyed for educational or recreational purposes consistent with this subsection.

(4) REVERSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Federal land or any portion of the Federal land conveyed under paragraph (1)(A) ceases to be used for the System, the Federal land, or any portion of the Federal land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(B) UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS.—If the System fails to complete the first building or show progression toward development of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas campus on the applicable parcels of Federal land by the date that is 50 years after the date of receipt of certification of acceptable remediation of environmental conditions, the parcels of the Federal land described in subsection (a)(3)(B) shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 10. LAND CONVEYANCE FOR SOUTHERN NEVADA SUPPLEMENTAL AIRPORT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Clark County, Nevada.

(2) MAP.—The term ''Map'' means the map entitled ''Land Conveyance for Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport'' and dated June 26, 2012.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) LAND CONVEYANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date described in paragraph (2), subject to valid existing rights, and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to the County, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (c).

(2) DATE ON WHICH CONVEYANCE MAY BE MADE.—The Secretary shall not make the conveyance described in paragraph (1) until the later of the date on which the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration has—

(A) approved an airport layout plan for an airport to be located in the Ivanpah Valley; and

(B) with respect to the construction and operation of an airport on the site conveyed to the County pursuant to section 2(a) of the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act (Public Law 106–362; 114 Stat. 1404), issued a record of decision after the preparation of an environmental impact statement or similar analysis required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(3) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the public land to be conveyed under paragraph (1) is withdrawn from—

(A) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(B) operation of the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws.

(4) USE.—The public land conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be used for the development of flood mitigation infrastructure for the Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (b) consists of the approximately 2,320 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management and described on the map as the ''Conveyance Area''.

(d) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare an official legal description and map of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(2) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(A) the map; or

(B) the legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 11. SUNRISE MOUNTAIN INSTANT STUDY AREA RELEASE.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that for the purposes of section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782), the public land in Clark County, Nevada, administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the Sunrise Mountain Instant Study Area has been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(b) RELEASE.—Any public land described in subsection (a) that is not designated as wilderness—

(1) is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S. C. 1782(c)); and

(2) shall be managed in accordance with land management plans adopted under section 202 of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1712).

(c) POST RELEASE LAND USE APPROVALS.—Recognizing that the area released under subsection (b) presents unique opportunities for the granting of additional rights-of-way, including for high voltage transmission facilities, the Secretary of the Interior may accommodate multiple applicants within a particular right-of-way.

SEC. 12. NELLIS DUNES OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE RECREATION AREA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of North Las Vegas, Nevada.

(2) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Clark County, Nevada.

(3) ECONOMIC SUPPORT AREA.—The term ''Economic Support Area'' means the land identified on the map as the ''Economic Support Area''.

(4) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 1,211 acres of Federal land in the County, as depicted on the map.

(5) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Nellis Dunes Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area'' and dated June 26, 2012.

(6) NELLIS DUNES RECREATION AREA.—The term ''Nellis Dunes Recreation Area'' means the Nellis Dunes Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area identified on the map as ''Nellis Dunes OHV Recreation Area''.

(7) NET PROCEEDS.—The term ''net proceeds'' means the amount that is equal to the difference between—

(A) the amount of gross revenues received by the County from any activities at the Economic Support Area; and

(B) the total amount expended by the County for capital improvements to each of the Economic Support Area and the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area, provided that the capital improvements shall not exceed 80 percent of the total gross proceeds.

(8) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(9) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Nevada.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND TO CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey to the County, subject to valid existing rights, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcels of Federal land.

(2) USE OF FEDERAL LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The parcels of Federal land conveyed under paragraph (1)—

(i) shall be used by the County—

(I) to provide a suitable location for the establishment of a centralized off-road vehicle recreation park in the County;

(II) to provide the public with opportunities for off-road vehicle recreation, including a location for races, competitive events, training and other commercial services that directly support a centralized off-road vehicle recreation area and County park; and

(III) to provide a designated area and facilities that would discourage unauthorized use of off-highway vehicles in areas that have been identified by the Federal Government, State government, or County government as containing environmentally sensitive land; and

(ii) shall not be disposed of by the County.

(B) REVERSION.—If the County ceases to use any parcel of the Federal land for the purposes described in subparagraph (A)(i) or subparagraph (C)—

(i) title to the parcel shall revert to the United States, at the option of the United States; and

(ii) the County shall be responsible for any reclamation necessary to revert the parcel to the United States.

(C) RENEWABLE AND SOLAR ENERGY.—The Federal land conveyed to the County under paragraph (1) and the land conveyed to the County under section 1(c) of Public Law 107–350 (116 Stat. 2975) may be used for the incidental purpose of generating renewable energy and solar energy for use by the Clark County Off Highway Vehicle Recreation Park, the shooting park authorized under Public Law 107–350 (116 Stat. 2975), and the County.

(D) CONSULTATION WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.—

(i) RESTRICTION.—Any project authorized under subparagraph (C) shall not interfere with the national security mission of Nellis Air Force Base (or any military operation).

(ii) CONDITION.—Before the construction of any proposed project under subparagraph (C), the project proponent shall consult with the Secretary of Defense (or a designee).

(E) FUTURE CONVEYANCES.—Any future conveyance of Federal land for addition to the Clark County Off Highway Vehicle Park or the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area shall be subject to—

(i) the binding interlocal agreement under paragraph (3)(B); and

(ii) the aviation easement requirements under paragraph (6).

(F) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Air Force and the County, may develop a special management plan for the Federal land—

(i) to enhance public safety and safe off-highway vehicle recreation use in the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area;

(ii) to ensure compatible development with the mission requirements of the Nellis Air Force Base; and

(iii) to avoid and mitigate known public health risks associated with off-highway vehicle use in the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area.

(3) ECONOMIC SUPPORT AREA.—

(A) DESIGNATION.—There is designated the Economic Support Area.

(B) INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Before the Economic Support Area may be developed, the City and County shall enter into an interlocal agreement regarding the development of the Economic Support Area.

(ii) LIMITATION OF AGREEMENT.—In no case shall the interlocal agreement under this subparagraph compromise or interfere with the aviation rights provided under paragraph (6) and subsection (c)(4).

(C) USE OF PROCEEDS.—Of the net proceeds from the development of the Economic Support Area, the County shall—

(i) annually deposit 50 percent in a special account in the Treasury, to be used by the Secretary for the development, maintenance, operations, and environmental restoration and mitigation of the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area; and

(ii) retain 50 percent, to be used by the County—

(I) to pay for capital improvements [that are not covered by subsection (a)(6)(B)]; and

(II) to maintain and operate the park established under paragraph (2)(A)(i)(I).

(4) AGREEMENT WITH NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the Federal land may be conveyed to the County under paragraph (1), the Clark County Board of Commissioners, the Bureau of Land Management, and Nellis Air Force Base shall enter into an interlocal agreement for the Federal land and the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area—

(i) to enhance safe off-highway recreation use; and

(ii) to ensure that development of the Federal land is consistent with the long-term mission requirements of Nellis Air Force Base.

(B) LIMITATION.—The use of the Federal land conveyed under paragraph (1) shall not compromise the national security mission or aviation rights of Nellis Air Force Base.

(5) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—With respect to the conveyance of Federal land under paragraph (1), the Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(6) AVIATION EASEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each deed entered into for the conveyance of the Federal land shall contain a perpetual aviation easement reserving to the United States all rights necessary to preserve free and unobstructed overflight in and through the airspace above, over, and across the surface of the Federal land for the passage of aircraft owned or operated by any Federal agency or other Federal entity.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Each easement described in subparagraph (A) shall include such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Air Force determines to be necessary to comply with subparagraph (A).

(c) DESIGNATION OF THE NELLIS DUNES NATIONAL OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE RECREATION AREA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The approximately 10,000 acres of land identified as ''Nellis Dunes'' in the Bureau of Land Management Resource Management Plan shall be known and designated as the ''Nellis Dunes Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area''.

(2) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Director of the Bureau of Land Management may develop a special management plan for the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area to enhance the safe use of off-highway vehicles for recreational purposes.

(3) EXCLUSION FROM NATIONAL LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION SYSTEM.—The Nellis Dunes Recreation Area shall not be considered a unit of the National Landscape Conservation System.

(4) AVIATION RIGHTS.—The aviation rights described in subsection (b)(6) shall apply to the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area.

(d) WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF LAND FOR NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE.—

(1) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and except as otherwise provided in this subsection—

(A) the Federal land and interests in the Federal land identified on the map as ''Land to be withdrawn for Nellis Air Force Base'' are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the general land laws, including the mining, mineral leasing, and geothermal leasing laws; and

(B) jurisdiction over the land and interest in land withdrawn and reserved by this subsection is transferred to the Secretary of the Air Force.

(2) RESERVATION.—The land withdrawn under paragraph (1) is reserved for use by the Secretary of the Air Force for—

(A) the enlargement and protection of Nellis Air Force Base; or

(B) other defense-related purposes consistent with the purposes of this subsection.

(3) CHANGES IN USE.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall consult with the Secretary before using the land withdrawn and reserved by this subsection for any purpose other than the purposes described in subsection (b)(2).

(4) EASEMENT.—The United States reserves—

(A) a right of flight for the passage of aircraft in the airspace above the surface of the Federal land conveyed to the County; and

(B) the right to cause in the airspace any noise, vibration, smoke, or other effects that may be inherent in the operation of aircraft landing at, or taking off from, Nellis Air Force Base.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 3348. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the multifamily transitional housing loan program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

S. 3348

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY FOR PAYMENT BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OF GUARANTEES FOR LOANS GUARANTEED BY SECRETARY FOR MULTIFAMILY TRANSITIONAL HOUSING PROJECTS.

Section 2053 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following new subsection (a):

''(a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may, for any loan guaranteed under this subchapter, pay the guarantee, in part or in full, if the loan is not in default. Such guarantee payment may include amounts necessary to extinguish the loan and pay all prepayment premiums and transaction costs.

''(2) The Secretary may forgive, waive, release, or discharge a borrower's liability to the Secretary with respect to a loan or a guarantee for the loan for any loss resulting from a payment made under paragraph (1).

''(3) The amount resulting from a decision of the Secretary to forgive, waive, release, or discharge any repayment obligation owed by the borrower to the Secretary with respect to a loan guaranteed by the Secretary under this subchapter for a multifamily transitional housing project—

''(A) shall not be included in the borrower's gross income;

''(B) shall be treated as an amount not derived from a Federal grant for purposes of subsection (d)(5)(A) of section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

''(C) shall not otherwise reduce the borrower's depreciable basis or eligible basis (for purposes of such section 42) of such housing project.''.

By Mr. REED:

S. 3349. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, and the United States Housing Act of 1937 to enhance and expand the assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to homeless veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce the Zero Tolerance for Veteran Homelessness Act. This bill enhances and expands the assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to homeless veterans and veterans at risk of becoming homeless.

It is one of our Nation's great tragedies that on any given night, according to estimates by the Department of Veterans Affairs, more than 67,000 veterans are homeless. The Department further estimates that about 145,000 veterans experience homelessness each year and that nearly 1/5th of all homeless people in the United States are veterans. These numbers are expected to climb as our service members who have fought in Iraq and Afghanistan return home to face tough economic conditions.

Indeed, some veterans return from deployments to discover that the skills they have honed in their military service can be difficult to transfer to jobs in the private sector. Others struggle with physical or mental wounds of war. Still others return to communities that lack safe, affordable housing.

Our veterans have made great sacrifices to serve our country, and it is especially important to honor our commitment to them. The Department of Veterans Affairs is certainly a part of that commitment, providing benefits, medical care, support, and a sense of community to homeless veterans. However, a number of other federal agencies provide service to veterans, including the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and this legislation builds on that existing infrastructure.

Many programs through HUD and the VA are already helping homeless veterans with transitional housing, health care and rehabilitation services, and employment assistance. However, a more comprehensive and coordinated approach would strengthen these programs and help prevent more at-risk veterans from becoming homeless.

First, this legislation would make it easier for non-profits to apply for capital grants through the VA's grants and per diem program to build transitional housing and other facilities for veterans. This would streamline the process for non-profit organizations to be able to use financing from other sources to break ground on new housing construction. This is particularly important in the current economy, when non-profits are stretched and have to be more creative than ever to fund new capital projects.

Second, the Zero Tolerance for Veterans Homelessness Act would create a Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs within HUD. The Special Assistant would ensure that veterans have access to HUD's existing programs and work to remove any barriers. The Special Assistant would also serve as a liaison between HUD and the VA, helping to connect and coordinate the services the two departments provide.

Additionally, this legislation recognizes the need to measure progress of efforts to combat homelessness. The bill would require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to analyze existing programs and develop a comprehensive plan with recommendations on how to end homelessness among veterans. Establishing a plan with appropriate benchmarks will enable the VA to more easily track progress towards this important goal.

Only by working together, across the federal government and in partnership with non-profits and local housing authorities, will we be able to comprehensively help homeless veterans and reach those in danger of becoming homeless. We owe it to our veterans to ensure that they and their families have safe, affordable places to live and to provide the services and benefits they have earned. The nation's brave veterans deserve nothing less.

I am pleased that provisions from this bill, which follows on legislation I introduced last Congress, have been included in comprehensive legislation that is moving through the Veterans

Affairs Committee. I hope my colleagues will join in supporting these important efforts.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 511—COMMENDING THE PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY LUTES SOFTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2012 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION III SOFTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 511

Whereas, on May 21, 2012, the Pacific Lutheran University Lutes (referred to in this preamble as ''the PLU Lutes'') Softball Team defeated the Linfield College Wildcats by a score of 3–0 to win the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III Softball Championship;

Whereas this victory is the first softball championship for Pacific Lutheran University in its history, as well as its first national championship since 1999;

Whereas the PLU Lutes Softball Team finished the 2012 season with a record of 45 wins and 11 losses, breaking the record at Pacific Lutheran University for most wins in a season;

Whereas the PLU Lutes Softball Team also broke the school record for most runs scored and most total bases in a season;

Whereas senior pitcher Stacy Hagensen was named the tournament's Most Outstanding Player by allowing only 3 hits and giving up no runs;

Whereas the team members and coaches of the PLU Lutes Softball Team have set an example of leadership for women in collegiate athletics;

Whereas PLU Lutes Softball Team head coach Erin Van Nostrand, associate head coach Greg Seeley, and assistant coaches Tiffany McVay, Dena Harkovitch, and Dena Slye led the team to the championship with their leadership and winning philosophy;

Whereas the PLU Lutes Softball Team exemplifies the mission of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as ''Title IX''), which Congress enacted to ensure that gender discrimination did not interfere with educational opportunities;

Whereas the passage of Title IX has led to a 574 percent increase in female participation in college sports and a 1,000 percent increase in female participation in high school sports;

Whereas, before Title IX, only 2 percent of the college students participating in sports were female;

Whereas, in 2001, 43 percent of the college students participating in sports were female;

Whereas, by a 3-1 ratio, female athletes perform better in school and have higher graduation rates than females who do not participate in sports;

Whereas student-athletes have higher annual graduation rates than their classmates who do not participate in sports; and

Whereas the success of the 2012 PLU Lutes Softball Team demonstrates the accomplishments that a team can achieve when each player adopts a teamwork mentality: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the Pacific Lutheran University Lutes (referred to in this resolution as the ''PLU Lutes'') Softball Team for winning the 2012 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III Softball Championship;

(2) recognizes the people of Washington State for their support of the PLU Lutes Softball Team;

(3) honors the achievements of every player, coach, and support staff who was instrumental in the success of the PLU Lutes Softball Team during the 2012 season; and

(4) requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution for appropriate display to the PLU Lutes Softball Team.

SENATE RESOLUTION 512—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF RICE UNIVERSITY

Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 512

Whereas Rice University is celebrating its 100th year as a renowned research university advancing education in the arts, humanities, and sciences;

Whereas the William Marsh Rice Institute for the Advancement of Literature, Science, and Art, named for its benefactor William Marsh Rice and now known as Rice University, was inaugurated on October 12, 1912, in Houston, Texas;

Whereas the first president of Rice University, Edgar Odell Lovett, set forth an ambitious vision for a prestigious research university;

Whereas Rice University is a leading institution of higher education, ranked among the top 20 universities in the United States by U.S. News & World Report every year since the rankings began in 1983;

Whereas Rice University is dedicated to keeping high quality education affordable through generous financial aid programs and ranks among the 10 best value private colleges by Princeton Review;

Whereas Rice University plays a leading role in research in many fields, including nanotechnology, space, cellular technology, bioinformatics, energy, health, and the environment;

Whereas Rice University has invaluably contributed to space exploration, becoming the first university in the United States to create a department dedicated to space exploration and donating the land now home to the Johnson Space Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

Whereas the groundbreaking discovery of buckminsterfullerene, referred to as ''buckyballs'', on the campus of Rice University in 1985 launched the new field of fullerene chemistry, helped launch the new scientific field of nanotechnology, earned two Rice University professors, Dr. Richard Smalley and Dr. Robert Curl, the Nobel Prize in Chemistry, and is now leading to life-saving and life-enhancing breakthroughs in medicine, transportation, energy, the environment, defense, and many other endeavors;

Whereas Nobel Prize recipient Dr. Richard Smalley of Rice University played a significant role in forming The Academy of Medicine, Engineering, and Science of Texas, an organization for the Texas members of the National Academies and the first organization in Texas dedicated to building collaboration among Texas's most distinguished scientific, academic, and corporate minds in research and public policy;

Whereas the goal of Rice University is to prepare its students to succeed in a highly competitive and complex world, and many of its alumni have distinguished themselves in their service and contributions to the United States;

Whereas Rice University is one of three Texas universities to be chosen as a member of the Association of American Universities, and the only private university in Texas that is a member of that association;

Whereas Rice University is fortunate to have exceptionally fine trustees, administrators, and faculty members who have placed emphasis on inspiring students to succeed in the arts, humanities, and sciences;

Whereas the contributions of Rice University and its alumni have enriched the history of the United States and the world in the arts, humanities, sports, and sciences; and

Whereas the success of Rice University is the result of a united effort by many resourceful and dedicated individuals, and all who are associated with the preservation of the great traditions of Rice University deserve to be proud of their accomplishments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the 100th anniversary of Rice University and expresses gratitude to the university for its innumerable contributions to higher education and the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 50—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ACTIONS TO PRESERVE AND ADVANCE THE MULTISTAKEHOLDER GOVERNANCE MODEL UNDER WHICH THE INTERNET HAS THRIVED

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 50

Whereas given the importance of the Internet to the global economy, it is essential that the Internet remain stable, secure, and free from government control;

Whereas the world deserves the access to knowledge, services, commerce, and communication, the accompanying benefits to economic development, education, and health care, and the informed discussion that is the bedrock of democratic self-government that the Internet provides;

Whereas the structure of Internet governance has profound implications for competition and trade, democratization, free expression, and access to information;

Whereas countries have obligations to protect human rights, which are advanced by online activity as well as offline activity;

Whereas the ability to innovate, develop technical capacity, grasp economic opportunities, and promote freedom of expression online is best realized in cooperation with all stakeholders;

Whereas proposals have been put forward for consideration at the 2012 World Conference on International Telecommunications that would fundamentally alter the governance and operation of the Internet;

Whereas the proposals, in international bodies such as the United Nations General Assembly, the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development, and the International Telecommunication Union, would attempt to justify increased government control over the Internet and would undermine the current multistakeholder model that has enabled the Internet

to flourish and under which the private sector, civil society, academia, and individual users play an important role in charting its direction;

Whereas the proposals would diminish the freedom of expression on the Internet in favor of government control over content;

Whereas the position of the United States Government has been and is to advocate for the flow of information free from government control; and

Whereas this and past Administrations have made a strong commitment to the multistakeholder model of Internet governance and the promotion of the global benefits of the Internet: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, should continue working to implement the position of the United States on Internet governance that clearly articulates the consistent and unequivocal policy of the United States to promote a global Internet free from government control and preserve and advance the successful multistakeholder model that governs the Internet today.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2485. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1940, to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2486. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1940, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2487. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1940, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2485. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1940, to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. ___. FACILITIES IN COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREAS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''coastal high hazard area'' has the same meaning as in section 9.4 of title 44, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto;

(2) the term ''eligible entity'' means an entity that receives a contribution under section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5172);

(3) the term ''essential to a community's recovery'' means, with respect to a structure or facility, that the structure or facility is associated with the basic functions of a local government, including public health and safety, education, law enforcement, fire protection, and other critical government operations; and

(4) the term ''major disaster'' means a major disaster declared by the President under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170).

(b) REGULATIONS.—

(1) SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENTS.—Notwithstanding section 9.4 of title 44, Code of Federal Regulations, an action relating to a structure or facility located in a coastal high hazard area for which an eligible entity received a contribution under section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5172) shall be deemed to be a ''substantial improvement'' for purposes of such part 9 if—

(A) the action involves the replacement of a structure or facility that—

(i) was located in the coastal high hazard area before the incident that caused the structure or facility to be totally destroyed; and

(ii) is essential to a community's recovery from a major disaster;

(B) there is no practicable alternative to locating a replacement structure or facility in the coastal high hazard area;

(C) the replacement structure or facility conforms to the most recent Flood Resistant Design and Construction standard issued by the American Society of Civil Engineers, or any more stringent standard approved by the Administrator; and

(D) the eligible entity develops evacuation and emergency response procedures to reduce the risk of loss of human life and operational disruption from a flood.

(2) RELOCATION.—

(A) RELOCATION REQUIRED.—The amendments under paragraph (1) shall provide that if the Administrator determines that there is a practicable alternative to the original site of a structure or facility described in paragraph (1) that is outside the coastal high hazard area and that provides better protection against the flood hazard or other hazards associated with coastal high hazard areas, the replacement structure or facility shall be relocated to the alternative site.

(B) RELOCATION.—If a replacement structure or facility is relocated under subparagraph (A), the original site for the destroyed structure or facility shall be deed restricted in conformance with part 80 of title 44, Code of Federal Regulations.

(C) NO RELOCATION.—If a replacement structure or facility is rebuilt at the same location, the eligible entity shall set aside an alternative parcel of land in the coastal high hazard area of equal or greater size, to be deed restricted in conformance with part 80 of title 44, Code of Federal Regulations, that the Administrator determines—

(i) provides better protection against floods; or

(ii) promotes the restoration of natural and beneficial functions of coastal floodplains, including protection to endangered species, critical habitat, wetlands, or coastal uses.

(3) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply with respect to any major disaster or emergency declared on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2486. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1940, to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 140, strike subsection (d) and insert the following:

(d) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding section 1310 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017), there shall be available to the Administrator from the National Flood Insurance Fund, of amounts not otherwise obligated, not more than $750,000 to carry out subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section.

(e) PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not earlier than 90 days and not later than 180 days after the date on which the Administrator submits the report required under subsection (c), the Administrator shall establish a pilot program (referred to in this subsection as the ''program'') to provide means-tested, targeted assistance through vouchers or subsidies for the purchase of flood insurance to individuals who are economically distressed and cannot afford flood insurance coverage.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish appropriate criteria under which an individual may qualify for a voucher or subsidy under the program.

(B) INCOME REQUIREMENTS.—The criteria established under subparagraph (A) shall specify that an individual is not eligible for a voucher or subsidy under the program if—

(i) the annual adjusted gross income of the household of the individual is greater than 80 percent of the area median income, as determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; or

(ii) the individual does not reside in an area that is subject to the mandatory purchase requirements under sections 102 and 202 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a and 4016).

(3) VOUCHERS AND SUBSIDIES.—

(A) ADJUSTMENT OF AMOUNT.—The Administrator may adjust the amount of a voucher or subsidy provided to an individual under the program based on the level of financial need of the household of the individual, including by establishing a tiered system, sliding scale, or standard of affordability that evaluates the cost of flood insurance coverage as a percentage of the adjusted gross income of a household.

(B) LIMITATION.—The amount of a voucher or subsidy provided to an individual under the program may not exceed the cost of flood insurance coverage for the individual under the National Flood Insurance Program.

(4) USE OF VOUCHERS AND SUBSIDIES.—The Administrator may not provide a voucher or subsidy under the program to an individual to pay for flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program for—

(A) any property that is not the primary residence of the individual;

(B) any business property; or

(C) any real property purchased by the individual after the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may take all necessary and appropriate action to carry out the program, including entering into agreements with other Federal agencies, agencies or instrumentalities of State, local, or special-purpose local governments, or private or nonprofit organizations to carry out the program.

(B) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator may request information from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Social Security Administration, or a State agency in order to verify information relating to the income of—

(i) an individual seeking to participate in the program; and

(ii) the household of an individual seeking to participate in the program.

(6) FUNDING.—

(A) SOURCE OF FUNDING.—Notwithstanding section 1310 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017), the Administrator may use amounts of the National Flood Insurance Fund not otherwise obligated to carry out the program.

(B) TOTAL AMOUNT OF FUNDING.—The total amount of the vouchers and subsidies provided under the program for a fiscal year may not exceed $10,000,000.

(C) OFFSETS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title or the amendments made by this title, the Administrator may not increase risk premium rates for flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program to offset amounts expended by the Administrator to carry out the program.

(7) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the Administrator establishes the program, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that evaluates the performance and outcomes of the program.

(8) SUNSET.—On and after September 30, 2017, the Administrator may not provide a voucher or subsidy to any individual under the program.

SA 2487. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1940, to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 141, insert the following:

SEC. 142. IMPACTS OF FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS IN AGRICULTURAL AREAS AND RURAL COMMUNITIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(2) AGRICULTURAL AREA.—The term ''agricultural area'' means an area in which substantially all of the land use is agricultural.

(3) PROGRAM.—The term ''program'' means the national flood insurance program established under chapter 1 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.).

(4) RURAL COMMUNITY.—The term ''rural community'' means a community located in an area in which a substantial portion of the economy, currently is and historically was, based on agricultural production.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) TASK FORCE.—The term ''task force'' means the task force established under subsection (b).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator and the Secretary shall jointly establish a task force that shall conduct a study to analyze the challenges faced by agricultural areas and rural communities designated as areas having special flood hazards for purposes of the program.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—The task force shall consist of 13 members, of whom—

(1) 2 shall be the Administrator and the Secretary, or designees; and

(2) 11 shall be appointed jointly by the Administrator and the Secretary from individuals who are 1 of the following:

(A) A member or representative of—

(i) a farm or agricultural organization;

(ii) the insurance, banking, or financial industry; or

(iii) a floodplain management or flood control organization.

(B) A landowner or farmer.

(C) An elected official representing an agricultural area or rural community.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the task force shall submit to the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report regarding the study conducted under subsection (b).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The report shall include any recommended changes to the program to strengthen the economic viability and vitality of agricultural areas and rural communities, including an analysis of and recommendations regarding—

(A) the impacts of program building restrictions on the agricultural economy;

(B) legislative changes to the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.) (including regulations), that might mitigate the impacts identified;

(C) the feasibility, advantages, and disadvantages of the establishment of a new program flood zone for agricultural areas and rural communities;

(D) options for lower-cost flood insurance under the program in agricultural areas and rural communities and the financial implications to the program if such insurance were offered; and

(E) impacts, if any, of the program on the total acreage of land used for agricultural purposes.

NOTICES OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator TOM COBURN, intend to object to proceeding to S. 3338, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make the provision of technical services for medical imaging examinations and radiation therapy treatments safer, more accurate, and less costly; dated June 27, 2012.

I, Senator CHARLES GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Mark J. Mazur, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; dated June 27, 2012.

I, Senator CHARLES GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Matthew S. Rutherford, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; dated June 27, 2012.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 27, 2012, at 10:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 27, 2012, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CONRAD. 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 June 27, 2012, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 27, 2012, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session on June 27, 2012. The Committee will meet in room SD–124 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 27, 2012, at 3 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jesse Ervin-Combs be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMENDING THE PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY LUTES SOFTBALL TEAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 511, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 511) commending the Pacific Lutheran University Lutes Softball Team for winning the 2012 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III Softball Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any related statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 511) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 511

Whereas, on May 21, 2012, the Pacific Lutheran University Lutes (referred to in this preamble as ''the PLU Lutes'') Softball Team defeated the Linfield College Wildcats by a score of 3–0 to win the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III Softball Championship;

Whereas this victory is the first softball championship for Pacific Lutheran University in its history, as well as its first national championship since 1999;

Whereas the PLU Lutes Softball Team finished the 2012 season with a record of 45 wins and 11 losses, breaking the record at Pacific Lutheran University for most wins in a season;

Whereas the PLU Lutes Softball Team also broke the school record for most runs scored and most total bases in a season;

Whereas senior pitcher Stacy Hagensen was named the tournament's Most Outstanding Player by allowing only 3 hits and giving up no runs;

Whereas the team members and coaches of the PLU Lutes Softball Team have set an example of leadership for women in collegiate athletics;

Whereas PLU Lutes Softball Team head coach Erin Van Nostrand, associate head coach Greg Seeley, and assistant coaches Tiffany McVay, Dena Harkovitch, and Dena Slye led the team to the championship with their leadership and winning philosophy;

Whereas the PLU Lutes Softball Team exemplifies the mission of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as ''Title IX''), which Congress enacted to ensure that gender discrimination did not interfere with educational opportunities;

Whereas the passage of Title IX has led to a 574 percent increase in female participation in college sports and a 1,000 percent increase in female participation in high school sports;

Whereas, before Title IX, only 2 percent of the college students participating in sports were female;

Whereas, in 2001, 43 percent of the college students participating in sports were female;

Whereas, by a 3-1 ratio, female athletes perform better in school and have higher graduation rates than females who do not participate in sports;

Whereas student-athletes have higher annual graduation rates than their classmates who do not participate in sports; and

Whereas the success of the 2012 PLU Lutes Softball Team demonstrates the accomplishments that a team can achieve when each player adopts a teamwork mentality: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the Pacific Lutheran University Lutes (referred to in this resolution as the ''PLU Lutes'') Softball Team for winning the 2012 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III Softball Championship;

(2) recognizes the people of Washington State for their support of the PLU Lutes Softball Team;

(3) honors the achievements of every player, coach, and support staff who was instrumental in the success of the PLU Lutes Softball Team during the 2012 season; and

(4) requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution for appropriate display to the PLU Lutes Softball Team.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF RICE UNIVERSITY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 512 submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 512) recognizing the 100th anniversary of Rice University.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 512) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 512

Whereas Rice University is celebrating its 100th year as a renowned research university advancing education in the arts, humanities, and sciences;

Whereas the William Marsh Rice Institute for the Advancement of Literature, Science, and Art, named for its benefactor William Marsh Rice and now known as Rice University, was inaugurated on October 12, 1912, in Houston, Texas;

Whereas the first president of Rice University, Edgar Odell Lovett, set forth an ambitious vision for a prestigious research university;

Whereas Rice University is a leading institution of higher education, ranked among the top 20 universities in the United States by U.S. News & World Report every year since the rankings began in 1983;

Whereas Rice University is dedicated to keeping high quality education affordable through generous financial aid programs and ranks among the 10 best value private colleges by Princeton Review;

Whereas Rice University plays a leading role in research in many fields, including nanotechnology, space, cellular technology, bioinformatics, energy, health, and the environment;

Whereas Rice University has invaluably contributed to space exploration, becoming the first university in the United States to create a department dedicated to space exploration and donating the land now home to the Johnson Space Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

Whereas the groundbreaking discovery of buckminsterfullerene, referred to as ''buckyballs'', on the campus of Rice University in 1985 launched the new field of fullerene chemistry, helped launch the new scientific field of nanotechnology, earned two Rice University professors, Dr. Richard Smalley and Dr. Robert Curl, the Nobel Prize in Chemistry, and is now leading to life-saving and life-enhancing breakthroughs in medicine, transportation, energy, the environment, defense, and many other endeavors;

Whereas Nobel Prize recipient Dr. Richard Smalley of Rice University played a significant role in forming The Academy of Medicine, Engineering, and Science of Texas, an organization for the Texas members of the National Academies and the first organization in Texas dedicated to building collaboration among Texas's most distinguished scientific, academic, and corporate minds in research and public policy;

Whereas the goal of Rice University is to prepare its students to succeed in a highly competitive and complex world, and many of its alumni have distinguished themselves in their service and contributions to the United States;

Whereas Rice University is one of three Texas universities to be chosen as a member of the Association of American Universities, and the only private university in Texas that is a member of that association;

Whereas Rice University is fortunate to have exceptionally fine trustees, administrators, and faculty members who have placed emphasis on inspiring students to succeed in the arts, humanities, and sciences;

Whereas the contributions of Rice University and its alumni have enriched the history of the United States and the world in the arts, humanities, sports, and sciences; and

Whereas the success of Rice University is the result of a united effort by many resourceful and dedicated individuals, and all who are associated with the preservation of the great traditions of Rice University deserve to be proud of their accomplishments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the 100th anniversary of Rice University and expresses gratitude to the university for its innumerable contributions to higher education and the United States.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 2012

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 28; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that the majority leader be recognized; that the first hour of debate be 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, we will continue to debate the flood insurance reauthorization bill tomorrow. We will also await House action on the transportation bill. We need to consider the student loan extension before the end of the week.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. 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 5:20 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 28, 2012, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER,

FOR THE PERSONAL RANK OF CAREER AMBASSADOR IN RECOGNITION OF ESPECIALLY DISTINGUISHED SERVICE OVER A SUSTAINED PERIOD:

WILLIAM R. BROWNFIELD, OF TEXAS
KRISTIE ANNE KENNEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
THOMAS ALFRED SHANNON, JR., OF VIRGINIA

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. HOWARD D. STENDAHL

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAMES O. BARCLAY III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DONALD M. CAMPBELL, JR.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MAME REILEY

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a longtime Virginia resident and dear friend, Ms. Mame Reiley, whose decades-long service to the Democratic Party and local nonprofit institutions has had such a positive impact on people's lives both locally and nationally.

In 1989, Mame was the one who convinced me to run for Congress. Because of her legendary ability to make people see the art of the possible, and my confidence in her timing and instincts, we took on a tough race, beating the odds. She served as my Chief of Staff for the next six years, ably guiding me to some major policy successes and a coveted seat on the Appropriations Committee in only my second term.

Mame fell in love with politics as a youngster, cheering Jack Kennedy on to his historic Presidential election and playing a significant role in college for his brother Ted's run. In the years following, she has become a force within the Party, chairing the Women's Caucus for the DNC, and having played a major role in the career of virtually every major Virginia Democrat from Doug Wilder to Tim Kaine. Among her many positions she's held over the years: running inaugural activities for Governor Mark Warner, serving as political director of his PAC, One Virginia, serving as senior advisor to Governor Tim Kaine, and directing my brother Brian's gubernatorial run.

Mame's skill, knowhow, and hard work led Governor Warner to appoint her to the Board of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA) in 2002. While on the MWAA Board, she quickly gained the respect of her peers, rising to the position of Chairman of the Board, and the Board's prestigious Dulles Corridor Committee. Her efforts helped pave the way for Rail to Dulles, the largest expansion of the Metro rail system since it was created.

Commitment to public service and the Democratic Party has been the theme of her life's work. Mame's involvement with the DNC and other influential local organizations continues to this day. In 1992, she was elected to the DNC from Virginia. Since that time, she has risen to Chair the Women's Caucus and serves on the DNC's Executive Committee and its highly influential Rules and Bylaws Committee. She is also a member of the Economic Club of Washington and the Federal City Council Executive Committee. In her spare time, Mame has continued to operate the Reiley Group, a well-known public relations and event planning firm.

Mame has garnered the respect of countless individuals and admirers. She is a force to be reckoned with, her honesty and advice frequently sought-out, and if you're in a foxhole, she's the person you want next to you, protecting your back and bringing levity to even the toughest situation.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions and accomplishments of my long time friend and mentor, Mame Reiley.

RECOGNIZING THE MONTFORD POINT MARINES FOR RECEIVING THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

HON. ERIC CANTOR

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Montford Point Marines for their selfless service to our country and for their fortitude in the face of social turmoil. This group of warriors forever remains a testament to the American ideals of bravery, patriotism, and liberty.

Through the courageous efforts of civil rights activists and President Franklin D. Roosevelt's signing of Executive Order 8802, race restrictions on the defense industry were eliminated during the buildup of World War II. And in 1941, African Americans wanting to serve their country were given the right to do so.

Though still facing adversity in segregated camps, these brave soldiers answered the call to arms without hesitation and trained to become United States Marines at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. Between 1942 and 1949, more than 20,000 men were recruited and enlisted at Montford Point. These Marines would steadfastly serve our country during a time of great social unrest. The example they set and the legacy they left at Montford Point inspired countless future Marines and inspires us all today.

President Truman's signing of an executive order in 1949 desegregating the military is surely a direct reflection of these Marines' role as trailblazers of racial equality. The sacrifice of the Montford Point Marines represented a pivotal step forward for our country and they deserve our utmost respect and admiration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me today in saluting the Montford Point Marines as they receive the Congressional Gold Medal commemorating their timeless example of valor and American heroism.

HONORING BONNIE LEMOINE

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I have the opportunity to recognize the remarkable 34-year career of Bonnie Lemoine, Procter & Gamble (P&G) External Relations Leader.

Bonnie was born and raised in Central Louisiana and has dedicated her career and life to the Pineville/Alexandria area. Throughout her career, Bonnie has worked tirelessly to make Louisiana an attractive place to do business and a great place to live.

In addition to her job at P&G, Bonnie served as chair and board member of the Central Louisiana Chamber of Commerce, Chair and executive board member of the Louisiana Association of Business and Industry, board member of Central Louisiana Economic Development Alliance and Tioga Historical Museum, member of North Rapides Business Alliance and Local Water Board Commissioner, and many others.

Throughout the years, Bonnie has received numerous awards, including: Lantern Award, Intercity Economic Development Award, Cypress Award, Better Business Award and P&G Recognition Shares.

I offer the following testament to Bonnie's kind-hearted and altruistic nature. After Hurricane Katrina, P&G's Folgers Coffee Manufacturing Plant, in New Orleans, was completely flooded as well as many of the employees' homes. Bonnie immediately went into action. She asked employees in the P&G Pineville, LA plant if they would open their homes to the P&G Folgers families displaced by the floods. Everyone needing a roof over their heads was accommodated. Once this was achieved, Bonnie started working to get the plant up and running again. Within weeks, there were 125 FEMA trailers on-site for employees to reside, and power had been restored to the site. The Folgers plant was one of the first manufacturing plants in the area to resume production. It even received a visit from President Bush as he personally recognized the incredible efforts to help employees and their families and get the plant up and running in record time.

Bonnie has earned the respect and admiration of everyone she has met along her journey. It is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Bonnie Lemoine on an exemplary career as she celebrates her retirement. I thank her for her service to our community and wish her the best in her future endeavors.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SAFETY AND INNOVATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 2012

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3187, as amended, the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act.

I am proud to represent many of the hard working employees at the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and this legislation provides them with the resources to fulfill FDA's mission to protect and advance public health and safety. This bipartisan legislation enables FDA to review drugs and medical devices in a

timely fashion, reduces costs by authorizing a new user fee program for generic drugs, and takes important steps to prevent and mitigate critical drug shortages.

As the co-chairman of the Childhood Cancer Caucus, I am pleased that this legislation contains several provisions that will facilitate the development of safe and effective childhood cancer treatments. The legislation makes permanent two key complementary pediatric drug programs—the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act (BPCA) and the Pediatric Research Equity Act (PREA). Both of these programs foster the development of prescription drugs for children and the safe use of drugs by children. Finally, I am pleased that this legislation incorporates the Creating Hope Act, which I introduced with Representatives MCCAUL, BUTTERFIELD, and MYRICK. Under this incentive program, a pharmaceutical company that develops a drug specifically to treat a rare pediatric disease will be rewarded with a priority review voucher for another drug. I'm hopeful that this program will kick start private sector investment in new and innovative treatments for children and families affected by cancer.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support S. 3187 to provide FDA the resources it requires to guarantee the safety of American's prescription drugs and medical devices.

HONORING PETER S. PAINE, JR.

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my dear friend Peter S. Paine, Jr. upon his receipt of the Ordre des Palmes Academiques (Order of Academic Palms). This prestigious honor was awarded by the Messieurs Jean-Claude Duthion, Education Attaché of the French Embassy in recognition of his work to preserve Fort Ticonderoga and its international educational mission.

The Ordre des Palmes Academiques is an order of chivalry of France for academic, cultural, and educational figures. Originally founded by Emperor Napoleon to honor eminent members of the University of Paris, it was established as an order in October 4, 1955 by President René Jules Gustave Coty.

Peter's career as a lawyer and strong advocate for the environment first came to the fore when he was named a member of the Temporary Study Commission on the Future of the Adirondacks from 1968 to 1970, and then as a Commissioner of the Adirondack Park Agency from 1971 to 1995. Peter served as the principle draftsman of the Adirondack State Land Master Plan and the NY State Wild Scenic and Recreational Rivers legislation, masterfully displaying his skill and passion for the environment. He also served as a trustee and former chairman of the Adirobtlack Nature Conservancy, served on the NY State Nature Conservancy Board of Trustees, was founding member and long time general counsel of the Lake Champlain Committee, and also served as one of the founding trustees of what is now Environmental Advocates. He also has served on the Board of Trustees of the Fort Ticonderoga Association and a trustee of the Adirondack Community Trust pay projects and played an important role in numerous land conservation contracts in the Champlain Valley including the preservation as a bird sanctuary of the Four Brother Islands in Lake Champlain and the addition of the Split Rock Mountain Range to the NY State Forest Preserve. As a major supporter and co-organizer of the Noblewood Park and Nature Preserve Project in the town of Willsboro, along with Assemblywoman Teresa Sayward, he helped create the Coon Mountain Nature Preserve in Westport. Peter lead the Paine family in donating conservation easements to the Adirondack Nature Conservancy starting in 1978 which protected five miles of shoreline on Lake Champlain and the Boquet River as well as some 1,000 acres of farm and forestland.

Peter had a long career in the law with the law firm of Cleary Gottlieb Steen and Hamilton LLP and has served as Chairman of the Champlain National Bank in Willsboro, NY.

Peter is an avid hunter, fisherman, horseman, and wilderness expedition leader. I can tell you from my personal interaction with him over many years that he is a man of uncommon intelligence, clear thinking, and one not afraid to express his opinion on any subject. He performs his duties with alacrity, clarity, and with concern for his environment and fellow man.

Let me offer in conclusion my sincere congratulations on his receipt of the Ordre des Palmes Academiques. I wish him the best of luck in all future endeavors.

"Peter, mes sincéres félicitations pour votre prix á l'ordre des Palmes Académiques. Je tiens á vous souhaiter mes meilleures vceux de succés, et je vous prie d'agréer l'expression de mes salutations les plus distinguées."

SUPPORTING THE SELECTION OF IDAHO'S JERRY KRAMER INTO THE PRO FOOTBALL HALL OF FAME

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight the career and advocate for one of Idaho's most distinguished professional football players, Jerry Kramer.

Jerry graduated from Idaho's Sandpoint High School and attended college at the University of Idaho on a football scholarship. He was a standout player there, garnering selections to both the East-West Shrine Game and the College All-Star Game.

Over a dozen professional football teams courted Kramer and after being drafted 39th overall, he signed on to play guard for the Green Bay Packers in 1958. The Packers of that era, with help from Kramer, are the only team to win three championships in a row. Jerry Kramer made the "Packer Sweep" famous.

Jerry Kramer is perhaps most famously known for "The Block" where he led quarterback Bart Starr into the end zone as time ran out in the 1967 NFL Championship game, defeating the Dallas Cowboys in what is known as the "Ice Bowl."

Jerry Kramer was a five-time All-Pro, a member of five championship teams, including the first two Super Bowls, and a member of the NFL's 50th Anniversary All-Time team. He was named to the NFL's All-Decade Team of the 1960s at offensive guard and led the NFL in field goal percentage in 1962.

Surprisingly, Jerry Kramer is the only player selected to the NFL's 50th All-Time Anniversary team who has not been inducted into the Pro Football Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for this oversight to be corrected. Jerry Kramer is so highly regarded that seventeen current members of the NFL Hall of Fame, many who played against Kramer, have endorsed his nomination and election to the Hall. That list of players includes such greats as Roger Staubach, Frank Gifford, Alan Page, Bob Lilly, Jan Stenerud, Gino Marchetti and Coach Joe Gibbs, to name just a few

Besides his contributions on the football field, Jerry is a highly regarded citizen of Idaho who gives his time to worthy causes including serving on the selection committee for the World Sports Humanitarian Hall of Fame. Idahoans are proud of his accomplishments and football fans throughout the state support his induction

There is no doubt in my mind that Jerry Kramer's NFL career clearly qualifies him for induction into the Pro Football Hall of Fame

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 26th, 2012, I missed rollcall vote 416 for unavoidable reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall No. 416: "no" (Connolly of Virginia Amendment).

ON POINT, SHADES OF BLACK AND GREEN IN HONOR OF THE MONTFORD POINT MARINES AND THE PRESENTATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Montford Point Marines, were the first enlisted Blacks ever to serve in The United States Marine Corps. Today we honor these magnificent heroes with the presentation of Congress's highest civilian award, The Congressional Gold Medal. These heroes fought on two fronts: at home against discrimination and across the seas to defend our nation. Beginning in 1942 they served in the Pacific Theater, and fought as valiantly as any Americans ever have. Their courageous lives have helped bring this Nation one step closer to equality. I ask in honor of all of these heroes living and deceased, this poem be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ON POINT, SHADES OF BLACK AND GREEN

(by Albert Carey Caswell)

On . . .
On Point!
All in those Shades of Black and Green!
As a war can so be fought on two fronts
sometimes so sadly seen!

As had all of those Montford Point Marines . . .
All in their most magnificent shades, shades of Black and Green . . .
For only The Few, Shall Ever Be United States Marines!
As a Nation's dark deep past so convened!
All in what discrimination so really means!
As throughout all of those generations,
and all of those tears and pain upon a Nation!
But, To Be A United States Marine!
But, some dreams never die as so it seems!
To walk so proudly and wear those brilliant shades of Green!
And to go so boldly forth,
all in your most heroic course!
As A United States Marine!
And even though what we so did to them was a disgrace as seen,
these fine heroes would not so lost pace, these Marines!
As they so heroically marched off into that shadow of death with high esteem!
While, all of their most brilliant hearts so gleamed!
OohRah!
Because, discrimination is no match for A United States Marine!
With the world at its edge,
as Mankind bled . . .
To Save The World, all in those magnificent shades of black and green!
So that into a future, A King Among could so speak of his Dream!
Because, no more fiercer warrior has so been seen!
Than, all of those Magnificent Montford Point Marines!
As I pity those poor Japanese,
who had to so face all of their most heroic screams!
As Jesse Owens,
had already laid the ground work in Germany it seems!
When, the second wave came crashing in as seen!
Bringing a setting sun in the land of the Japanese!
As what their fine hearts for our country tis of thee would mean!
All in that Pride,
that which so dwells deep inside of being a United States Marine!
As their courage and their faith,
put our Nation one step closer to that place!
Where all of our forefathers' hearts had so truly dreamed!
For all men are created equal all in this golden theme!
So on this day,
look around you and pray and so say thank all of these Marines!
All in their most magnificent shades of Black and Green!
Whose courage and undying faith,
so made this our world a much better place all of these Marines!
Listen closely, can you but not hear the liberty bell!
Ringing out for the freedoms that they so fought for across the shores so well!
For all these magnificent men where On Point,
as our Lord God knows so very well!
All in their most magnificent shades of Black and Green!
All of these Magnificent Montford Point Marines . . .
As time and history would tell!

IN RECOGNITION OF THE EL PASO YOUTH SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the El Paso Youth Symphony Orchestra (EPYSO) and their Diplomatic International Cultural Exchange Tour.

From June 25th through July 2nd, the EPYSO will partner with the Mexican national youth symphony, Sinfonica Esperanza Azteca, in a regional tour that will take them to prestigious venues in southern California. The journey will culminate with a performance aboard the USS *Midway*, honoring veterans and soldiers.

The recognition of the tour would not be complete without mentioning the talented orchestra behind it. This year, Maestro Phillip Gabriel Garcia and his students will celebrate the 20th anniversary of the respected and accomplished EPYSO. With over 3,500 students taught and 200 shows performed, it is amazing to consider that just two decades ago, Phillip was a senior at Hanks High School when he first started this orchestra. EPYSO is now playing nationally in front of thousands. Its philanthropic motive of discovering hidden talent and potential in students throughout the city is also noteworthy.

With the tour underway, the band is focused on providing a phenomenal show. Mayor John Cook and Maestro Garcia have worked with the El Paso musicians to promote the message that they are a band against bullies. Their musical compositions come with a moral that bullying in schools must stop. Their song "I Am Not a Bully" will not only demonstrate and promote equal and fair school policies, but also display to our Mexican counterparts that Americans are more sympathetic than many in the international community label us.

Bullying is an unacceptable and growing problem in our schools. Bullying in all forms is unacceptable and social networks like Facebook and Twitter have only added fuel to the fire. All students suffer when bullying is tolerated, and we need to change if we want to see our youth progress as a generation. Our goal should be to provide students with a safe academic environment where students are comfortable and focused on their social and educational goals. Additionally, as a father and a grandfather, I would not want to witness any child being harassed or picked-on. Being bullied, especially at a young age, has a serious implication on a child's early social development that will negatively impact them for the rest of their lives. Thankfully many activists—like the students in the EPYSO and others—are combating this growing problem.

I am proud of the Diplomatic International Cultural Exchange Tour. As the EPYSO travels across the Southwest with their Mexican counterparts, I hope that their message of tolerance will be one which the cities they visit will embrace and share in their communities.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

SPEECH OF

HON. RICK LARSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Black Motion to Instruct.

This motion is a step back for highway safety, and a step back for our country. This country has done a lot to improve highway safety in the last thirty years. We've mandated safety belt use. We've addressed our many of our most dangerous intersections and developed better signage and more visible traffic signals. And we created a federal mandate that raised the drinking age to 21.

But there are new challenges—and distracted driving is one of the most important. This motion is exactly the opposite of what we should be voting on.

We should be doing everything in our power to encourage responsible driving and protect lives. Couching this argument in the 10th amendment is simply cover for irresponsible legislation.

There are numerous grant programs throughout the federal government that provide funding for states based on national policies that Congress wants to advance. To single out a safety program is totally out of left field—or rather, right field in this case.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion.

CONGRATULATING MS. STEPHANIE ODOM ON THE OCCASION OF RECOGNITION AS A UNITED HEALTH FOUNDATION DIVERSE SCHOLAR

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great pleasure to congratulate Ms. Stephanie Odom for being honored as a United Health Foundation Diverse Scholar. Ms. Odom's unwavering commitment to academic excellence in the field of science, deem her worthy of this recognition.

The United Health Foundation began highlighting Diverse Scholars in 2007 as an initiative to increase the quantity of deserving, yet underrepresented individuals entering the health workforce. In 2009, the Foundation sought to further engage scholars with access to resources by hosting a forum in our Nation's capital with representatives from government, academia, and various industries.

Ms. Odom is a native of Macon, North Carolina. She has excelled at Edward Waters College as an undergraduate biology major. Currently in her second year of education at Edward Waters, Ms. Odom has consistently achieved Dean's List honors by maintaining a minimum 3.5 GPA since her freshman year. As a result, she is a member of the prestigious national honor society, Phi Eta Sigma.

She credits the United Health Foundation scholarship with assisting her goal of completing post-secondary education. She is a

humble, yet gracious leader; when asked about challenges faced while achieving her goal of higher education, Ms. Odom replied that she is challenged daily, but will not allow anything to discourage her dream of becoming a physician.

As a resident of North Carolina's First Congressional District, I am proud to call her one of our own. The United Health Foundation has shown great judgment in selecting Ms. Stephanie Odom as a Diverse Scholar.

Again, congratulations. Best wishes for her continued academic success and commitment to the uplift of science and humanity.

HONORING THE PASADENA JEWISH TEMPLE AND CENTER

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Pasadena Jewish Temple and Center in Pasadena, California, upon its 90th anniversary.

Incorporated in 1921, Jewish members of Pasadena built their first synagogue, Temple B'nai Israel, on Hudson Avenue in Pasadena. In 1929 the congregation moved to a larger meeting room due to a rapid growth in membership. By 1932 membership had grown to 207 family members. In the 1940's, the congregation purchased land and built a new temple on Altadena Drive in Pasadena, its current location.

David Cohen became Rabbi in 1942, followed by Rabbi Max Vorspan, who served from 1947 until 1952. During this time, the Pasadena Jewish Community was re-named as the Pasadena Jewish Temple and Center (PJTC). In 1952, Maurice T. Galpert became Rabbi, serving until his death in 1988. Rabbi Galpert led the PJTC through growth and modernization, which included building a new sanctuary and school and the ratification of a new constitution. In 1989, Rabbi Gilbert Kollin, long established as a rabbinic leader in the greater Los Angeles Jewish community, led PJTC until his retirement in 2003. Joshua Levine Grater became Rabbi in 2003 and under his leadership, the PJTC has become not only a place to worship but also a positive role model with many service and outreach programs.

Since its inception, the PJTC has provided spiritual guidance to its members and support for the community. In addition to hosting affiliated Jewish organizations such as the Weizmann Day School and B'nai B'rith, there are many service committees including the Sisterhood, United Synagogue Youth, Men's Club, and Israel Committees. The Tikkun Olam & Social Justice Committee coordinates ongoing humanitarian and social action work within PJTC and the greater community, and its efforts include coordinating charitable responses to occurrences such as Hurricane Katrina and ending the genocide in Darfur. Members also volunteer with Union Station Homeless Services and Project Isaiah, a food and clothing distribution program, and provide tutoring to Longfellow Elementary School students in Pasadena.

I consider it a great privilege to represent the Pasadena Jewish Temple and Center and I ask all Members to join me in congratulating the congregation upon their 90th anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL R. HOLLIS

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a natural born leader, an entrepreneur, a trailblazer and a very dear friend. Michael R. Hollis departed this life on June 18, 2012, at the tender age of 58, but not before he achieved his goal to "do something in life that would make a difference."

A native of Atlanta, Georgia, Michael was born in Grady Memorial Hospital, a beloved institution that later in life he would help save. From a young age he demonstrated he was extremely gifted. When he was only 15, he led the Atlanta Youth Congress and worked on Sam Massell's mayoral campaign, which earned him a spot on the Mayor's race relations commission. The following year, Michael's talents landed him a coveted job in the Atlanta Braves' public relations department. At 16, he also served as a Georgia delegate to the White House Conference on Youth and led the Young Atlantans for Maynard Jackson during Jackson's 1969 bid for the U.S. Senate. It was only after he accomplished these remarkable achievements that he graduated from Booker T. Washington High School.

Michael went on to graduate with honors from Dartmouth College and earned a Juris Doctorate from the University of Virginia School of Law. While in law school, he continued to demonstrate extraordinary leadership by becoming the first African American to be elected national president of the American Bar Association's student organization.

Following law school, Michael returned home to Atlanta, but his political connections called him into service. President Jimmy Carter appointed him to serve as associate chief counsel to investigate the legal implications of the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant accident in 1979. In that position, he helped lead the investigative committee to recommend nuclear safety protocols that are still in effect today.

In addition to his political acumen, Michael was an entrepreneur at heart. While serving as Vice President for Public Finance at Oppenheimer & Co. in New York, he incorporated Air Atlanta at the age of 27. He left the investment firm three years later in 1983 to lead his fledgling airline. It folded in 1987, but Michael was not deterred.

In the years that followed, he formed Hollis Communications and helped build a 50,000 watt radio station in Atlanta. He also launched Hanover Credit Company, Blue Sky Petroleum Company and Nevis Securities, LLC.

Michael served on the Fulton-DeKalb Hospital Authority and the Grady Memorial Hospital board. He was founding trustee of Clark Atlanta University and served as a member of the Emory University Board of Visitors.

Michael is survived by his beloved wife, Deena Freeman Hollis; sisters Virginia Hollis and Joan Hollis Mitchell; and brothers, Flem Hollis and Julius Hollis.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to join me in honoring Michael R. Hollis, a bright light that was dimmed too soon. He was a remarkable example of what one can accomplish if you hold fast to your dreams. In his own words he couldn't "pass through this life and pass up on great opportunities." His many achievements stand as testaments to a life well lived, and will serve as his lasting legacy.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF DR. CALVIN HYLTON SHIRLEY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of an outstanding human being. Dr. Calvin Hylton (Kappa) Shirley passed away on June 23, 2012 at the age of 91. He was my doctor and great friend.

Dr. Shirley was born on January 28, 1921, grew up in Pensacola, Florida and graduated from Florida A&M University. He served as a Navy corpsman in the Pacific during World War II, and went on to earn his degree from Boston College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Dr. Shirley was an accomplished physician who specialized in the fields of obstetrics and family practice. He was among the first black doctors to work in Broward County, starting the historic Provident Hospital in Fort Lauderdale, which was the first medical facility in the city for blacks. Dr. Shirley served there for 54 years and delivered over 6,000 babies. In 1949, he established his own practice, and allowed those who could not pay for his services to offer him crops as payment. Dr. Shirley was a man who lived by his principles, stating that, "A good doctor is one who is concerned with giving service, as opposed to one who's only concerned with the almighty dollar."

In addition to his outstanding service to the community, Dr. Shirley paved the way for African Americans in the medical community. He was one of the first four black physicians in Broward County to have his own medical practice. He was also the first medical advisor to the Sickle Cell Foundation. Furthermore, Dr. Shirley was the first and only black physician to receive the coveted Heideman Memorial Doctor of the Year award, and serve on the Executive Board of the Florida State Health Planning Council as well as serve on the staff of Broward General Hospital. He was also the first black obstetrician-gynecologist in Broward County and the first black staff physician at Broward Health Medical Center.

On top of his professional career, Dr. Shirley was affiliated with many organizations rooted in the South Florida community. He was one of the founding members and first Polemarch of the Fort Lauderdale Alumni Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc., an organization of which I am a proud member. Additionally, Dr. Shirley was a 32nd Degree Mason, a Shriner of Kazah Temple 149, and a member of Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity of Alpha Rho Boule.

My chief of staff Art Kennedy, also a Kappa with Dr. Shirley and myself, remembers him fondly, "Brother Shirley was always a gentleman, very cool and calm, and he loved Kappa."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my sincere condolences to all

those who have been impacted by the loss of such a great man. My thoughts and prayers are with Dr. Shirley's family and friends during this most difficult time. He was a tremendous individual who selflessly dedicated his life to helping all those around him, and he will be dearly missed.

UNITED HEALTH FOUNDATION'S DIVERSE SCHOLARS PROGRAM

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, as we work to modernize our Nation's health care system, it is critical to invest in the next generation of the health care workforce so that they will be properly equipped with the tools and capabilities to improve the quality and delivery of health care. United Health Foundation's Diverse Scholars Initiative has helped multicultural students reach their higher education dreams while inspiring them to pursue careers in health. I would like to congratulate this year's Scholars who are participating in United Health Foundation's Annual Diverse Scholars Forum on their academic achievements and their commitment to enter the health care workforce to create a more culturally relevant and effective health care system, particularly in underserved communities.

Rosilem Barclay, 7th Congressional District of Alabama, Birmingham, Alabama

Gwendolyn Wagner, 1st Congressional District of Arizona, Chinle, Arizona

Karen King, 1st Congressional District of Arizona, Fort Defiance, Arizona

Angela Allen, 2nd Congressional District of Arizona, Surprise, Arizona

Marcus Marable, 3rd Congressional District of Arizona, Phoenix, Arizona

Paulette Lizarraga, 4th Congressional District of Arizona, Phoenix, Arizona

Lorraine Sophia Cuesta, 6th Congressional District of Arizona, Apache Junction, Arizona

Luz Marina Bradberry, 6th Congressional District of Arizona, Chandler, Arizona

Osvaldo Amezcua, 12th Congressional District of California, San Francisco, California

Jared Wigg, 17th Congressional District of California, Del Rey Oaks, California

Marizabel Orellana, 34th Congressional District of California, Downey, California

Isidro Landa, 35th Congressional District of California, Los Angeles, California

Jessica Gomez, 38th Congressional District of California, Montebello, California

Trang Vu, 40th Congressional District of California, Westminster, California

Melanie Castillo, 42nd Congressional District of California, Brea, California

Sydney Bailey, 4th Congressional District of California, Roseville, California

Izzybeth Rodriguez, 51st Congressional District of California, National City, California

Briana Truong, 5th Congressional District of California, Sacramento, California

Jillian Canete, 5th Congressional District of California, Sacramento, California

Chinsin Sim, 11th Congressional District of California, Stockton, California

Min Ju Lee, 15th Congressional District of California, Cupertino, California

Adrian Hernandez, 20th Congressional District of California, Bakersfield, California

Linda Sapien, 21st Congressional District of California, Fresno, California

Alice Yotat, At-Large, District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

Lelia Uchuya, 19th Congressional District of Florida, West Palm Beach, Florida

Laura Martin, 25th Congressional District of Florida, Hialeah Gardens, Florida

Monica Fernandez Junco, 25th Congressional District of Florida, Miami, Florida

Gretchen Betancourt, 2nd Congressional District of Florida, Tallahassee, Florida

Arielle Watson, 13th Congressional District of Georgia, Marietta, Georgia

Sharmori Lewis, 3rd Congressional District of Georgia, Hampton, Georgia

Kristen-Kaye Goulbourne, 4th Congressional District of Georgia, Conyers, Georgia

Ashley Turner, 5th Congressional District of Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia

Jesse DeMonte Andrews, 5th Congressional District of Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia

Saba Tesfmariam, 5th Congressional District of Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia

Brandi Turner, 7th Congressional District of Georgia, Dacula, Georgia

Carolina Gonzalez, 2nd Congressional District of Idaho, Pocatello, Idaho

Dave Cervantes, 15th Congressional District of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois

Charniece Martin, 2nd Congressional District of Illinois, Calumet City, Illinois

Sally Mei, 3rd Congressional District of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois

Shahrose Rahman, 5th Congressional District of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois

Stacey Pereira, 7th Congressional District of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois

Sophia Phuong Le, 1st Congressional District of Iowa, Davenport, Iowa

Aaron Alvarado, 2nd Congressional District of Kansas, Leavenworth, Kansas

Tracey Lynn Thomas, 6th Congressional District of Louisiana, Baker, Louisiana

Awawu Ojikutu, 4th Congressional District of Maryland, Hyattsville, Maryland

Andrea Leiva, 8th Congressional District of Maryland, Silver Spring, Maryland

Nelson Hernandez, 1st Congressional District of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts

Victoria Okuneye, 3rd Congressional District of Minnesota, Brooklyn Park, Minnesota

David Koffa, 5th Congressional District of Minnesota, Robbinsdale, Minnesota

Kimber Cain, 9th Congressional District of Missouri, Kirksville, Missouri

Aura-Maria Garcia, 13th Congressional District of New Jersey, Jersey City, New Jersey

Gene Wright, 3rd Congressional District of New Jersey, Willingboro, New Jersey

Sheridan Cowboy, 1st Congressional District of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico

Justine Correa, 2nd Congressional District of New Mexico, Laguna, New Mexico

D'Ayn DeGroat, 3rd Congressional District of New Mexico, Crownpoint, New Mexico

David Martin, 15th Congressional District of New York, New York, New York

Elizabeth Fuentes, 16th Congressional District of New York, Bronx, New York

Jing Lin, 5th Congressional District of New York, Flushing, New York

Maria Zaida Beltran, 7th Congressional District of New York, East Elmhurst, New York

Francisco Narvaez, 4th Congressional District of New York, Floral Park, New York

Stephanie Odom, 1st Congressional District of North Carolina, Macon, North Carolina

Diego Motta, 11th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, Scranton, Pennsylvania

Alicia Henriquez, 1st Congressional District of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Milan Davis, 2nd Congressional District of Pennsylvania, Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

Rochanne Johnson, 6th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, Bala Cynwyd, Pennsylvania

Hector Colon-Rivera, At-Large, Puerto Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico

Adrienne Harris, 5th Congressional District of Tennessee, Nashville, Tennessee

Abigayle Banda, 10th Congressional District of Texas, Elgin, Texas

Marisela Alejandra Soto, 12th Congressional District of Texas, Fort Worth, Texas

Julia West, 16th Congressional District of Texas, El Paso, Texas

Ana Diaz, 20th Congressional District of Texas, San Antonio, Texas

Laura Bordallo, 20th Congressional District of Texas, San Antonio, Texas

Vincent Job, 25th Congressional District of Texas, Austin, Texas

Megan Gingoyon, 2nd Congressional District of Texas, Humble, Texas

Jenniffer Duran, 6th Congressional District of Texas, Mansfield, Texas

Elzary Asberry, 9th Congressional District of Texas, Houston, Texas

Joanne Lane, 9th Congressional District of Washington, Federal Way, Washington

SECURING MARITIME ACTIVITIES THROUGH RISK-BASED TARGETING FOR PORT SECURITY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 2012

Mr. CONYERS. I rise today to provide some additional views on H.R. 4251, the "SMART Port Security Act." I strongly support many of the provisions in this bill, which will streamline and strengthen our Nation's port security. In particular, I am pleased to see that this bill makes needed reforms to the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) program by streamlining and reforming the process of enrolling, issuing, and renewing worker credentials. This legislation will spare workers the financial and procedural burden of renewing their application until the Department of Homeland Security issues a final rule on biometric readers and implements the infrastructure needed to make the program fully functional.

I want to express my concern about the possible consequences of Section 114 of the bill, which would create a new pilot program aimed at accelerating the deployment of medium-sized unmanned aircraft along the northern border. While improving our Nation's surveillance capabilities along our border is a laudable goal, law enforcement and border security officials have a responsibility to ensure that any use of drone technology in domestic airspace does not unnecessarily or illegally invade the privacy of ordinary citizens who happen to live close to the border.

This legislation and the recent reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration are both components of a significant recent legislative effort aimed at significantly loosening

regulations and other legal barriers that have, until now, limited the deployment of drones domestically. Before this technology is deployed along the border and elsewhere within the United States, Congress must put in place common sense protections that ensure that the privacy and due process rights of Americans are protected. For example, drones should not be deployed for open ended surveillance or law enforcement purposes. If a drone will intrude on reasonable privacy expectations, a warrant should be required. Legal protections should be put in place that clearly outline how personally identifiable information is collected and retained by a drone program. The process by which our country develops these policies and protections should be transparent and include all stakeholders.

This technology has the capacity to dramatically change the character of public life in our country. We must ensure that a legal structure is put in place that will allow us to reap the benefits of this technology, while still preserving the freedoms and values that make our country great.

INTRODUCING THE SES REFORM ACT OF 2012

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Senior Executive Service Reform Act of 2012. To put it simply, this bill will make the Senior Executive Service more attractive to senior General Schedule employees by reforming SES compensation, improving SES career management, reforming the SES hiring process, and increasing diversity within the SES.

Today approximately 64 percent of the nearly 7,100 Senior Executives will be eligible to retire by 2016. According to officials at the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), there are insufficient numbers of candidates to replace outgoing Senior Executives. The Senior Executive Service is not broken, but needs reform to continue to attract, retain, develop and reward our nation's most talented civil servants.

Although Senior Executives can earn more at the upper ranges, lower-level Senior Executives have significant pay overlap with upper-level GS–14 and 15 employees, who receive locality and overtime pay. Pay compression, as the phenomenon is known, reduces the attractiveness of joining the SES, where employees work longer hours and are more susceptible to being geographically relocated.

To address pay compression, this bill would provide an automatic pay raise equal to the annual average GS pay raise for any SES that receives a ''fully successful'' rating. Additionally, this bill would allow Senior Executives to count performance awards and bonuses towards their High–3 annuity calculation. Each reform is intended to alleviate pay compression, making the SES more financially attractive for high-performing GS employees.

Mr. Speaker, more attention needs to be given to ensuring that Senior Executives receive continuing professional development throughout their careers. This bill will require each agency to establish onboarding programs for newly appointed Senior Executives. Agency programs must include an overview of the mission, priorities, strategic plan of the agency and the roles and responsibilities of the new appointee.

To improve the hiring process, agency heads will also be required to advertise vacancies for a sufficient period of time to allow a larger pool of applicants to apply. The bill will reduce the exhaustive amounts of paperwork that needs to be submitted into a more manageable process that will allow agencies to provide timely notification to applicants regarding the status of their application.

Finally, I am proud that this bill will require each agency to create plans to increase diversity within their agencies. The plan, which will need to be updated biennially, will maximize the opportunities for the appointment of minorities, women and individuals with disabilities to the SES.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce the SES Reform Bill of 2012 with my colleagues Representatives GERRY CONNOLLY and CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, who have been such great leaders on federal employee issues.

RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS OF RETIRING ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS OFFICIAL MARIE McCULLOUGH

HON. MARK S. CRITZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the distinguished career of a devoted public servant, steadfast patriot and personal friend of mine. On June 30, 2012, Marie McCullough will transition into retirement after 29 years with the Army Corps of Engineers and over 33 years as a federal government employee. Marie has spent the last three-plus decades strengthening our communities and inspiring public trust in government.

Marie began her career in the federal government with the IRS. From there, she went to work for the Army in Nuremberg, Germany as a Payroll Liaison Clerk and Lead Military Personnel Clerk. In 1983, Marie joined the Army Corps of Engineers. She worked in the Corps' Pittsburgh District office for several years in a number of different capacities before joining the Programs and Project Management Branch in 2007. While working in Project Management, she adeptly managed several critical Environmental Infrastructure Programs, including the Section 313 South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Infrastructure Program. Under Marie's stewardship, this program—which was created by my mentor and predecessor, the late Congressman John P. Murtha—provides grant funding for numerous water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection projects.

Marie managed more than 30 projects involving over $28 million during her 5 years in Project Management. Furthermore, when the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) became law in 2009, she managed $8.5 million of additional funds to further assist our communities throughout southwestern Pennsylvania.

Through her energetic and agreeable personality, Marie has served as a skilled community liaison for the Army Corps of Engineers and has done a great deal to improve southwestern Pennsylvania's environmental infrastructure and resource conservation capacity. The impact of her outstanding work will undoubtedly continue to be felt throughout our region for years and years to come.

Mr. Speaker, we should all strive to emulate the passion and skill Marie has exhibited throughout her long and successful career in public service. I wish her the best of luck as she begins a new chapter in her life.

HONORING SHAUNTIERA DOUGLAS ON THE OCCASION OF HER NATIONAL TITLE

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Ms. Shauntiera Douglas, a resident of Garfield, New Jersey, and a fine young scholar-athlete on the occasion of her earning a national title at the New Balance Nationals Track and Field Championship. Ms. Douglas, a senior at Garfield High School, placed first in javelin at Nationals on June 15th and 16th.

Inspired by the memory of her niece, Destynne, Ms. Douglas has achieved great recognition in athletics in both Track and Field and basketball. Shauntiera was named ''Female Athlete of the Week'' by the Bergen Record this past February for her leadership and performance on Garfield High School's girls basketball team, in addition to numerous accolades in her main sport, javelin.

Ms. Douglas won her first javelin state championship this past year at the New Jersey State Meet of Champions, throwing 150 feet and 3 inches. Her championship is Garfield High School's first javelin state championship and only the second track and field championship in the history of the school.

Shauntiera's most important honor, however, came just one month ago at the New Balance National Track and Field Championship in North Carolina, where she threw 148 feet 7 inches, a full 9 inches further than her next competitor, to capture the national championship, beating out the previous record-holder. This high honor is a fitting finish to an impressive, undefeated season.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Shauntiera on her state and national championship titles. Her accomplishments on the field demonstrate her commitment to her team, her love of her sport, and her determination to succeed. I join with all of my constituents in New Jersey in honoring her achievements and wishing her continued success in her athletic and academic endeavors.

OBAMACARE

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since its creation in 2009, a majority of patients in this country have been united behind

a single truth—they do not want ObamaCare. Young people don't want it because it increases their costs—making them pay high prices for care they don't need or cannot afford. Patients with chronic illnesses don't want it because it allows a board of bureaucrats to restrict access to life saving treatments if they cost too much. Seniors don't want it because it takes $575 billion out of the Medicare program and will make it harder for them to find a physician or hospital for treatment when they are sick.

Tomorrow, the Supreme Court will rule on the constitutionality of ObamaCare. Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of work ahead of us but one thing is certain: my former patients do not want ObamaCare in any way, shape, or form.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM JORDAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, because my scheduled flight into Washington was cancelled yesterday afternoon, I was absent from the House Floor during four rollcall votes taken on Tuesday.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcalls 412, 413, and 415, and "no" on rollcall 414.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS' BENEFITS IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 2012

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, I submit the attached June 19, 2012 letter from Chuck Canterbury, National President of the National Fraternal Order of Police, in regards to H.R. 4018, the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvements Act of 2012.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE
Washington, DC, June 19, 2012.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. LAMAR S. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMEN: I am writing this letter on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.R. 4018, the "Public Safety Officers' Benefits (PSOB) Improvements Act," introduced by Representative Michael G. Fitzpatrick (R-PA), and S. 1696, the Senate companion bill introduced by Chairman Leahy. It is our understanding that both committees have agreed to compromise language and we are pleased to offer our support for this bipartisan, bicameral bill.

The legislation, which has received a neutral score from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), will reduce claims processing delays, reduce administrative costs, and make explicit that beneficiaries of Federal death or disability benefits must offset one award with another. The legislation as crafted and considered by the Judiciary Committees in both chambers is widely supported in the law enforcement and public safety community.

It was distressing in the extreme to learn that further action on the legislation is being deliberately blocked by Senator Thomas A. Coburn, MD (R-OK), who has taken his anti-public safety agenda to new lows by calling for the repeal of the PSOB program or to at least restrict it to Federal officers. The FOP views this not as a politician embracing the principle of federalism, but as a transparently cynical and cowardly ploy to place even greater strain between law enforcement and other public safety officers that serve on the local and State level and their colleagues employed by the Federal government. When a police officer puts himself in harm's way, he does not stop to think about jurisdiction. He does not ask the offender if he is committing a local, State or Federal crime. He acts in the best interest of the safety of those he has sworn to protect. A family that loses a loved one in the line of duty should not just be left adrift, their sacrifice ignored because their loved one was a local firefighter or State Trooper and not a Federal agent.

Since Senator Coburn was sworn in as a U.S. Senator, seventeen police officers have been killed in the line of duty in Oklahoma. Seventeen families lost a son, father or brother, and I am sure some or all of these families relied on the PSOB program to help them through the financial hardships they faced after the loss of their loved one. Senator Coburn would punish the families of the fallen—the heroes who put their life on the line and paid the ultimate price.

I know both of you reject Senator Coburn's call for the repeal of the PSOB program, and I commend you both of your constant support of the program and of the rank-and-file officers that protect our homes and neighborhoods. The legislation will improve the ability of the PSOB Office to process death and disability claims more swiftly and efficiently, providing the families of our fallen with the help they need. On behalf of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I thank you both for your dedication and outstanding leadership on this issue. If I can be of any further assistance on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

HONORING THE BICENTENNIAL OF FORT ROSS

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the bicentennial of the establishment of the Russian colony at Fort Ross. Founded in September 1812 by Russian explorers, Fort Ross was the southernmost Russian settlement in North America and the first European settlement in Sonoma County. After the fort's assets were sold to John Sutter in 1841, Fort Ross became a shipping hub and tourist destination and in 1909 it was established as one of California's first State Historic Parks.

This year we commemorate the natural, cultural, and human history of Fort Ross, which has been influenced by diverse groups of people, including Russians, Kashaya, Pomo, and Miwok Natives, Spaniards, Mexicans, and Americans. These diverse groups, who settled at Fort Ross or lived in the surrounding area, made important contributions to early California history: they built California's first ships and windmills, introduced glass-paneled windows, created the first brickyard, and catalogued the local plant and animal life. At Fort Ross, Native people of various tribes lived, hunted, and labored alongside the Russian colonists; many learned Russian and intermarried with both Russians and Natives of other tribes. The story of the people of Fort Ross is unique, and it serves as an excellent example of the best that California and Sonoma County have to offer the world: a rich history, diverse cultural legacy, beautiful nature, and dedicated people.

Today, Fort Ross is a National Historic Landmark visited by 150,000 people each year. It also still serves as an important connection between Sonoma County and Russia. In 2010, California State Parks signed an agreement with Russia's Renova Group, creating a public-private partnership to provide financial support for Fort Ross. The Fort Ross Renova Foundation continues to provide support for maintenance, educational programs, cultural events, and other initiatives for the enhancement of Fort Ross.

Mr. Speaker, Fort Ross is an important cultural and historical landmark celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of its founding. Please join me in honoring the bicentennial of the establishment of Fort Ross.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GARY C. SAIN

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute today to a good friend and national leader for tourism, Mr. Gary C. Sain. Gary passed away unexpectedly on Friday, May 4th after addressing a dinner event in support of the Central Florida Boys and Girls Club, which was one of his community efforts, where he provided vital leadership in support of our youth. I was at that event and spoke to Gary as he shared his excitement about Central Florida

being the leading national tourist destination. Everyone in our region will testify that we have never had a better champion for tourism in Central Florida.

Gary began his career in the hotel industry and held positions at several of the hotel industry's top brands for more than 40 years. He diversified his career to the cruise industry, serving as marketing director for one of the industry's top brands. As a well-respected marketing expert, Gary then went to work for a top international hospitality marketing agency. In February 2007 Gary was selected to chief executive of Visit Orlando.

As the leader of the organization that markets and sells the Orlando area as the number one family leisure destination in the world, and one of the top meetings and convention destinations in America, Gary is credited with Orlando reaching a record 51.5 million visitors in 2010, the first U.S. destination to surpass the 50 million visitor milestone. In 2011 Orlando set another record with more than 55 million visitors.

Gary sat on national and international boards of directors including the U.S. Travel Association, Visit Florida, Destination Marketing Association International and Meeting Planners International. He was a resource for members of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate, providing information on travel issues affecting America domestically and internationally. Gary was a great husband to Pam and the proud father to two lovely daughters, Olivia and Vanessa. He remains with us in sprit, fond memory and appreciation for sharing his friendship.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life and memory of Gary C. Sain.

CHAMPIONSHIP EXEMPTION PROTECTION ACT

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support Chairman Tim WALBERG as an original co-sponsor of H.R. 5969 and H.R. 5970. These two pieces of legislation reaffirm the importance of maintaining access to quality, affordable, in-home companionship care.

Last year when the Department of Labor first proposed a rule to change the in home companionship care exemption under the Fair Labor Standards Act, I introduced a preemptive piece of legislation, H.R. 3066, that sought to clarify some issues the Secretary of Labor is seeking to change through regulation.

The Secretary, not surprisingly, did not listen. Her department continues to run roughshod over the will of Members of Congress and what is best for patients that rely on this important service.

When testifying before a Senate panel earlier this Congress, the Secretary admitted that her agency had not consulted with State Medicaid officials on how the proposed regulation would impact them. Independent economic analysis has proven that this regulation will end up driving more people into having to use Medicaid to utilize nursing home care and further exacerbate that budgetary crisis many states are in.

H.R. 5969 preserves the companionship services exemption by clarifying what these services entail and who specifically the third party employers in this space are. H.R. 5970 reaffirms that the Secretary of Labor shall not finalize her proposed rule, titled ''Application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to Domestic Service.'' I hope she chooses to listen and re-evaluate.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker on Tuesday June 26, 2012, I was away from Washington. If I were here, the following is how I would have voted on the votes listed below.

Rollcall 412 (PQ on H.R. 5972 and H.R 5973)—I would have voted ''no.''

Rollcall 413 (H. Res. 697—Rule for H.R. 5972 and H.R. 5973)—I would have voted ''no.''

Rollcall 414 (Democratic Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4348—Mr. HOYER)—I would have voted ''yes.''

Rollcall 415 (Republican Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4348—Ms. BLACK)—I would have voted ''no.''

H.R. 5972—Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2013:

Rollcall 416 (Connolly Amendment)—I would have voted ''yes.''

Rollcall 417 (McClintock Amendment)—I would have voted ''no.''

Rollcall 418 (Garrett Amendment)—I would have voted ''no.''

Rollcall 419 (Capps Amendment)—I would have voted ''yes.''

Rollcall 420 (Gosar Amendment)—I would have voted ''no.''

Rollcall 421 (Broun Amendment #1)—I would have voted ''no.''

Rollcall 422 (Broun Amendment #2)—I would have voted ''no.''

Rollcall 423 (Broun Amendment #3)—I would have voted ''no.''

HONORING COLONEL DENNIS L. BEATTY

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the achievement and career of Colonel Dennis L. Beatty. Beatty is the current Deputy Command Surgeon, Headquarters Air Mobility Command, Scott Air Force Base, Ill. In this capacity he serves as AMC Command Surgeon in the Surgeon's absence to advise and represent the AMC commander on all aspects of the command's medical service mission. This includes supervising and monitoring the peacetime healthcare at AMC's 12 community-based medical treatment facilities comprised of approximately 6,600 medical personnel who provide health care for more than 429,000 beneficiaries using an operating budget of $672 million and assets exceeding $1.3 billion. He also serves as 18th Air Force (AFTRANS) Surgeon.

After serving assignments in Texas, Colonel Beatty was competitively selected for an Air Force Institute of Technology scholarship in 1992 and was admitted to the Washington University Health Administration Program in 1993. In 1994, he was accepted into the Washington University School of Engineering under a dual degree program in Information Management. He successfully completed masters' degrees in Health Administration and Information Management in June 1995, both with honors.

Upon graduation, Colonel Beatty was selected for assignment to the 375th Medical Group at Scott AFB, Ill., as the Resource Management Flight Commander. He was assigned to the Medical Manpower Division, Directorate of Programs and Resources, Office of the Surgeon General, Bolling AFB, D.C. from June 1997 to July 2001. Colonel Beatty served as commander of the 45th Medical Support Squadron from July 2001 to July 2003. In July 2003, he assumed command of the 42nd Medical Support Squadron at Maxwell AFB, Ala. In July 2005, Colonel Beatty became Chief of the Medical Programming Division, Directorate of Plans and Programs, Office of the Air Force Surgeon General. Colonel Beatty became the commander of the 6th Medical Group on 3 July 2008. From Dec. 2009 to June 2010 he was deployed as the Deputy Group Commander of the 332nd Expeditionary Medical Group at Joint Base Balad, Iraq.

Colonel Beatty was the previous commander (CEO) of the new clinic at MacDill Air Force Base (6th Medical Group) from 2008–2011. In his current position at Air Mobility Command headquarters in Tampa, FL, he continues to oversee medical operations at MacDill as well as all other Air Mobility Command hospitals and clinics at Travis AFB, CA; Scott AFB, IL; McGuire AFB, NJ as well as others.

The Tampa community and MacDill Air Force Base are proud to recognize Colonel Beatty for his outstanding career and his many significant contributions to the Air Force and our country. His determination and hard work have made him an inspirational leader within our nation's Armed Services. I ask that you and all Americans recognize such a remarkable patriot for his service to his country.

RECOGNIZING THE MONTFORD POINT MARINES

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplishments and valor of the Montford Point Marines as they are awarded the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest civilian honor bestowed by the United States Congress. During an era when African-American men faced racism and Jim Crow segregation, these Marines left home to defend the United States during World War II.

In 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued an executive order barring government agencies from denying employment in defense efforts based on race, creed, color or national origin. The military was required to recruit and enlist African-Americans and a year later, recruitment began for African-American Marines who would train at Montford Point.

Thousands of African-American men enlisted, despite widespread segregation and discrimination both in and outside of the military. From 1942 until 1949, approximately 20,000 African-American men enlisted in the Marine Corps and trained at a segregated facility, Camp Montford Point, near Jacksonville, North Carolina.

Successfully completing training was a substantial feat for these Marines. While their white counterparts may have been required to run ten miles, Montford Point recruits often had to run twenty. These challenges gave them the endurance, both physical and emotional, to serve. As Marines, they bravely fought in theatres from the Pacific to Europe.

In 1948, President Harry S. Truman ordered the desegregation of the United States Armed Forces. In 1949, recruit training at Montford Point was discontinued as all recruits, regardless of race, were sent to other integrated training facilities.

Many Montford Point Marines continued their service as Marines after the conclusion of World War II, including in both the Korean and Vietnam Wars.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I honor the Montford Point Marines. Their legacy has paved the way for African-Americans to serve proudly in all branches of the United States Armed Services.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the Legislative Day of June 26, 2012, upon request of a leave of absence, I missed a series of votes. Had I been present for these rollcall votes, I would have voted ''No'' on rollcall 412—the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H. R. 5972 and H. R 5973; ''No'' on rollcall 413—H. Res. 697—Rule providing for consideration of both H. R. 5972—Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2013 and H. R. 5973—Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration Appropriations Act, 2013; ''Yes'' on rollcall 414—Hoyer Motion to Instruct Conferees on H. R. 4348; ''No'' on rollcall 415—Black Motion to Instruct Conferees on H. R. 4348; ''Yes'' on rollcall 416—the Connolly Amendment; ''No'' on rollcall 417—the McClintock Amendment; ''No'' on rollcall 418—the Garrett Amendment; ''Yes'' on rollcall 419—the Capps Amendment; ''No'' on rollcall 420—the Gosar Amendment; ''No'' on rollcall 421—the Broun Amendment #1; ''No'' on rollcall 422—the Broun Amendment #2; and ''No'' on rollcall 423—the Broun Amendment #4.

HONORING MARION MEREDITH BEAL FOR HIS SERVICE TO THIS NATION

HON. KAREN BASS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I honor an extraordinary individual from my home district—Marion Meredith Beal for his receipt of the Congressional Gold Medal for his dedication and contribution to the United States Marine Corps. A seasoned leader in his community, he serves as an outstanding example to the Los Angeles area and the nation, demonstrating profound service and devotion to the betterment of his family, his community members, and his country.

Mr. Beal was born in East Texas, moved to Los Angeles in the early 1950's, and acquired his bachelor's degree at Bishop College and Master's at Pepperdine University. He served his country honorably in the U.S. Marine Corps from 1943 to 1945 being named ''Honor Man'' of his platoon, as he served as an original Montford Point Marine during World War II. He later established himself as Chief Clerk at the Montford Point Marine Corps headquarters serving as the only African American on his staff. Among many other notable achievements, he was also the first enlisted African American to perform duty in the U.S. Marine Corps headquarters in Washington D.C. Mr. Beal helped set the foundation for integration into the U.S.M.C. during a very crucial time for the U.S. Military.

After his service, Mr. Beal continued to demonstrate commitment to his community and country through his work with the Veteran's Administration Hospital in West Los Angeles, and his time with the Los Angeles Unified School District as Assistant Supervisor of Student Body Finance, among other positions. He also helped found the 78th Street Block Club, and the Cub Scout and Boy Scout troops in his neighborhood. Mr. Beal is devoutly dedicated to the Greater New Light Baptist Church and is passionately devoted to his family. He is a very powerful and influential role model with over 50 years of active involvement in his community and he continues to be a positive example with a caring and genuine character that has dedicated himself to the well-being and improvement of Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to have such an inspirational community leader like Marion Meredith Beal as a part of California's 33rd Congressional District and I congratulate him on the receipt of this award.

H.R. 2578—CONSERVATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH ACT

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2578. This bill threatens the environmental integrity of millions of acres of federal lands, including the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park in Minnesota. These lands are among our state's greatest treasures and must be protected and maintained for future generations. This misguided legislation is a politically-motivated assault on the environment, not a national security imperative as my Republican colleagues claim.

Instead of protecting our border and our environment, this bill, and especially the Title XIV National Security and Federal Lands Protection Act in it, causes irreparable harm to our most cherished places. It exempts the Department of Homeland Security's Customs and Border Protection, CBP, from federal environmental regulations while performing border-security operations. It blocks the Department of Interior, DOI, and Department of Agriculture, USDA, from enforcing over 30 environmental protection laws that protect our fish and wildlife, national parks, forests, and other historic places. In addition, this legislation would give CBP the authority to construct offices, roads, fences and other infrastructure within 100 miles of the U.S. border with Canada and Mexico—an area that includes at least 54 National Park System properties, 228 national wildlife refuges and 122 wilderness preserves. It undermines these essential protections based on the false premise that it is somehow impossible to secure our national borders while also protecting our national heritage.

According to Homeland Security Secretary Napolitano, this legislation is ''unnecessary'' and ''bad policy.'' On July 8, 2011, the US Customs and Border Patrol, CBP, testified before Congress that, ''CBP enjoys a close working relationship with the Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture that allows us to fulfill our border enforcement responsibilities while respecting and enhancing the environment.'' Importantly, the Border Patrol made clear in its testimony that, ''Border Patrol agents have the authority at any time to conduct motorized off-road pursuit in the event of exigency/emergency involving human life, health, safety of persons within the area, or posing a threat to national security.'' It is clear that the federal agencies that would receive this unfettered authority don't want it, don't need it, and shouldn't have it.

In my state of Minnesota, the National Park Service; U.S. Forest Service; and the Red Lake, Grand Portage and Boise Forte Tribal Governments work cooperatively and openly with Homeland Security to minimize border issues. The National Park Service at Voyageurs National Park and Grand Portage National Monument already enjoy a good relationship with the local Border Patrol and work with them on a range of issues in a cooperative fashion. However, if Border Patrol is exempt from following existing protections, resources will be lost and tourism important to the local economy will decline.

Title XIV would also affect the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, a world-renowned area within the Superior National Forest. This legislation would allow the Border Patrol to erect roads and bridges in a sacred place where people from around the world come to enjoy Minnesota's Greats Outdoors.

We must also recognize the many tribal nations on lands near Minnesota's Canadian border, including the Grand Portage Band of Chippewa, Red Lake Band of Chippewa, Boise Forte Band of Chippewa. This bill unacceptably threatens existing treaties and tribal sovereignty.

This is an unnecessary and bad bill. I oppose H.R. 2578 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes:

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise to urge my colleagues to work together to pass a comprehensive transportation bill before current law expires at the end of this week. The First District of Oregon is home to some of the country's most innovative thinkers, many of whom work at the technology giant Intel. Unfortunately, one of the biggest challenges of their workday often comes before it even starts, and continues after it ends: it is their commute. The roads leading to the ''Silicon Forest,'' as the technology cluster in Oregon is known, can back up for miles—a good sign for the economy, but bad for our transportation infrastructure.

The City of Hillsboro is home to many innovative tech companies. When the City applied for a TIGER grant to improve mobility and reduce congestion in the Silicon Forest, I supported their application. Infrastructure investments like this make it easier for people to get to work and they facilitate efficient transport of goods to market. This project wasn't selected by the Department of Transportation, but the application highlighted an important point. Investing in our transportation infrastructure is an economic multiplier. Not only do we employ hard-working Americans by building and maintaining infrastructure, we also improve the productivity and vibrancy of the workers who rely on the infrastructure to get to their workplace every morning.

Infrastructure improvements are important for safety as well. The Portland metro area is nationally renowned as a bike-friendly community, and our companies attract highly qualified employees in part because of the safe, multimodal transportation network in our region. Maintaining this infrastructure is critical to continuing to bring new businesses into our communities; investment in infrastructure will help to keep our roads and transportation routes safe.

So now, even though virtually every elected official talks about jobs as a first priority, somehow this transportation bill is stalling. We all agree that passing a surface transportation bill will create jobs. Let's do what is best for our constituents and pass a bill that keeps our construction workers on the job, reduces congestion for our commuters, and supports our struggling economy.

CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL ACTIVE AND RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES DULLES CHAPTER 1241 ON ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Dulles Chapter 1241 on the occasion of its 40th anniversary. The Northern Virginia region is home to more than 160,000 federal employees and a large number of retirees who have chosen to stay in the region. Throughout their careers, these dedicated civil servants give their time and effort to serving their fellow Americans, and NARFE consistently has provided them with coordinated support.

NARFE is increasingly important in these challenging budgetary times when many proposals would seek to single out federal workers and retirees and make draconian cuts to federal retirements and health care. The federal government, regardless of the size one feels is appropriate, cannot function efficiently or effectively without the hard work and expertise of dedicated employees. Federal workers devote years of their lives in service to the nation; the government could not function without their expertise, and it is imperative that they are treated fairly. For the past 40 years, NARFE Chapter 1241 has ably advocated on behalf of the dedicated civil servants in the Northern Virginia region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating NARFE Chapter 1241 for 40 years of service to our federal workers and to wish them continued success protecting the rights of current and future federal workers and retirees.

IN SUPPORT OF RESTORING FUNDING FOR NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING PROGRAMS FISCAL YEAR 2013 TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of restoring funding for Native Hawaiian housing programs.

The bill before us zeroes out funding for Native Hawaiian housing programs.

This is disappointing for the Native Hawaiian community and the families that need assistance from these programs.

It is also disappointing because Congress has a long history of bipartisan support for Native Hawaiian housing—and a responsibility to continue this legacy.

It has been nearly a century since the passage of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. Congress passed this Act in 1921 at the urging of Hawaii's Delegate to Congress, Prince Jonah Kūhiō Kalaniana'ole. That legislation set aside some 200,000 acres of land to provide homesteads specifically for Native Hawaiians.

With the enactment of the Statehood Act of 1959, the control and administration of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act was transferred from the federal government to the new State of Hawaii. A year later in 1960, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, DHHL, was created to administer the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

Then in 2000, Congress passed the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act.

This legislation established two programs to help provide housing to Native Hawaiians: The Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant, NHHBG, Program and the Section 184A loan guarantee program.

Hawaii has some of the most expensive real estate prices in the country. At the same time, more than 33,200 Native Hawaiian households are considered low-income. So without support from the NHHBG and 184A programs, many Native Hawaiians would not have access to quality, affordable housing. The grant funds are used primarily to develop infrastructure on Hawaiian Home Lands, which tend to be in the most isolated parts of our islands, typically in rural areas, and some with terrain that is difficult and costly to develop.

Not only are these programs necessary but they are effective.

For example, in FY2011 Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant funds were used to build 55 new homes, acquire 12 homes, and rehabilitate 12 homes. In addition, the Section 184A program has supported 255 home loans totaling $64.4 million. This program also has a strong track record, with a foreclosure rate elow 1 percent.

That's 79 new units of housing and 255 opportunities for Native Hawaiians to access financing for their own homes that would not have existed absent the NHHBG and 184A programs. These are real people in real homes—They are not statistics.

The bottom line is that these programs don't just provide housing—they expand opportunities for homeownership.

Owning a home has long been a pillar of the American dream. This is a dream that people do not forget, and do not give up on.

In fact, over 26,000 eligible families are currently on waiting lists for an opportunity to live on their home lands.

There are many stories of Native Hawaiians who have been on waiting lists for decades. In fact, some have died waiting to see this dream fulfilled.

Eliminating these funds—Which total $14 million for the two programs—won't solve our budget woes. All it will accomplish is closing off opportunities for a community that utilizes federal funds effectively.

This is the type of program that makes a difference in the lives of people by supporting strong communities and expanding opportunity.

There is a continued need for Native Hawaiian housing programs and I urge my colleagues to carry on Congress's bipartisan support for making the American dream of homeownership possible.

I hope that this matter will be resolved as the House and Senate negotiate a final Transportation-HUD Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2013.

Mahalo nui loa (thank you very much).

HONORING NELSON BENTON

HON. JOHN F. TIERNEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Nelson Benton, who will soon retire after 40 years of service at The Salem News in Salem, Massachusetts.

Since he was hired in 1972, Nelson has worked as a reporter, city editor, managing editor, and editorial page editor. Nelson's weekly political column, which has been a fixture in the paper for more than 25 years, is widely read and discussed throughout the region. Nelson was recognized by the New England Society of Newspaper Editors in 2008, when they awarded him the prestigious Yankee Quill award. He was also inducted into the New England Press Association Hall of Fame in 2009.

For four decades, Nelson has covered issues impacting our community, from the Blizzard of '78 to issues of education and transportation to the careers of Mayors, State Lawmakers, and Members of Congress. Nelson has been quick to adapt his content to new technologies and formats. Even in his upcoming retirement, I am confident that Nelson will be blogging and tweeting with the best of them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Nelson Benton, a seasoned journalist, on his retirement. I wish Nelson and his wife Laurie, who has served as a longtime public school teacher in our community, the best of luck as they move west to Arizona.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 2012, I was detained and missed votes. In my 26 years in Congress, I have taken pride in having missed very few votes. Had I been here, I would have cast the following votes:

On rollcall 412, on ordering the Previous Question for consideration of the FY13 Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 413, on H. Res. 69, the rule for consideration of the FY13 Agriculture and Transportation Appropriations bills, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 414, the Hoyer Motion to Instruct Conferees on the surface transportation reauthorization bill, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 415, the Black Motion to Instruct Conferees on the surface transportation reauthorization bill, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 416, an amendment offered by Mr. Connolly of Virginia to H.R. 5972, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 417, an amendment offered by Mr. McClintock of California to H.R. 5972, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 418, an amendment offered by Mr. Garrett of New Jersey to H.R. 5972, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 419, an amendment offered by Ms. Capps of California to H.R. 5972, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 420, an amendment offered by Mr. Gosar of Arizona to H.R. 5972, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 421, the first amendment offered by Mr. Broun of Georgia to H.R. 5972, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 422, the second amendment offered by Mr. Broun of Georgia to H.R. 5972, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 423, the fourth amendment offered by Mr. Broun of Georgia to H.R. 5972, I would have voted "no."

JUDGEMENT DAY FOR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department, with the aid of the ATF, facilitated the smuggling of over 2,000 weapons to the drug cartels south of the border—the national enemy in Mexico.

Hundreds of Mexican nationals died as a result of this operation.

Mexican Attorney General Morales says she was left in the dark about Operation Fast and Furious.

And she wants those officials who were involved to be extradited and sent to the U.S. for prosecution.

She is more interested in Fast and Furious than our own Attorney General.

Our own Attorney General says he still doesn't know who authorized this reckless and deadly operation and doesn't want any help from Congress to find the answers.

Tomorrow is the day of reckoning for AG as he still refuses to turn over the evidence.

What is he hiding? And why is he hiding it.

The time of hiding is over. It's time for Congress to hold someone accountable. We call it contempt.

Tomorrow is Judgment day for the Attorney General.

And that's just the way it is.

OUR UNCONSCIONSABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $15,782,570,144,097.96. We've added $5,155,693,095,184.88 to our debt in just over 3 years. This is debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

On this day in 1950, President Harry Truman ordered air force and naval forces into the Korean War. A robust economy supported our powerful military. We must balance the budget in order to support our troops more fully.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in my family, I missed the following Rollcall Votes: No. 379 through No. 411 during the week of June 18–June 21, 2012.

If present, I would have voted:

Rollcall Vote No. 379—S. 684, To provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of land to the town of Alta, Utah, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 380—S. 404, To modify a land grant patent issued by the Secretary of the Interior, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 381—On Ordering the Previous Question, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 382—On Agreeing to the Resolution, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 383—DeFazio (OR) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 384—Markey (MA) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 385—Grijalva (AZ) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 386—H.R. 2578, On Motion to Recommit with Instructions, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 387—H.R. 2578, To amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act related to a segment of the Lower Merced River in California, and for other purposes, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 388—H.R. 2938, Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Clarification Act, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 389—H. Res. 691, On Ordering the Previous Question, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 390—H. Res. 691, On Agreeing to the Resolution, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 391—On Walz of Minnesota Motion to Instruct Conferees, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 392—Hastings (WA) Amendment, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 393—Waxman (CA) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 394—Connolly (VA) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 395—Green (TX) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 396—Rush (IL) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 397—Holt (NJ) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 398—Connolly (VA) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 399—Amodei (NV) Amendment, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 400—Markey (MA) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 401—Landry (LA) Amendment, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 402—Rigell (VA) Amendment, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 403—Holt (NJ) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 404—Wittman (VA) Amendment, "aye."

Rollcall Vote No. 405—Bass (CA) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 406—Capps (CA) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 407—Speier (CA) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 408—DeLauro (CT) Amendment, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 409—On Motion to Recommit with Instructions of H.R. 4480, "nay."

Rollcall Vote No. 410—H.R. 4480, Strategic Energy Production Act of 2012, ''aye.''

Rollcall Vote No. 411—On McKinley of WV Motion to Instruct Conferees, ''aye.''

IN HONOR OF THE MONTFORD POINT MARINES

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the Montford Point Marines and the sacrifices they made in service to our Nation.

The Montford Point Marines were the first African-Americans to serve in the United States Marine Corps. The United States of America owes these heroes a debt of honor that can never be repaid.

In June of 1941, President Franklin Roosevelt issued an Executive Order that opened the doors for African-Americans to enlist in the United States Marine Corps. Between 1942 and 1949, approximately 20,000 African Americans earned the right to call themselves Marines at Camp Montford Point in Jacksonville, North Carolina. Today, we honor them.

I would especially like to recognize a few of the surviving members of the Florida Chapter of the Montford Point Marines. I would like to commend Marines Wilfred Carr of Palm Coast; Eli Graham, Jr. of Daytona Beach; James Huger of Daytona Beach; James Sharpe of Palm Coast; Robert Blanks of Orange City; and John Steele of Daytona Beach who have all helped keep the memory and service of the Montford Point Marine's alive in the State of Florida.

The Congressional Gold Medal is a fitting tribute to the Montford Point Marines. It not only serves as an appropriate tribute to these trailblazing heroes, but also marks our Nation's endeavor toward a more perfect union, and I am pleased to offer my support.

A TRIBUTE TO MS. SUZANNE GOSS OF JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA—PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CLEAN WATER AGENCIES

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Ms. Suzanne Goss, Government Relations Specialist for JEA (Jacksonville Electric, Water & Sewer) on her election as the new President of the National Association of Clean Water Agencies, NACWA.

Ms. Goss is an accomplished leader and committed environmental steward who played a prominent role in seeking a sound direction for the implementation of the Clean Water Act. Throughout her career in the water industry, Ms. Goss has exemplified what it means to be a public servant. She is ideally suited to serve as President of one of the nation's leading associations responsible for environmental policies that advance clean water. Ms. Goss will continue to ensure that Florida's, and the nation's, clean water agencies are sustainable, that the environment continues to improve, and that public health is protected.

At JEA, Ms. Goss works for an advanced publicly owned water, electric, and sewer utility, providing invaluable services to approximately 420,000 people in Northeast Florida. Ms. Goss effectively engages in complex state and federal legislative and regulatory issues involving wastewater and drinking water with an in-depth knowledge of the affordability concerns of her community and the need for a partnership between all levels of government. She also manages JEA's Grant Program.

A member of NACWA's Board of Directors since 2007, Ms. Goss has served as the organization's Secretary, Treasurer, and Vice President, and has been a member of many NACWA committees and workgroups. She has played a leading role in NACWA's pretreatment program and is also one of the drivers behind the organization's funding efforts. In 2005 she received the President's Award for her work as Vice Chair of the Clean Water Funding Task Force.

Ms. Goss has experience in both the energy and water fields, as JEA provides both services to its customers. As the clean water industry and NACWA increasingly define the ''Water Quality Utility of the Future,'' JEA and public servants like Ms. Goss exemplify the need to break down traditional silos and move toward a watershed approach, as well as a focus on the energy-water nexus. JEA stands as a model for other utilities seeking to adopt these ideas.

In addition to her work with NACWA, Ms. Goss is an active member of local, regional, state and national professional organizations. These include the American Water Works Association, the New Water Supply Coalition, the Florida Municipal Energy Association, the Florida Water Environment Association, the Florida Energy Coordinating Group, the Pinellas County Sewer System and the Advisory Council on Environmental Policy and Technology Sustainable Infrastructure.

Ms. Goss has selflessly shared her time, passion, energy and ideas to carry out the objectives of the Clean Water Act.

It is my sincere pleasure to congratulate Suzanne Goss on becoming President of NACWA, and I am certain her actions will ensure continued water quality progress for the Jacksonville area, the state of Florida and the nation.

THE RETIREMENT OF SPIROS DROGGITIS

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Spiros Droggitis, a Bethesda, Maryland resident who retired from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission on December 31, 2011 after 35 years of service in the Federal Government, including three years working in the U.S. Senate. During his three decades with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Mr. Droggitis provided support, advice, scheduling and planning for a variety of programs and two NRC Commissioners.

Since July 2007, Mr. Droggitis served as associate director for Federal and External Affairs in the Office of Congressional Affairs at NRC. In that position, he was the primary point of contact for communications and outreach with other Federal agencies and external organizations, including public interest groups, non-governmental organizations, and the nuclear industry.

During his distinguished career at the agency, he served in several senior positions and received numerous performance awards and accolades for his contributions. Among his many accomplishments, he was recognized in 1988 for his participation in the agency's 10-year effort to consolidate NRC offices scattered across the Washington metropolitan area to a single location in Rockville, Maryland. More recently, he was a member of the Headquarters Fukushima Support Team that assisted in communicating information about the nuclear accident in Japan following the March 11, 2011 9.0-magnitude earthquake and subsequent tsunami.

After graduating in 1974 from Bowdoin College in Brunswick, Maine, Mr. Droggitis began his career as an assistant press liaison for the U.S. Senate under the Sergeant-at-Arms and also worked as a researcher in the office of Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine. He later joined Senator Muskie's staff full time as a personal assistant during the 1976 reelection campaign, doing advance work for campaign events, traveling with the Senator, and interacting with the media and the public. Following the election, he became an assistant to the Senator and was given a special assignment analyzing data on a state-wide energy questionnaire. He also developed a method of providing more timely responses to constituent mail that was approved and instituted by his supervisor.

Mr. Droggitis joined the NRC in 1979 as a congressional liaison officer in the Office of Congressional Affairs. He then served as a special assistant to Commissioner James K. Asselstine from 1982 until 1987. At the end of Commissioner Asselstine's term in 1987, Mr. Droggitis went to work in the State, Local and Indian Tribe Programs in the Office of Governmental and Public Affairs, where he served as a senior intergovernmental programs analyst responsible for developing and maintaining relationships with state, local and tribal governments. Mr. Droggitis was selected as special assistant to Commissioner Jeffrey S. Merrifield in September 2002 and became his executive assistant in October 2004.

Throughout his career, Mr. Droggitis has demonstrated a dedication to the NRC's organizational values of integrity, service, openness, commitment, cooperation, excellence and respect. He and his wife, Ottilie, plan to return to his native state of Maine to spend time with friends and family. I offer both of them my best wishes and thank Mr. Droggitis for his service to our nation.

AMERICA'S SHAMEFUL HUMAN RIGHTS RECORD

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I submit a timely op-ed from Former President Jimmy Carter on the ramifications of drone strikes on America's human rights record.

[From the New York Times, June 24, 2012]

A CRUEL AND UNUSUAL RECORD

(By Jimmy Carter)

ATLANTA.—The United States is abandoning its role as the global champion of human rights.

Revelations that top officials are targeting people to be assassinated abroad, including American citizens, are only the most recent, disturbing proof of how far our nation's violation of human rights has extended. This development began after the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, and has been sanctioned and escalated by bipartisan executive and legislative actions, without dissent from the general public. As a result, our country can no longer speak with moral authority on these critical issues.

While the country has made mistakes in the past, the widespread abuse of human rights over the last decade has been a dramatic change from the past. With leadership from the United States, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted in 1948 as ''the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.'' This was a bold and clear commitment that power would no longer serve as a cover to oppress or injure people, and it established equal rights of all people to life, liberty, security of person, equal protection of the law and freedom from torture, arbitrary detention or forced exile. The declaration has been invoked by human rights activists and the international community to replace most of the world's dictatorships with democracies and to promote the rule of law in domestic and global affairs. It is disturbing that, instead of strengthening these principles, our government's counterterrorism policies are now clearly violating at least 10 of the declaration's 30 articles, including the prohibition against ''cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.''

Recent legislation has made legal the president's right to detain a person indefinitely on suspicion of affiliation with terrorist organizations or ''associated forces,'' a broad, vague power that can be abused without meaningful oversight from the courts or Congress (the law is currently being blocked by a federal judge). This law violates the right to freedom of expression and to be presumed innocent until proved guilty, two other rights enshrined in the declaration.

In addition to American citizens' being targeted for assassination or indefinite detention, recent laws have canceled the restraints in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to allow unprecedented violations of our rights to privacy through warrantless wiretapping and government mining of our electronic communications. Popular state laws permit detaining individuals because of their appearance, where they worship or with whom they associate.

Despite an arbitrary rule that any man killed by drones is declared an enemy terrorist, the death of nearby innocent women and children is accepted as inevitable. After more than 30 airstrikes on civilian homes this year in Afghanistan, President Hamid Karzai has demanded that such attacks end, but the practice continues in areas of Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen that are not in any war zone. We don't know how many hundreds of innocent civilians have been killed in these attacks, each one approved by the highest authorities in Washington. This would have been unthinkable in previous times.

These policies clearly affect American foreign policy. Top intelligence and military officials, as well as rights defenders in targeted areas, affirm that the great escalation in drone attacks has turned aggrieved families toward terrorist organizations, aroused civilian populations against us and permitted repressive governments to cite such actions to justify their own despotic behavior.

Meanwhile, the detention facility at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, now houses 169 prisoners. About half have been cleared for release, yet have little prospect of ever obtaining their freedom. American authorities have revealed that, in order to obtain confessions, some of the few being tried (only in military courts) have been tortured by waterboarding more than 100 times or intimidated with semiautomatic weapons, power drills or threats to sexually assault their mothers. Astoundingly, these facts cannot be used as a defense by the accused, because the government claims they occurred under the cover of ''national security.'' Most of the other prisoners have no prospect of ever being charged or tried either.

At a time when popular revolutions are sweeping the globe, the United States should be strengthening, not weakening, basic rules of law and principles of justice enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But instead of making the world safer, America's violation of international human rights abets our enemies and alienates our friends.

As concerned citizens, we must persuade Washington to reverse course and regain moral leadership according to international human rights norms that we had officially adopted as our own and cherished throughout the years.

Jimmy Carter, the 39th president, is the founder of the Carter Center and the recipient of the 2002 Nobel Peace Prize.

HONORING MCKENZIE JOANN POLLOCK

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a phenomenal young woman, Ms. McKenzie JoAnn Pollock, daughter of Philip and Cheryl Pollock. Throughout her time in high school, McKenzie has been extremely devoted to both her academics and extracurricular activities.

McKenzie's motivation to excel prompted her to do anything she could to ensure that she would be successful academically. In accordance with this, she took Advanced Placement classes throughout high school and she maintained all "A's" throughout her high school career. As a result of McKenzie's work ethic, she was rewarded numerous scholarships to college. She received the Lucky Day Citizenship Scholarship and the Choral Service Award from the University of Southern Mississippi, as well as the Best Buy Scholarship Award, the Mississippi Eminent Scholars Grant, and the Mississippi Tuition Assistance Grant.

Not only has McKenzie excelled academically, but she has also been heavily involved in numerous extra-curricular activities. She served as the Warren Central Hall of Fame Club President, Student Government Senior Class Secretary; was a member of the Mock Trial Attorney and Witness team, Mu Alpha Theta Society, Varsity Choir, the Band, Drama Club, School Musical, National Honors Society, Youth Advisory Council, and she worked with the Children of the American Revolution and Fundraising for the Children's Miracle Network. She also works for the U.S. Army Engineering Research and Development Center as a Civil Engineering Technician.

McKenzie has competed in several competitions in addition to her other responsibilities. She was the Poetry Out Loud School winner in 2009, and she has received the Gold Medal at the Mississippi Music Teachers' Association Evaluations (MMTA) and Federated Music Clubs of America for her singing. In 2011, McKenzie was crowned Miss Vicksburg's Outstanding Teen, and she went on to finish in the top ten in the Miss Mississippi's Outstanding Teen Scholarship Pageant.

Per her interest in the performing arts McKenzie is an active theatre participant. She has performed in many productions at the Vicksburg Theatre Guild and the Westside Theatre Foundation. McKenzie strongly believes that the performing arts should be an integral part of a child's education, and she enjoys every opportunity that allows her to introduce children to the arts. During summer of 2011, she was an assistant instructor in the Southern Cultural Center's Spectrum summer arts camp, which allows children the opportunity to explore the arts.

To culminate her high school career, McKenzie is honored to be named Valedictorian of the Warren Central High School's senior class of 2012. In the fall, McKenzie plans to attend the University of Southern Mississippi, where she will major in Music-Vocal Performance with a minor in dance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in honoring the Valedictorian of Warren Central High School's senior class of 2012, Ms. McKenzie Joann Pollock an outstanding young woman.

IN HONOR OF THE 10 YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF PLANTATION HOME

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor David Stein on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of his interior design business, Plantation Home. Located in downtown Lakewood, Plantation Home offers a unique selection of home furnishings, gifts and accessories. At a time when scores of companies have closed their doors due to turbulent economic upheaval, Plantation Home has weathered those hardships and continues to be one of Lakewood's most successful and community driven companies.

Mr. Stein has graciously committed himself to the betterment of the Lakewood community in which he has lived since 1989. Stein has been a sponsor of the Lakewood Relay for Life, contributes to the Beck Center for Performing Arts, opened his home for the Lakewood Historical Society Home and Garden Tour and served on the City of Lakewood Community Relations Board where he designed a program to establish modern and artistic bus stops. He is the current board President of the Downtown Lakewood Business Alliance where he directs efforts to revitalize and enrich the merchant environment with efforts including a City Wide Street Sale, Spring Stroll and Fashion Show, Streetwalk, Chocolate

Walk, Gingerbread House Tour and Scavenger Hunt and ''Light Up Lakewood'' during the holiday season—an effort to create beautifully decorated storefront windows reminiscent of Cleveland's downtown department store windows of years past. Annually, he awards a $500 scholarship to one boy and one girl, the king and queen of the Light Up Lakewood festival, to put toward college, asking only that they dedicate 20 hours of community service to Lakewood in return.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Mr. Stein for his leadership, loyalty, civic pride and above all, caring for his community and what he and his business has meant to the City of Lakewood and Northeast Ohio for the past ten years.

HONORING EVANGELIST PIA HAYNES WILLIAMS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the contributions of Evangelist Pia Haynes Williams, to the Texas Northeast First Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction of the Church of God in Christ, Inc. Evangelist Williams is being installed as the Jurisdictional Supervisor of Women, where she will oversee the work and ministry of over 35,000 women and youth in 300 congregations throughout North Texas.

Evangelist Williams has a proven record of service to the church. In keeping with her lifelong dedication to advance her faith, Evangelist Williams is founding President and CEO of her own international evangelistic ministry. Evangelist Williams also oversees the Women's and Youth ministries at the Love Sanctuary Church in Fort Worth, alongside her husband of almost thirty years. There, she continues to focus her efforts on empowering women to succeed in their personal and spiritual endeavors.

Considered a true ''Daughter of the Church,'' Evangelist Williams also comes from a rich familial heritage, filled with loyalty and service to the Church. Evangelist Williams is the granddaughter of the founding Jurisdictional Bishop and First Lady of the Texas Northeast First Jurisdiction of the Church of God in Christ, while her father currently sits on the General Board of Bishops. Despite this highly decorated past, Evangelist Williams has remained a humble and compassionate servant of the church and its followers.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to honor the work of Evangelist Pia Haynes Williams as she continues to provide spiritual guidance for thousands of North Texans. Her dedication to her community and faith will serve her well in this new capacity, and I wish Evangelist Williams continued success at the Texas Northeast First Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction of the Church of God in Christ.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF MR. JOSEPH M. GAUL

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Mr. Joseph M. Gaul, the former Mayor of Fairview Park, Ohio.

Born in Cleveland, Ohio to Leroy and Gertrude Gaul, Joseph was a lifelong resident of Northeast Ohio. He attended Cathedral Latin High School and graduated from John Carroll University in 1957. Between graduating from high school and attending college, Mr. Gaul bravely served his country during the Korean War with the United States Air Force from 1951 to 1953, during which time he was stationed in Panama.

In 1958, Mr. Gaul moved to Fairview Park and became active in politics. He was elected Ward 2 Councilman in 1965 and served until he was elected Councilman-at-Large in 1969. In 1971, Mr. Gaul was elected Council President and served in that role for four years. Mr. Gaul was elected the Mayor of Fairview Park in 1975 and would be reelected twice. He ended his career after more than thirty years in 1992. During his tenure as mayor, Mr. Gaul was instrumental in developing Willowood Manor, Fairview Park's Senior Citizens residential complex and in annexing RiverEdge Township.

In addition to his political accomplishments, Mr. Gaul also served as the Vice Chair of the RTA Board of Directors and worked as sales manager for Wolverine Express, Central Transport, Inc. He was a parishioner at St. Angela Merici Church for more than fifty years and was member of the Parish Council. In 1996 the Ohio State Senate named Mr. Gaul the ''Irishman of the Year.''

I offer my condolences to his former wife of 46 years, Joan Adler; brothers, William and Leroy; children, Joseph Jr. (Meg), Patty, Eileen (Bart), Brian (Kathy), Kathleen (Mike), John (Marybeth), Michael (Julie), and Megan; and twenty-two grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring the memory of Mr. Joseph M. Gaul, who bravely fought for his country and valiantly served the residents of Fairview Park.

HONORING ELAINE WALKER MAYOR OF LOVETTSVILLE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Loudoun County's longest-serving mayor, Elaine Walker of Lovettsville. At the end of the month, Mayor Walker will step down after serving as mayor of Lovettsville for nearly 22 years.

Mayor Walker's accomplishments during her tenure as mayor include acquiring land for a 92-acre county park, helping develop the Lovettsville bike and pedestrian path and most recently making the town's veterans memorial a reality. I have had the privilege of knowing and working with Elaine for many years. She has been an outstanding mayor and her leadership and steady hand will be missed.

Public service is one of our nation's highest callings and I extend my deepest gratitude for her service to our community. I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

I also submit the following article from Leesburg Today on Mayor Walker's final council meeting.

LOUDOUN MAYORS PAY TRIBUTE TO WALKER

[From Leesburg Today, June 22, 2012]

It was all hugs and tributes in Lovettsville Thursday night as Mayor Elaine Walker received flowers and praise from a bevy of well wishers, including four of her fellow mayors, in what was her final council meeting.

Walker, who did not seek reelection in May, steps down June 30 after 10 years on the Lovettsville Town Council and almost 22 as the town's mayor—a governance record that is unlikely to be matched any time soon.

The mayors of four other Loudoun towns attended the meeting as well. ''It was a complete surprise, I had no idea,'' Walker said of the appearance of Purcellville Mayor Bob Lazaro, Leesburg Mayor Kristen Umstattd, Middleburg Mayor Betsy Davis and Hamilton Mayor Greg Wilmoth. Hillsboro Mayor Roger Vance and Round Hill Mayor Scott Ramsey were unable to be present.

Davis said Walker's first reaction was to say to the group ''What are you doing here?''

Lazaro led the delegation, presenting Walker with a plaque honoring her service. ''We knew this was your last meeting and we wanted to say thank you for those 30 years,'' and for being a good friend and colleague to local government.

Davis told Walker ''how much I will miss you as a friend, seeing you at all our [Coalition of Loudoun Towns] meetings. Thank you for all you've done for the county.''

''But, we'll still have lunch,'' Umstattd said to her longtime colleague, also expressing her appreciation of Walker's service. Umstattd, who has been Leesburg's mayor for 10 years following service on the Town Council, will take over as the most tenured Loudoun mayor.

Wilmoth, the newest mayor in the group, said he appreciated all the help Walker has given him. ''You have set the bar high for the rest of us,'' he said.

Walker's husband Cliff Walker, who served on the council in the 1970s, was present as was Lazaro's wife Carolyn—who both would get together during Virginia Municipal League conferences. ''They're VML soulmates,'' Lazaro teased.

Walker said she did not plan to go away into the sunset. ''I hope to still do some conferences, including the VML meetings. I love the camaraderie,'' she said.

Vice Mayor Bob Zoldos, who will become Lovettsville's mayor July 1, invited everyone to share some sweet-toothed goodies in recognition of the occasion.

The tributes went on with more flowers being presented—by the Lovettsville Fire-Rescue Squad in appreciation for Walker's long support, while Bob Zoldos' fifth grade son Bobby also presented a bouquet of flowers and read aloud a poem he had written in Walker's honor.

The last tribute came from Lovettsville's Community Police Officer, Sheriff's Office Deputy Bryan Wacker, who is being transferred to a new assignment. He thanked Walker for her assistance and said she had been ''a great ally.'' He said his time with the mayor had been ''one of the best working relationships'' he'd ever had.

IN HONOR OF H.E. AMBASSADOR SAMEH SHOUKRY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of H.E. Ambassador Sameh Shoukry, who is ending his tenure as the Arab Republic of Egypt's Ambassador to the United States of America.

Born on October 20, 1952 in Cairo, Egypt, Ambassador Shoukry is a second generation diplomat. He graduated from Ein Shams University in 1975 with a law degree and specializes in disarmament and non-proliferation issues. Just a year later, in 1976, Ambassador Shoukry joined the Egyptian Diplomatic Corps. Throughout his more than 30-year career, he has served in the Egyptian Embassies in London, Buenos Aires and the Permanent Mission of Egypt in New York.

Prior to being appointed Egypt's Ambassador to the United States in September, 2008, Ambassador Shoukry served as Egypt's Permanent Representative to the United Nations in Geneva, Egypt's Ambassador to Austria and as Permanent Representative to the International Organizations in Vienna. He has also served as the Director of the Minister of Foreign Affairs cabinet and led the department of the United States and Canada in the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring H.E. Ambassador Sameh Shoukry, the Arab Republic of Egypt's Ambassador to the United States, as we bid him farewell.

RECOGNITION OF GENERAL (RET.) BRUCE CARLSON, DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we recognize General (ret.) Bruce Carlson, who will step down as the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office in July 2012 after three years of exemplary leadership.

General Carlson leaves a legacy of remarkable accomplishments with the National Reconnaissance Office including, the most aggressive launch campaign in a quarter of a century, all major systems acquisition programs operating at or below budget, a corporate process for making critical budget and space architecture decisions, and a significantly more healthy space reconnaissance constellation. General Carlson's dedicated leadership; integrity and hard work have positioned the National Reconnaissance Office for continued success that will have an enduring impact on our national security.

Prior to his time at the National Reconnaissance Office, General Carlson had a distinguished career spanning over 37 years with the U.S. Air Force. He began his military career as a commissioned officer in 1971 after graduating with distinction from the Air Force Reserve Officer Training program at the University of Minnesota, Duluth. He is a command pilot with more than 3,700 flying hours in ten different aircraft, and saw combat as a forward air controller in the OV–10 Bronco. His various flying assignments included commanding the 49th Fighter Wing at Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico, the Air Force's first stealth fighter wing. His staff assignments included positions at Tactical Air Command, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, and the offices of the Secretary of the Air Force and Secretary of Defense. He also served as the Director of Force Structure, Resources and Assessment on the Joint Staff; Commander, 8th Air Force, Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana; and Joint Functional Component Commander for Space and Global Strike, U.S. Strategic Command, Offutt AFB, Nebraska. Prior to his retirement from the U.S. Air Force, General Carlson served as Commander Air Force Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, which is responsible for development, testing, acquisition and sustainment of Air Force weapons systems. In that role, he had responsibility for 74,000 people and $59 billion annually. He was promoted from Lieutenant General to General, pinning on his fourth star, on September 1, 2005.

He and his wife, Vicki, are very proud of their three children and ten grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Bruce Carlson has been a dedicated public servant, both in his service to his country in the U.S. military and as a senior executive at the National Reconnaissance Office. It is appropriate that we honor him today for his many contributions.

IN RECOGNITION OF WIRE-NET

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize WIRE-Net, Cleveland's West Side Industrial Retention and Expansion Network, on the event of its annual meeting on Wednesday June 27, 2012.

WIRE-Net is a premier business-led organization, one of the few that focuses on the shared interests of manufacturing companies and urban communities. Its mission focuses on providing programs and services that strengthen manufacturing to create healthy communities and fuel economic growth.

WIRE-Net is a membership organization with 260 members. WIRE-Net was organized in 1988 to help manufacturing businesses—and jobs—stay in the community at a time when plant closings and downsizing were commonplace. Its staff went straight to the source, visiting almost 200 companies to better understand their challenges. WIRE-Net found that even though manufacturing companies, most with fewer than 100 employees, provided about 60 percent of the community's jobs, they had been overlooked and under-appreciated as community assets. WIRE-Net helped businesses get organized to win attention from federal, state and local government, and built relationships between business leaders and public officials. This effort helped get streets repaved, improved neighborhood safety, and led to new programs like Cleveland's Industrial Retention Initiative (CIRI) to support manufacturing. WIRE-Net also effectively blocked efforts to weaken industrial zoning on Cleveland's west side.

At this year's annual meeting, WIRE-Net recognizes its Executive Director, John Colm, for his 25 years of service to the community through the organization. WIRE-Net will also present its 2012 Mission Builder Award for plant expansion, new business growth, and/or creating jobs to: Electric Cord Sets; Miceli Dairy Products; Nestle Professional—L J Minor Division; Norlake Manufacturing; National Safety Apparel (NSA); and Philips Healthcare. This year's keynote speaker is Rob Atkinson, founder and president of the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, who will discuss his work promoting U.S. based manufacturing and organizing the American Manufacturing Charter, which is supported by a broad coalition of labor, business, and economic policy leaders.

Mr. Speaker and respected colleagues, please join me in recognizing WIRE-Net, its long-time Executive Director John Colm, the winners of its 2012 Mission Builder Awards, and its influential speaker Rob Atkinson at WIRE-Net's Annual Meeting on June 27, 2012.

HONORING LEMUEL MCWILLIAMS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor, Lemuel McWilliams. Mr. McWilliams is the third of five children born to Mrs. Eva McWilliams and the late Mr. Milton McWilliams of Ruleville, Mississippi. He was born in Clarksdale, Mississippi. Mr. McWilliams is a member of Merry Grove Missionary Baptist Church where he is a Sunday School Teacher, usher, and he is also active in other church auxiliaries.

From the time Lemuel entered school he always worked to excel. While at Ruleville Middle School he received numerous academic awards and graduated Salutatorian of his class. When Lemuel entered high school he continued to make education his priority, and has received numerous awards. He received the highest average in English III, Algebra II, Advance Placement History, and Creative Writing; and Lemuel was also awarded the Sunflower County Chamber of Commerce scholarship, and both the Principal's and the Superintendent's Scholar Awards.

As a member of the Leaders Envisioning a Future, he has also been involved in community service projects. Mr. McWilliams has been a mentor to fellow classmates by encouraging and helping them reach their educational goals. He wants to encourage younger students that they can accomplish any of their goals as long as they are committed to working hard to achieve it.

Mr. Williams received full scholarships to Jackson State University and Alcorn State University. In the fall he plans to attend Jackson State University where he will major in PreMed and Biology. After obtaining his degree, Lemuel wants to become a Pediatrician.

Mr. Lemuel McWilliams credits his parents for encouraging and supporting him to pursue his dreams of becoming a physician. His siblings Toni, Rahman, Ivan, and Ezra also encourage him to achieve his educational and career dreams, because they understand

Lemuel's passion for achieving his goals and helping others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Lemuel McWilliams as the 2012 Valedictorian at Ruleville Central High School Class.

IN RECOGNITION OF CLEVELAND PRIDE FESTIVAL

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Cleveland Pride Festival, just one of countless celebrations taking place throughout the country during LGBT Pride Month. June marks the 43rd anniversary of the Stonewall Riots, an event which is largely regarded as the catalyst for the modern day LGBT movement for equality.

There is a long history of systematic discrimination against the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered and questioning community in every state in the union. Discrimination against someone based on any part of their identity means that anyone who is expressing themselves can be discriminated against. It means we are creating a system in which everyone has to be the same, and everyone has to express themselves the same way. Boring and wrong!

Fortunately, over the last several years, we are beginning to see responses to the growing demand for protection against discrimination in all forms, including workplace protections to prevent discrimination based on actual or perceived gender identity and sexual orientation.

As a strong proponent of LGBT rights, I have supported legislative initiatives that work toward codifying equality for members of the LGBT community. I strongly support legislation such as the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA), the Student Non-Discrimination Act, the Respect for Marriage Act and the Social Security Equality Act, initiatives that simply provide members of the LGBT community with the same privileges, protections and benefits as everyone else. As one of over 100 members to sign onto an amicus brief challenging the constitutionality of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) in court, I applaud the recent decision by a federal appeals court to rule DOMA unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me as people throughout the City of Cleveland and the country celebrate LGBT Pride Month. Let us work to ensure that all people are treated equally regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SAFETY AND INNOVATION ACT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 5651, the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act, to reauthorize the Prescription Drug User Fee Act and the Medical Device User Fee Act. These critically important laws have improved patient access to important therapies and expedited the FDA's approval times while upholding the most rigorous standards for patient safety.

The Prescription Drug User Fee Act, PDUFA, was enacted in 1992 when drug review times were lagging and FDA simply couldn't keep up with the flood of new drug applications. Through user fees paid by applicants, the FDA gained resources it needed to hire and support more staff. The program has been successful at reducing review-time backlogs, and expediting safe and effective therapies to patients.

Along with faster drug approvals, Congress also recognized the need to study drugs in children. As the original author of the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act, BPCA, and the Pediatric Research Equity Act, PREA, I'm proud of how successful these programs have been in treating children, resulting in new dosing information, new indications of use, new safety information, and new data on effectiveness. Before BPCA and PREA, the vast majority of drugs, more than 80 percent, used in children were used off-label, without data for their safety and efficacy. Today, that number has been reduced to 50 percent.

We know that children are not just small adults. They have unique medical needs and drugs react differently in their bodies. That's why in this year's reauthorization, it was important for us to look at areas in need of improvement. The bipartisan legislation gives FDA the tools it needs to ensure companies are thinking about pediatric populations as early as possible in the drug development process, and that they're able to enforce timelines that are routinely missed. The language encourages further study into untested age groups, like neonates, and clarifies any confusion over what some see as ''loopholes'' to allow companies to access the market exclusivity incentive without completing additional studies.

The legislation also ensures that companies routinely submit their pediatric plans earlier in the process by establishing a clear timeline and expectations.

I thank my House colleagues, Representatives MIKE ROGERS and EDWARD MARKEY who have worked very hard with me to improve these programs. I applaud the bipartisan and bicameral efforts of the House and Senate staffers who were able to combine the bills from both chambers to produce strong consensus language that has broad support from Members and stakeholders.

I have confidence that the bill we vote on today will improve BPCA and PREA to benefit children for generations to come, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

IN HONOR OF GREATER CLEVELAND COMMUNITY SHARES

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the members of the Greater Cleveland Community Shares for their years of service and dedication to social justice.

Community Shares of Cleveland is a workplace giving federation with a focus on social justice. It generates the operating funds for nonprofit organizations that work for positive community change such as providing education, promoting health care, and protecting women and children.

Founded in 1984, Community Shares is Cleveland's only such fund, and is the second largest in the country. Its philosophy is based on the power of participation and the individual's ability to shape change. Community Shares keeps its administrative costs low so that each contribution is responsive directly to the community's needs. It is governed by a Board of Directors which consists of representatives from member organizations and Community Directors. Greater Cleveland Community Shares is a member of Community Shares USA.

Greater Cleveland Community Shares has 41 area member organizations and more than 160 area employers include Community Shares in their annual workplace charitable campaigns.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Greater Cleveland Community Shares.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF JUDGE PAUL A. RASMUSSEN

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the dedicated public service and esteemed legal career of Judge Paul A. Rasmussen upon his retirement from Florida's First Judicial Circuit Court in Escambia County. Judge Rasmussen spent his career serving the people of Northwest Florida, and I am proud to recognize his dedication and service.

Judge Rasmussen first came to Florida in 1968 with the United States Navy to attend Aviation Officer Candidate School at Naval Air Station Pensacola. After graduating and completing his training at Naval Air Station Glynco, in Georgia, he went on to serve four years on active duty with the Navy, completing successful tours of duty in Guam and Vietnam. After Judge Rasmussen was honorably discharged from the Navy, he returned to Florida where he attended the University of Florida College of Law.

Following his graduation from law school, Judge Rasmussen began his public service as a State's Attorney in Pensacola. He later entered private practice with then future Judge John T. Parnham, now retired from the bench in the First Judicial Circuit. Judge Rasmussen also served as legal counsel to the city of Gulf Breeze and the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. In 1990, Judge Rasmussen was elected to Florida's First Judicial Circuit Court where he has served the people of Northwest Florida for the past 22 years. In 1998, he was recognized by the Children's Home Society of Florida as Child Advocate of the Year.

Judge Rasmussen's service to Northwest Florida does not stop at the bench. He is also actively involved throughout the community, most notably as a Sunday School Teacher at First Baptist Church of Pensacola and as a committeeman for Boy Scout Troop 10 in Pensacola.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am honored to recognize Judge Paul A. Rasmussen for his many years of service to the people of Northwest Florida and his dedication to his family and community. Throughout his career, Judge Rasmussen has served with honor and distinction, and his unwavering commitment to the fair administration of the law and to public service is a shining example of our legal system working at its finest. My wife Vicki and I wish him, his wife, Jean, their children and grandchildren all the best.

IN HONOR JOANNA TRZECIAK

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Joanna Trzeciak of Cleveland, Ohio, who placed among the final four contestants in the International category of Canada's Annual Griffin Poetry Prize Contest.

The Griffin Poetry Prize Contest accepts poetry that is either written or translated from other languages. The contestants are in either the Canadian or International category of the competition. Ms. Trzeciak competed with her translation of a book of poems by the Polish poet Tadeusz Rozewicz. Rozewicz was born in Ramomsko, Poland in 1921 and published his first collection of poems when he was 26. Rozewicz was Trzeciak's father's favorite poet.

Ms. Trzeciak is a native of Poland and currently lives in Cleveland Heights. She is a professor in the Implied Linguistics, Institute for Department of Modern and Classical Language Studies at Kent State University.

Trzeciak's scholarly research has been awarded Fulbright and Woodrow Wilson Fellowships. Her translations have appeared in The New Yorker, The Times Literary Supplement, Harper's Magazine, and The Atlantic Monthly, among others. Placing among the top four final contestants, Ms. Trzeciak won $10,000 and gained exposure for Rozewicz.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Joanna Trzeciak and congratulating her on her accomplishments in the field of poetry and in Canada's Annual Griffin Poetry Prize Contest.

AZERBAIJAN

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw my colleagues' attention to the tiny nation of Azerbaijan, which is a giant in world affairs.

Situated between Iran and Russia, Azerbaijan stands as a friend of the United States and that friendship frequently concerns nearby nations.

Part of what makes Azerbaijan a remarkable ally for the United States is that some 20 million Iranians are of Azeri descent, a large part of northern Iran is frequently referred to as ''southern Azerbaijan'' as a reminder that the territory was—for centuries—part of Azerbaijan.

The development of Azeri oil and gas in the Caspian Sea, along with the major Azeri export pipelines that pump energy to Western markets, makes the region all the more strategic as a U.S. ally.

But it is their geographical location to Afghanistan that makes them absolutely an essential ally for the U.S. Azerbaijan provides a crucial transit route to supply our troops in Afghanistan. With the expected closing of Manas air base in 2014, this route will be even more essential to our troops. They are a Muslim nation that is our friend, and our ally in the world.

This Muslim nation is the example for a secular society of religious diversity. A majority Muslim nation with a significant population of Jews, Azerbaijan is an ally of Israel. Just this month, on the anniversary of Pope John Paul II's visit to Azerbaijan, the Vatican's Cardinal Fernando Filoni spoke at the Catholic Church of Baku, reminding us that ''An atmosphere of exemplary tolerance exists in Azerbaijan.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the importance of Azerbaijan—both to the United States and to the world.

IN HONOR OF THE 21ST ANNIVERSARY OF SLOVENIAN STATEHOOD

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of the 21st anniversary of Slovenian Statehood. I am also pleased to be joined by the Consul General of the Republic of Slovenia, Mr. Jure Zmauc and his wife, Mrs. Janja Zmauc, to celebrate Slovenian Statehood Day.

The twenty-fifth of June is Slovenian Statehood Day, an annual celebration of Slovenia's independence and the sovereignty it gained in 1991. It is a commemoration of the struggles and triumphs of the people of Slovenia. It also serves as an opportunity for residents of Northeast Ohio to celebrate the customs, traditions and contributions of Slovenian Americans to our community.

This year's celebration of Slovenian Statehood Day will be held at the Rotunda at Cleveland City hall and is sponsored by the City of Cleveland Mayor Frank Jackson and Councilmen Michael Polensek and Joe Cimperman. This year's celebration will feature a musical performance by composer and saxophonist, Professor Oto Vrhovnik.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of the 21st anniversary of Slovenian Statehood. Slovenia has grown in many facets over the years and should be recognized for its prosperity.

HONORING LEMUEL MCWILLIAMS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor, Lemuel McWilliams. Mr. McWilliams is the third of five children born to Mrs. Eva McWilliams and the late Mr. Milton McWilliams of Ruleville, Mississippi. He was born in Clarksdale, Mississippi. Mr. McWilliams is a member of Merry Grove Missionary Baptist Church where he is a Sunday School Teacher, usher, and he is also active in other church auxiliaries.

From the time Lemuel entered school he always worked to excel. While at Ruleville Middle School he received numerous academic awards and graduated Salutatorian of his class. When Lemuel entered high school he continued to make education his priority, and has received numerous awards. He received the highest average in English III, Algebra II, Advance Placement History, and Creative Writing; and Lemuel was also awarded the Sunflower County Chamber of Commerce scholarship, and both the Principal's and the Superintendent's Scholar Awards.

As a member of the Leaders Envisioning a Future, he has also been involved in community service projects. Mr. McWilliams has been a mentor to fellow classmates by encouraging and helping them reach their educational goals. He wants to encourage younger students that they can accomplish any of their goals as long as they are committed to working hard to achieve it.

Mr. Williams received full scholarships to Jackson State University and Alcorn State University. In the fall he plans to attend Jackson State University where he will major in PreMed and Biology. After obtaining his degree, Lemuel wants to become a Pediatrician.

Mr. Lemuel McWilliams credits his parents for encouraging and supporting him to pursue his dreams of becoming a physician. His siblings Toni, Rahman, Ivan, and Ezra also encourage him to achieve his educational and career dreams, because they understand Lemuel's passion for achieving his goals and helping others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Lemuel McWilliams as the 2012 Valedictorian at Ruleville Central High School Class.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GUST GALLUCCI COMPANY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 100th anniversary of the Gust Gallucci Company and its strong commitment to the Cleveland community.

The Gust Gallucci Company opened in 1912 when Gust Gallucci emigrated to Cleveland from Faeto, Italy. Mr. Gallucci longed for the authentic Italian food that he had been raised on and soon discovered that he was not the only one. Mr. Gallucci began selling his products from a large wooden cart which became so popular that he moved into his first store on the west side of Cleveland.

While the location of the store changed four times, Mr. Gallucci's friendly personality and great food kept Clevelanders coming back for more. The business has remained in the family, passed down from Mr. Gallucci to sons Frank and Ray after he passed away in 1952. Now the fourth generation has become involved and has worked to move the store into the 21st century.

Over the last 100 years, the Gust Gallucci Company has become ingrained in the lives of Clevelanders. Families have been enjoying the authentic Italian cuisine for generations. The Gust Gallucci Company has always maintained that it is neither an ''East'' or ''West'' business but a Cleveland business.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring the Gust Gallucci Company on its 100th anniversary and in honoring its never-ending support of the Cleveland community.

RECOGNIZING THE HUDSON LADY HORNETS FOR WINNING THE TEXAS 3A SOFTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with enormous pride that I recognize and congratulate the Hudson Lady Hornets on an amazing 2012 softball season in which they captured the Texas State Class 3A Softball Championship. These tenacious Lady Hornets have reached the pinnacle of success in Texas softball with their first state championship.

The Lady Hornets demonstrated just how powerful they were as a team, playing as one well-tuned machine. The final game saw the Hudson Lady Hornets defeat an outstanding Henderson Lady Lions team with an 8–4 win. The championship game showed the strength of each team as they both played scoreless for the first half of the game. They then unloaded the sticks and went at it in the final innings. Henderson represented themselves very well, but Hudson came out triumphant as an outstanding example of a great east Texas Champion.

There is no doubt that player, coach, and supporting person involved with the success of the Lady Hornets was inspired to experience the amazing outcome when they give absolutely all the effort that have to their team and to achieve a mutual goal.

Clearly a team does not get to such a level of excellence without a coaching staff that knows its players, what they can accomplish and just how far they can be pushed. This tribute goes out to all of the athletic staff including Coach Jimmy Eby, and Assistant Coaches Wes Capps and Amanda Malone.

The team members achieving this memorable accomplishment included Freshmen Madison Jeffrey, Adrianna Mosley, Bryli Lee and Marie Mireles; Sophomores Kaylee Parker, Ashley Davis and Madison Selman; Juniors Cassidy Brasuell, Alyssa Dotson, Kayla Caldwell and Kelsee Selman; and Seniors Lauren Gilcrease, Kelsey Moulder, Elizabeth Pierce, Marlee Guidry, and Jade Havard.

No athletic team ever becomes a champion without unwavering support, and that is exactly what the Lady Hornets experienced from the Hudson Independent School District staff and the entire community. That is why congratulations go to all who contributed in any way to the success of the Lady Hornets during the 2012 season. Throughout the season, they were empowered by the scripture as revealed in Philippians 4:13 which reads, ''I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me.''

May God continue to bless all of their efforts both in school and as they one day finish high school and use that same drive and determination to make this country even stronger. Congratulations to the State Champion Hudson Lady Hornets, as their legacy is now recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

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, June 28, 2012 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 29

Time to be announced

Finance

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Mark J. Mazur, of New Jersey, and Matthew S. Rutherford, of Illinois, both to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and Meredith M. Broadbent, of Virginia, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission.

Room to be announced

JULY 10

2:30 p.m.

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

JULY 11

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the impact on competition of exclusion orders to enforce standard-essential patents.

SD–226

JULY 12

10 a.m.

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine creating positive learning environments for all students.

Room to be announced

2:30 p.m.

Intelligence

To hold a closed meeting to consider certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4645–S4687

Measures Introduced: Ten bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3342–3351, S. Res. 511–512, and S. Con. Res. 50. **Page S4674**

Measures Reported:

S. 2165, to enhance strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 112–179) **Page S4674**

Measures Passed:

Pacific Lutheran University Lutes Softball Team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 511, commending the Pacific Lutheran University Lutes Softball Team for winning the 2012 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III Softball Championship. **Pages S4685–86**

100th Anniversary of Rice University: Senate agreed to S. Res. 512, recognizing the 100th anniversary of Rice University. **Page S4686**

Measures Considered:

Small Business Jobs and Tax Relief Act: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2237, to provide a temporary income tax credit for increased payroll and extend bonus depreciation for an additional year. **Pages S4645–68**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

A routine list in the Department of State.

Pages S4686–87

Messages from the House: **Pages S4671–72**

Measures Referred: **Page S4671**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S4651–52, S4672**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4672–74**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4674–75**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4675–84**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4669–71**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4684–85**

Notices of Intent: **Page S4685**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S4685**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4685**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 5:20 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 28, 2012. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4686.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NATIONAL PARKS BILLS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine S. 1897, to amend Public Law 101–377 to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station, S. 2158, to establish the Fox-Wisconsin Heritage Parkway National Heritage Area, S. 2229, to authorize the issuance of right-of-way permits for natural gas pipelines in Glacier National Park, S. 2267, to reauthorize the Hudson Valley National Heritage Area, S. 2272, to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Mount Denali, S. 2273, to designate the Talkeetna Ranger Station in Talkeetna, Alaska, as the Walter Harper Talkeetna Ranger Station, S. 2286, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 2316, to designate the Salt Pond Visitor Center at the Cape Cod National Seashore as the "Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. Salt Pond Visitor Center", S. 2324, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Neches River in the State of Texas for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic River System, S. 2372, to authorize pedestrian and motorized vehicular access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, S. 3078, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install

in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on June 6, 1944, the morning of D–Day, and S. 3300, to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Los Alamos, New Mexico, and Hanford, Washington, after receiving testimony from Herbert Frost, Associate Director, Natural Resources Stewardship and Science, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Ingrid Kolb, Director, Office of Management, Department of Energy; Mayor Thomas L. Beehan, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, on behalf of the Energy Communities Alliance; Warren Judge, Dare County Board of Commissioners, Manteo, North Carolina; and Derb S. Carter, Jr., Southern Environmental Law Center, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Derek J. Mitchell, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to the Union of Burma, Department of State, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

SYRIA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee received a closed briefing on Syria from national security briefers.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Frank Paul Geraci, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, who was introduced by Senator Schumer, Fernando M. Olguin, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, and Charles R. Breyer, of California, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission, who were both introduced by Senator Feinstein, and Malachy Edward Mannion, and Matthew W. Brann, both to be a United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, who were both introduced by Senators Casey and Toomey, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

HEALTH AND BENEFITS LEGISLATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine health and benefits legislation, including S. 3340, to improve and enhance the programs and activities of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs regarding suicide prevention and resilience and behavioral health disorders for members of the Armed Forces and veterans, S. 3336, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a major medical facility project lease for a Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic at Ewa Plain, Oahu, Hawaii, S. 3324, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to nonprofit organizations for the construction of facilities for temporary lodging in connection with the examination, treatment, or care of a veteran under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, S. 3316, to require the Secretary of Labor to carry out a pilot program on providing veterans with access at One-Stop Centers to Internet websites to facilitate online job searches, S. 3313, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, to improve health care furnished by the Department, S. 3309, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to homeless veterans, S. 3308, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the furnishing of benefits for homeless veterans who are women or who have dependents, S. 3282, to amend title 38, United States Code, to reauthorize the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education, S. 3270, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to consider the resources of individuals applying for pension that were recently disposed of by the individuals for less than fair market value when determining the eligibility of such individuals for such pension, S. 3238, to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs community based outpatient clinic in Mansfield, Ohio, as the David F. Winder Department of Veterans Affairs Community Based Outpatient Clinic, S. 3206, to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay a monthly assistance allowance to disabled veterans training or competing for the Paralympic Team and the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance to United States Paralympics, Inc., S. 3202, to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that deceased veterans with no known next of kin can receive a dignified burial, S. 3084, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reorganize the Veterans Integrated Service Networks of the Veterans Health Administration, S. 3052, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide veterans, when such veterans electronically file claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, with notice that relevant services may be available to the veterans from veterans service organizations, S. 3049, to amend title 39, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the

laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, S. 2320, to direct the American Battle Monuments Commission to provide for the ongoing maintenance of Clark Veterans Cemetery in the Republic of the Philippines, S. 2259, to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2012, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, S. 2244, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to assist in the identification of unclaimed and abandoned human remains to determine if any such remains are eligible for burial in a national cemetery, S. 2045, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require judges of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims to reside within fifty miles of the District of Columbia, S. 1849, to require a five-year strategic plan for the Office of Rural Health of the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs for improving access to, and the quality of, health care services for veterans in rural areas, S. 1838, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on service dog training therapy, S. 1806, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate overpayments of tax as contributions to the homeless veterans assistance fund, S. 1799, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for certain requirements relating to the immunization of veterans, S. 1755, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for coverage under the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs of certain disabled veterans for travel for certain special disabilities rehabilitation, S. 1707, to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the conditions under which certain persons may be treated as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes, S. 1705, to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Spokane, Washington, as the "Mann-Grandstaff Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center", S. 1631, to authorize the establishment in the Department of Veterans Affairs of a center for technical assistance for non-Department health care providers who furnish care to veterans in rural areas, S. 1391, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder or mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and S. 1264, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to permit facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be designated as voter registration agencies, after receiving testimony from Senators Boxer, Portman, Ayotte, Wyden, Franken, and Heller; Madhulika Agarwal, Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Policy and Services, Veterans Health Administration, and Thomas Murphy, Director, Compensation Service, William Schoenhard, Deputy Under Secretary for Health Operations and Management, and Richard Hipolit, Assistant General Counsel, all of the Veterans Benefits Administration, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs; Joy J. Ilem, Disabled American Veterans, and Heather L. Ansley, VetsFirst, both of Washington, DC.; Mark T. Edney, American Urological Association Legislative Affairs Committee, Salisbury, Maryland; and Tracy Keil, Parker, Colorado.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 6029–6046; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 709–710 were introduced. **Pages H4155–56**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4157–58**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

Legislative Review and Oversight Activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs During the 112th Congress (H. Rept. 112–552) and

H. Res. 708, relating to the consideration of House Report 112–546 and an accompanying resolution, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 706) authorizing the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas. **Page H4155**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Nugent to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4067**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:21 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4075**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated yesterday, June 26th:

Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvements Act of 2012: H.R. 4018, amended, to improve the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program. **Page H4079**

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013: The House resumed consideration of H.R. 5972, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013. Further proceedings were postponed. **Pages H4079–H4135, H4135–51**

Agreed to:

Clarke (MI) amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Homeless Assistance Grants by $5,000,000; **Page H4112**

Cravaack amendment that prohibits funds from being used by the Secretary of Transportation to research or implement a distance-based fee system, commonly referred to as Vehicle Miles Traveled, that would levy a fee on a vehicle user based on the distance traveled; **Pages H4137–39**

Cravaack amendment that prohibits funds from being used in furtherance of the implementation of the European Union greenhouse gas emissions trading scheme for aviation activities established by European Union Directive 2008/101/EC; **Pages H4139–40**

Posey amendment (No. 8 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used for the International Highway Technology Scanning Program; **Page H4141**

Griffith (VA) amendment that prohibits funds from being used for any new grant under the livable communities program of the Department of Transportation or the sustainable communities program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development or to implement any transfer of funds for any such new grant; **Pages H4141–42**

Flores amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007; **Pages H4142–43**

Turner (OH) amendment (No. 7 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used to establish, issue, implement, administer, or enforce any prohibition or restriction on the establishment or effectiveness of any occupancy preference for veterans in supportive housing for the elderly that (1) is provided assistance by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and (2)(A) is or would be located on property of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or (B) is subject to an enhanced use lease with the Department of Veterans Affairs; **Page H4144**

Garrett amendment that prohibits funds from being used to promulgate, issue, establish, implement, administer, finalize, or enforce the proposed rule issued by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and published in the Federal Register on September 16, 2011 (relating to Implementation of the Fair Housing Act's Discriminatory Effects Standard); **Pages H4144–46**

Cassidy amendment that prohibits funds from being used by the Secretary of Transportation to make any transfer under the last proviso under the heading "Department of Transportation—Office of the Secretary—Payments to Air Carriers"; **Page H4146**

Chabot amendment that prohibits funds from being used to design, construct, or operate a fixed guideway project located in Cincinnati, Ohio; and **Pages H4146–47**

Scalise amendment that prohibits funds from being used to implement any rule or regulation that expressly prohibits an owner or landlord of housing from using a criminal conviction to deny housing to an applicant for such housing. **Pages H4150–51**

Rejected:

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for the Office of Public and Indian Housing salaries and expenses by $6,500,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 168 ayes to 256 noes, Roll No. 424); **Pages H4096, H4126–27**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for the Office of Community Planning and Development salaries and expenses by $3,500,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 178 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 425); **Pages H4096–97, H4127**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for the Office of Housing salaries and expenses by $5,000,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 248 noes, Roll No. 426); **Pages H4097, H4128**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for the Office of Policy Development and Research salaries and expenses by $115,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 229 noes, Roll No. 427); **Pages H4097–99, H4128–29**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity salaries and expenses by $304,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 178 ayes to 247 noes, Roll No. 428); **Pages H4099, H4129**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for the Public Housing Capital Fund by $110,000,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 169 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 429); **Pages H4101–02, H4129–30**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for the Public Housing Operating Fund by $562,150,000 and apply the savings to the spending

reduction account (by a recorded vote of 160 ayes to 264 noes, Roll No. 430); **Pages H4102–03, H4130–31**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for the Federal Maritime Commission salaries and expenses by $900,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 172 ayes to 249 noes, Roll No. 431); **Pages H4121, H4131**

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to reduce funding for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation by $12,300,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 172 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 432); **Pages H4122–23, H4131–32**

Chaffetz amendment that sought to reduce funding for the Community Development Fund by $396,000,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 157 ayes to 267 noes, Roll No. 433); **Pages H4104–05, H4132–33**

McClintock amendment that sought to eliminate funding for the Community Development Fund and apply the savings, $3,404,000,000, to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 80 ayes to 342 noes, Roll No. 434); **Pages H4105–06, H4133**

McClintock amendment (No. 11 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2012) that sought to eliminate funding for the Community Development Loan Guarantees Program and apply the savings, $6,000,000, to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 123 ayes to 300 noes, Roll No. 435); and **Pages H4108–09, H4133–34**

Flake amendment that sought to reduce funding for the HOME investment partnerships program by $200,000,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 178 ayes to 242 noes, Roll No. 436). **Pages H4109–10, H4134–35**

Withdrawn:

Diaz-Balart amendment (No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2012) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have provided that unless explicitly provided, not to exceed 25 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated for the Community Development Fund may be expended for public services as defined by law; **Pages H4106–07**

Price (GA) amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration from requiring the placement of line markers under section 195.410(a)(1) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, other than at public road crossings and railroad crossings; and **Pages H4140–41**

Herrera Beutler amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used to build flood protection walls for Interstate 5 between mile posts 72–82 in Lewis County, Washington. **Page H4151**

Point of Order sustained against:

Nadler amendment (No. 3 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2012) that would have increased funding for Tenant-Based Rental Assistance by $460,000,000; **Pages H4100–01**

Hanabusa amendment that would have provided funding, by offset, for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant in the amount of $13,000,000; **Pages H4103–04**

Bachus amendment (No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2012) that would have provided that with respect to the HOME Investment Partnership programs, up to $200,000,000 shall be for disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of housing and infrastructure, and economic revitalization in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster; **Pages H4110–11**

LaTourette amendment that would have expanded the percentage of Neighborhood Stabilization Program 2 and Neighborhood Stabilization Program 3 funds that can be used for demolition projects to 75%; **Pages H4117–18**

Price (NC) amendment that would have allowed public housing agencies to merge operating and capital funds; **Pages H4118–19**

Garamendi amendment that would have changed section 412 of the bill regarding the Buy American Act to ensure that domestic content makes up 85% of all steel, iron, and manufactured goods, including rolling stock; and **Pages H4124–25**

Burgess amendment that would have prohibited funds from being used by the Secretary of Transportation to authorize a person (1) to operate an unmanned aircraft system in the national airspace for the purpose, in whole or in part, of using the unmanned aircraft system as a weapon or to deliver a weapon against a person or property or (2) to manufacture, sell, or distribute an unmanned aircraft system, or a component thereof, for use in the national airspace system as a weapon or to deliver a weapon against a person or property. **Pages H4143–44**

Proceedings Postponed:

Blackburn amendment that seeks to reduce each amount made available by this Act by 1%; **Pages H4135–36**

McClintock amendment (No. 13 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2012) that seeks to prohibit funds from being used for the Third Street Light Rail Phase 2 Central Subway project in San Francisco, California; **Pages H4136–37**

Lankford amendment that prohibits funds from being used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Federal Highway Administration to implement, administer, or enforce the Migratory

Bird Treaty Act with respect to the cliff swallow or barn swallow; **Pages H4147–48**

Denham amendment (No. 9 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2012) that seeks to prohibit funds from being used for high-speed rail in the State of California or for the California High-Speed Rail Authority; and **Pages H4148–49**

Landry amendment that seeks to prohibit funds from being used to promulgate or implement any regulations that would mandate global positioning system tracking, electronic on-board recording devices, or event data recorders in passenger or commercial motor vehicles. **Pages H4149–50**

H. Res. 697, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to yesterday, June 26th.

Recess: The House recessed at 5:24 p.m. and reconvened at 8:15 p.m. **Page H4135**

Motion to Instruct Conferees: The House debated the Hahn motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4348. Further proceedings were postponed. **Pages H4151–53**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Thirteen recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4126–27, H4127, H4128, H4128–29, H4129, H4130, H4130–31, H4131, H4131–32, H4132–33, H4133, H4133–34, H4134–35. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 11:12 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a markup of Activity Report of the Committee on Agriculture for the 3rd Quarter of the 112th Congress. The Activity Report of the Committee on Agriculture was adopted without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup of the adoption of the Semiannual Activities Report of the Committee on Appropriations. The Semiannual Activities Report was adopted without amendment; and began markup of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2013.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a markup of the Third Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 112th Congress. The Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Armed Services was passed, without amendment.

CREATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled ''The Creation and Implementation of the National Nuclear Security Administration''. Testimony was heard from Eugene Aloise, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a markup of H.R. 5872, the ''Sequestration Transparency Act of 2012''. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a markup of Report on the Activities of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for the third quarter of the 112th Congress. The Report on the Activities of the Committee on Education and the Workforce was ordered reported, without amendment.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing on discussion draft of the ''Increasing Manufacturing Competitiveness Through Improved Recycling Act of 2012''; and H.R. 2997, the ''Superfund Common Sense Act''. Testimony was heard from Representative Long; Mathy Stanislaus, Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency; and public witnesses.

FUTURE OF VIDEO

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled ''The Future of Video''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a markup of Semiannual Report on Activities of the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives During the 112th Congress; and H.R. 4367, to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to limit the fee disclosure requirement for an automatic teller machine to the screen of that machine. The Semiannual Report on Activities of the Committee on Financial Services was passed without amendment. H.R. 4367 was ordered reported, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup of the report of the Legislative Review and Oversight Activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the 112th Congress, 3rd Quarter; and H.R. 6018, the ''Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2013''. The report of the Legislative Review and Oversight Activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was passed without amendment and H.R. 6018 was ordered reported, without amendment.

INTERNATIONAL IP ENFORCEMENT: PROTECTING PATENTS, TRADE SECRETS AND MARKET ACCESS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''International IP Enforcement: Protecting Patents, Trade Secrets and Market Access''. Testimony was heard from Teresa Stanek Rea, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Deputy Director of the Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held a hearing on H.R. 3356, the ''ACCESS (ADA Compliance for Customer Entry to Stores and Services) Act''. Testimony was heard from Representative Daniel E. Lungren and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing to approve the 3d quarter semi-annual 112th Congress, Report on Legislative and Oversight Activities; and Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing entitled ''Mandatory Conditioning Requirements on Hydropower: How Federal Resource Agencies are Driving Up Electricity Costs and Decreasing the Original Green Energy''. Testimony was heard from Senator Carper, Representatives Carney, Chaffetz, Denham, Hastings (WA), Pearce, Tsongas, and Turner; Carl Rountree, Director, National Landscape Conservation System, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Jim Pena, Associate Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; John Curtis, Mayor, City of Provo; Victor Knox, Associate Director for Park Planning, Facilities and Lands, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Ingrid Kolb, Director, Office of Management, Department of Energy; Kevin Cann, Supervisor, Mariposa County; and public witnesses. The 3d quarter semi-annual 112th Congress, Report on Legislative and Oversight Activities was approved, without amendment.

AUTHORIZATION, STANDARDS, AND PROCEDURES FOR WHETHER, HOW, AND WHEN INDIAN TRIBES SHOULD BE NEWLY RECOGNIZED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing entitled ''Authorization, standards, and procedures for whether, how, and when Indian tribes should be newly recognized by the federal government''. Testimony was heard from Ken Salazar, Secretary, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a markup of H.R. 459, the ''Federal Reserve Transparency Act of 2011''; H.R. 4155, the ''Veteran Skills to Jobs Act''; H.R. 4631, the ''Government Spending Accountability Act of 2012''; H.R. 6016, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for administrative leave requirements with respect to Senior Executive Service employees, and for other purposes; H.R. 3912, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 110 Mastic Road in Mastic Beach, New York, as the ''Brigadier General Nathaniel Woodhull Post Office Building''; H.R. 4389, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 19 East Merced Street in Fowler, California, as the ''Cecil E. Bolt Post Office''; H.R. 5788, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the ''National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office''; H.R. 5867, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4605 Tutu Park Mall in St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands, as the ''Kenneth Leslie Hermon Post Office''; H.R. 2896, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the ''Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building''; H.R. 2338, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 600 Florida Avenue in Cocoa, Florida, as the ''Harry T. and Harriette Moore Post Office''; H.R. 1369, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1021 Pennsylvania Avenue in Hartshorne, Oklahoma, as the ''Warren Lindley Post Office''; and Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Third Semiannual Activities Report, June 2012. The following measures were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 459; H.R. 4155; H.R. 4631; H.R. 6061; and the Semiannual Activities Report; the following measures were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 3912; H.R. 4389; H.R. 5788; H.R. 5867; H.R. 2896; H.R. 2338; and H.R. 1369.

RELATING TO THE CONSIDERATION OF H. REPT. 112–546 AND AN ACCOMPANYING RESOLUTION; AND H. RES. 706, AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM TO INITIATE OR INTERVENE IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS TO ENFORCE CERTAIN SUBPOENAS

Committee on Rules: Full Committee granted, by a record vote, a rule providing that if H. Rept. 112–546 is called up by direction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, all points of order against the report shall be waived and it shall be considered as read. The resolution provides a closed rule for the resolution accompanying H. Rept. 112–546. The rule provides 50 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution accompanying the report. The rule provides that the resolution accompanying the report shall be considered as read. The rule further provides one motion to refer at the conclusion of debate if offered by Rep. Dingell of Michigan, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule provides one motion to recommit the resolution accompanying the report with or without instructions. The rule provides that the Chair may reduce the minimum time for electronic voting on the motion to recommit the resolution accompanying the report as though pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX.

The resolution further provides a closed rule for H. Res. 706. The rule provides 20 minutes of debate on H. Res. 706 equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution. The rule provides that the resolution shall be considered as read. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit H. Res. 706. Testimony was heard from Chairman Issa, Representative Cummings and Dingell.

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES IN SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE PROSPERITY: CHALLENGES AND EXPECTATIONS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Science Education held a hearing entitled ''The Role of Research Universities in Securing America's Future Prosperity: Challenges and Expectations''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CONTINUING OVERSIGHT OF THE NATION'S WEATHER SATELLITE PROGRAMS: AN UPDATE ON JPSS AND GOES–R

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight and Subcommittee on Energy and Environment held a joint hearing entitled ''Continuing Oversight of the Nation's Weather Satellite Programs: An Update on JPSS and GOES–R''. Testimony was heard from Kathryn Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Environmental Observation and Prediction and Deputy Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Marcus Watkins, Director, Joint Agency Satellite Division, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and David A. Powner, Director, Information Technology Management Issues, Government Accountability Office.

REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT COMPLIANCE: IS EPA FAILING SMALL BUSINESSES; AND MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a markup of Semiannual Report on the Activity of the Committee on Small Business; and Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Regulatory Flexibility Act Compliance: Is EPA Failing Small Businesses?''. The Report on the Activity of the Committee on Small Business was passed, without amendment. Testimony on Regulatory Flexibility Act Compliance was heard from public witnesses.

REVIEW OF VESSELS USED TO CARRY STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE DRAWDOWNS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled ''A Review of Vessels Used To Carry Strategic Petroleum Reserve Drawdowns''. Testimony was heard from John D. Porcari, Deputy Secretary, Department of Transportation; and a public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a markup of H.R. 3730, the ''Veterans Data Breach Timely Notification Act''; H.R. 4481, the ''Veterans Affairs Employee Accountability Act''; and H.R. 5948, the ''Veterans Fiduciary Reform Act of 2012''. The following measures were forwarded, as amended: H.R. 3730; H.R. 4481 and H.R. 5948.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a markup of H.R. 5735, to provide for the establishment of a Tomb of Remembrance at Arlington National Cemetery for interment of cremated fragments of the remains of members of the Armed Forces killed in Afghanistan, Iraq, or a subsequent conflict when the fragments are unidentifiable by use of DNA testing or other means because of the condition of the fragments, are unclaimed, or are identified and authorized by the person designated to direct disposition of the remains for internment in such memorial; H.R. 5880, the ''Veterans Disability Examination Access Improvement Act''; and H.R. 5881, the ''Access to Veterans Benefits Improvement Act''. The following measures were forwarded, as amended: H.R. 5735; and H.R. 5881. The following measure was forwarded, without amendment: H.R. 5880.

HOW WELFARE AND TAX BENEFITS CAN DISCOURAGE WORK; AND MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup of approval of the Report on the Legislative and Oversight Activities of the Committee on Ways and Means during the 112th Congress; and Subcommittee on Human Resources and Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, joint hearing entitled ''How Welfare and Tax Benefits Can Discourage Work''. Testimony was heard from Representative Moore (WI) and public witnesses. The Report on the Legislative and Oversight Activities of the Committee on Ways and Means was approved without amendment.

SECURING THE FUTURE OF THE DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing entitled ''Securing the Future of the Disability Insurance Program''. Testimony was heard from Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner, Social Security Administration; and public witnesses.

ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing on ongoing intelligence activities. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 2012

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the need for privacy protections, focusing on industry self-regulation, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine innovative non-federal programs for financing energy efficient building retrofits, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine The Law of the Sea Convention (Treaty Doc. 103–39), focusing on perspectives from business and industry, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Subcommittee on African Affairs, to hold hearings to examine economic statecraft, focusing on embracing Africa's market potential, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider 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. 1560, to amend the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act to allow the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo Tribe to determine blood quantum requirement for membership in that tribe, H.R. 1272, to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, et al, by the United States Court of Federal Claims in Docket Numbers 19 and 188, S. 134, to authorize the Mescalero Apache Tribe to lease adjudicated water rights, S. 1065, to settle land claims within the Fort Hall Reservation, S. 2389, to deem the submission of certain claims to an Indian Health Service contracting officer as timely, and S. 3193, to make technical corrections to the legal description of certain land to be held in trust for the Barona Band of Mission Indians, 2:15 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 285, for the relief of Sopuruchi Chukwueke, S. 1744, to provide funding for State courts to assess and improve the handling of proceedings relating to adult guardianship and conservatorship, to authorize the Attorney General to carry out a pilot program for the conduct of background checks on individuals to be appointed as guardians or conservators, and to promote the widespread adoption of information technology to better monitor, report, and audit conservatorships of protected persons, and the nominations of Terrence G. Berg, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, Jesus G. Bernal, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Lorna G. Schofield, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and Danny Chappelle Williams, Sr., of Oklahoma, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Oklahoma, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, continued markup of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2013, 9 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing entitled ''Promoting Safe Workplaces Through Voluntary Protection Programs'', 9:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing entitled ''The American Energy Initiative: A Focus on the New Proposal to Tighten National Standards for Fine Particulate Matter'', 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy, hearing entitled ''Fractional Reserve Banking and the Federal Reserve: The Economic Consequences of High-Powered Money'', 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity, hearing entitled ''Appraisal Oversight: The Regulatory Impact on Consumers and Businesses'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, hearing entitled ''Economic Espionage: A Foreign Intelligence Threat to American Jobs and Homeland Security'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing entitled ''Identity Theft and Income Tax Preparation Fraud'', 9:45 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Full Committee markup of H.R. 1860, the ''Digital Goods and Services Tax Fairness Act of 2011''; H.R. 823, for the relief of Maria Carmen; H.R. 316, for the relief of Esther Karinge; H.R. 794, for the relief of Allan Bolor Kelley; H.R. 357, for the relief of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic; H.R. 824, for the relief of Daniel Wachira; H.R. 1857, for the relief of Bartosz Kumor; H.R. 3120, the ''Student Visa Reform Act''; and the ''Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act''; and the Third Semiannual Activity Report of the Committee on the Judiciary for the 112th Congress, 12 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing on the following measures: H.R. 5987, the ''Manhattan Project National Historical Park Act''; H.R. 624, the ''First State National Historic Park Act''; H.R. 3640, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire not more than 18 acres of land and interests in land in Mariposa, California, and for other purposes; H.R. 4109, the ''Los Padres Conservation and Recreation Act of 2012''; H.R. 4334, the ''Organ Mountains National Monument Establishment Act''; H.R. 4484, the ''Y Mountain Access Enhancement Act''; H.R. 5319, the ''Nashua River Wild and Scenic River Study Act''; H.R. 5958, to name the Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge Visitor Contact Station of the Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge unit of Gateway National Recreation Area in honor of James L. Buckley; 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security, Homeland Defense and Foreign Operations hearing entitled ''Assessment of the Transition from a Military to a Civilian-Led Mission in Iraq'', 9:15 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee of TARP, Financial Services and Bailout of Public and Private Programs, hearing entitled ''The JOBS Act in Action Part II: Overseeing Effective Implementation of the JOBS Act at the SEC'', 9:30 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Technology, Information Policy, Intergovernmental Relations and Procurement Reform hearing entitled, ''Mandate Madness: When Sue and Settle Just Isn't Enough'', 9 a.m., 2203 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 5856, the ''Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013''; H.R. 6020 the ''Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2013''; and adoption of Rules Committee Activity Report for the 3rd Quarter of the 112 Congress, 2 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Strengthening the Scientific Backbone of the EPA: An Examination of Agency Practices and Foundations for Regulations Affecting the American Economy'', and adoption of the 3rd Semiannual Report of the Activities of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight and Subcommittee on Energy and Environment joint hearing entitled ''Continuing Oversight of the Nation's Weather Satellite Programs: An Update on JPSS and GOES–R'', 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce, hearing entitled ''Unlocking Opportunities: Recidivism versus Fair Competition in Federal Contracting'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''A Review of the Delays and Problems Associated with TSA's Transportation Worker Identification Credential'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, markup of H.R. 4115, the ''Helping Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans Return to Employment at Home Act''; H.R. 3524, the ''Disabled Veterans Employment Protection Act''; H.R. 4057, the ''Improving Transparency of Education Opportunities for Veterans Act of 2012''; H.R. 4740, the ''Fairness for Military Homeowners Act of 2012''; and H.R. 5747, the ''Military Family Home Protection Act'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 5949, the ''FISA Amendments Act Reauthorization Act of 2012''; and adoption of the Semiannual Committee Activity Report, 9 a.m. HVC–304 Capitol. A portion of this hearing will be closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: The Majority Leader will be recognized. Senate expects to resume consideration of S. 1940, Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, June 28

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of House Report 112–546 and an accompanying resolution (Subject to a Rule) and H. Res. 706—Authorizing the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas (Subject to a Rule). Resume consideration of H.R. 5972—Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Alexander, Rodney, La., E1147
Bass, Karen, Calif., E1155
Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E1148
Bonamici, Suzanne, Ore., E1156
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1148, E1158
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1149
Cantor, Eric, Va., E1147
Castor, Kathy, Fla., E1154
Clarke, Yvette D., N.Y., E1155
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E1150
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1157
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E1156
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1151
Critz, Mark S., Pa., E1152
Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E1154
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1162
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E1152
Gohmert, Louie, Tex., E1164
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1150
Hirono, Mazie K., Hawaii, E1156
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1160, E1163
Jordan, Jim, Ohio, E1153
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1158, E1159, E1160, E1161, E1161, E1162, E1162, E1163, E1163, E1163
Larsen, Rick, Wash., E1149
Lewis, John, Ga., E1157
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1155
Mica, John L., Fla., E1153, E1158
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1157, E1162
Moran, James P., Va., E1147, E1152
Owens, William L., N.Y., E1148
Paulsen, Erik, Minn., E1151
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1157
Reyes, Silvestre, Tex., E1149
Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E1152
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E1150
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E1148
Smith, Adam, Wash., E1154
Terry, Lee, Nebr., E1154
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E1159, E1161, E1163
Tierney, John F., Mass., E1157
Turner, Michael R., Ohio, E1161
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1147, E1158
Welch, Peter, Vt., E1153
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1160
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E1153

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.