United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2011 No. 64

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 11, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RENEE ELLMERS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, yesterday, I joined members of the Pennsylvania State legislature, gun owners, and the president of the NRA at the Pennsylvania State capital in support of our Second Amendment rights. I appreciate their deep belief in freedom and protecting the Second Amendment that guarantees our citizens the right to own and bear arms. Our Second Amendment is this country's original homeland security. Where this right is freely exercised without government infringement, our citizens live in freedom with a deterrent and defense to violent crimes.

Sadly, Second Amendment rights are under attack from within, most recently, the fast and furious scandal perpetrated by the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives that approved felonious gun sales, directing thousands of illegally purchased firearms to be smuggled into Mexico as part of a sting operation. These actions contributed to the death of a U.S. border agent and perpetuate the lie that U.S. gun dealers supply the bulk of guns to criminal elements in Mexico.

As elected Representatives, it is our duty to respect and defend the freedoms that our Constitution guarantees. Those in the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives that engineered this dangerous strategy that took a life and threatens our freedoms must be held accountable.

SUPPORT THE TROOPS BY BRINGING THEM HOME

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, the successful raid on Osama bin Laden's hideaway 10 days ago came with an important, and somewhat ironic, reminder. This mission was carried out in Pakistan where we are not at war and have no troop presence. Meanwhile, next door in Afghanistan, we continue to maintain an enormous military footprint of 100,000 or more troops. We're still there, even though Osama bin Laden hasn't been there since he escaped our grasp at Tora Bora nearly 10 years ago, and most of the al Qaeda leadership fled long ago.

The death of bin Laden clearly underscores the folly of our current policy. This is exactly the right moment to rethink our approach to Afghanistan and national security more generally, especially with the President's deadline for redeployment just 50 days from now in July.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, our military leaders don't seem to be rising to the moment. According to yesterday's Wall Street Journal, officers in Afghanistan have drawn up a plan that would withdraw 5,000 troops by July 1 and 5,000 more by the end of this year. Madam Speaker, that's not even close to an adequate response to the demands of the moment. It's not the bold move that was suggested when the July 1, 2011, drawdown date was first announced; 10,000 fewer troops by the end of the year doesn't even get us to pre-surge levels.

We owe it to the American people to do much, much more. They have sacrificed enough. What do we have to show for the 1,500-plus people we've lost and the nearly $7 billion a month we continue to throw at this mission? If anything, we have emboldened the terrorists instead of defeating them. If anything, we've undermined our national security interests instead of advancing them. If anything, we've weakened America instead of strengthening it.

Americans see that Osama bin Laden is dead; that the military occupation of Afghanistan isn't accomplishing its goals; that we have urgent priorities right here at home. And they are quite rightly asking: Why do we still have boots on the ground in Afghanistan? We also owe it to the men and women who wear those boots to end this war. Our troops have served with honor and valor in Afghanistan. A deeply flawed and morally objectionable policy is not their fault, but they are bearing the untold burden that will not be easily lifted.

Printed on recycled paper.

Earlier this week, USA Today reported on a new military study showing that troop morale is at an all-time low, thanks to the punishing emotional and psychological strain of multiple deployments and intense combat. The percentage of Army soldiers reporting acute stress has nearly tripled since the year 2005. Even if the war ended tomorrow, Madam Speaker, the anxiety and trauma plaguing so many of our troops won't go away anytime soon, if ever; but it's time to let the physical and mental health healing begin. It's time to stop sending our best and our bravest into this grinder.

We have asked enough of them. Madam Speaker, I can think of no better way to support our troops than to bring them home immediately.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the One Hundred Twelfth Congress:

The Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE).

The Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

The Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

GAS PRICES

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

Mr. HURT. Madam Speaker, all across Virginia's Fifth District, people are suffering from skyrocketing fuel prices. As I have heard from families and small businesses and farmers who are seeing a negative impact on their bottom lines, we need to take action now if we are going to address this serious problem of skyrocketing fuel prices.

Instead of supporting policies that will help bring down the cost of gas, the Obama administration continues to actively block and delay domestic energy production, causing more pain at the pump, increasing our dependence on foreign oil, and destroying jobs. We only have to look at our soaring energy costs to see the consequences of these failed policies. Gas prices have doubled under the President's watch and are now hovering around $4 per gallon in Virginia; and as these rising prices continue to directly affect all central and southside Virginians and threaten our economic recovery, I believe we should take action now to address this crisis.

Last week, the House passed a bill that would expand American energy production and create jobs by reopening the oil exploration in the Gulf of Mexico and off the coast of Virginia that has been delayed or canceled by the Obama administration. It is estimated that offshore energy development in Virginia, which has bipartisan support, could lead to the production of more than half a billion barrels of oil and 2.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and create nearly 2,000 jobs for our State. At a time like this, there is no reason to leave these resources untouched when it will help provide relief to all Americans.

This week, we are continuing our work to maximize American energy production by considering two bills that will end the White House's de facto moratorium on new American offshore energy production in a safe, responsible, and transparent manner. By reversing the administration's anti-energy policies and tapping into these resources to maximize our domestic energy supply, we will take a significant step towards lowering gas prices, reducing our dependence on foreign oil, and creating thousands of jobs for the Commonwealth and our Nation.

□ 1010

I urge support of H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1231 and hope that the Senate and the administration will join us in our efforts to move towards achieving true energy independence by approving all three energy bills the House of Representatives has considered thus far.

DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT OF NEW NUCLEAR REACTOR TECHNOLOGIES

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation I introduced to encourage the development of a vital component to the next generation of nuclear reactors that will provide clean, domestic energy solutions for all Americans.

The Department of Energy initiated the Nuclear Power 2010 Program in February 2002 as a joint public-private program to develop advanced reactor technologies and encourage the private sector to build new nuclear power plants in the United States. My legislation, the Nuclear Power 2021 Act, applies the Nuclear Power 2010 model to small modular reactors. Under the bill, the Department of Energy would be able to enter into public-private partnerships to design and license two small modular reactors by the year 2021.

As my colleagues may know, today's traditional larger reactors range from 1,000 to 1,700 megawatts and cost between $5 billion and $10 billion to construct. In contrast, small modular reactors generate 10 to 300 megawatts and cost about $750 million to construct. These small reactors offer several advantages to large reactors in certain situations, including shorter construction times, increased safety controls, and electricity generation. While large reactors are built on a future generation site, a process that can take up to 5 years, smaller reactors can be manufactured in modular pieces in factories and transported by rail or truck, cutting construction times in half. Small reactors can also be completely manufactured and fueled in a factory. They can be sealed and shipped to the site for power generation, and after use, they can be shipped back to the factory for defueling, minimizing the potential spread of nuclear material.

Additionally, small modular reactors produce a small nuclear reaction which generates less heat, making them easier to shut down in the event of a malfunction. Another advantage of small modular reactors is that, unlike large reactors, they can generate power in any location. While large reactors require millions of gallons of water per day for cooling and must be located near large water sources, small reactors can be water-cooled or air-cooled. This technology could open up new parts of the country to nuclear development, such as the arid West and locations that cannot support larger capacity generation, such as isolated rural areas or regions with smaller grids.

Unfortunately, development and deployment of new nuclear reactor technologies can currently take upwards of two decades. Time and resources are limited for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to develop the institutional capacity to license new reactor designs, and traditional public-private partnerships are often insufficient to mitigate the business risk of bringing small modular reactors to market. This is why I believe this legislation is crucial for developing this all-American technology that could help us lead the world in electricity innovation and generation. I encourage my colleagues to join me in making America more energy independent, creating good-paying American jobs, and working toward the future of clean energy generation by cosponsoring the Nuclear Power 2021 Act.

HARVESTING AMERICAN ENERGY RESOURCES

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I am glad to be able to take the floor after the Member from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) talking about energy because it's something that's on everybody's mind today. He is talking

about nuclear energy, and he concluded with the remarks, What can we do to find American-made energy solutions? What can we do to find American energy independence? What can we do to provide good-paying American jobs? Folks, those things are all intertwined. There is not a product that we produce in this country that does not have an energy component to it. We have to have that access to energy in order to have access to jobs. That's why I'm so proud that in the tail end of last week and the beginning of this week, that's what we're focused on here on the House floor. What can we do to find those domestic energy solutions?

There aren't going to be as many folks here, Madam Speaker, as I look around the gallery, who might have been alive in the 1970s. Madam Speaker, I think you and I were here then. We remember some of those gas lines. Would you believe that we bring less American oil to market today than we did in 1970? Would you believe it's almost half?

We have been blessed in this country with domestic energy resources the likes of which no other country on the planet can claim. And yet we seem to be doing everything that we can to keep those resources in the ground and, instead, send precious American dollars overseas, often to folks who don't like us and would like to see our demise.

Folks, energy independence isn't just a tag line. It's not just about $4 prices at the pump. It's about national security. It's about, what is our vision for the future of this country? Is it a vision of dependency upon our enemies overseas? Or is it a vision of independence where we're bringing American resources out of the ground with American workers, creating American capital?

It's not just, Drill, drill, drill. I'm a big believer in drill here, drill now. But that's not because we're not sensitive to what's happening in a changing energy environment across this planet. Would you believe, for example, that in this country, we use less energy per capita today, fewer Btus today, than we did just 5 years ago, than we did 10 years ago, than we did 20 years ago, than we did 30 years ago. To say that we need energy independence, to say that national security depends on getting our resources out of the ground is not to say that conservation isn't a part of the model as well. It is. We're doing it, we're doing it successfully, and we should continue to do it, but we have to get our resources out of the ground.

Would you believe that as a percentage of the energy that we use in this country, that petroleum is in decline? Each and every year, we use less oil per capita than we used the year before, but that doesn't mean that we don't still need to get American oil out of the ground. In fact, we are importing more oil today than we did just 10 years ago, than we did just 20 years ago. We have the resources here. We know of more oil that's in the ground in America today than we have ever known of before, and yet we choose to send our dollars overseas to import that energy instead.

There are three bills we're working on here, Madam Speaker, and you know them well. H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act. Can you believe, Madam Speaker, that in a time of record-high gas prices that we have the second-largest shallow water drilling operation in the country going out of business for lack of work? For lack of work. Oil prices are headed back towards historic highs, and American drillers are going out of business for lack of work. And it's not just the company, Madam Speaker; it is each and every one of the American men and women who work on those drill rigs who are out of work because we can't get permits issued out of Washington, D.C. Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act.

H.R. 1231, Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act. We have these resources. We have this national security need. We have men and women who want to go to work to solve that need, and we won't let the permits out of Washington, D.C. Washington, D.C. has not been the solution here. Washington, D.C. has been the problem.

Folks, if what you want to say is, We're going to pass a bill on this floor that's going to ban automobiles, and we just won't use any more gasoline, fair enough. If what you want to say is, We're going to pass a bill on this floor that's going to ban plastic and say, we're just not going to produce any more, fair enough. If you are going to pass a bill that says, We're not going to produce any more fertilizer in this country, who needs it, fair enough. But until you do—and I would vote ''no'' on each one of those proposals—but until you do, we need American oil, and we need to get it out of the ground, and we need to get it out of the ground now.

Madam Speaker, I am tremendously grateful for the leadership you have shown in bringing these bills to the floor, and I thank you for the time.

RESILIENCE OF THE CITY OF MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I represent the Tennessee Ninth Congressional District, which is Memphis. Memphis has been in the news quite a bit these past few weeks, and partly it's been for a bad reason: a flood, the greatest flood since 1937 on the Mississippi River. There has been a massive flow of water across lands and into our downtown and other areas, and it's affected a lot of people. I have toured the damage. There are at least 1,500 people whose homes have been lost. They are in shelters. They have lost possessions.

□ 1020

But the city of Memphis is coming together with a lot of volunteerism to help those people, and the Federal Government, through FEMA and the Corps of Engineers, is doing all it can to protect property and protect people and offer them shelter and food. And because it's a disaster area, we'll be helping them get back on their feet once again. It's a tragedy for those people and a tragedy for a lot of other people up and down the river.

But the fact is the city of Memphis is open and open for business, and most of the city of Memphis is not affected by the flood. Contrary to what you might see on the news, the entire city is not underwater. The business sections, most of the city, are totally dry, and people are going to work, flying Federal Express planes all over the world to deliver packages. International Paper and all the businesses that are there are fully operational.

Our Memphis Grizzlies are still alive and playing tonight in the NBA Western finals, and the people of Memphis are filling the FedEx Forum when they play and cheering them on and bringing the city together in the spirit that Memphians have come together for years.

The city of Memphis has had problems over the years. A yellow fever epidemic in the 1870s almost destroyed the city, but it didn't. The city came back and came back even stronger.

The assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King on the 4th of April, 1968, was an awful moment in our city history and one we had to overcome. But the city did. And on that site, the Lorraine Motel, has been built a great civil rights museum, the National Civil Rights Museum, like a phoenix from the ashes telling the story of the civil rights movement and the movement out of slavery and out of Jim Crow into an era where an African American could and has been elected President of these United States.

The city of Memphis and the people have an indomitable spirit. They have come back from problems in the past and will continue to do so.

Yesterday, the city of Memphis received great news when President Obama announced that of all the schools that applied in this Nation in the Race to the Top program to be recognized and to be honored by his presence as the commencement speaker for graduation, that Booker T. Washington High School, a high school created in the 1800s, a Jim Crow school, an African American school in the 1800s, which has done spectacularly well in academics, increased their graduation rate from the fifties into the 81st percentile, best in the State on algebra scores and other scores, and great improvement and shown innovation, was chosen as the school in the country to have the President come to their graduation. He will speak at the Booker T. Washington High School graduation next Monday in Memphis. It will be his

first visit to Memphis, and the city of Memphis has looked forward to his visit. I look forward to his visit, and have encouraged the President to come to Memphis, and I hope he'll come more times after that.

But for those students and other students who need to have inspiration and hope, particularly at this time when there is flood and many people have been dispossessed, it's so important that the President be there and give those students hope and encourage them to continue to make good grades and to lift themselves up.

Many of the students at Booker T. Washington lived in housing projects, Cleaborn Homes, which was recently demolished to make way for a HOPE VI project, the fifth of six in the city of Memphis, which has gotten rid of projects but given people private residences or apartments and a better way of life. Those students saw their homes destroyed, but they've worked hard in their school and stayed at Booker T. Washington High School and will be honored by the President's visit.

They, like everybody else in Memphis, cheer for the Memphis Grizzlies, and the Grizzlies cheer towel is one that I bring you today. ''Believe Memphis.'' Believe Memphis has carried the Grizzlies, an eighth-seeded team, to the championship game. The city believes. The city is strong. We urge you to come to Memphis, have some ribs, have some music and enjoy our hospitality.

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1951 U.N. REFUGEE CONVENTION

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

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 60th anniversary of the 1951 Convention related to the Status of Refugees. The Convention was historic in spelling out a set of basic human rights that should be afforded a refugee. It was initially directed toward European refugees in the aftermath of World War II, but was expanded in 1967 to include refugees from all around the world. The U.N. Convention defines who a refugee is, and outlines assistance that refugees should receive. It stipulates that refugees should not be returned to a country where they fear persecution.

My district in the San Gabriel Valley of California is home to a large and diverse refugee population who fled persecution from countries such as Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. In Los Angeles County they come from places as far as Iran to El Salvador.

Since arriving on our shores, many of the refugees have established themselves as civic leaders, small business owners and hardworking Americans. Some are working with resettlement agencies to help new refugee populations integrate, settle their families, and restart their lives.

The open arms with which our Nation welcomes refugees from around the world reaffirms America's commitment to human rights. And on this 60th anniversary, I look forward to continuing the U.S. commitment to human rights through strengthening of our refugee resettlement program.

RAPE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE U.S. MILITARY

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak again about rape and sexual assault in the military. But first I want to recognize the role our military played in bringing Osama bin Laden to justice. Taking down the world's most notorious man, someone responsible for the deaths of thousands of innocent Americans, is a tremendous accomplishment. Our Nation is so proud of the service of our members of the military.

The news about killing Osama bin Laden is another reminder that military service is one of our Nation's highest callings. This is precisely why we cannot, as a country, allow a few bad actors to besmirch the honor of the Armed Forces. And we certainly cannot condone a system that is designed to protect the perpetrators and punish the survivors.

Just as the military sought justice for the victims of September 11, we must continue to seek justice for those who have served their country, only to be raped or sexually assaulted by one of their own.

As a reminder, the numbers are staggering. The Department of Defense has said that over 19,000 members of the military were raped or sexually assaulted in 2010. Those are the Department of Defense numbers. And only 13 percent of them actually report the assaults.

I made a pledge to share the victims' stories every week until Congress and this administration does something more than offer lip service. I recently set up an email account so survivors could share their stories with me. The address is StopMilitaryRape@mail.house.gov.

Today I want to share one of those emails. A servicewoman wrote:

I endured over a year of harassment while stationed at Point Loma, California. My class leader was a fleet returnee that referred to women by a number of derogatory names. He and two other men in the class would grope women. They would then publicly grope each other to prove that they were equal opportunity harassers.

The class leader also would accuse women of being ''on the rag,'' or he would ask us if our vagina hurt. What would happen if one of your colleagues asked you if your vagina hurt? And yet this is largely permitted in uniform. It is permitted with a culture of fear that would rival the prison experience or the tyranny of gang infested neighborhoods.

I reported the behavior and the class leader was relieved of his duties. He was already on a suspended bust for sexual harassment that he committed while on recruiting duty in his hometown. I then was ostracized for reporting bad behavior. This class leader told all the male students at this training center to make sure that whoever went to sea with me should make me pay.

Another petty officer deployed on a mission a month ahead of me. He told the ship that I was a feminist and a lesbian that got someone that was on a suspended bust into more trouble.

While stationed aboard that ship, I was groped and harassed by my work center supervisor. When we went to sea, he would send everyone back to their barracks by saying that he and I would finish cleaning up. Then he would rape me.

The ship sailed for the Caribbean. We sailed through hurricanes and tropical storms off the coast of Florida. I was put on consecutive watches with this guy and he raped me most of the time we were on watch together. I did get some reprieve because in high seas he would get seasick. Once he got sick all over me while he was raping me.

□ 1030

I tried to report this rape and harassment to my chain of command. My senior chief took me out to the fan tail of the ship and told me that the chain of command knew that I was a feminist and a Democrat; and, if I said anything more about this, I would just be proving that I wanted to get the rapist in trouble.

I attempted suicide, but backed out at the last minute. It still makes no sense.

Well, it doesn't make sense. I have received countless emails like this and will continue to share them in the weeks ahead. Again, I invite survivors to tell their stories by writing to StopMilitaryRape@mail.house.gov.

During a time of such tremendous pride for our military, we should commit ourselves to removing the stain of rape and sexual assault from this great institution once and for all.

INSTITUTE FOR INCLUSION IN THE LEGAL PROFESSION

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession.

Lawyers serve an important role in our society, and yet the legal profession, like many others, is in need of serious improvement in the diversity of its membership. There are a number of individuals and organizations who are working to change that fact, and, thanks to their efforts, there has been progress. Yet the legal profession, which above all should stand for fairness and equality, is still a long way

from being open and welcoming to all irrespective of individual characteristics and background.

The Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession, a new group with a promising approach to diversity and inclusion in the legal profession, was established in Chicago, Illinois, in September 2009.

The Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession is addressing the contrast between the increasingly diverse society in which we live and what certainly appears to be an entrenched lack of diversity and inclusion. The Institute is working to improve diversity and promote inclusion through comprehensive outreach and innovative programs.

For example, the Institute asks hard questions and finds the answers to them. Working with legal, judicial, professional, educational, and governmental institutions, the Institute provides programs and tools to promote equity in the legal field. IILP uses a new and, in many ways, unique approach. Its comprehensive programs include lawyers, judges, and law students to address all facets, all practice settings, and all types of diversity within the legal profession. Beyond working to overcome the barriers facing diverse lawyers, it looks at the pipeline for new legal talent. This aspect is key. By helping diverse students become law students, enter the legal profession, and eventually become successful lawyers and judges, the profession will become more diverse and inclusive.

A few examples of the work of the Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession include a pledge to the profession where lawyers across the country are being asked to dedicate a minimum of 1 day of service to work with young people to educate them about the legal profession and encourage them to join it; Professionalism in Practice, a program where law students and judges learn from each other about the profession and, in doing so, about diversity and inclusion; the ''Business Case for Diversity: Reality or Wishful Thinking?'' a research project that provides the first hard data examining the impact of the business case for diversity and the state of diversity; and, ''The State of Diversity and Inclusion in the Legal Profession,'' which is an annual report and series of symposia designed to educate the bar about its current state, cutting-edge issues surrounding diversity and inclusion and the most promising programs, efforts, and initiatives aimed at making entry into and success within the legal profession more accessible to all.

The mission and work of the IILP is an important contribution to social justice in the United States. I consider it an honor to recognize the Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession and invite all Members to join me in recognizing them for the importance of their mission and the great work they are undertaking.

H.R. 71

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. We have had a very challenging week, Madam Speaker, and I thank you for the time.

It is a time of great patriotism and great respect for the institutions of democracy that this country represents. It is a statement that says that we will not be an offender, but we will be a defender. We will defend our values; we will defend our soil; we will defend the people of the United States.

I have served on the Homeland Security Committee as the dust was rising from the site of 9/11. When I traveled to New York, I walked along sidewalks where there were walls of letters and pictures of loved ones who had not been designated as being lost and people were trying to see if loved ones were in hospitals. I saw the pain. And so the capturing and the demise of Osama bin Laden is the finishing of an era and a story. And we are to commend the President of the United States, the Navy SEALs, the JSOC and intelligence communities, and the United States military and persons around this Nation who are part of this great effort.

Well, we live in a different world now. As the facts are unfolding in Pakistan, as evidence has been reviewed by the various tapes, we know that terrorism and al Qaeda is an active entity around the world. The United States is not the only target, but we are and will continue to be in the eye of the storm.

As we have heard representations from terrorists and to-be leaders and wanna-bes about what they intend to do to retaliate, it is important for us to be responsible with the resources that we have. And so for over a year I have introduced H.R. 71, the FAMS Augmentation bill, the Federal Air Marshal. And I call on, today, for the administration and the Congress to work together to increase the number of air marshals on domestic flights, on long-distance flights, and to increase the numbers of air marshals traveling on inbound flights to the United States. What more do we need?

Over the last couple of days, any series of incidents that have occurred, and thanks to the brave passengers now well aware since 9/11 and flight attendants for whom I have fought consistently to get more training, unarmed, obviously, and many without training, are now being confronted with individuals who are charging now reinforced pilot doors, some going to the exit doors, over the last 4 days a series of incidents that no one knows whether or not they will stop.

Now, we know that some allegations have been that individuals are suffering from mental challenges, and we understand that. We also know that, to date, no one had a weapon, and so the Transportation Security Administration is doing its job. But this is happening. That is what air marshals are for: to protect the traveling public, flying more than they have ever flown, paying higher prices for bags and food, and now we expect them not to be safe and secure. It is time now to augment and to pass H.R. 71 and to increase the number of air marshals.

Now, we have an issue of a deficit and a debt. My question is, as someone would say: Are we going to be penny-wise and pound-foolish? Are we going to not safeguard the American people because there happens to be the mantra on this side of the aisle, Republicans, who don't want to spend a dime for anything? Well, my friends, we have to invest in the American public. We have got to be able to build infrastructure, and at the same time we have got to be responsible spenders.

But I will tell you this. I will take spending for national security any day with bringing home the troops from Afghanistan, because that mission is complete. Now we must invest in American people. And I'm angry about this, that we would be so cheap that we would not provide the resources to give us new and additional trained Federal air marshals, many of whom come from the United States military. Many of these soldiers coming home would make excellent air marshals.

□ 1040

Many of them come from the U.S. Marshals Service and many other marshals services.

What is more precious than the mother and father and children and relatives that are traveling to visit loved ones or for business, and they are coming home to the United States and we are putting them in jeopardy because we do not have the air marshals to protect them against these unknown threats?

So my challenge today is stop being cheap, stop nickel-and-diming security, stop not understanding that we have the responsibility to go ahead and secure the American public. Today I call for more air marshals on the Nation's airplanes, and I call for it now. H.R. 71 should be passed immediately.

PUERTO RICO'S COMEBACK STORY

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

Mr. PIERLUISI. Madam Speaker, the United States stands at a crossroads. Responsible leaders recognize that a bipartisan fiscal strategy must be crafted to reduce deficits. A deal will require courage on the part of its proponents, because each revenue raiser and spending cut is bound to trigger opposition.

Unless officials can persuade voters that sacrifice and self-restraint now are essential for stability and strength later, a deal will not happen. Even with public buy-in, leaders must be ready to

take action, despite the political perils, and be prepared to raise the national interest above their personal interests and reelection. It will not be easy, but it must be done.

For officials in Washington who are in search of a comeback story, I suggest the case of Puerto Rico. In January 2009, the U.S. territory stood on the brink of disaster. The new government had inherited a deficit of $3.3 billion. As a percentage of revenue, this was the largest deficit of any U.S. administration. The new administration was even forced to take a loan to meet its first payroll. Major rating agencies had downgraded Puerto Rico's credit to near junk status. Simply put, the island's economy was about to implode.

Leaders in San Juan faced a stark choice. Like their predecessors, they could usher Puerto Rico down this unsustainable path, paralyzed by the fear that tough choices would antagonize voters; or they could place their responsibility to protect Puerto Rico's future above their desire to preserve their poll numbers.

Fortunately for Puerto Rico, the new leadership chose the right course. For 2-plus years, Governor Luis Fortuno and the island's legislature have taken decisive action to impose fiscal discipline and create a leaner, more responsible government. They have cut government spending by nearly 20 percent, sharply reducing the deficit as a percentage of revenue. Indeed, by this metric, the island has moved from last in the Nation to a fiscal position that is better than 30 States. The rating agencies have rewarded Puerto Rico's progress, with Moody's giving the island its highest rating in 35 years.

To achieve savings, the government cut expenses and political appointments and was compelled to reduce its payroll. In my experience, rational leaders do not lay off workers because they think this will play to their political advantage. To the contrary, few actions are likely to arouse greater public displeasure. After all, work does more than put bread on the family table. It gives men and women dignity and a sense of purpose. But the Government of Puerto Rico's actions were absolutely necessary and were taken despite serious political risks.

Measures were taken to cushion the blow for those workers who were let go, and layoffs did not include teachers or first responders. More importantly, the government factions prevented an economic disaster, which would have resulted in far greater suffering and job loss.

It is important to emphasize that these decisions were not partisan. Governor Fortuno is a Republican and I, as Puerto Rico's only Representative in Congress, am a proud Democrat, and I supported his policies. The island legislators who voted to advance this agenda are affiliated with both national parties. And unlike in some States, Puerto Rico's leaders did not politicize ARRA or other Federal funding which served as a lifeline for the island. Rather, they have worked to put every dollar to good use.

So for leaders in Washington who say it will be impossible to achieve bipartisanship in the budget debate, the case of Puerto Rico should provide a measure of hope. As it nurses the economy back to health, the Puerto Rico Government is also advancing a long-term, pro-growth strategy. For example, the government has reduced individual and corporate tax rates and ensured that everyone contributes their fair share; boosted sales of housing and commercial properties through other incentives; and worked to address Puerto Rico's high energy costs and dependence on foreign oil, including through the development of a natural gas pipeline that will create thousands of jobs, lower carbon emissions and significantly reduce energy bills for individuals and companies on the island.

In closing, Puerto Rico's leadership has proven that it is possible to work across party lines to control spending and create growth. I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to work in this same spirit and to set aside partisan differences to secure the long-term fiscal health of the country we love.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Wallace Shepherd, Second Baptist Church, Santa Barbara, California, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we bless You, Lord, in this season, while our homeland faces difficult decisions and conflicts across many nations.

We bow before You this day, requesting Your mercy and Your grace. Grant this Congress Your guidance as they work collectively as one. We pray, dear Lord, as resolutions are prepared, that there will be a united commitment to the development of comprehensive laws.

Lead this Congress and Nation in the direction of tranquility that reflects the intent of our forefathers. Endow us as a Nation to be humble, as we transcend the norm, without forgetting those that are in need. Anchor our hearts with prudence, as we consider the development of our youth. Protect our troops, as they fight for democracy and freedom throughout the world. Steer us on the path of righteousness with temperance. Bless our government, and bless this Nation.

In Jesus Christ's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. ELLMERS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND WALLACE SHEPHERD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a valued constituent and a good friend, Dr. Wallace Shepherd.

Dr. Shepherd came to the Second Baptist Church of Santa Barbara as pastor in 2006. Since then, Pastor Shepherd has reestablished Santa Barbara's Martin Luther King Day event as a capstone celebration on the central coast of California.

He is an active board member of the Endowment for Youth program, which supports the education of underprivileged children through tutoring and scholarships. Dr. Shepherd also helped to found Eco Faith, a nonprofit organization that promotes conservation of energy in churches and houses of worship.

He has been appointed evangelism director of the Central District of California, and also the vice president of the Third Sunday Fellowship for Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties. But as our House has just witnessed, he is at the core a powerful presence and a humble servant in the name of his faith.

I am honored to welcome him here to Congress, and thank him for his invaluable service to our community and to our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

H.R. 1425

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

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1425, the Creating Jobs Through Small Business Innovation Act. This bipartisan bill is being marked up today in the House Small Business Committee.

Our bill reauthorizes the SBIR and STTR programs, which have a proven track record of creating jobs, stimulating small business growth, and helping startups succeed by providing the impetus to start projects that otherwise would not have gotten off the ground. But, most importantly, our bill does not cost anything. This program simply requires that the Federal agencies slice out a portion of their overall budget for small firms to compete for research and development for new innovative ideas.

The SBIR program is set to expire on May 31. As chairwoman of the House Small Business Committee on Health and Technology, I believe it is vital that we expedite reauthorization of the SBIR program so that small businesses can continue to compete for the contracts that will springboard ideas, create jobs, and spur economic growth.

GAS PRICES

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 20 weeks this Chamber has been discussing ways to reduce our Nation's deficit, debating the merits of cutting one program or another, most times including important initiatives like job training funds, education, and health-related services.

The fact of the matter is that we have to cut spending. The issue is not whether to reduce the deficit, but how we do it.

If we really want to get serious about the deficit, we would stop handing out billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies to big oil companies which price gouge at the pumps.

Oil company profits are at a record high, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are using high gas prices as an excuse to keep giving them billions in taxpayer handouts. Taxpayer-funded giveaways for big oil add to the deficit. My constituents gain nothing at the pumps, nor do Americans all across this country. Instead, we should be focusing on measures that would actually bring down the price of gas at the pump.

It is time to bring to the House floor measures which would release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and legislation aimed at preventing big oil from engaging in price gouging schemes which drive up the price of oil. These measures could provide immediate relief to our constituents from the rising price of gasoline that truly threatens our economic recovery and the well-being of hardworking middle class families.

JOBS

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, we've been here for about 5 months so far. It's easing up on June. It won't be long until it's summertime. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has not brought a single bill to create a single job.

I was very pleased to hear the gentlewoman from North Carolina say that they are marking up a bill on jobs. It would be the first one, if it ever gets here. That's a shame, because I think when people voted last November, they were thinking, hey, we've got to do something about some jobs. And yet the Republican majority has dallied away and done everything but work on jobs.

Yeah, they've tried to take away the Affordable Care Act and take away health care from people who really need it. Yeah, they've tried to do a whole lot of things, push a social agenda. They've done all these things, but they have yet to focus on the one thing that Americans need most, which is a job.

If you want to reduce the deficit, you've got to have people making some money, and that means getting some jobs. People pay taxes. People would love to pay taxes, but they would do it if they had work. But they don't have work because our Republican majority has got other things to do.

Remember, jobs are the key. I am looking forward to Republicans bringing a bill to the floor.

MEDICARE/GAS PRICES RELIEF

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 this body voted to create Medicare and Medicaid to ensure that all seniors and disabled Americans would always have access to health coverage, and those today expect the same kind of coverage for themselves and their children.

But over the years, my Republican colleagues have tried to weaken the programs and privatize safety nets like Social Security. Sadly, history is repeating itself. Instead of focusing on priorities, like creating jobs and lowering gas prices, Republicans have put forward an agenda that ends Medicare as we know it.

So far this year, Republicans have voted—and we can't say they haven't. They have voted to eliminate guaranteed Medicare coverage for seniors, convert Medicare to a voucher program, reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole, and extend tax breaks for big oil companies that ship jobs overseas. Even worse, new data shows the Republican budget will kick 44 million low-income Americans off Medicaid.

We must stop this insanity. Let's work together to preserve Medicare and lower the deficit.

□ 1210

STICKING IT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, it's happened. Gas is over four bucks a gallon. It's killing our economic recovery, American families and small businesses.

Now, Goldman Sachs, not exactly a friend of the consumer, says that 60 to 85 cents per gallon is purely useless, speculative activity. And what are the Republicans running the House of Representatives going to do about that? Nothing. They're going to pretend that future possible leasing off Virginia 10 years from now will do something about today's prices. It won't.

But why are they like, bait-and-switch? Why are they passing these phony bills and not taking on the price gouging and the speculation? Because that would mean taking on Big Oil and Wall Street. And, guess what? They're always looking forward to the next campaign, and Big Oil and Wall Street have been so generous to the new majority that they don't want to upset them. So they want to pretend they stand with their constituents and consumers, but they're really standing behind Big Oil and Wall Street.

Congratulations, guys. You just stuck it to the American people and the economy.

SUPPORTING MENTAL HEALTH MONTH

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, May is Mental Health Month, and as the cochair of the Mental Health Caucus, I bring to you information, especially on the military.

Since 2001 to current date, we have had 2,103 military service personnel die by suicide, suicide, my friends, in the Iraq and Afghan wars. In the Afghan war alone, it is over 1,000, more than some of the figures we have listened to recently.

One in five servicemembers suffer from major depression, posttraumatic syndrome, or traumatic brain injury, TBI. It affects the military and their families, their children. There's lots of divorce because of this and substance abuse that continues as they age.

We must expand mental health services to our military personnel and their families. Through their blood and their service they have earned it. We owe it to them. We've made some strides, but

we've got a long way to go, Mr. Speaker. We need to reduce the stigma, accept it as the illness that it is, and expand mental health services.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the military members and their families during May, Mental Health Month.

RECOGNIZING CHARLES P. WEST ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure today of recognizing a very special Delawarean who recently celebrated his 90th birthday.

Charles P. West is one of a kind who served our State and Nation with distinction as a soldier, legislator, businessman, and advocate for the values that are important to his community of Gumboro. Charlie was first elected to the Delaware House of Representatives in 1956, serving one 2-year term. He returned to the statehouse in 1978 and served for 24 years before retiring in 2002.

Charlie took great pride in helping his constituents. As he used to tell me all the time, he fought for the little guy. He was a fierce advocate for those who were the backbone of his district: chicken and grain farmers, small business owners, and sportsmen.

Charlie and his wife of 63 years, Eleanor Lee, are good friends of mine, and they have helped me better understand what is important to our State. It is my pleasure today to wish Charles P. West a happy 90th birthday and wish him and his family many more years together.

GIVING MORE ACCESS TO AMERICAN OIL

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, the pain at the pump is real. In this, the most difficult economy in the last 25 years, my constituents have gas prices on their mind, and with due cause: $4.18 a gallon average back in the Hoosier State, higher than the national average, gas prices have climbed more than $1 over the last year. And, frankly, with the summer travel season upon us and with the rising treacherous waters in the Mississippi threatening our refinery capability, we could see $5 a gallon gasoline in the near future.

It is time to give the American people more access to American oil. Starting last week and this week, this majority in Congress will continue to move legislation that opens up our own domestic energy reserves in the Gulf of Mexico and offshore to the American people. The answer to the pain at the pump is energy independence. Part of that answer is by giving the American people more access to our own domestic reserves.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting measures on the floor this week and last week and lead us toward that lodestar of energy independence and relieve the pain at the pump once and for all.

SUPPORT THE MAKE IT IN AMERICA AGENDA

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, families and small businesses have been hurting for too long. While the world is changing, Washington has made things worse by ignoring American manufacturing and stifling American ingenuity. But here is what hasn't changed. Americans are still the most creative and most productive people in the world. We're still great at making things. And that's why I support the Make It In America agenda, because American manufacturing can and should be the central driver of our economy.

The St. Louis region I represent has a strong base in manufacturing, and now we need to tap into that strength to bring high-quality, high-paying jobs back home. That's why my office is helping St. Louis-based heating and air conditioning manufacturer Unico after being unfairly targeted by regulators. With a level playing field, companies like Unico can compete anywhere in the world, and if we invest in education, innovation, infrastructure, and manufacturing, we can restore making things to a central place in our economy.

I ask my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, to stand with me to make these job-creating investments so we can Make It In America again.

START GOVERNING AND STOP CAMPAIGNING

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I came down here to do a public service announcement. On behalf of all Americans, I want the Republican majority to know that the elections are over. You've won the majority for now, so now start governing and stop campaigning. If you can't handle the responsibility of governing, get out of the way and let's move towards progress.

This week we're considering two bills that Republicans claim would bring down the price of gas immediately. Let's just pretend that is a fact, that that is true, although we know it is not.

If it's true, then why would you bring a bill to the floor that expedites drilling permits, which I could agree with, but you add in a provision to strip the American people's right to challenge drilling permits that are not environmentally sound?

Let's look at the next bill, Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act. That isn't the name of a bill. That's the name of a campaign speech. That's the name of political rhetoric.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is now time to have the responsibility of governing and take it seriously so that the American people are not paying $5 a gallon for gas.

Mr. Speaker, I would just ask that you remind the Republicans that the campaign is over and it is time to govern.

This public service announcement is brought to you by Americans For a Functional Congress.

CONGRATULATING THE TEXAS A&M WOMEN'S EQUESTRIAN TEAM'S WESTERN SQUAD ON WINNING THEIR THIRD STRAIGHT NATIONAL TITLE

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the second athletics team from Texas A&M University to win a national championship in the past month. The Texas A&M Women's Equestrian Western Squad recently took home their third straight national title with a 5–3 victory over Kansas State in the finals of the Varsity Equestrian National Championship in Waco, Texas. Including the overall national title in 2002, the A&M Equestrian Team has won nine national championships since it was formed in 1999.

These lady Aggies, who hail from various parts of Texas and numerous States around the country, glided through a near perfect season and had their eyes set on another national trophy to add to an already filled trophy case. This team is a shining example of how hard work and perseverance pays off.

I would also like to applaud Coach Tana McKay and her staff for an outstanding job in guiding the Aggie Women's Equestrian Team throughout their success. Congratulations, Aggies, on a job well done, and gig' em.

□ 1220

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

(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. Mr. Speaker, we've been waiting for 17 weeks for the Republican majority to bring to the floor a jobs bill. I voted against the recess 2 weeks ago because I believe we ought to stay here until we get our job done, which is to create jobs for the American people. What's the majority doing? Last week, they tried restricting a woman's right to choose. Then they attacked health insurance protections. This week, they're

trying to repeal commonsense protections that prevent oil spills. Jobs? Nowhere to be found.

Last week, Democratic Whip STENY HOYER unveiled Make it in America. My Build America Bonds legislation is part of that agenda. In the last 2 years, every dollar invested in Build America Bonds leveraged $41 in private sector funds, or $181 billion to construct and repair schools and build bridges and roads in every State in America. These infrastructure improvements created hundreds of thousands of jobs. That's what we need to focus on—not an ideological agenda.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1540, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until 5 p.m. on Tuesday to file its report to accompany H.R. 1540.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1231, REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 257 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 257

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. House Resolution 257 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 1231. The rule makes in order eight amendments, all of which comply with the rules of the House. Of the eight, seven are Democratic amendments.

Mr. Speaker, today we are debating H.R. 1231, the Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act. This legislation, which will have profound impacts on our domestic energy supply, our national security, and our economy, is ripe for consideration by this body. It is no secret that Americans are feeling the pain at the pump. In my congressional district in western New York, my constituents, my family, my wife and I are routinely forced to pay in excess of $4 per gallon for gasoline for automobiles. We need to develop policies that will lessen our dependence on foreign fossil fuels, create stability in the financial markets, and provide relief to our constituents. In addition, this piece of legislation will create American jobs.

We must get our financial and energy priorities in order. We can no longer be held victim to instability in the Middle East and across the world. The United States must develop our own energy solutions which will reduce our dependence on foreign fossil fuels.

Most importantly, this will create American jobs. H.R. 1231 is one more example of our conference's commitment to developing domestic natural oil and gas resources. It adopts a philosophy that we need to drill smart, drill where the resources are, and produce our own energy.

Drilling for oil and natural gas can be done safely and responsibly. There have been millions of wells drilled in the United States. There is a strong record of sound environmental practices. Total petroleum industry spillage has decreased consistently over the last 40 years.

H.R. 1231 does two things. First, the legislation requires that in developing a 5-year offshore leasing plan for drilling the Outer Continental Shelf, that each 5-year plan must include leases for sale in the areas containing the greatest known oil and natural gas reserves. For the 2012–2017 plan being written by the Obama administration, this would mean targeted lease sales only in those areas estimated to contain 2.5 billion barrels of oil or 7.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. At least 50 percent of those areas must be made available for leasing in the 2012–2017 plan.

Second, this legislation requires the implementation of production goals during the 5-year plan being written by the Obama administration. For this period, the goal would be 3 million barrels of oil per day and 10 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day from American domestic sources of energy. This increase in oil production equates to a tripling of current American offshore production and will reduce significantly foreign imports by nearly one-third. Most importantly, this will create American jobs and protect our national security interests.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and very strong opposition to the underlying legislation.

Here we go again. Another week. Another day. Another bill that helps record profit-making Big Oil but does absolutely nothing to help American families paying $4 at the pump for gasoline. Although Republicans continue to frame these efforts as a cure for rising gas prices and a way to decrease our dependence on foreign oil, the truth is that oil prices are set on a world market. It's simply not possible for us to drill our way out of these problems.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee I offered an amendment as a stand-alone bill, again, that would eliminate subsidies for Big Oil. While I do not agree with H.R. 1231, my amendment would have done nothing to prevent this bill from moving forward. Instead, my amendment would have allowed for a separate bill to come up under this rule that would end subsidies for big oil corporations that are making money hand over fist while gouging Americans at the pump.

Let me remind my Republican colleagues of the facts. Two weeks ago, ExxonMobil announced that in the first 3 months of this year it had made nearly $10.7 billion in profits. That's $10.7 billion. Billion with a B. There's nothing wrong with corporations making

profits. That's what they're in business to do. What is wrong is for American taxpayers to be subsidizing wildly profitable companies at a time when too many Americans are still unemployed and struggling to pay their bills. With their tax dollars funding corporate welfare for Big Oil and then still paying astronomical prices at the pump, it's a double whammy for American families. With all the talk of cutting spending and reducing subsidies here in Washington, I would have thought that the Rules Committee would have made my amendment in order.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues that energy companies are sitting on thousands of drilling leases in the Gulf of Mexico, and they're not producing anything. And despite the misleading title of this legislation, no drilling moratorium currently exists. Since October 2010, when the drilling moratorium was lifted, 39 shallow water and 10 deepwater permits have been granted, roughly the same average rate even before the BP oil spill.

Mr. Speaker, while H.R. 1231 may make for a good sound bite, this is not a serious solution to bringing down high gas prices. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and to oppose H.R. 1231.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking my friend, the newest member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Corning, New York, for a superb job in the way he has comported himself in the management of this rule and for his great service on the Rules Committee. He has literally hit the ground running, and this is the third bill that he's managed, the second rule, on the House floor, and I congratulate him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the comments of my friend from Worcester, and I will say that this measure that's before us is about several things. Number one, job creation and economic growth is something that Democrats and Republicans alike say that they are concerned about; and that happens to be, continues to be, our priority.

Creating jobs for the American people who are hurting right now is what this bill is all about and, at the same time, the notion of trying to free ourselves or at least diminish the kind of dependence that we have on foreign oil. I don't personally believe that we ever in this global economy should be completely free of the flow of energy and other sources, but I do believe that we can take steps that will diminish the level of dependence that we have on sources of energy outside of our country. And that's what this measure is designed to do.

I also want to touch on the very important question that was raised by my friend about the issue of subsidization by the American taxpayer of the energy industry. And I know that my friend likes to say, well, the Rules Committee can just take care of this in one fell swoop and make this amendment in order. And it was very interesting that our colleague from Boulder said that if it were to be considered under an open rule, he'd like to allow for consideration of a measure that would reduce the top corporate rate as we look at the issue of ending this kind of subsidization.

Well, that is a global approach that I believe needs to be looked at by the House Ways and Means Committee, by the Energy and Commerce Committee; and I'm supportive, I'm very supportive, of our doing that. But the idea of saying that we would do what my friend has proposed, actually under the provision that my friend from Boulder said that he'd support up in the Rules Committee, it's a violation of House rules.

So the idea here is we need to do what we can to diminish the level of subsidization. I personally have opposed agriculture subsidization. I'm not a proponent of subsidization of private industry. I do think that in the context of having the highest corporate tax rate of any nation in the world now that Japan has actually reduced their corporate rate, we need to look at ways in which we can bring that rate down and deal with closing loopholes. And that's something that President Obama talked about here in his State of the Union message.

So I think that if my friend would recognize that we've had opportunities to do this when they were in the majority, and we've been in session for a matter of a few months, and the idea of saying that we haven't addressed it yet on the House floor, I think, doesn't really pass the laugh test because we are right now in the process of looking at overall reform, and it will include dealing with the issue of subsidies. So I agree wholeheartedly with the need for us to step up to the plate and take this issue on.

I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished chair of the Natural Resources Committee, our friend Mr. HASTINGS. Unfortunately, due to an illness, he's not able to be here this week, but I spoke with him yesterday and he's doing a lot better. And he has every degree of confidence, a high level of confidence, that we're going to be able to effectively address this issue of working to drive energy prices down; to diminish the kind of dependence we have on foreign sources of energy; and the very, very important issue of creating jobs here in the United States of America, which continues to be our priority.

So I thank my friend for yielding. I encourage my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying legislation.

And I'm happy to say that we've been able to make almost all of the amendments in order that were submitted to us as long as they comply with the rules of the House. The CutGo provision is germane. We've tried to make most of those in order, and it's a new day. We've had more amendments considered here in the first few months of this Congress than we did in the entire last Congress. So I think that this work product that we're going to have before us today is further evidence of that.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just make a couple of points that a New York Times editorial, entitled ''The Return of 'Drill Baby Drill' '' made, and that was that drilling alone cannot possibly ensure energy independence in a country that uses one-quarter of the world's oil while owning only 2 percent of its reserves.

The other point it makes is the Energy Information Agency recently projected what would happen if the Nation tripled production on the Outer Continental Shelf. There would be no price impact at all until 2020 and only 3 cents to 5 cents a gallon in 2030.

The bottom line is that we need an energy policy that does not rely solely on drilling for oil; and we've tried to pass a bill that would do that, only to have strong objection from my Republican colleagues.

I would also say I just want to make sure we're clear on one thing because the chairman of the Rules Committee seemed to intimate that bringing up my legislation that would allow for there to be a vote to cut taxpayer subsidies to oil companies would somehow be against the rules. It's not against the rules. It would be totally within the rules, and the Rules Committee could have made it in order.

One of the things that I hear, when I go back home, from my constituents is, Why are you cutting programs that help elderly people be able to heat their homes in the winter? Why are you cutting programs that would invest in alternative energy and at the same time you have Congress protecting taxpayer subsidies to big oil companies that are making record profits? People are outraged by that.

[From the New York Times, May 6, 2011]

THE RETURN OF ''DRILL, BABY, DRILL''

As President Obama observed in a March 30 address on energy issues, drilling alone cannot possibly ensure energy independence in a country that uses one-quarter of the world's oil while owning only 2 percent of its reserves. Nor can it lower prices, except at the margins. Only coordinated measures—greater auto efficiency, alternative fuels, improved mass transit—can address these issues.

Still the oil industry and its political allies persist in their fantasies. On Thursday, the House passed the first of three bills that will require the Interior Department to accelerate drilling permits without proper environmental or engineering reviews, reinstate lease sales off the Virginia coast that

were canceled after the BP blowout, and open up protected coastal waters—East, West and in Alaska—to drilling.

The bills would make regulation of offshore drilling even weaker than it was before the spill. They would also do almost nothing to solve the problems of $4-a-gallon gas.

Here's the hard truth: Prices are set on the world market by the major producers, OPEC in particular. Even countries that produce more oil than they need, like Canada, have little leverage. Canada's prices track ours.

The Energy Information Agency recently projected what would happen if the nation tripled production on the outer continental shelf. There would be no price impact at all until 2020 and only 3 cents to 5 cents a gallon in 2030.

By contrast, the agency found, raising the fuel efficiency of America's cars would do real good. Increasing the fleetwide average from roughly 30 m.p.g. today to 60 m.p.g. in the next 15 years, an ambitious but not implausible goal, could bring prices down by 20 percent.

Some politicians get it. Senator Max Baucus, a Montana Democrat, is drafting a bill that seeks to repeal $4 billion in annual taxpayer subsidies to the oil industry and use the proceeds to develop more efficient cars and alternative fuel sources. Mr. Obama has tried twice, without success, to get rid of those subsidies, and the House voted in March to preserve them in the current budget.

The tax breaks—fast write-offs for drilling expenses, generous depletion allowances, and the like—may have been useful years ago but are wholly unnecessary when oil prices and industry profits are reaching new highs.

Even John Boehner, the Republican leader, conceded in a recent ABC News interview that oil companies ''ought to be paying their fair share.'' When horrified aides reminded him that ending the subsidies would amount to a tax increase—anathema among Republicans—he backed off.

Repealing these breaks would reduce the deficit and yield revenues to be invested in cleaner fuels, while having no real impact on prices. Mr. Obama may not be able to persuade the House of these simple truths. But he can and must seize whatever opportunities are offered in the Senate, involving himself, not just rhetorically, in the hard but necessary struggle for a sane energy policy.

At this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans act as if they're trying to help the consumer with this legislation. But all they're really doing is helping Big Oil—bigger profits, bigger tax breaks. I mean, the first quarter earnings for the oil companies were bigger than ever, billions of dollars in profits. Even BP, even after the disaster a year ago, was still making huge profits; and, of course, we've got about $4 billion in tax breaks that the Republicans continue to give to the oil companies.

No more oil is going to be brought to market because of this legislation. As my colleague from Massachusetts said, we're talking years before any oil could be brought to market. And at the same time, we have the huge environmental risks.

The fact of the matter is that the BP oil spill a year ago showed us the environment risks that are involved with deepwater drilling. And there was a bipartisan commission that was put forward; Democrat and Republican testified before the Natural Resources Committee that I serve on. But no Republican effort is being made to implement those recommendations and say, okay, we need to do certain things before we can do offshore drilling in these deepwater areas. Nothing at all. So when you open up these areas under this legislation to new drilling, you're just inviting another BP-type spill because nothing is being done by the Republicans to prevent it.

Now, I would point out there are all kinds of leases out there now, on land, offshore, that the oil companies can drill and they're not doing it. They're just stockpiling them. There's more oil production that's been put forward in the last year or so under President Obama than ever before. So we're producing oil. No one is saying that you can't drill in the areas that are already leased. And there's more production. All we're saying is, why in the world are you risking these areas that now we know, after the BP spill, shouldn't be put into production when you've got all kinds of other opportunities out there?

Now, I offered an amendment. The chairman of the Rules Committee said that we were going to allow a lot of amendments. Well, they didn't allow my amendment; and my amendment simply said that the Atlantic coast for the next 5 years under the President's plan is off-limits because of what happened with BP and that we should keep that in place. But my amendment was not allowed in order.

□ 1240

What the President has done and what all of us are saying here is, in the aftermath of the BP spill, there are certain areas that shouldn't be allowed offshore production and in which the leases shouldn't go out. We learned from the BP spill that these areas should be off-limits because we are concerned about the environmental risks.

In my case in the State of New Jersey, we're talking about billions and billions of dollars in tourism related to the shore that would be put at risk if we had another oil spill. That's where the jobs are. Tourism is the number one industry in the State of New Jersey. Up and down the Atlantic coast, tourism is a huge business. It creates all kinds of jobs. What minimal jobs will be created by allowing these areas to be put out to lease and by allowing the drilling compared to the risk of the jobs that would be destroyed?

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal by former Democratic Member Harold Ford.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 11, 2011]

WASHINGTON VS. ENERGY SECURITY

(By Harold Ford, Jr.)

Even former President Clinton calls the Obama administration's deep water drilling policy 'ridiculous.'

When President Obama introduced his energy plan in March, he pointed out that the U.S. keeps going ''from shock to trance on the issue of energy security, rushing to propose action when gas prices rise, then hitting the snooze button when they fall again.''

It's true that since the Nixon administration U.S. leaders have all made the same commitment to cutting our reliance on foreign oil, finding reliable sources of clean energy, and keeping energy prices low. Yet Americans keep hearing only short-term solutions and narrowly focused rules and regulations. The U.S. still imports more than half its oil, gasoline prices are at historic highs, and consumers are paying the price.

One bipartisan policy tradition is to deny Americans the use of our own resources. President George H.W. Bush took aggressive steps to keep off-limits vast supplies of oil and gas along the coasts of California and Florida. Since then, the build-up of restrictions, limitations and bans on drilling (onshore and off) have cost the U.S. economy billions of dollars while increasing our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

In the year since the Deepwater Horizon spill, the Obama administration has put in place what is effectively a permanent moratorium on deep water drilling. It stretched out the approval process for some Gulf-region drilling permits to more than nine months, lengths that former President Bill Clinton has called ''ridiculous.''

Then there's tax policy. Why, when gas prices are climbing, would any elected official call for new taxes on energy? And characterizing legitimate tax credits as ''subsidies'' or ''loopholes'' only distracts from substantive treatment of these issues. Lawmakers misrepresent the facts when they call the manufacturing deduction known as Section 199—passed by Congress in 2004 to spur domestic job growth—a ''subsidy'' for oil and gas firms. The truth is that all U.S. manufacturers, from software producers to filmmakers and coffee roasters, are eligible for this deduction.

We won't achieve energy security by restricting our own companies from drilling or singling them out for punitive taxes. We're talking about an industry that provides millions of jobs and, for the foreseeable future, the power for our economic growth.

So our focus right now has to be to find ways to encourage domestic energy supplies, even while we encourage new sources of energy. President Obama is right that this isn't a long-term solution. But we can't lose sight of what the country needs today.

Here are a few steps to take:

First, let's conduct a comprehensive review of existing policies, rules and restrictions and root out any that needlessly hamper energy production at home. Do the existing environmental rules, for example, accurately reflect the industry's technological advancements in the ability to safely recover oil and gas supplies?

Second, let's develop the skills we need to find new and better ways to recover domestic supplies of energy—and to develop next-generation fuels to secure the future. That means encouraging more students to study math, science and other disciplines this industry needs.

And third, let's stop demonizing Big Oil to score political points. It does nothing to encourage the new talent, new ideas, and new entrepreneurs who are most likely to make breakthroughs in new sources of energy.

The kickoff of the presidential campaign season and the spike in fuel prices offer an opportunity to constructively debate a comprehensive national energy strategy. Effective policies will ensure sufficient domestic production and the healthy operation of U.S. companies abroad, which together will provide the secure, affordable energy supply that Americans need.

At this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and of H.R. 1231, the Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act.

When gas prices hit $4 a gallon in the summer of 2008, Congress and President Bush lifted a decades-old ban on drilling, allowing for exploration off both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. However, these plans were postponed or cancelled by the Obama administration, and we are now back in the same situation of high gas prices, of squeezing the budgets of American families and small businesses. The facts are clear: The current administration is blocking American energy production and is hurting middle class America. On the other hand, they are also using American tax dollars to help offshore drilling in Brazil.

Since President Obama took office, the national average price of gasoline has nearly doubled to $4 a gallon in most States, and the energy policies of the Obama administration have resulted in the loss of hundreds of thousands of barrels of domestic daily oil production. To make matters worse, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, offshore energy production is expected to drop 13 percent in 2011.

It is not too late to change our country's course of action and to begin to undo the damage done by these policies. The energy reserves off our coasts and under our public lands belong to the American taxpayers, and should be utilized in an efficient and environmentally safe manner to create jobs, to grow our economy, to lower energy prices, and to enhance our national security by reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

The Federal Government also has the ability to realize substantial revenues through the leasing of these areas, which will help pay down our $14 trillion national debt. According to the CBO, enacting H.R. 1231 would increase receipts to the Federal Treasury by about $800 million over the next 10 years. This important legislation will require the Obama administration to expand access to areas offshore that contain the most oil and natural gas reserves. When we do so, we will improve our energy security and grow American jobs.

I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS for his efforts in bringing H.R. 1231, along with two other American Energy Initiative bills, to the floor. I also would like to offer my special appreciation to Chairman HASTINGS for his support in allowing me to offer an amendment to H.R. 1229, which includes language from a bill I recently introduced, which extends certain leases affected by the administration's moratorium for 1 year.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

I am amazed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to be apologists for Big Oil. The fact of the matter is that Big Oil in this country is about making profits for Big Oil. They don't seem to care very much about the consumer.

I hold this chart up, Mr. Speaker, just to kind of prove a point that, notwithstanding the fact that they're raising prices on consumers, in the first quarter of this year as compared to last year, all of these oil companies—Exxon, Oxy, Conoco, Chevron, BP—all made record profits. Exxon is up 69 percent. They made $10.7 billion in profits in the first quarter.

What is particularly outrageous is they're making all this money, and my friends on the other side of the aisle continue to protect the subsidies and the tax breaks that they get. It's outrageous. They cut money for poor families who are trying to heat their homes in the winter; and on the other hand, they go out of their way to protect Big Oil from any amendments that we could bring to the floor here to be able to go after these subsidies and tax breaks.

My colleague from California, the chairman of the Rules Committee, says, oh, he's sympathetic. Well, we don't want your sympathy. We want your vote. I brought this amendment to go after the subsidies that the oil companies currently enjoy, taxpayer-funded subsidies, three times in the Rules Committee. All three times, it was voted down. So enough is enough.

In terms of this rule, I want to point out something. There was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL). It was germane, and it complied with the Republicans' new cut-go rules. It simply required that anyone who gets a lease under this bill would have to give preference to hiring veterans—the men and women who we have sent over to Afghanistan and Iraq. When they come back, we ought to go out of our way to make sure they have jobs. This amendment was voted down in the Rules Committee, an amendment to help our veterans.

I mean, it is unbelievable to me that the Republicans voted this amendment down. Maybe there's a reason someone could give me on the other side of the aisle as to why this was ruled out of order. It was germane, and it complied with the cut-go rules; but the idea that we're not going out of our way to help our veterans, I think, is unconscionable.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act, which will lift the President's ban on new offshore drilling by requiring the administration to do what my constituents in southeastern and eastern Ohio have been calling for Congress to do: open up for production the areas that contain the most oil and natural gas resources right here in America.

The hardworking people of my district have made it abundantly clear that their number one concern is the rising price of gas at the pumps. Over the past week, this side of the aisle has begun to show the American people that we are serious about addressing our energy crisis and that we will not succumb to bringing up bogus proposals that may poll well in the court of public opinion but that will only result in higher gas prices.

In 2008, our country was also experiencing record high prices at the pump, and in a logical and commonsense response to those record-high prices, that Congress and that President took action to end a decades-long drilling ban offshore by opening up new areas in the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans for exploration and production. Unfortunately, this administration has reversed the will of the people, and has taken steps to reinstate this moratorium from new lease sales in these offshore areas.

Not only has the administration abandoned the plan to go forward with opening up new areas for production, but they have also cancelled previously scheduled lease sales. We are now again faced with rising prices at the pump, and instead of being able to focus on new ways to make America's energy secure, we are forced to bring up legislation that will do again what Congress did 3 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, recently, the Secretary of the Interior testified before the Natural Resources Committee. Between his testimony and answers to questions, he made it painfully obvious that this administration does not have a real national energy strategy. Today, with this legislation, we're going to help the Secretary and the administration take a big step toward developing a real energy plan for America. This legislation requires the administration and the Secretary of the Interior to set specific goals on the amount of oil and natural gas production that is estimated from each of the 5-year lease plans contained in this legislation.

During my 26-plus-year career in the United States Air Force, we set goals and objectives, and then we set out about working hard to not only meet them but to exceed them. This legislation sets the production goals at a level that is triple the level of America's current production, and it therefore reduces foreign imports by one-third.

Once this legislation is adopted, we will send a signal to the world oil markets that America means business when it comes to our energy future. I am fully confident that if we set the bar high, as this legislation does, American drive and ingenuity will rise to the occasion and will exceed this goal.

□ 1250

If we're going to become energy secure, Mr. Speaker, we must increase our energy production, not limit it, and we need to commit ourselves to developing our own resources. That is why I strongly support the Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

It appears, based on what I'm hearing here, that what the Republicans are dedicated to is helping the oil companies make more profits but doing nothing to help the consumer.

With that, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member on the Resources Committee, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

So here's where we are. The Republicans—this is unbelievable—are blocking any legislation from passing that is going to have new safety rules for drilling off of the beaches of the United States 1 year after the BP spill. They're blocking any new safety legislation to make sure that the United States, which has four times the fatality rate of countries in Europe in drilling off our shores, has rules that are put on the books to make sure that those worst of all safety violators, these companies that drill off of our shores, have those new safety rules.

Number two, the Republicans are fighting any attempts to take away the $4 billion in tax breaks which the American consumer gives to the oil companies each year, even as the oil companies report ExxonMobil, $10 billion; Shell, $8 billion; BP, $7 billion; Chevron, $6 billion, et cetera, for the last 3 months. That's how much money they made. The Republicans think that's not enough money, even as people get tipped upside down and have money shaken out of their pockets at the gas pump. No, not enough money. They also need to give the oil companies tax breaks. That's the Republican perspective.

What else do they do? They also slash the renewable energy budget, the clean energy budget, by 70 percent. So you're a kid out there in America; you're in the sixth grade; you're looking to America for the 21st century.

Here's what the Republicans are doing:

They're slashing the solar and wind budget by 70 percent;

They are saying to the oil companies, you don't need any more safety off of the beaches to drill;

They're saying that your profits are not windfall profits, which, of course, they are in the oil industry.

But instead, here's what we're going to let you do:

We are going to let you drill off of the beaches of California for oil, off of the beaches of Florida for oil. We're going to let you drill off the beaches—3 miles off of the coast, by the way—off the beaches of Cape Cod, of Georges Bank. We're going to turn Georges Bank into ExxonMobil's Bank. We're going to turn, not shellfish into a product that we sell, but Shell Oil will be out there. That's the agenda for the Republican Party.

This is almost surreal that they want to take the tax breaks that the oil industry has, fight like the devil to protect them, even as they want to cut Medicare for Grandma and cut wind and solar as the energy sources for the future. It's almost like they think it's 1958 and gasoline is 28 cents a gallon and we're all cruising around pretending that we're not part of the rest of the world.

This debate today is kind of a microcosm of what's wrong with Republican policies. That before, I think; people want themselves to see oil rigs off of their beaches in California and North Carolina, in Massachusetts and Maine, the least I think that you owe these people is that you have new safety rules that reflect what happened. You have that BP commission report implemented. But you guys are just running ahead as though nothing has happened.

By the way, do you want to know what else is really wrong here? We know because of Goldman Sachs that this $20 to $30 a barrel of oil of increase in price over the last 11 weeks comes from speculators. What you're doing is you guys are trying to kneecap the speculator cops on the beat so that they're not even out there policing these speculators, and you're trying to reduce the budget for the speculator cops, the people who will be chasing down these speculators.

So it's all so ExxonMobil, it's all so Shell and BP and Chevron and ConocoPhillips—and, by the way, at least you're true to your colors. At least this is really what you believe in. You don't believe in wind and solar, so you're cutting that budget by 70 percent, and you want to open up the beaches as well for drilling in the States that don't want oil rigs off their beaches. I mean, my goodness, this is something that at least you should be able to respect.

You also disapprove the using of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve as a weapon to tell speculators, you could go bankrupt because we're going to use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the 700 million barrels of oil that the U.S. has stored.

This is a very important debate to have. I'm glad we're having it today because this ''Drill, baby, drill'' just says, yeah, your policy is not all of the above; it's oil above all. Everything else gets defunded.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are demanding relief at the pump and for Congress to create an environment that creates jobs. Republicans are answering that demand with practical solutions that will have an immediate impact on the price of gasoline, energy security, and jobs.

Liberal Democrats are still adhering to the sort of demagoguery that may score political points with their base, but that doesn't create a single job nor does it reduce the cost of energy by 1 cent.

Republicans strongly believe that energy security depends on strong domestic energy production. The liberal Democrats and President Obama have actively blocked and delayed American energy production, destroying jobs, raising energy prices, and making the U.S. more reliant on unstable foreign countries for energy. This is hurting American families and small businesses who are vital to creating the new private sector jobs we desperately need during this time of high unemployment. The liberal proposals fail to create jobs in America but help create jobs overseas for the citizens of foreign nations.

President Obama's reckless moratorium on domestic energy production has cost the gulf coast region 12,000 jobs since it was enacted last year. His moratorium now threatens an additional loss of over 24,000 jobs in the gulf and 36,000 jobs nationwide if we do not reverse this dangerous liberal endeavor.

The Republicans believe that energy security will not only create jobs but will also help reduce the deficit. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, H.R. 1231 will generate $800 million in revenue over 10 years while reducing foreign oil imports by nearly one-third.

The solution provided by the Democrat elites? More taxes, resulting in higher costs that will get passed on to American families. The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service says Democrat tax increases ''would make oil and natural gas more expensive for U.S. customers,'' and even some liberals admit ''it would cost thousands of jobs.''

Renowned economist Dr. Joseph Mason has stated that Republican proposals for domestic energy production will create 1.2 million American jobs.

If the liberal Democrats care about our energy security, prices at the pump, job creation, and strengthening our domestic energy capability, they would join Republicans in supporting this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, American families cannot wait any longer for relief at the pump. American families cannot wait any longer for jobs. If you stand with American families, if you stand with American energy security, and if you stand for job creation in America, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague on the Rules Committee talked about all the people she stands with. I want to know

why she didn't stand with the veterans last night when we had a vote that would help make sure our veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan would have preference in terms of these so-called new jobs that were going to be created. I find it unconscionable that the Rules Committee did not make that amendment in order, the Boswell amendment.

At this time, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. Yes, indeed, the taxpayers are waiting for relief at the pump, but this bill is not it. I rise in opposition to this rule and to H.R. 1231.

□ 1300

Once again the House will vote on Republican legislation that takes a ''let's put all our eggs in one basket'' approach to our national energy policy. And what's their answer to high gas prices? Drill for more oil offshore, and preserve taxpayer subsidies for Big Oil. Big Oil gets $4 billion in subsidies from us taxpayers. This helped them rake in $35 billion in profits in the first quarter of 2011 alone. Meanwhile, my taxpayers in Hana, Maui, have to pay over $6 per gallon to fill up their cars to go to work. Do these taxpayers get a subsidy? No. People in Hawaii pay the highest gas prices in the country. When I was in Hawaii recently, my constituents were astonished to hear about the record profits and continuing subsidies that are provided to Big Oil.

At the same time that the Republican majority is defending subsidies for oil companies which don't lower the price at the pump, they're also working to cut Federal funding for clean, alternative energy, public transit, and energy efficient programs. They also, adding insult to injury, want to disarm the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, which is the main cop on the beat when it comes to oil speculation. Republicans also want to pretend that there are no consequences to the near indiscriminate drilling authorized by these bills. Less than a year after the catastrophic BP oil spill, which was caused by lax regulation of a dangerous industry, they want us to undo the reforms that have been made. And for what?

The Energy Department's Energy Information Administration estimates that drilling authorized by these bills may lead to a measly 1.6 percent increase in domestic energy production from 2012 to 2030. That is not a prescription for relieving pain at the pump in the short term, and it's a poor strategy for long-term energy security. Instead, we need to invest in fuel-efficient technologies and expand our transportation options. We need to focus on harnessing clean alternative energy sources, and that way, we can leave our children a cleaner, healthier planet and wean ourselves from foreign oil. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and against this drill-only bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, can I respectfully ask how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 13 minutes. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 12½ minutes.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from California (Mr. DENHAM).

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. The rule we have before us today allows for an open process and provides this body the opportunity to debate an issue of increasing importance to our constituents back home. The future of our energy policy in this country is at stake here today, which is why I'm proud to cosponsor this bill reversing the President's offshore drilling moratorium.

This past weekend, I visited with a number of constituents at gas stations throughout my district. Some are asking, Will we get to $5 gas prices? If you come to my district, we're already there. I visited Wawona, California, last week. Everybody likes to talk about tourism. In California, we've got a great deal of tourism. But everybody that I talked to at that pump said, We planned this trip quite a while ago. We can't afford to do it today. We wouldn't have done it had we known gas prices would have been this high. Well, gas prices are still going up. We're afraid that in Wawona, we'll see $6 gas prices. You want to affect tourism, try hitting America's pocketbook at $6 a gallon.

But it's not just tourism. If you go to one of the farms in my district, diesel gas has gone up. If you are frustrated about paying higher gas prices, wait until you pay higher grocery prices, because in California's great ag economy, the prices are going up. In fact, some crops are going to stay in the field this year just because we can't afford the gas to bring them to market.

Parents are feeling the same thing. You know, as I'm going to swim practice over the weekend, talking to parents, they are frustrated about just being able to get their kids to school every day. You think this bill won't do something for gas prices? It's common sense to know if we've got a greater supply here in our great Nation, gas prices are going to go down. We want American jobs. We want to be self-reliant.

We talk about veterans here on this floor. I am a veteran. I served my country. I don't want to be reliant on foreign oil anymore.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

A lot is always talked about us utilizing 25 percent of the world's gas. And where we disagree is the number of 2 percent of the world's oil. It's not a disagreement. The fact is, we've got 65 percent of the world's reserves between our oil shale. You just have to be willing to go get it. Natural gas, we want to use natural gas. Let's utilize our own natural gas. We have some of the largest oil reserves in the world. We just have to be willing to have American jobs and reduce our reliance on foreign oil.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does absolutely nothing to lower gas prices, and it does everything to increase profits for the big oil companies. Again, I repeat the question that I have been asking over and over again: why was the amendment that would help our veterans get jobs on their return from Iraq and Afghanistan defeated in the Rules Committee? I have no idea why.

At this point, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me time, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question.

The bills proposed by the Republican leadership today, H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1231, do nothing to lower the high gas prices burdening America's families today. That's why I will be offering legislation that will produce real fuel savings for consumers, reduce our dependence on imported oil, and stimulate American manufacturing.

The Advanced Vehicle Technology Act proposes real solutions to high gas prices by helping America develop the next generation of high-tech fuel-efficient vehicles. I hope my colleagues will see that this is a better alternative to the bills that are being voted on today.

First, this bill has broad support, unlike the Republican measures before us. My bill passed last Congress with a bipartisan majority. A majority of the Members in the House today have already voted in favor of this legislation. Unlike the Republican bills, this legislation is supported by both business groups, like the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, as well as the League of Conservation Voters and the Sierra Club, proving that you can support the economy while also protecting the environment.

Second, this bill will quickly result in real cost savings to consumers. Technologies have already been developed to achieve remarkable fuel savings, and putting more money into R&D increases the speed in which new technologies can be adapted and used. Unlike the Republican drilling plan, which will take nearly a decade to produce results, technologies being developed today can be commercialized and put into cars in the very near future. I have visited auto companies and suppliers in my district and have seen firsthand the level of technological advancement. For example, they have

technologies that are ready to be commercialized that can improve efficiency by 30 percent and sometimes more. That means you can drive your car 30 percent further on the same tank of gas. That represents real savings to consumers.

A large focus of this bill is on commercializing those technologies so that they can be brought to consumers and start reducing gas bills today, not 10 years from now. This bill also targets fuel savings in medium- and heavy-duty trucks. It's widely known that there are huge efficiency gains to be made in these vehicles. By placing a greater focus on research and development in this area, we can achieve the greatest bang for the buck. More efficient trucks also yield consumer savings because it will reduce transportation costs of food and other goods that we buy at the store. The fuel savings we receive from these technological advancements in cars and trucks will have a national security benefit as well. Simply put, the bill reduces the amount of oil we import from unfriendly nations. Sixty percent of our petroleum needs today are met by imported supplies. Reducing the demand for imported oil is one of the best ways to meet our energy independence goals and end the immense transfer of American dollars to undemocratic and unfriendly nations.

Finally, the legislation supports American manufacturing and high-paying jobs. Rising gas prices are going to drive up demand for advanced vehicles around the world, and it is in our national interest to ensure that the research, development, and manufacturing happens right here in the United States. That's why this bill was included in the Make It in America agenda, a plan to rebuild American manufacturing and create well-paying jobs, unveiled by House Democrats and Democratic Whip HOYER last week.

□ 1310

The Advanced Vehicle Technology Act epitomizes the goals of Make It in America by ensuring that our country remains a leader in producing the cars and trucks of the future and supporting high-tech research and engineering jobs right here at home.

Fuel-efficient vehicle research is a win/win for our economy. It creates jobs and makes transportation more affordable for American families.

There is no doubt in the years ahead that more Americans will be driving hybrids, plug-in hybrids, battery electric vehicles, and cars and trucks powered by hydrogen fuel or natural gas. The only question is whether these new technologies will be researched, developed and manufactured here in the United States or overseas.

At the same time, domestic automotive and commercial vehicle manufacturers and suppliers have increasingly limited resources for research and development of advanced technologies. That's why the Advanced Vehicle Technology Act will create partnerships between the Department of Energy and private companies, and ensure that the American automobile industry and manufacturing base will continue to be globally competitive and that, as a Nation, we will not trade our dependence for foreign oil for a dependence on foreign batteries and other emerging technologies.

This bill does what the American people expect from us. It bridges the partisan and ideological divide.

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

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

Mr. PETERS. It's legislation that has support from the business community, the environmental community and the labor movement. We must stop voting on bills like the ones the majority is offering that pit priorities against each other, and, instead, we need to move legislation like my bill that brings our priorities together.

This legislation will lower costs for consumers, reduce the amount of oil we import from countries that don't like us, and create and sustain manufacturing and R&D jobs here in the United States.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that we can support this legislation to Make It in America.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the American families, the farmers and the fishermen, especially those across north Florida and northwest Florida who are being crushed today by these incredibly high rising fuel costs.

I represent and I am privileged to represent the largest land mass district in Florida, and I'll tell you, those that make their living in farming, those that make their living in one of our eight coastal counties in the fishing industry, they are being hammered day in, day out, day in, day out by rising fuel costs, especially the cost of diesel fuel.

We have the responsibility to American people today to alleviate our energy crisis through tough economic times. We can do this and must achieve this important goal while protecting the sensitive coastal regions.

And, yes, I took my baby steps on the beaches of Panama City, so I understand how important our environmental concerns are. My family's been there since Florida became a State, so I understand how critically important our environment is.

But at the same time, we must also preserve our military mission capabilities. We are the home of Tyndall Air Force Base and the home of the F–22, and so I understand how critical they are to our communities and our environment and our economies down in Florida as well.

We must do all these things while at the same time making sure that what we do in this House protects the American family budget and, especially in regards to rising fuel costs. Most family budgets today are spending over 10 percent, right at, near and over 10 percent of their family budget on rising fuel costs.

Unfortunately, some of our colleagues today believe the best thing to do, rather than to get out of this hole, is to dig this hole even deeper. As my grandfather would have said, Son, that would violate walking around sense? Okay? Instead of getting out of the hole, you just drive and dig a deeper hole.

This chart that I'm looking at right here beside me that I want you to see talks about the declining crude production in the Gulf of Mexico. In mid 2009, the United States was producing 1.73 million barrels of oil per day in the Gulf of Mexico. According to the Energy Information Administration, that number will fall to 1.18 million barrels per day next year.

Earlier we heard one of my colleagues talk about the sixth graders around the country. Well, sixth graders, I will tell you, they understand and they will soon learn in economics that, in order to reduce the price, you have to have more of something. That's simple. They're going to learn that much in basic economics. You have to have more of it.

What does this drastic reduction in the gulf exploration mean for people in Florida's Second Congressional District? They mean that if they go to the marina to try to go catch their two fish this year per day out in the Gulf of Mexico, that they're going to spend almost $6 per gallon of gas to fill that boat up—$6 per gallon of gas. I'm telling you, that is unbearable.

The second chart that I have right here is the exodus of American jobs, rigs leaving the gulf for foreign waters under the Obama administration's de facto moratorium.

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

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. You will see on here that jobs are leaving the Gulf of Mexico, and they're going to the Mediterranean Sea, Egypt, Australia, Nigeria and Sierra Leone and, as we know, our favorite pick of late is Brazil.

I'm saying that what we have to do in this body today is we have to make sure that we put our lives in the lives of the American family, and we have to make sure that it is time today to do what this body should have done many, many years ago, and we have to make sure that we take care of them and make sure that we tap into our natural resources that we have in this country.

I stand today and rise in support of this rule as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 5 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. This bill does nothing, nothing at all to lower

fuel costs, and everything to increase the profits by big oil companies. I think it shows where the priority of the Republican Party is at this moment.

At this time I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1367, the Advanced Vehicle and Technology Act and ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question.

This legislation rewards American workers and American innovation. It's a true investment in American ingenuity and will help us Make It in America. By reauthorizing the Department of Energy's vehicle technologies research program, the Freedom car and the 21st century truck partnerships, the next generation of advanced vehicles will be built in America.

The Advanced Vehicle Technology Act is one important part of the Democratic jobs plan, a jobs plan that focuses on making it in America because there is no way that we can maintain our position as a great economic power without making things in America.

Making things in America is a key part of rebuilding our Nation's economy. It's about reversing the manufacturing job loss trend, recommitting ourselves to the things that created America's middle class, good-paying jobs, world-class education, top-notch research and sound infrastructure.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1367, because when we invest in American ingenuity and innovation, when we Make It in America, our middle class will be strengthened and our Nation will be prosperous.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. Hypocrisy. It's hypocrisy. Reuters', April 27, reported that the President urged other countries to lift crude oil output, to lift crude oil output. How come, if other countries increase their output, it affects the price; but yet, if we increase our output, it does not?

So if other countries promote their drill, baby, drill, it affects the price; but yet, when we in America try to drill, we don't affect the price, according to my colleagues on the other side.

Electric cars. So let's get this straight. They want Americans to charge their car up on a system, on a grid system that's already failing and broken. We've had rolling brownouts and blackouts in this country, and that's what we want to plug our cars into? I'm sorry. No.

□ 1320

Then they say there are the hybrid cars. I can't pull my boat with a Prius. I can't do it. I enjoy going fishing. I enjoy the time that I get to take my little boy out and teach him what my father and my grandfather taught me, and I have to do that pulling a boat with my Chevrolet pickup truck. I sure wish that, when I fill it up, that it was affordable.

And we can make it in America. Let's make American energy. That's what this bill, our bill, does. That's why I rise in support of this rule and this bill. If we want to make things in America, let's start with making our energy. When we can make our energy in America, we can make our products here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE).

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize that the gentleman from Louisiana had it partially right. You know, the way we create jobs, we do it the old-fashioned way. We import great cars from Detroit.

So I urge you to defeat the previous question, support the bill that we have been talking about that will create great fuel-efficient cars, that will create jobs, and also save our motorists a lot of money because they won't have to fill up their cars with this expensive gasoline. They will be able to power their vehicles through other alternative sources of energy.

It's good for our environment, it's great for our country, it will save the motorists money, but, most importantly, it will create jobs.

Let's import these good-paying jobs by importing fuel-efficient vehicles from the city of Detroit. That's how you make it in America.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, the rising cost of gas is quickly becoming the hottest topic in any meeting, and especially in my hometown and in my neck of the woods in southwest Washington State.

I hosted a job creators forum about 1½ weeks ago, and one of the biggest issues I heard about was the rising cost of gas prices.

One gentleman owns a pizza delivery operation. They make pizzas and deliver them. You can all imagine what rising gas prices do to a small business like this. They've had to let people go in the past, and they're certain to hire people again. One of his requests was: make this affordable. One of the ways we can do that is by supporting this bill, because we open up the opportunity to get more domestic energy. And that's the reality.

I can't wait for the day when our country no longer is dependent on fossil fuels, when we don't need gasoline or we don't need to get it from countries that don't like us. I can't wait for that day. And I support those explorations of alternative energies. But the problem is we're not there yet. We are not there today. The reality is, every time gas goes up, we lose jobs, and in my neck of the woods, where we have double-digit unemployment, 13 percent, 14 percent going on 3 years, it is unacceptable that this Congress would sit on its hands and do nothing while the price of gas goes up.

If we explore for energy here domestically and we do it now, we're going to bring relief today to those small business owners in our region. They're going to be able to hire more people.

As we all go back to our districts next week, we know we're going to hear from moms and dads, we're going to hear from business owners about the high cost of gas. I invite my Democratic colleagues to join with us. Let's look our constituents in the eye and say: we supported legislation that will lower energy prices today to meet their needs.

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

I just want to remind the gentlewoman that the Department of Energy says that if we go ahead with this plan, prices will go down by 3 cents to 5 cents in the year 2030.

If you're serious about alternative forms of energy, then my question is, Why have you defunded all the programs that would fund those new clean, green jobs?

While my Republican friends cut Medicare; while they cut fuel assistance for elderly people who can't afford the cost of fuel during the cold months; while they cut Pell Grants; while they go out of their way to protect the tax cuts of Donald Trump and millionaires while putting all the burden to reduce the deficit on middle class families; while they protect the subsidies for big oil companies, it is shameful. It is shameful that with the record profits that Big Oil is making, that taxpayers continue to subsidize them by billions of dollars. It is unconscionable.

Do you want to reduce the deficit? My friends on the other side go after programs that benefit the poor. They protect programs like corporate welfare that goes to big oil companies.

We should be investing in alternative forms of energy. We should be investing in cleaner and greener technologies. That's what we have been trying to do, but my friends on the other side have been obstructing everything that we have proposed.

They say they want to not be so reliant on fossil fuels in the future, and yet they cut the very programs that will allow us to become more energy independent. This bill here will do nothing, absolutely nothing, zero, to impact the price of gasoline. It does nothing.

Everybody knows how Big Oil operates, and they do whatever they want to do. At a time when they're raising their prices, they're going to make more money this year than they did last year. It's outrageous what they're doing to the American people, how they're gouging the American people.

This bill is not an answer to anything. It is just a sound bite for them to go home and say, hey, we did something, knowing it will never pass the Senate, but also knowing that even if it did pass the Senate and if the President signed it, it would mean nothing.

So rather than focusing on things to help create jobs, to help make it in America, to help create more products in this country, we are going through these ridiculous exercises every week on different subjects; and today it happens to be a bill that is a big wet kiss to Big Oil.

To me, this is the wrong thing we should be taking our time up doing. We should be talking about how should we create jobs in this country, how do we put people back to work. And, yes, we should be talking about ways that we could truly reduce the cost of energy for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I am urging that we defeat the previous question. I will offer an amendment, if we defeat the previous question to the rule, to provide that, immediately after the House adopts the rule, it will bring up H.R. 1367, the Advanced Vehicle Technology Act of 2011, introduced by Representative PETERS.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. One final thing, Mr. Speaker. Again, we had an amendment in the Rules Committee offered by Mr. BOSWELL that would help give hiring preferences to our veterans who are risking their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it was defeated. That is an outrage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so we can debate and pass a bill that American companies develop the next generation of high-tech fuel-efficient vehicles. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, on this rule and on this bill, I think this side of the aisle is demonstrating to all of America that we are listening.

Right now, with gas prices going through the roof, right now, with people suffering high unemployment across the Nation, we have before us a rule and a bill that will undoubtedly create jobs, 1.2 million jobs, according to economist Dr. Joseph Mason.

We have a bill and a plan that is going to bring us closer to less dependency on foreign energy supplies. It will reduce foreign oil imports by nearly one-third.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the aisle are going to deal with the American people in an honest fashion. We are not going to scare the American people. We are going to have an open and honest conversation with the American people. We will lead. And what we are doing here is answering a call that the American people have reached out to us to do, and that is to commit to our domestic supplies of energy so that we have energy supplies that will allow manufacturers in the private sector to create the new opportunities for generations of Americans that are yet to come.

This is not a bill that is about protecting Big Oil. This is not about tax subsidies. I take great disagreement with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when they say we are fighting for tax subsidies for Big Oil. What they are talking about is intangible drilling costs. They are talking about basic tax policy where there are income and expenses that are being calculated and deducted off income taxes. It goes back to my life in the private sector when I read income and expense sheets. All we are talking about are expenses, not tax subsidies.

If we want to engage in rhetoric, that's fine. But we are focused on the substance of the issue, and that substance is getting Americans back to work, 1.2 million jobs under this proposal. We will generate $800 million in revenue over 10 years, and we are going to lead.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying legislation by voting in favor of both.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 257 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1367) to provide for a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application in vehicle technologies at the Department of Energy. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. REED. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUNYAN). Pursuant to House Resolution 245 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. 1229.

□ 1331

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. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico, with Mr. POE of Texas (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, May 10, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 112–73 by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) had been postponed.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 112–73 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. HANABUSA of Hawaii.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. DEUTCH of Florida.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) 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 187, noes 235, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

AYES—187

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—235

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

NOT VOTING—9

Bilirakis
Braley (IA)
Costa
Davis (KY)
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Van Hollen
Westmoreland

□ 1358

Messrs. TERRY, SOUTHERLAND, and HUIZENGA of Michigan changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. LOBIONDO, SMITH of New Jersey, CARSON of Indiana, and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 302, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 302, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 302, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) on which further proceedings were

postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 247, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

AYES—179

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—247

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

NOT VOTING—5

Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Huizenga (MI)
Johnson, Sam
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1404

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 254, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

AYES—174

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—254

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent

DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—3

Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan) (during the vote). There is less than 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 1408

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) 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 258, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

AYES—169

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—258

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

NOT VOTING—4

Bilbray
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1412

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) 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 205, noes 222, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

AYES—205

Ackerman
Aderholt
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—222

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

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Schock

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Members have 1 minute remaining on the vote.

□ 1417

Messrs. ROGERS of Alabama and GINGREY of Georgia changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) 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 185, noes 239, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

AYES—185

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—239

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming

Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
Nunes
Schock
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama) (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1422

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, I am recorded as voting "nay" on rollcall vote No. 307; this was inadvertent. I intended to vote "aye."

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, 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. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico, and, pursuant to House Resolution 245, reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I am in its present form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Connolly of Virginia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1229 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 4, after line 6, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate accordingly):

"(3) COASTAL RESTORATION.—The Secretary shall not issue a permit under paragraph (1) to any applicant that has been required to pay a civil penalty, a criminal fine, or monetary damages resulting from the applicant's activities on the outer Continental Shelf, until such penalties, fines, or damages have been paid in full, or the applicant has entered a formal agreement to pay such penalties, fines, or damages, in order to redress economic and environmental harm caused to the Gulf of Mexico Region.

Mr. LANDRY. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, this simple motion to recommit ensures that oil companies clean up their mess from their oil spills prior to receiving a new permit under the guidelines of this bill.

This is the final amendment to the bill, and if it is adopted, we will immediately vote on final passage.

Although we may disagree on the underlying bill, we surely can agree that it is necessary to protect taxpayers who would otherwise have to foot the bill for cleaning up oil companies' oil spills. It's also necessary to protect the individuals whose lives have been directly affected by those spills.

To illustrate how important this final amendment is look no further than last year's Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. The gulf's fisheries were worth $5.5 billion annually prior to the spill. Shouldn't we require BP to pay those economic damages before it receives another permit to drill again?

The gulf coast fisheries supported 200,000 fishing jobs prior to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Shouldn't BP have the responsibility to pay economic damages to those fishermen who may have lost their livelihoods as a result of their oil spill?

More than 407,000 residents and 102,000 businesses on the gulf have submitted claims for damages due to the spill, and fewer than half have been paid. Shouldn't BP have to resolve all of those claims before it takes more of our publicly owned oil from America's Outer Continental Shelf?

In many cases, payment of claims is the difference, Madam Speaker, between survival and bankruptcy for small businesses. Of the 102,000 of them that claim damages as a result of the gulf oil spill, more than 55,000 submitted claims in excess of $10,000. Losses ranging from $10,000 to more than $500,000 are not trivial, and we should not allow companies like BP to force businesses into bankruptcy even while they seek permission to take more oil from America's Outer Continental Shelf.

We still don't know the full extent of cleanup costs resulting from Deepwater Horizon, but the costs continue to grow. Consider how labor intensive restoration is. To help prevent some sea turtles from being wiped out, restoration teams rehabilitated more than 1,000 of them and relocated 14,000 turtle hatchlings to Florida's east coast which was not damaged by oil.

More than 4,200 people are still working to clean up more than 544 miles of gulf coastline, and this work is essential to restore the gulf's fisheries and tourist economy. For example, the Coast Guard is still cleaning up tar balls and tar mats from Gulf Shores, Alabama.

While we can all appreciate the resources that BP has put into the cleanup to date, it is important that we set a clear standard for the Gulf of Mexico: Oil companies that cause oil spills have to clean up their mess first. We should never allow companies like BP to get away with giving the gulf coast cleanup a lick and a promise or let other oil companies continue extracting America's oil until they have finished cleaning up their mess.

If the oil companies responsible for spills do not pay for their oil spill cleanups and private damages, then America's taxpayers will end up paying for it. So we need to send a simple message to oil companies that cause spills: It's your mess; you clean it up. We cannot afford to be subsidizing them at a time when we're wrestling with record deficits and they're experiencing record profits.

By passing this simple final amendment to the bill, we'll be honoring the lesson that most of us probably learned from our mothers: If you are responsible for it, you've got to clean it up.

□ 1430

And if some oil companies aren't willing to clean up their mess, then they shouldn't get to extract more of our oil, because there are plenty of responsible businesses that would conduct business in a manner that doesn't

endanger the livelihoods and lives of nearby residents.

Remember, this final amendment doesn't stop a single oil well from being drilled. All it does is ensure that an oil company that caused the spill clean up its mess before drilling new wells on oil on our property; it has to take responsibility for the cleanup.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this simple amendment.

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

Mr. LANDRY. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve my point of order while rising in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANDRY. Madam Speaker, my Democrat colleagues are trying to distract us from the central issue, which is jobs. We're trying to put people back to work, but instead of putting people back to work, we're having to deal with procedural gamesmanship. The American people are tired of games. They want results.

Last night, on the phone while I checked on my constituents who are preparing for floodwaters not seen in some 50 years, constituents who may lose their homes, one gentleman asked me, he said, Congressman, when are we going to get back to work? I will need my offshore job to pay for the damages that this flood brings us.

Shockingly, I said, do you understand that these floodwaters may not recede for months? He looked at me and he replied, like any good old Cajun, sha, them floodwaters were sent here by God, and it will recede; the same God who gave me my two hands and my two feet, so that I can get back to work.

My job is gone because of a man and my government, not God. Please tell them that we are not only ready to get back to work, we need to get back to work.

Now, my friends, how do you say no to him?

How do you say no to a people who have endured over two calamities per year since 2005. Katrina, Rita, Ike, Gustav, the *Deepwater Horizon* incident, the Mississippi River floods that are coming upon us?

These people simply want to get back to work. They understand that putting them back to work will ease the price at the pump they too pay.

Let's put our differences aside. Let's put America back to work. Let's crank up those steel mills in Pennsylvania. Let's tell the boys in Illinois that we need those Caterpillar engines. Let's tell the Texans, the Louisianans, the Mississippians, the ones in Florida, Alabama, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, that jobs are coming back to the gulf.

Let's fuel our plants with American energy and American oil. No more shall we beg those who hate us for their oil. America is on her way back, and it starts in the Gulf of Mexico. Let's put the gulf back to work so we can put America back to work.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 1229, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 257; and adoption of House Resolution 257, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 239, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

AYES—186

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

NOES—239

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

NOT VOTING—6

Clarke (NY)
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
Polis

□ 1453

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

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, on roll-call No. 308 I was tied up in an elevator. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 263, noes 163, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

AYES—263

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

NOES—163

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Fortenberry
Giffords
Goodlatte
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam

□ 1459

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, on roll-call No. 309 I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CONGRESSIONAL SPORTSMEN'S CAUCUS

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

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus is the largest bipartisan caucus in the Congress. Every year, we go out and have a little bit of fun shooting sporting clays, skeet, and trap. It's kind of like the baseball game and the football game and all the other stuff that goes on around here where we try to get out and get to know one another better.

This year, just yesterday, out at PG County, the Annual Congressional Sportsman's Caucus Trap, Skeet, and Sporting Clay Competition was held, and I'm pleased to report, Madam Speaker, that for the third consecutive year the Democrats won the trophy. Did I say for the third consecutive year?

Top Gun Member of Congress went to MIKE THOMPSON.

Top Gun Democrat went to COLLIN PETERSON.

Top Gun Republican went to JOHN KLINE.

Top Skeet Member was JEFF DUNCAN.

Top Trap Member was AUSTIN SCOTT.

Top Sporting Clays Member was BENNIE THOMPSON.

Top Beginner Member was RENEE ELLMERS.

Top Laser Shot went to HEATH SHULER.

With that, Madam Speaker, I would yield to my cochair of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I'll make this very brief.

Congratulations.

It was a great day to be out there. I promise to those on our side of the aisle we will not be handicapped next year by only shooting .410 slugs. We will use shotguns with open chokes.

It was a great day. It went to a good cause for those that enjoy the outdoors, conservation, and the environment. I appreciate the opportunity to chair the Republican side of the Sportsman's Caucus.

Congratulations to our friends. I was in the team right behind BENNIE THOMPSON. Bennie, we're going to get you on our side.

Congratulations.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1231, REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 257) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1231) to

amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 179, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—241

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

NAYS—179

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Ellison
Fattah
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Hirono
Hoyer
Johnson, Sam
Kind
McDermott
Petri
Royce

□ 1510

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 310, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 310, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 179, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

AYES—243

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

NOES—179

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (TX)
Ellison
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Hoyer
Johnson, Sam
McDermott
Rogers (MI)
Shuster

□ 1529

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, on May 11, 2011, I inadvertently missed rollcall Nos. 310 and 311. Had I been present I would voted ''yes.''

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: As the Steering Committee has formally selected me to sit on the House Committee on Financial Services, I formally seek to resign my seat on the House Committee on Agriculture and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I am very pleased with the opportunity to serve on the Financial Services Committee, and I look forward to being an active and effective Member.

Again, thank you for your assistance. Please contact me if I can answer any questions.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN L. FINCHER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 263

Resolved, That the following named members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees:

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES—Mr. Fincher.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE—Mr. Ribble.

Mr. MILLER of Florida (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 1800, EXTENDING COUNTER-TERRORISM AUTHORITIES

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until 5 p.m. on Wednesday, May 18, 2011, to file its reports on H.R. 1800.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS ON SUNDRY LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until 5 p.m. on Friday, May 20, 2011, to file its reports to accompany the following bills: H.R. 1407, H.R. 1484, H.R. 1627, H.R. 1383, H.R. 1657, and H.R. 802.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 427

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 427, a bill originally introduced by Representative HELLER of Nevada, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 673

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 673, a bill originally introduced by Representative HELLER of Nevada, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 16 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 16

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

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR SOAP BOX DERBY RACES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association (in this resolution referred to as the ''sponsor'') shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, soap box derby races (in this resolution referred to as the ''event''), on the Capitol Grounds.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on June 18, 2011, or on such other date

as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make such additional arrangements as may be required to carry out the event.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 46 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 46

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

SECTION 1. USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary (in this resolution referred to as the ''sponsor'') shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the 30th Annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service (in this resolution referred to as the ''event''), on the Capitol Grounds, in order to honor the law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 2010.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on May 15, 2011, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1231.

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

There was no objection.

REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROUN of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 257 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1231.

□ 1534

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, with Mrs. MILLER of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, the Americans suffering from $4 a gallon gas today, $5 a gallon gas next month must feel like they're experiencing a sense of deja vu. It was just three short years ago, in 2008, when gasoline prices reached a record high of $4.11 per gallon. Those high prices cut deep into the pockets of Americans that summer and generated enough public outcry to force Congress to act.

That fall, the Democrat-controlled Congress and the Republican President took bipartisan action to lift the offshore drilling ban that had been in place for decades. This monumental step opened up all of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts to new offshore energy production. Three years later, most Americans would likely be shocked to learn that no energy development has happened in these new areas and that they have actually once again been placed off-limits.

The progress that was made in 2008 by lifting the drilling moratorium has been completely reversed by the Obama administration. The President says he wants to ''win the future,'' but his policies are taking us back to the past.

Now American families and businesses are once again facing $4 gasoline, as I said, $5 the first of June; and we're no further ahead in expanding American energy production than we were 3 years ago. That's outrageous and unacceptable.

The House has already passed two bills to increase offshore energy production, create jobs, and lower prices. Today, we will vote on a third offshore drilling bill, H.R. 1231, in order to reverse the moratorium that President Obama has single-handedly placed on new offshore drilling.

This bill requires the administration to move forward with offshore lease sales in areas containing the most oil and natural gas. For the 2012–2017 lease plan being written by the Obama administration, this would include areas containing at least 2.5 billion barrels of oil or 7.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Based on the government's own estimates of our oil and natural resources, this would open up areas in the north and central Atlantic coasts, the southern California coast, and offshore Alaska.

Even in the face of rising gasoline prices, the President wants to drill nowhere new. This bill says let's move forward with leasing and drilling in those areas where we know America has real and significant resources. In contrast to the President's drill nowhere new plan, this is a drill smart plan.

This bill requires the Secretary to set specific production goals for 5-year plans. For 2012–2017 it sets a goal of 3 million barrels of oil per day and 10 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day by the year 2027. By comparison to today's levels, this increase of oil equates

to a tripling of current American offshore production and would reduce foreign imports by nearly one-third.

This bill will not only significantly increase American energy production; it would also create good-paying American jobs. Economist Dr. Joseph Mason testified that this bill would create 250,000 jobs short term and 1.2 million jobs long term.

This bill will also generate hundreds of millions in new revenue to help strengthen our economy and pay down the national debt. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill will generate $800 million in revenue over the next 10 years.

Recent polls show that the majority of Americans—Republicans, Democrats, and independents—all support increased offshore drilling. They recognize that our national economic security should not be left in the hands of Iranian-led OPEC and that expanding American energy production will translate into more jobs, more revenue and lower gasoline prices.

Madam Chairman, the Obama administration is trying to lead us into a supposedly new era of time without understanding the importance of fossil fuels. It is the largest tax on every family. Approximately $1,100, Mr. and Mrs. America, you're paying to the Obama administration in taxes because of the high cost of oil, high cost of gas to you.

It's time America steps up and becomes independent from those that have been selling this oil for the past 25 years. It's not just this President. This has been going on for a while. But next year we're going to send $400 billion overseas to the countries that do not like us, that do not create one American job, not anything for America—send the money over and buy foreign oil.

□ 1540

I watched the President say this down in Brazil, We want to be your partner. You are developing new oil fields, and we want to buy your gasoline. So Mr. And Mrs. America, keep in mind, we have the fossil fuels, we have the opportunity, and it's time that we open the offshore for development of the good State of America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are at a historic juncture in our country's history, as northern Africa and the Middle East explode. And what we have, of course, is a real instability in the oil marketplace, and we have to do something that fundamentally responds to that challenge.

In the first 3 months of this year, Exxon-Mobil made $10 billion off of the American consumer—in January, February, and March of this year. Shell reported that they had made $8 billion. BP reported that they had made $7 billion. So what are these companies asking for? These companies are now asking that we open up the beaches of California to drill for oil, we open up the beaches of Florida to drill for oil, we open up the beaches of New Jersey and New England to drill for oil.

I will tell you right now, in most of those places—actually, in all of those places, the only oil the people who live near those beaches want is the suntan oil that they use when they're out on those beaches. They don't want oil coming in the way it did in the Gulf of Mexico. And why are they concerned? They're concerned because the oil companies, exercising their power—and right now, those oil companies are centered down in the Gulf of Mexico—those companies have exercised their power to block any new safety reforms from being put in place that would protect against another catastrophic spill.

So the temerity of these oil companies is that they are coming out here today, and they're saying: No safety; no lessons learned from what happened in the Gulf of Mexico, devastating the beaches of the gulf. Now we want permission to drill off of the California coast, the Florida coast, the New England coast, the New Jersey coast without any new safety. And by the way, although we've made a fortune just in the last 3 months, with the skyrocketing prices that people who travel here to Washington—they've been coming down all of the highways towards our Capitol, watching the price of gasoline go up even as they are traveling, heading up to $4 and, in some places, $5 a gallon—they're saying that the Congress shouldn't take away their tax breaks. Don't even touch those tax breaks, the oil companies are saying. Cut Medicare for grandma. Exxon-Mobil and Shell, they are advocating cutting Medicare for grandma, to take that money and to give it to the oil companies as tax breaks to put on top—kind of like a cherry on top of the sundae—to put it on top of all of these profits that they are making off of the American consumer. That's what they're trying to do, and that's what this debate is all about.

So what we're saying as Democrats is, let's implement the safety recommendations to make sure that the drilling doesn't endanger the beaches of the east coast and the west coast the way they did in the Gulf of Mexico. The oil companies are coming in here, with the Republicans as their advocates, saying, Don't worry about it. Yes, we're going to block any safety measures from being put on the books, but that's our prerogative because we have the votes here. The Republicans are going to make sure that the votes are there to block any safety—we want to keep the tax breaks; the Republicans say fine. We don't want any new safety regulations; the Republicans say fine.

By the way, we don't even like the idea of this competition from wind and solar, so we would like to ask you, as the Republican majority, to cut the solar and wind budget by 70 percent—and they did it, believe it or not. It's 2011. We're watching the Middle East explode, and the Republicans cut wind and solar in the United States by 70 percent. Keep the tax breaks for the biggest oil companies, and ask grandma to take a lower Medicare benefit to pay for it all for the oil companies. This is 2011, ladies and gentlemen. This is a message. It is so dangerous for our country.

We have to oppose this bill because, first of all, they already have 60 million acres of American land—the size of Minnesota they already have to drill on, that they haven't drilled on yet, which has about 11 billion barrels of oil underneath it and an equivalent amount of natural gas. So vote ''no'' on this Republican bill. It's just a giveaway to Exxon-Mobil and Shell, and they're the last people in the world right now that need a handout.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, as record high gas prices are causing American families to suffer in their daily routines, like buying groceries at the grocery store and driving to work each morning, it is inexcusable that this liberal administration continues to turn its back on the problem. Just last month, Americans spent around $368 on average just to fill their tanks, about the same amount a family would spend on groceries for 2 weeks. Yet the Democrats' only solution to the pain at the pump is to raise taxes on domestic oil producers, and they've already admitted that it will not lower gas prices.

I fully support H.R. 1231, a real proposal which would lift the President's ban on offshore drilling and get the ball rolling on domestic energy production. I urge my Democrat colleagues to pass this bill because both our cars and our economy should be running on American resources, not on their empty promises. Pass this bill to create American jobs and a strong American economy.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. Look, we have preserved millions of acres in Alaska. We want to preserve the shores of New Jersey. Now if you don't understand that, there are even more major problems.

Since last night, my friends on the other side have voted down no fewer than four amendments dealing with the safety of drilling. You could be for drilling. But I think it's common sense that we preserve and not take the chances that large companies are taking, and we saw what happened in the South. The Gulf of Mexico is still recovering from billions of dollars in economic and environmental damages caused by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

It's almost unbelievable. When you watch it, one blamed the other, and

those folks still don't have relief. It's almost unbelievable; in the wake of such a tragedy, this bill is before us today. There are 60 million acres of public land already under lease to drill, and I wouldn't give 1 more acre up until those companies drill on the land that they already have. You blame everything on the President. You're going to blame the plague on the President. That dog doesn't hunt anymore. Forget about it.

If we can't come together on issues like this, the one that the American people are disgusted with when they do pay their gasoline bill—you want to expand offshore drilling to vast new areas of our oceans, including the Atlantic coast, without taking any of the commonsense steps that the President's bipartisan oil spill commission recommended.

□ 1550

An oil spill on the Atlantic coast, which the Federal Government would be required to lease under this bill, would devastate the economy.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Tourism at the Jersey Shore supports jobs for over 500,000 people, generates over $50 billion in economic activity every year. These people depend on the responsible stewardship of our waters and coasts for their livelihoods.

Let's set the record straight. This legislation does nothing to address the current spike in gas prices. What we need to do is:

Stop wildly fluctuating oil prices. And that's up to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, which is writing the regulations as we speak right now.

Cap America's oil reserves. For a short period of time, we can afford to do that.

Crack down on gas gouging, which is happening and the U.S. Attorney General is correct in investigating this.

And, finally, evolve to a clean energy economy. It's not just that we need to depend less on foreign oil, we need to depend less on domestic oil. We know it's going to take time. We need to be reasonable about this and be safe about it as well.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I appreciate the gentleman's comments on why he represents the area he represents. But he did vote against ANWR, has supported no production, very, very important to me.

I can say one thing. The Obama administration, I got a big kick out of someone saying we can blame the President. I can remember Bush was in office for 8 years and we blamed him for the earthquakes and the tsunami and I don't know what else.

What bothers me the most is that this country moves its economy with fossil fuels. Our trucks, our ships, our planes, our automobiles and our trains are all using fossil fuels and must do so. That's what moves our commerce. That's also what will raise the price for everybody and every household in this Nation. It is being taxed by these high costs of fossil fuel.

We can stabilize that cost if we're allowed to produce off our shores and on our shores. But to not say we're going to produce any more oil—which is exactly what this administration is saying, because they want to transfer into a new era of time. We want to transfigure the country into a new era of time. We don't care about jobs. We don't care what happens to the economy. We're going to do it because we're right. I'm saying you're dead wrong.

Can we use the fossil fuel in America to use it as a bridge to new fuels? Yes. But you cannot stop using fossil fuels. We're buying $400 billion a year overseas from foreign countries, bleeding this country every day. It's time we get on with the job.

At this time, Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chairman, this truly is a tale of two parties.

The Democrats have been very clear in their approach on this issue. Heap additional taxes on producers, which will be immediately passed on to consumers, and continue to delay and obstruct the development of America's vast petroleum resources. Higher prices at the pump, increasing dependence on foreign oil, and thousands more families thrown out of work, that is the Democratic plan.

The Republicans have also been very clear on our approach. Open America's vast petroleum resources, triple the current production by 2027, cut foreign imports by one-third. Even more importantly, this bill means hundreds of thousands of new jobs and hundreds of billions of dollars of direct revenues into the national and State treasuries, not through higher prices for consumers but through growing prosperity for our country.

That's the choice between the two parties, plain and simple, and it's the choice I believe the American people are ready and eager to make.

Mr. HOLT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), who knows this subject very well.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1231, the last and most egregious bill in the Republicans' oil addiction agenda.

It's unconscionable that we're voting today to expand offshore drilling even before stronger safeguards can be put in place, to mandate new leasing off the economically important coastlines of southern California, Alaska, and the entire eastern seaboard, each time these waters are open to drilling.

And it's cynical to claim that more drilling will relieve high gas prices. More drilling only means more profits for the oil industry, not lower costs at the pump.

We all know oil companies hardly need a boost right now. They're receiving billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies and reaping record profits.

On top of that, the oil industry is already drilling more than ever before. For example, offshore production has increased by more than a third in the last 2 years, and the gulf produced 1.6 million barrels of oil per day last year, an all-time record. Yet, despite all that drilling, gas prices continue to soar, and the reason is clear: More drilling here in the U.S. has little effect on the global oil market.

Nearly three-quarters of the world's proven oil resources are owned by OPEC nations. And even if we expanded offshore drilling significantly, we wouldn't see an impact on gas prices until 2030; and even then, it would be a matter of just 5 cents a gallon. This is according to the Energy Information Administration.

If, instead, we further raised fuel efficiency standards, we could lower driver bills at the pump. Building cars that go further on a gallon of gas is the best way to protect American families. It also creates jobs. It slashes our oil imports, and it reduces dangerous air pollution. This is the kind of solution we need right now.

We shouldn't be promoting reckless drilling that will fail to lower gas prices and endanger our coastlines. Vote ''no'' on H.R. 1231.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the bill under consideration.

I heard one of my friends on the other side of the aisle suggest that the only thing people in California or other places that live near beaches, the only oil they're concerned about is suntan oil. I have to take exception to that.

Even though I represent an inland district now, I was born a block from the beach. I was a resident of a beachside community for 42 years. I grew up with kids whose parents worked in refineries, worked on oil rigs, were wildcatters, worked in offshore drilling in the Port of Long Beach, worked offshore, Huntington Beach.

I just have to tell you, I find it insulting to suggest that those people are not concerned about the good of the United States. We're talking about the loss of middle class jobs in America. There's nothing more middle class than those men and women who have worked for years in the oil industry.

Where do you think it comes from, from the sky? You've got to drill for it. You've got to produce it. You've got to refine it. And everything I hear on the other side of the aisle is we're not going to allow you to drill; we're not going to allow you to produce; we're not going to allow you to refine because somehow it's just going to show up.

We watched the President of the United States, supported by the Members on the other side of the aisle, journey to Brazil and laud their efforts to use American technology to explore and drill and maximize their recovery of their resources. He lauded them for it. He thanked them for it. He applauded them for it. Then he turned around and said, And we want to be your biggest customer. In other words, he promised that we would pay a foreign entity for a resource that we need.

I'm absolutely convinced that my friends on the other side of the aisle will oppose any notion that we can have any offshore drilling unless we make Brazil the 51st State. That's how absurd it is.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Chair, as someone who grew up with family members, with people whose families worked in this industry and did not consider it a dirty industry, considered it an all-American industry, how far have we come that now we denigrate it from top to bottom?

We also hear from the other side, well, it won't have any impact because it takes 5 to 10 years to develop it. I heard that on this floor 32 years ago. I heard that on this floor 27 years ago. I heard that on this floor 22 years ago. I heard that on this floor 5 years ago, and it is correct. My friends on the other side are correct. It will make no difference so long as they make sure we don't drill now, we don't drill 35 years from now, we don't drill 10 years from now.

We are harming ourselves. It's time to stop the harm.

□ 1600

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

Madam Chair, here we go again, considering legislation that is written as if the largest oil spill in U.S. waters did not occur. This is the third of the amnesia acts that we have seen offered in the last week.

I say to my friend from California, no one is saying that we oppose this bill because we shouldn't drill, ever. But let's be smart. H.R. 1231 would force the Interior Department to open up vast swaths of the American coastline to drilling, including California and all of the Mid and North Atlantic. It is incomprehensible that the majority would take such a reckless radical step before we even know the full cost of the gulf spill. Let's be smart.

This bill in particular represents something worse than the pre-spill mentality; it represents an alternative reality: facts evidently don't matter. Never mind the fact that, 1 year ago, 11 workers died in a Deepwater Horizon oil rig explosion. Never mind that about 60 died over the last decade. Never mind the fact that, prior to the gulf spill, offshore drilling in U.S. waters was four times more deadly than drilling of the same operations, the same kinds of operations by the same companies elsewhere in the world, even in the inhospitable territory of the North Sea.

Never mind the fact that the Gulf of Mexico workforce suffered 1,550 injuries, 948 fires over the last decade. Never mind that Congress has not enacted a single piece of legislation to improve the safety of offshore drilling. Never mind the fact that there were 79 reported losses of well control in the gulf between 1996 and 2009.

Never mind the fact that a single blowout caused more than 4 billion barrels of oil to spew from the Macondo well for 87 days, coating 1,000 miles of coastline, closing over 88 square miles of some of the Nation's most productive fisheries.

Never mind the fact that the independent Energy Information Administration has concluded that unlimited access to U.S. offshore resources would have zero effect on gas prices over the next decade and might have an effect of pennies after that.

Never mind that U.S. oil production will remain above the 2009 pre-gulf spill levels through 2035, as calculated by the Department of the Interior, without the proposed acceleration in leasing and drilling. Never mind that the United States cannot drill our way to lower pump prices when we possess about 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. About 2 percent of the oils reserves.

We are not dominant in this field. Oh, yes, we have some of the best companies and certainly the most profitable, but we consume 25 percent of the world's oil while we have about 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. Prices are determined by OPEC, with fluctuations above that basic price determined by speculation on the commodities market.

Never mind the fact that 79 percent of all of the potential oil reserves on the entire Continental Shelf are already available under the current leasing; 79 percent, I repeat to my friends, are already available under the existing leasing program. Never mind that 60 million acres are already under lease but not producing oil. That is onshore and offshore. And offshore, the existing leases contain more than 11 billion, billion with a B, barrels of oil.

Never mind the fact that the entire Atlantic contains less than 5 percent of the potential U.S. offshore oil reserves and less than 9 percent of the natural gas reserves. Never mind the fact that the entire Pacific contains only about 12 percent of the potential U.S. offshore oil reserves and less than 5 percent of the potential natural gas reserves.

Never mind the fact that, in the Gulf of Mexico, the oil companies already hold the drilling rights to 34 million acres, but are producing oil on only 6 million acres. Never mind the fact that the 28 million nonproducing acres in the gulf have more natural gas and about as much oil as you would ever get total from drilling up and down the east and west coasts.

Never mind, my friends, the fact that, from 2005 to 2009, Big Oil used less than 10 percent of their profits to explore for oil while they used between 60 and 90 percent of their profits to pay dividends and buy back stock. These are behaving like financial industries, not energy industries.

Never mind the fact that the majority refuses to end the $4 billion, actually more like $8 billion, in tax breaks for oil companies at the very time that the top five oil companies took home over $32 billion in profits in just the last 3 months.

Never mind the fact that when the top four oil companies took home $485 billion in profits during the 5 years from 2005 to 2009, they still reduced their combined American workforce by 10,200 employees. And my friends here are talking about jobs, when these companies make profits of nearly $500 billion, they lay off more than 10,000 workers? What kind of reality are they living in?

Never mind the fact that the Gulf of Mexico tourism and fishing industries employ five times as many people as the oil industry. Five times as many. Never mind the fact that the annual value of coastal tourism and fishing in the U.S. exceeds that of oil and gas extraction by tens of billions of dollars.

Never mind the fact that this bill before us is one more unjustified giveaway to Big Oil. Never mind all of those facts. Ignore the spill. Drill, baby, drill.

No, thank you. I prefer to live in the real world where facts matter, and where this bill could have devastating real-world consequences. I urge my colleagues, Remember the spill. Vote down this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, may I say there were no facts presented in that last presentation. There were opinions; there were no facts. When everybody says never mind the facts, there were no facts there. That's all opinion.

One thing that bothers me most, they talk about what the oil companies made. They made it overseas; they made it overseas selling us oil. These are international companies. International companies. That is something that really disturbs me, when you understand we're burning oil produced overseas, yes, by the same companies that work in the United States.

And, yes, they did lay off 10,000 people, because of this moratorium this President laid in place in Louisiana in the gulf. There's where the jobs are lost.

The biggest economic impact of the Horizon spill was the loss of employment of the people in Louisiana, Alabama, and the Gulf of Texas, the loss of jobs, loss of oil to this country.

That's the thing that concerns me, because there are no facts about the profits made and the people laid off, other than the fact it was done by the Obama administration.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. QUAYLE).

Mr. QUAYLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today because I support this bill.

And I do have a fact. The fact of the matter is that we have a gas crisis going on right now, and the fact of the matter is, when I go home and I fill up my tank, I cringe at how expensive it is. Our friends on the other side of the aisle, their so-called solution is to increase our taxes and to demagogue oil corporations, because that's the classic bogeyman approach that they go to.

But that is not a solution to get our people back to work, to get our economy moving again, because right now we are having some anemic growth in our economy. And if we start to increase taxes and have an energy increase in costs that is happening at the pump, that is going to have a negative effect on economic growth.

Instead of actually having solutions where we can get the people in the gulf back to work, where we can get our economy moving again, where we can actually tap the energy sources that we have in the United States, we have an administration that only pursues moratoriums on gulf drilling, moratoriums on actually having energy supplies.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. QUAYLE. I thank the gentleman.

If we actually started to look and invest in those sorts of thing and get our energy independence going, we could have charts down on this floor that show job growth.

According to CBO, if we pass today's legislation, we will generate $800 million in revenue over 10 years. Combined with the energy initiatives that the House passed last week, these three votes will create an estimated 250,000 jobs in the short term and 1.2 million jobs over the long term.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill and get our economy and our American people back to work.

□ 1610

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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. FLEISCHMANN) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL, 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. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 754, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–75) on the resolution (H. Res. 264) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 754) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 257 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. 1231.

□ 1616

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. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes with Mr. CAMPBELL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) had 16½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) had 12½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If enacted, this bill will open up areas of the Outer Continental Shelf where there are the greatest known oil and gas reserves that contain billions of barrels of oil. With resources like these, it is a wonder that we continue to rely on other countries for most of our energy. While the administration is encouraging other countries to produce oil, Americans are unable to access large areas of our own energy supply here.

H.R. 1231 will hold the administration accountable by setting production goals to make sure that we provide enough energy for our country while reducing the dependence on foreign oil. Gas prices have increased by 12.9 cents per gallon in my hometown of Chattanooga, Tennessee, during the last month alone.

Plain and simply, we know that increased oil and natural gas production will drive down gas prices. We should have the ability to access our vast resources at home. Mr. Chairman, we have the means to provide relief for our growing energy deficit, and passage of this bill will be a step towards providing these means for our country.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. BERG).

Mr. BERG. Mr. Chairman, my home State of North Dakota is rich in natural resources, and we have seen tremendous economic opportunity from the Bakken field. Through EMPOWER North Dakota, we were able to adopt a long-term energy plan in our State. It encouraged new energy development; and it created high-paying, high-quality jobs in the energy industry. In fact, today our unemployment rate is the lowest in the Nation.

We can have the same success on the national level, but to do so we need a long-term commonsense plan that is a national energy policy that must work to increase America's energy production, lower gas prices, and ultimately break our dependence on foreign oil.

□ 1620

America's families and small businesses are hurting. Gas prices are over $4 a gallon. Energy bills are hindering business growth. National unemployment remains a very high 9 percent. There is enormous potential in the gulf for energy development that can help turn our country's problems around. Our addiction to foreign energy is not sustainable. It threatens our national security. It's time to invest our resources that we have here in the United States. We need to lower energy costs and get Americans back to work.

As a member of the House Energy Action Team and a proud North Dakotan, I'm committed to working hard towards a national long-term energy policy. Let's pass this bill, get the gulf back to work and break our dependence on foreign oil.

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

The majority, the sponsors of this bill, say that we need it because supply is dwindling and gasoline prices are climbing and employment is terrible. Well, I'll grant they have got a point on a couple of items here. But it has nothing to do with this legislation. They bring forward a bill to help the oil supply when it is a fact, I say to my colleague, that 79 percent of all of the potential oil reserves as calculated by

the nonpartisan prospectors on the whole Continental Shelf are already under the current leasing program. Sixty million acres. This is indisputable. Sixty million acres offshore are under existing lease and contain 11.5 billion barrels. So this ''hurry up and drill'' legislation is certainly not necessary for that.

As for employment, I said it before and I'll say it again. It is a fact. During the 5 years previously when the four oil companies took home $485 billion in profits, their combined American workforce dropped by 10,200 employees. They made money. They laid people off. So we can check that one off, too. It's not about employment.

How about prices? This year's leases have nothing to do with this year's price at the gas pump—or next year's. In fact, not for 20 years. Might it have an effect? Oh, yes, there's a supply problem. The supply problem is that U.S. oil reserves amount to about 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. About 2 percent. My colleagues say, Oh, no, those calculations are wrong. Okay, I'll give you a break. Let's say we're off by a factor of two. How about a factor of three? How about a factor of four? We would still be one of the smallest oil supplies of the oil-producing countries. So this is not about that.

The prices are determined right now at the pump largely by speculation. According to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, speculators increased their energy future contracts—their positions—by 64 percent over the last couple of years, totaling more than a million contracts. They are trading in each day far more paper barrels than barrels of oil are ever delivered. It's speculation, pure and simple. Speculators have moved from holding 30 percent of the open interest in the commodity markets to 70 percent. And you wonder why the prices at the pump are so high. Even Goldman Sachs says that speculation is responsible for many tens of dollars of the hundred dollars a barrel that is now the world price for oil.

Going back a decade, the majority voted to exempt all energy derivatives from CFTC regulations. And then when the Dodd-Frank financial reform bill came along, they opposed the enactment to give the CFTC the power to regulate energy derivatives. They voted to slash the CFTC budget as part of H.R. 1. Right now in the Agriculture Committee and the Financial Services Committee, they are working to block any possibility that the CFTC would put in regulations to limit or reduce speculation.

So if my colleagues want to do something to deal with the high gas prices, I will give them a list of things to do. It is not this bill. We do not need to cut corners. We do not need to deem that inadequate applications for leasing are adequate. We do not need to deem that environmental impact statements that are clearly inadequate are adequate. We do not need to open up the east coast and west coast to willy-nilly rapid drill prospecting. We certainly do not.

Now, one thing I'll hand my colleagues. They yesterday said we really need to get away from these environmental regulations that are stymying the oil companies, that are making it hard for them to earn their profits, these burdensome environmental regulations. I'll give them one thing. These regulations, the environmental impact statement that was prepared for the drilling in the Gulf of Mexico this year that they want to expand on into the future that has in it a plan for dealing with walruses, because they think that's a really good environmental impact statement that's based on the real world facts—you're right. In the Macondo well in the blowout of the Deepwater Horizon, we didn't lose a single walrus's life.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. In closing, I just repeat, let's live in the real world. Let's deal with the facts. Facts matter. And this bill can have devastating consequences for workers, for those who have to travel by car and buy gasoline, and for those who earn their living fishing and dealing with tourism in the gulf and in New Mexico and in California. Let's not pass another ''Amnesia Act.'' Let's not ignore the spill and drill, baby, drill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. May I ask how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this legislation. I would like Americans to understand that the issue of whether we should drill or not is long overdue because I have heard this argument for 36 years because I was here when we drilled and opened the Trans-Alaska pipeline to provide 17 billion barrels of oil to America—17 billion barrels of oil.

I've heard people say that there's only 2 percent. That is a figure that was arrived at in 1955. We have new estimates with new technology. We think we have about 20 percent of the world's reserves in fossil fuels. And we're not producing them. I've heard the argument this wouldn't change the price of gasoline. It's not quick enough. I heard that 25 years ago.

We need to produce so we have a stable supply of domestic fossil fuels so other countries and speculators don't take advantage. They have us right now in a position they can take advantage of because we are not producing any oil of any consequence in the United States right now. We're down to 600,000 barrels a day in Alaska. If we drop much more, we won't even have that 600,000 barrels a day. Yet we have in Alaska in the Chukchi Sea, there's been $5 billion spent to find oil. We have not had the permit to drill because of this administration. They think there's 27 billion barrels of oil in one offshore development. The other one has approximately 14 billion barrels of oil in one offshore development. Of course, we have ANWR, which that side does not support, to a great degree, that has probably 39 billion barrels of oil.

□ 1630

You add up that amount of oil and you have oil that will last this country for a hundred years.

Now, yes, we ought to have other forms of energy. But the Obama administration is trying to force this country into a green energy future. This is a policy. I heard the former Speaker say it. Of course it makes sense to reduce our dependency on oil, as I said before, but no one takes into consideration the impact upon the economy of this Nation.

New Jersey is building an LNG plant to receive gas from overseas. That's well and good, buying foreign gas, when we have trillions of feet of gas in the United States of America.

We are costing not only jobs but the dependency—and everybody talks about the high price of gasoline. It's caused primarily because of spiking. Some little incident in the Middle East—the OPEC countries supposedly have 70 percent of our oil—raises the price of that gasoline. You can't have a model economy and a business and have those spikes. If the price was $5 across the board and you knew it was going to be $5 across the board for the next 40 years, you could build your economy on that. But we have gas at $5 a gallon now, the first of June, and it may go up to $6 in August. It may be down a little bit. We need to stabilize it. Only we can do this.

But this administration is trying to convert America into their green technology. Technology of wind. Technology of, let's say, solar. Wind power is 17 cents a kilowatt compared to 5 cents for coal. Mr. and Mrs. America, you're paying for that. And again, as I said in one of my statements, this, in fact, is a tax on the American people. This is an Obama tax because of the lack of the cheaper fuel that's necessary to keep our economy running.

The impediments of oil and gas production is another reason, the slowdown of Federal leases. We talk about everything that's leased and permitting offshore and onshore. Only six permits have been issued since the Gulf of Mexico, the time the BP spill happened—six permits. Leasing in the Gulf of Mexico coast has been delayed for several years. Offshore permitting for oil and gas has been slowed down to a real slow crawl.

America, I keep telling you, you are being taxed by an administration that does not understand the necessity for fossil fuels for our economy. The movement of product, the receiving of product and the shipping of product, the deliverance of people, the deliverance of

supplies by air, ship, plane, train, automobile, and truck. That's what makes this country great.

And here we sit with a group that says, oh, we're going to save the environment. I'm all for that. But you don't have an energy policy and you can't have it off fossil fuels. Anybody who says we're going to have one off fossil fuels is not even thinking about fuels, not even thinking about energy. You can't do it with wind power. We might get a little wind power if we put a propeller on the top of this Capitol to collect all the hot air that comes out of here most of the time. That might work. But we're not going to do it with solar power. You need all the forms of energy. And this administration so far has not promoted anything but the two most expensive: wind and solar.

We need our fossil fuels. We need to make sure the agencies under this administration make sure that we develop our energies, or we cannot go anywhere. And if they can't do it, then it's up to this Congress. This Congress, this bill, this legislation, and the two previous bills are a step forward, a necessary step for this Nation. We need to keep going. So employ Americans and quit buying foreign oil. You talk about being hooked on dope, that's what we are. We're hooked on foreign oil. Yet we have people that say we can't develop our own oil, we can't develop our own resources, that it will hurt somebody, somebody will be harmed and we can't do it.

That's not true. We can do it. In the gulf there were 41,000 wells drilled without a spill. Add one spill and everybody thinks the world came to an end. It was bad, yes. Do we learn from it? Yes, as we did with Exxon Valdez. We learned from that and we will improve upon that. But not to let them drill, not to let them produce that oil, not to let them help America out, not employ Americans, that is dead wrong.

So I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation and reject the amendments that are going to be offered. They are not the amendments they should be.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1231. I had offered amendments because I believe in responsible increase in offshore drilling. I offered amendments to improve upon this bill that would have provided for revenue sharing with coastal states and a study and report back to Congress to ensure that the Department of Interior has proper funding for staffing and training and technical engineers and such other personnel as is necessary to responsibly increase offshore drilling.

As a Representative from an oil and gas producing District and state, I am aware that offshore drilling is an important component of the nation's energy supply and provides many Gulf communities with significant jobs and income.

My state supplies 20 percent of the nation's oil production, one-third of the nation's natural gas production; a quarter of the nation's refining capacity and nearly 60 percent of the nation's chemical manufacturing.

The Texas energy and petrochemical clusters employ 600,000 people, which represent 70 percent and 15 percent, respectively, of the total U.S. workforce in those industries.

Houston is home to some of the world's largest oil, gas, and petrochemical facilities.

As the fourth most populous city in the United States, and the greater Houston area remains a diversified regional economy, with the energy industry contributing 50 percent of our economic base for employment. Even so there is no denying the importance of the energy industry for creating jobs in Houston and across our Nation.

We have consistently led the nation in petroleum production since the early 10th century and we have one-fourth of total U.S. oil reserves.

As a coastal state we provide the resources and the mechanisms to support the offshore drilling industry and we also bare the highest risk to our natural resources. Its stands to reason that we should also have access to revenue generated from Offshore leases.

Federal Revenues from offshore leases were estimated at $18.0 billion in FY 2008 by the Department of the Interior. During the previous 10 years (1998–2007), revenues from federal OCS leases reached as high as $7.6 billion in FY 2006. Higher prices for oil and gas are the most significant factors in the revenue swings. Of the $18.0 billion offshore revenue in FY 2008, $8.3 billion was from royalties and $9.5 billion came from bonus bids. Coastal states can use that money to further support the industry that utilizes our highways and waterways.

A significant portion of oil and gas produced from Gulf Outer Continental Shelf leases is transported to those refineries for processing via offshore pipeline through state waters.

Providing coastal states with additional access to revenue will enable these states to protect their natural resources and advance the transport of oil, gas, and petrochemicals across the United States.

Coastal States like Texas with energy development off their shores in federal waters have been seeking additional federal revenues generated off our shores.

We particularly want more assistance for coastal areas that may be most affected by onshore and near-shore activities that support offshore energy development.

Currently, the affected states receive revenue indirectly from offshore oil and gas leases in federal waters. This is in contrast to the direct revenues to states that have onshore federal leases within their boundaries.

Coastal states bear the greatest risks if there is a disaster. Because of the current and wind patterns in the Gulf of Mexico, Texas' coastal natural resources are most at risk for environmental damage in the event of an oil spill from an offshore production platform or pipeline. In addition, a substantial portion of federal Outer Continental Shelf production is refined in Texas and then transported via state highways or pipeline located in the state.

A significant amount of the infrastructure that will be used to explore and develop the resources in these new lease sales will be constructed in Texas and transported through state waters. The same might be said for other coastal states whose shores and resources are dedicated to offshore drilling.

Annual rental rates are $5–$9.50 per acre, with lease sizes generally ranging from 2,500–5,760 acres. However, annual rental rates for the March 2009 sale in the Central Gulf of Mexico begins at $11.00 per acre for lease in water depths over 200 meters. Initial lease terms of 5–10 years are standard, and leases continue as long as commercial quantities of hydrocarbons are being produced.

Demand for petroleum products in the U.S. remains strong. In 2005, each of the estimated 296 million people in the U.S. used an average of almost three gallons of petroleum every day. In 1978, the average American used 3.5 gallons per day.

In 2006, crude oil imports totaled 10.1 million barrels per day (MBD), two-thirds of the total U.S. supply of 15.2 MBD, according to the Energy Information Administration (EIA) of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). After several additions of other petroleum products by refiners and fuel blenders, total petroleum consumption came to 20.6 MBD for 2006.

The oil and gas industry supports job growth in my state of Texas and across our nation.

In Texas, the oil and gas industry supports 1.7 million jobs and approximately 25 percent of the state's economy, whereas nationwide the industry supports 9.2 million jobs and 7.5 percent of our nation's economy.

We should focus our attention on providing the Department of Interior with funding and resources it needs to provide for training and staffing of technical engineers and other such necessary personnel to review drilling permit applications and determine future offshore lease sale areas.

The Department of Interior must be properly funded and staffed with technical engineers to review permits, examine lease sales, and ensure that each application is afforded proper consideration

For these reasons, I urge the Members as they vote on this important measure which certainly relates to job creation and national energy independence, that they consider a fair and balance approach as we aim to protect the environment and determine the most responsible measures to provide for the energy our nation requires.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1231. This bill will ensure that our federal offshore oil and natural gas resources are accessible to us. This is essential for America's energy security.

For years, I have supported bills that would increase funding to research and development projects dealing with new and cleaner energy sources as well as provide financial incentives to produce energy from wind, solar, biomass, and geothermal, for consumers to purchase fuel efficient vehicles, increase energy efficiency standards for buildings and appliances, and promote public transit efforts. I will continue to support programs and projects seeking to create cleaner energy technologies because we all benefit from a cleaner environment.

Finally, coming from Texas, which is the nation's leader in renewable energy production and a pioneer in developing its own state portfolio standard, I support efforts to promote renewable energy production that meets the unique circumstances and resources of each state.

But even with these increases in renewable energy, the Energy Information Administration found that oil, natural gas, and coal will continue to make up the large majority of U.S. energy use in 2030 and beyond. As our nation's energy demand continues to increase, reasonable access and exploration of our offshore resources is a key component of our nation's energy security.

It is our job to provide affordable and reliable supplies of energy to American consumers, and this bill will help in our effort.

For these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment printed in the bill is adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1231

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act''.

SEC. 2. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM.

Section 18(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4)(A) In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall make available for leasing and conduct lease sales including—

''(i) at least 50 percent of the available unleased acreage within each outer Continental Shelf planning area considered to have the largest undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas resources (on a total btu basis) based upon the most recent national geologic assessment of the outer Continental Shelf, with an emphasis on offering the most geologically prospective parts of the planning area; and

''(ii) any State subdivision of an outer Continental Shelf planning area that the Governor of the State that represents that subdivision requests be made available for leasing.

''(B) In this paragraph the term 'available unleased acreage' means that portion of the outer Continental Shelf that is not under lease at the time of a proposed lease sale, and that has not otherwise been made unavailable for leasing by law.

''(5)(A) In the 2012–2017 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the Secretary shall make available for leasing any outer Continental Shelf planning areas that—

''(i) are estimated to contain more than 2,500,000,000 barrels of oil; or

''(ii) are estimated to contain more than 7,500,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas.

''(B) To determine the planning areas described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use the document entitled 'Minerals Management Service Assessment of Undiscovered Technically Recoverable Oil and Gas Resources of the Nation's Outer Continental Shelf, 2006'.''.

SEC. 3. DOMESTIC OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION GOAL.

Section 18(b) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) DOMESTIC OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION GOAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In developing a 5-year oil and gas leasing program, and subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall determine a domestic strategic production goal for the development of oil and natural gas as a result of that program. Such goal shall be—

''(A) the best estimate of the possible increase in domestic production of oil and natural gas from the outer Continental Shelf;

''(B) focused on meeting domestic demand for oil and natural gas and reducing the dependence of the United States on foreign energy; and

''(C) focused on the production increases achieved by the leasing program at the end of the 15-year period beginning on the effective date of the program.

''(2) 2012–2017 PROGRAM GOAL.—For purposes of the 2012–2017 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the production goal referred to in paragraph (1) shall be an increase by 2027 of—

''(A) no less than 3,000,000 barrels in the amount of oil produced per day; and

''(B) no less than 10,000,000,000 cubic feet in the amount of natural gas produced per day.

''(3) REPORTING.—The Secretary shall report annually, beginning at the end of the 5-year period for which the program applies, to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate on the progress of the program in meeting the production goal. The Secretary shall identify in the report projections for production and any problems with leasing, permitting, or production that will prevent meeting the goal.''.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 112–74. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, as a designee of Chairman DOC HASTINGS, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 10, strike ''(4)'' and insert ''(5)''.

Page 4, line 6, strike ''(5)'' and insert ''(6)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment that corrects a drafting error in the bill that was discovered by the legislative counsel after H.R. 1231 was reported from the committee with bipartisan support.

The amendment changes the paragraph numbers in section 2 so they correctly reflect the sequence of appearance in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection and we urge swift passage.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. 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 3, line 12, insert '', except in locations that would interfere, conflict with, or impede operations of the Armed Forces,'' after ''conduct lease sales''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this simple amendment clarifies that any expanded oil production will not interfere with ongoing operations by the Armed Forces of the United States.

I appreciate Congressman BOBBY SCOTT and Congressman JIM MORAN for their cosponsorship of this amendment. There are no stronger advocates for the military in my State than those two gentlemen.

□ 1640

As you know, the United States has more than two dozen coastal naval bases, including those located in Virginia, Washington, California, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Maryland, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maine, and Hawaii.

The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Readiness published a report, noting that many of these potential locations for oil exploration could and might conflict with DOD operations in these locations. For example, DOD has surface/subsurface operating areas and DOD special use airspace/warning areas off every coastal State in the continental United States.

You can see from this map that there are the red dots where they actually have bases and that the spiderwebs are where they have operations offshore.

These areas are important because the military uses some of these areas for surface and subsurface training as well as practice with live ordnance. Oil wells and live ordnance don't mix so well. For example, the Norfolk Naval Base in my home State of Virginia uses 78 percent of the proposed Lease Sale 220 area right now for training and live ordnance practice. The Navy wants to

ensure that oil drilling in that area does not interfere with live ordnance release and impact, including air to surface bombing; sensitive undersea and surface operations; combined shipboard systems qualification trials; and equipment testing and evaluation.

Norfolk is America's largest naval base and is a major driver of our State's annual $10 billion government contracting economy. It would be difficult to quantify how many billions of dollars taxpayers have spent building and maintaining these military installations all around the continental United States, but relocation costs would be substantial, and we don't have that money.

My friend from Alaska talks about putting people out of work or putting people into work. Believe me, if we had to close or relocate these bases, there would be a lot of weeping and mashing of teeth in the unemployment line all across America. The costs wouldn't just be borne by the taxpayers, Mr. Chairman, but also by the servicemen and -women who would have to relocate, and by the tens of thousands of contractor employees who rely on the DOD.

Perhaps it's possible to co-locate oil drilling infrastructure in areas now used by the Navy or other components of the Armed Forces. In that case, this amendment would not get in the way of the oil exploration. This amendment simply ensures that any additional oil drilling which takes place in accordance with this bill will not conflict with the national security operations of the Armed Forces.

I am sure that energy development and national security can be mutually reinforcing and compatible, and I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would support this commonsense amendment to protect our national defense and national security. I know we can all agree that preserving those should be paramount as we consider changes to our Nation's energy policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Both the Outer Continental Lands Shelf Act and the 2003 National Defense Act already fully protect the Defense Department's responsibilities in the Outer Continental Shelf and the State coastal areas of the OCS. H.R. 1231 continues these protections.

As Chairman HASTINGS stated last week during debate on a very similar amendment to H.R. 1230, preserving the working relationship between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior is of great importance to the Natural Resources Committee. Because of this, H.R. 1231 meets the mutual goals of balancing national security and energy independence, but this amendment would upset the balance.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense never notified, never talked to us about any opposition to this legislation.

H.R. 1231 fully supports the Department of the Interior's work with the Department of Defense in addressing the necessary stipulations that will protect the military mission on the OCS during the development of lease sales.

I also want to point out that gaining access to domestically available and affordable energy resources is also of paramount importance to our national security because it lessens our dependence on foreign sources of energy. Let me say that again. It must be very clear: Energy security and energy independence are a national security priority.

Additionally, developing our own energy resources benefits the Department of Defense. According to the Brookings Institution, every $10 increase in the price of a barrel of oil increases the cost of Defense operations by $1.3 billion. Lowering energy prices should be a priority for American consumers and for the Department of Defense.

This amendment isn't truly aimed at protecting DOD activities. It's aimed at trying to block lease sales and stopping offshore energy and development. That's what this is about. So I congratulate the people who are offering this amendment. It's exactly what you'd like to do.

Again, Defense activities are not hindered by energy development. The Departments of Defense and the Interior work well together to balance the needs of our Nation. H.R. 1231 allows both offshore energy leasing and military activities to go forward and exist in a safe, responsible way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I would just say to my friend from Alaska that I won't have anybody questioning my sincerity about trying to protect the national security interests of the United States of America. I come from a State with a long military tradition. I am proud of that tradition, and I am here sincerely to protect national security. If we want to disagree with that, that's fine, but questioning the motivations of whether there is another agenda is a different matter.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield the balance of my time to my distinguished colleague from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. May I ask the Chair how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the Chair, and I thank my good friend from Virginia.

I would remind my good friend from Alaska that the U.S. Atlantic Fleet is based at the Norfolk Naval Base, and operates in the same waters that this legislation proposes to sell for oil and gas development. Filling this area with drilling rigs is a bad idea.

Now, we have been told verbally and in writing that there should be no lease sales in 72 percent of this lease area because it's in direct conflict with the operations of the Navy. Five percent, in addition, would interfere with aerial operations and should not host permanent surface structures like drilling rigs. There is another 1 percent that would have site-specific stipulations. Then you're left with 22 percent, and much of that 22 percent is dedicated to the shipping lanes for the country's two busiest commercial ports: Hampton Roads and Baltimore.

There are other areas offshore, I'm sure, that are also important to the Armed Forces, but we are responsible for Virginia. We know the situation there. We are not going to jeopardize those jobs. I would say that national security interests ought to trump oil and gas development.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. May I inquire of the time remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alaska has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia's time has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment. It's unnecessary and boy if we can't get the government to work together there is something wrong, something deadly wrong. This is about defense. This is about the department of enter, this is about the American people. We ought to be able to work together and I'm sure they can. I'm confident of it and the idea that this is going to hurt the mission is again a way to stop drilling. That's all it is. Maybe if we had that 23 percent open and we knew exactly where it was we might be able to drill there but I don't think they would support that either.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY.

This amendment would prohibit offshore lease sales from going forward if those leases would interfere or impede the operations of the United States Armed Forces.

I represent the Hampton Roads region of Virginia, which is home to the world's largest Naval Base at Norfolk. Our Navy trains extensively off the coast of my state in the Virginia Capes Operations Area. A significant section of a proposed lease sale for drilling off Virginia's coast is within this important military training zone.

There are nearly 30 coastal naval installations in the United States and the Defense Department has expressed concerns that offshore oil and gas development could hinder the military's ability to train in many of these offshore areas.

I have long had reservations about drilling off the coast of Virginia. I believe the environmental, economic and national security risks for drilling off the coast of Virginia far outweigh any benefits. This amendment would simply ensure that offshore oil and gas development will not disrupt these vital functions to our national defense.

I urge my colleagues to support the Connolly Amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. MARKEY. 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 4, line 19, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 19 insert the following new paragraph:

''(7) ELIGIBILITY FOR NEW LEASES AND THE TRANSFER OF LEASES.—

''(A) ISSUANCE OF NEW LEASES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, beginning with the 2012–2017 5-year program, the Secretary of the Interior shall specify that the Secretary will not accept bids on any new leases offered pursuant to this Act from a person described in paragraph (2) unless the person has renegotiated each covered lease with respect to which the person is a lessee, to modify the payment responsibilities of the person to require the payment of royalties if the price of oil and natural gas is greater than or equal to the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

''(ii) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person referred to in clause (i) is a person that—

''(I) is a lessee that—

''(aa) holds a covered lease on the date on which the Secretary considers the issuance of the new lease; or

''(bb) was issued a covered lease before the date of enactment of this Act, but transferred the covered lease to another person or entity (including a subsidiary or affiliate of the lessee) after the date of enactment of this Act; or

''(II) any other person that has any direct or indirect interest in, or that derives any benefit from, a covered lease.

''(iii) MULTIPLE LESSEES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of clause (1), if there are multiple lessees that own a share of a covered lease, the Secretary may implement separate agreements with any lessee with a share of the covered lease that modifies the payment responsibilities with respect to the share of the lessee to include price thresholds that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

''(II) TREATMENT OF SHARE AS COVERED LEASE.—Beginning on the effective date of an agreement under subclaseu (I), any share subject to the agreement shall not constitute a covered lease with respect to any lessees that entered into the agreement.

''(B) TRANSFERS.—A lessee or any other person who has any direct or indirect interest in, or who derives a benefit from, a covered lease shall not be eligible to obtain by sale or other transfer (including through a swap, spinoff, servicing, or other agreement) any new lease made available in an oil and gas leasing program under this section, or the economic benefit of such a new lease, unless the lessee or other person has—

''(i) renegotiated each covered lease with respect to which the lessee or person is a lessee, to modify the payment responsibilities of the lessee or person to include price thresholds that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)); or

''(ii) entered into an agreement with the Secretary to modify the terms of all covered leases of the lessee or other person to include limitations on royalty relief based on market prices that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

''(C) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

''(i) COVERED LEASE.—The term 'covered lease' means a lease for oil or gas production in the Gulf of Mexico that is—

''(I) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

''(II) issued by the Department of the Interior under section 304 of the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (43 U.S.C. 1337 note; Public Law 104–58); and

''(III) not subject to limitations on royalty relief based on market price that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

''(ii) LESSEE.—The term 'lessee' includes any person or other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is in or under common control with, a lessee.

''(iii) NEW LEASE.—The term 'new lease' means a lease issued in a lease sale under this Act.

''(iv) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Chairman, in the first quarter of this year, the oil companies were actually able to make $35 billion in profits; but in my amendment, we are able to say to them, because of a flaw in leases in the 1990s which required them to pay no royalties on public lands—taxpayers' lands—for oil they're drilling for right now and charging $100 a barrel, $4 a gallon at the pump, that we think there is something wrong when the taxpayers don't get anything back.

□ 1650

And so what my amendment says is that they can't apply for any more leases on taxpayers' land unless they're willing to renegotiate the mistaken leases that were given to them that, by the way, will allow them to escape having to pay $53 billion in taxes, in royalties. That's another word for taxes, ''royalties.'' When you're talking about oil, ''royalties'' is the word we use to describe taxes.

This blank check to the oil industry is absolutely undeserved. The Republican approach to offshore oil royalty policy is to treat the Big Oil companies like royalty and to treat the consumers and taxpayers like peasants. They're just going to give away all these breaks to the oil industry.

You know, Prince William and Kate Middleton just left on their honeymoon. Their royalty honeymoon is just beginning. But for the oil companies who are drilling for free on public land, they have a royalty honeymoon that has been going on for way too long, and today, we're going to give the Members of the House a chance to end the honeymoon on the royalties that the oil industry has to pay.

Now, what are the Republicans going to do? They're going to oppose it. They're going to say, no, we need more tax breaks, $4 billion worth of tax breaks, for the oil industry. And so where are they going to find the money for those additional tax breaks that they want to give to the oil industry? Well, they looked around and they decided that the best place to find it was in Medicare, that is, in the health care that we give to Grandma and Grandpa. And so what they have done is they've set up a drilling rig for the oil industry on top of the Medicare program so they can drill into the pockets of Grandma and Grandpa to find the $4 billion in tax breaks, and then on top of that, protect them against having to pay the royalties, the taxes on where they're already drilling for free on taxpayers' land in our country.

Now, that's an unbelievable combination, and they do it while cutting the renewables budget by 70 percent. Can you believe this? It's 2011. The Republicans have already passed a bill cutting the renewables budget—wind and solar, biomass, geothermal—by 70 percent, and they're setting up an oil rig on top of the Medicare program of Grandma and Grandpa to drill for even more tax breaks for the oil industry. This is just an unbelievable debate that we're having.

And they say over here, ''Well, you know, we're the all of the above party; we want to do it all.'' But the truth is that they're really the oil above all party, and that's what this debate is all about, how can we get even more for the oil industry.

So what my amendment will do is to just give people an opportunity to reclaim that $53 billion from the oil industry and give it to Grandma. Of all the people who don't need a break, a subsidy this year, it's the oil industry. You know who needs a break? You know who needs a subsidy? It's Grandma. Let's not cut Medicare. Let's not cut her health care in order to help the oil industry. Vote ''aye'' for the Markey amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. With all due respect to Grandma and Grandpa, there's no Grandma and Grandpa that has Medicare taken away from them or anywhere else. That's pure demagoguery on this floor, and we know that, tied into the oil companies.

It's ironic to me, this House has debated and voted on this amendment over the years. They've defeated it by a bipartisan vote. Just like a bad penny, it keeps showing up and the Big Oil is all bad. All I know, the American public is being taxed every year, $1,100 every year by this administration's high gas prices.

Let's review the facts. The Deepwater Royalty Relief Act leases were issued by, oh, boy, Bill Clinton and Bruce Babbitt in 1996 and 2000. Oh, my good Lord, it was the Republicans that did all this. They're the ones that issued these leases, and those who hold these leases have repeatedly been successful in challenging the Interior Department's authority to include price thresholds in lease agreements. The Department of the Interior has lost at the Federal district court, the appellate court, the United States Supreme Court, and now we're going to interfere with a court decision?

If this amendment passes, those holding such leases will be required to renegotiate the lease terms with DOI to include price thresholds before getting new leases. Bill Clinton would turn over—no, he's not in his grave, so I can't say that. The Secretary does not—and I repeat does not—have the authority to include price thresholds on these leases. In addition, forcing companies to renegotiate the leases would be a violation of contract law and would be challenged in court.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that just comes out of where, I don't know. It's a time to demagogue on the floor about Medicare. It has nothing to do with oil leases. It has nothing to do with the so-called tax breaks that Bill Clinton and Bruce Babbitt put in place. George Bush wasn't there. Mr. Obama wasn't there. Bill Clinton did this.

Lo and behold, somebody has to renegotiate something. Let's start renegotiating contracts all over the countryside. Maybe we ought to start doing that. Some of the contracts made, and I think we did this the last election, their contracts were terminated.

I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Could the Chair tell me how much time we have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Alaska has 2½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Alaska has the right to close.

Mr. MARKEY. We have a big choice here. We can reclaim $53 billion from the oil and gas industry that they owe to the American taxpayer and put it into wind and solar and all-electric vehicles and the revolution that we need to transform our country's relationship with OPEC. We should be able to tell OPEC, We don't need your oil any more than we need your sand.

This is a chance here to reclaim the $53 billion in windfall profits by escaping royalties that the oil industry owes, and put it into a new technology innovation agenda that talks about the future of wind and solar and electric vehicles that will transform our relationship with the rest of the planet.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' comments, but wind power is subsidized energy. That's all it is. Wind power is subsidized by the taxpayer. Solar power is subsidized by the taxpayer. To try to transform this country into using wind and solar by raising the cost of gasoline to the American consumer is dead wrong. That's not the way to solve this problem.

I will support wind power when it's not subsidized. I will support solar power when it's not subsidized, and I will support nuclear power when we can, which the gentleman's opposed every time, and I will support hydropower. In fact, I will support all forms of power so we can become more independent, and I go back to the concept of fossil fuels. It moves objects. It moves objects. Wind power doesn't move objects, no. Solar power doesn't move objects, no. It takes fossil fuels to run our ships, our planes, our automobiles, our trucks, and our trains. That's the commerce of this Nation, and that's what's hurting this Nation today in the recovery.

We have to start producing our own fossil fuels so we can have the commerce that's necessary to employ people and create the jobs in this country. In this country, it should be done. Yes, we can have the other forms of power, but we have to have the fossil fuels to continue hopefully the recovery of this country economically.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. KEATING. 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 4, line 19, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 19 insert the following new paragraph:

''(7) DATA REGARDING BONUSES PROVIDED TO EXECUTIVES.—In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall include requirements under which the Secretary shall make available to the public data provided by each lessee under the program with respect to the bonuses provided to the executives of the lessee from the most recent quarter.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 1231. As our constituents see soaring gas prices, oil companies have revealed record profits. The top five multinational oil companies earned over $1 trillion in the past decade. These firms are eating up more and more of our constituents' paychecks.

And where is it going? Only a small portion of the profits are reinvested back into the company to pave the way for efficiencies and research into alternatives to oil. Rather, oil companies are providing bumps to stockholders and high bonuses to their company executives, a pat on the back for high prices at the pump.

My amendment would provide transparency to the U.S. taxpayer. The amendment requires the Secretary to disclose the executive bonuses for any company that is given a drilling lease.

The time is now to hold the largest oil companies accountable, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment in order to provide transparency back to the American taxpayer.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, when I first saw this amendment, I was wondering if we were debating financial services legislation here on the floor. Clearly, this amendment attempts to raise issues outside the realm of today's debate on increasing American-made energy and creating jobs.

The Department of the Interior should spend its time focusing on reviewing permits, conducting environmental safety reviews, protecting our resources and leasing offshore areas that are most prospective for oil and natural gas production. The Department shouldn't have dozens of employees sitting around reading companies' Securities and Exchange Commission filings and assembling a list of which executives got what bonus.

The information that this amendment would burden the Interior Department with gathering and publishing is already publicly disclosed. It should be made public, and that's why it already is. This amendment is not about openness and transparency of disclosing information. That's already the law.

The real effect of this amendment is duplicative requirements and government waste. Let's get away from the political games and gotcha amendments. Let's allow the Department of the Interior to focus on OCS safety, environmental protection and leasing, and leave the bonuses to the Securities and Exchange Commission officials studying that. I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in terms of the relevancy to this debate, I would take this time, in the spirit of bipartisanship, to thank the Rules Committee for allowing this amendment and, thus, I agree with them that this is relevant to this debate.

I would like to comment on one more thing. My friend from Alaska brought up the point of a burden. The burden that exists right now is the burden that's being borne right on the gas pumps of the people in my district, in his district, and the people in the United States of America. That is the burden that working families are undergoing, the suffering that they are undertaking as they pay over $4 a gallon for gasoline in my district. Transparency and accountability are necessary, though the people who are beholden to the price spikes know where their money is going.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The question I ask is, How much would this cost the Department of the Interior? Would this take away from safety inspections? And to my good friend from Massachusetts, the burden is going to get worse. You are going to be paying about $5 a gallon by the first of June; if not, maybe a little bit later, but not later than the Fourth of July. And the burden is something that bothers me a great deal.

But in Massachusetts alone, not one time has any one of your Members in the Congress ever voted to produce energy, other than wind power and solar power. And that doesn't drive your constituents' automobiles. That doesn't drive your trucks that deliver your products to the restaurants or the hospitals. That doesn't drive that train that people ride to try to get automobiles off the road. It doesn't drive the ships to bring the products to your shores. Fossil fuel is the key to our commerce; and we should recognize that in this Congress. And we should develop an energy plan that includes everything. You can't do it with just wind power. You can't do it with solar power. But you can do it with all powers.

That's what's wrong with this Congress and this administration and, yes, previous administrations: they don't grasp the necessity of having more power available to increase the economy of this country. And we're on the cusp right now. I believe this bill will help us. If it does not help us, then shoot me another solution. I have not seen one on that side of the aisle.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112–74.

Ms. TSONGAS. 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 4, strike the closing quotation marks and second period at line 19, and after line 19 insert the following:

''(7) WORST-CASE CONTAINMENT AND CLEAN-UP PLAN REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall include, in each 5-year oil and gas leasing program, a requirement that each applicant for a permit to drill under a lease issued in a lease sale under the program must include a plan for containment and clean-up of a worst-case oil and gas discharge scenario in activities conducted under the permit, if issued.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last summer, we all saw the painfully disorganized and ineffective response to the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. The frustration was palpable across our country. During that tragedy, it was clear that BP and the Federal Government had no plan to contain the oil spill and that BP lacked the capacity to respond to a spill of that magnitude.

The amendment that I am offering today is very straightforward and simple, one that seeks to implement the lessons learned from the events of last summer. My amendment would require that all applicants for a drilling permit under a lease sold under H.R. 1231 submit a plan for containment and clean-up of a worst-case scenario oil or gas spill.

This amendment does not limit drilling. It says simply and sensibly that when we drill, we should have a plan in place before an accident occurs. We shouldn't wait until a disaster like last year's 3-month-long spill has already begun. There wasn't a person I spoke to who wasn't horrified by the devastating oil spill in the gulf. I believe that the American people want us to learn from that environmental and economic tragedy, and this amendment helps us accomplish that. When we drill, we should have a plan for dealing with possible disaster.

Some have argued that we don't need a law because initial steps are being taken at the agency level or by oil and gas companies. Some have said that requiring a worst-case-scenario plan is anti-drilling or anti-jobs. We shouldn't get distracted from the simple truth of this amendment: when we drill, we should have a plan. We have seen the consequences of not having a plan, and it was lost jobs.

□ 1710

This amendment is pro-jobs. Requiring oil and gas companies to have a plan in place will not prevent the creation of a single oil and gas job, but it will protect fishing jobs and tourism jobs instead of asking us to put those jobs at risk should a spill occur.

Our constituents deserve to know that we have required oil and gas companies to plan for the worst. Opposing this amendment irresponsibly denies the tragic events of last summer.

For the sake of our economy, our environment, and our coastal jobs, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, simple amendment requiring oil and gas companies to have a plan. Join me in demonstrating to our constituents that we have learned from the events of last summer, and we are taking steps to prevent such a disaster in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, here again is another amendment that is redundant, but let's call it what it is: It's an obstruction.

The Department of the Interior already requires that applicants must calculate worst case discharge before approving a permit. On June 18, 2010, the Department of the Interior issued a notice to lessees outlining the information requirements and standards to be met before a permit would be approved. In the notice it is required that a lessee ''describe the assumptions and calculations that you used to determine the volume of your worst case scenario.''

It's already required on permit applications today, and is further reiterated by the language in H.R. 1229, which passed the House earlier today.

The minority continues to try to divert attention away from the real issue of increasing energy production, creating jobs, lowering energy costs, and

improving national security by lessening our dependence on foreign oil.

In fact, it seems that the Democrats simply do not want to face the fact that this bill says we can move forward with an aggressive program of responsible oil and gas development while, at the same time, ensuring that increased safety measures are undertaken. These are not mutually exclusive goals.

Republicans want to make U.S. offshore drilling the safest in the world, and it is the safest in the world, so we can produce more American energy, create American jobs and strengthen our national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. I thank my colleague for bringing this issue up. The June 18 notice to lessees is a great first step toward having worst case scenario containment and cleanup plans. But a notice to lessees is not the same as legislation. It is not intended to set policy, and it is not intended to have the force of law, which is why I am offering this amendment today.

We need Federal laws, not notices, that require companies to submit worst case scenario oil spill containment and cleanup plans to ensure that another spill like the BP spill never happens again. Our constituents deserve to know that we have required oil and gas companies to plan for the worst, or give them an honest reason why we think no such plan is necessary, given the events last summer.

If the majority agrees that we should have a plan, they should support this amendment. It simply requires that oil and gas companies have a plan, nothing more. It is about drilling safely, it protects jobs, oil and gas jobs, tourism and fishing jobs. And again, as I said, if the majority agrees that we should have a plan, they should support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I can only say that, to my knowledge, there's little chance of any oil drilling off the coast of Massachusetts. But there is a great possibility off the coasts of Florida, Virginia, Alaska, California, and this bill really sets out which areas should be drilled, not in large massive areas, but specifically.

I personally will tell you, if I could drill in Alaska, offshore, which we should be able to do, but this administration has delayed a permit for 5 years—5 years. Five billion dollars put into investment to develop that field. It can't be done because of this administration.

This bill tries to expedite that process for the good of this Nation and for the good of the people, not the good of the oil companies, because we need that oil.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

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

Ms. TSONGAS. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112–74.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. 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 4, line 19, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 19 insert the following new paragraph:

''(7) MAKING MORATORIUM IN THE EASTERN GULF OF MEXICO PERMANENT.—The Secretary shall not make available for leasing in any oil and gas leasing program under this section any area referred to in section 104(a) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (title I of division C of Public Law 109–432; 43 U.S.C. 1331 note).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer to H.R. 1231 an amendment that would make the current ban on drilling in the eastern Gulf of Mexico permanent. This amendment would not have any effect on the budget as scored by the Congressional Budget Office. However, it would have a significant impact on the economy of Florida, given that the State's tourist industry will be protected from future oil spills which could destroy our beautiful beaches and coastal areas. Certainly, Florida's coastline is a treasure, not just for Floridians but for all Americans and people throughout the world. For years, the Florida delegation has worked together to protect our coastline and natural resources, and as long as those rigs are in this area, the potential for devastation to Florida beaches persists.

If an accident was to occur causing oil to wash ashore and to Florida beaches, both the environmental and the economic damage would be devastating to the State. And following the disaster off of Louisiana's gulf coast last year, we saw a quick glimpse of what could happen to Florida's economy in the event of an oil spill.

I toured the region by helicopter last year and witnessed the devastation firsthand. That said, before any new areas are opened and Florida's pristine beaches are put at risk, I would very much like to see drilling in the areas that are already open and increased funding for research for new technology.

I strongly believe that any drilling off of Florida's gulf coast would be extremely deterrent to the State economy and ecosystem. As we saw in the BP oil spill last year in the Gulf of Mexico, wherein 11 workers died and an estimated 5 million barrels of crude oil poured into the Gulf of Mexico, the risks of drilling oil off of Florida's shores bring about extreme risk to our State in an already depressed economy, and with unemployment in the State of Florida still hovering at 11 percent, the last thing we need is to endanger nearly 1 million tourist-related jobs and the $60 billion tourist industry in the Sunshine State.

Drilling off the coast of Florida is a misguided miscalculation. The risk of danger to the environment and the economy greatly outweighs any potential benefits. I would very much like to see increased drilling in areas already open and increased funding for research for new technology.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. The underlying bill is focused on opening the Outer Continental Shelf to safe and responsible energy production. This bill aims to fulfill the promise that both Democrats and Republicans made to the American people when we voted in a bipartisan basis in 2008 to lift the moratoria on offshore energy production.

Since taking office, President Obama and his administration has effectively reimposed the moratorium. This bill would reverse his actions.

In December 2006, a majority of the House and the Florida delegation voted in favor of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, a bipartisan compromise that opened a portion of the western and central gulf but maintained the eastern planning area moratoria until 2022.

□ 1720

This amendment seeks to go backwards and single-handedly undo that agreement to close off forever the possible energy production in a portion of the Gulf of Mexico. This is exactly the wrong direction for America to be heading.

Congress should not foreclose the possibility of future energy production. This is especially true in the eastern planning area of the gulf, which the Department of the Interior believes contains technically recoverable resources in the amount of 4 billion barrels of oil and over 21 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Let's be clear, the area in the eastern gulf covered by this amendment is currently under moratorium until 2022. That is over a decade from now. This bill does not propose to change the 2022 date.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. More than 20 years after the Exxon Valdez oil spill,

we have yet to clean up Prince William Sound in Alaska. Oil is still being found buried in sand from the BP oil spill.

The frequent occurrence of extreme weather that the eastern gulf coast experiences, including hurricanes and severe storms, could easily produce an oil spill, even with the technological improvements in oil and natural gas operations. Storms along the gulf coast in 2005 caused 124 oil spills in the waters of the Gulf of Mexico, Hurricane Katrina caused a 233,000 gallon oil spill, and Hurricane Rita worsened the damage with 508,000 gallons of oil spilled. If these rigs were in the gulf coast, our beaches would face complete destruction. As we have seen recently, cleanup methods for these spills are incapable of removing more than a small fraction of the oil.

In addition, from the BP oil spill alone, Florida has over 284,000 claims with only 117,000 paid. That is less than half, for a total of over $1.45 billion. For the total gulf region, there have been 10,000 fishing claims, 122,000 food and lodging claims, 74,000 retail and sales claims, and a total of $1.6 billion paid on even more lost earnings and wages. We cannot afford another disaster of this magnitude. With more drilling, we still are living on borrowed time. Support the Corrine Brown amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. 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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. 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 4, line 19, strike the final closed quotation mark and the following period.

Page 4, after line 19, insert the following new subparagraph:

''(C) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary may not include in any oil and gas leasing program under this paragraph any lease sale in the Northern California Planning Area.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, according to this bill's drafters, the legislation would not require leasing permits in the northern California planning area, which is the coastline of my district. My amendment merely makes that clear.

Drilling on the north coast of California is a disastrous idea, and the legislation must be clear that it is not acceptable to drill off California's north coast. Because this amendment is a clarification of the legislation's intent, there is no cost associated with it.

Just about 3 weeks ago, we marked the 1-year anniversary of the Nation's worst oil spill. I will not let what happened to the Gulf of Mexico happen to the north coast of California. I have introduced separate stand-alone legislation which would permanently ban drilling off the coast of my district.

It is important to me and to my constituents that H.R. 1231 clearly notates that drilling will not occur in the northern California planning area along the coasts of Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte Counties. The coastal area of my district is one of only four major upwellings in our world's oceans.

An upwelling is where cold, nutrient-rich waters are brought from the ocean depths to the surface. Upwelling regions promote seaweed and growth, which, in turn, supply energy for some of the most productive ecosystems in our world, including many of our world's fisheries.

North coast ecosystems also sustain some of the largest salmon populations in the lower 49 States and provide essential habitat for Dungeness crab, rockfish, sole, and urchin.

In 2006 and 2008, commercial fishery disasters that virtually eliminated salmon fishing in California were economically disastrous to my district, to our States, and our Nation. If an oil spill were to occur off the coast of my district, the environmental and economic costs would be staggering. Drilling for oil or gas off California's north coast could cause serious harm to the unique and productive ecosystem and abundant marine life found in this area.

My district is economically dependent upon the rich natural resources we are blessed to have, but it is also subject to significant earthquakes which exacerbate the issues, the threats, and the problems related to oil spills.

One of my counties just wrote to me, and I quote, ''The modest amount of oil available in terms of our Nation's daily demand does not justify jeopardizing our fisheries, our environment, and our economic livelihoods.''

This amendment will merely protect the north coast of California and will simply clarify what the drafters of this bill say that the bill does, and that is that they claim that it does not require drilling off the coasts of Mendocino, Humboldt, or Del Norte Counties.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this is the second amendment of three today designed to close off portions of the Outer Continental Shelf to oil and natural gas exploration production, the opposite of what the bill under consideration today is about. The underlying bill is focused on opening the Outer Continental Shelf to safe and responsible energy production.

H.R. 1231 aims to fulfill the promise that both Democrats and Republicans made to the American people when we voted on a bipartisan basis in 2008 to lift the moratoria on offshore energy production. Since taking office, President Obama and his administration have effectively reimposed the moratorium, and this bill would reverse his actions.

This amendment proposes to take America in exactly the wrong direction in which we should be heading. Congress should not foreclose the possibility of future energy production. With the price of gasoline going to $4 and $5 a gallon, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and keep our focus on those offshore areas that contain substantial oil and natural resources, where increased American energy production will create new jobs, lower energy prices, and increase our economic and national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, I want to point out that the majority party has told me and told my staff that the bill that they have offered today, the bill that we are going to be voting on, does not affect the north coast of California. Now, my effort with this amendment is merely to trust but verify.

□ 1730

To oppose this amendment really calls into question, what is the underlying motivation of this bill? Does it do what they claim and not affect this region of our ocean, again, one of only four major upwellings in the world's oceans. This is an area that feeds and promotes the fisheries and the marine life not only in my area, but in all the ocean. And the idea we would put it at any kind of risk. Those of you who know the area know how rough the water is, know how rocky the shores are. If there was an oil spill there, it would never be cleaned up. The area is seismically active. To drill in that area with the threat of earthquakes, you are

looking at a situation that would make the Gulf of Mexico disaster pale in comparison.

It is not too much to ask that we merely verify what it is the majority party says that they are not doing with this bill. And the idea that this amendment would be opposed is quite startling to me. I believe that this is something that everyone can get behind. To say that the bill doesn't do this and then refuse to take the amendment calls into question the motive of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. How much time do I have left, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from California brings out some legitimate points. But right now, today, under existing law, the northern California planning area is available for leasing. This bill does not change that current situation. It has been available since 2008 when gasoline prices hit $4 a gallon and the President and Congress lifted the offshore drilling moratoria.

I will remind the House that in 2008 the coast of California was opened for potential leasing and drilling, that Democrats were in the majority in the House and NANCY PELOSI of San Francisco was Speaker of the House. For months, they resisted Republican efforts to end the offshore ban, but eventually the American people won out and the bans were lifted.

I would also like to point out that this bill provides direction that when the Federal Government is writing 5-year leasing plans, that the focus be on areas with the greatest estimated oil and natural gas resources. This particular planning area does not have and has not registered high in this regard and this bill does not direct that leasing occur in this planning area. With gasoline back to the 2008 highs of over $4 per gallon, let's keep the focus on where it should be, increasing American offshore energy production. That's what we're trying to do.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I don't know that there is a great deal more to add to what he has just said about permits and about the issue that has been discussed just recently.

The thing that really bothers me is just a few years ago, 25 years ago, we were importing about 28 percent of our oil. Today we are importing 62 percent of our oil, more than double what we were doing just a few years ago, and the American people are paying the price. Instead of $1.50 or $2 a gallon for gas, they are spending $4 a gallon for gasoline.

Nationwide, there are 86 billion barrels of oil. Fifty-one percent of that is in the Gulf of Mexico, which means there are 44 billion barrels of oil in the Gulf of Mexico, and there are 240 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. For us to continue to be dependent on foreign energy sources is crazy. We ought to start drilling and doing what needs to be done here in America. And we can do in an environmentally safe way. We can do it in Alaska, offshore, we can do it in a number of places. But to sit by and continue to send our money to Saudi Arabia and other countries around the world that aren't our friends just doesn't make any sense, and the American people understand it.

I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle ought to go back and talk to their constituents, who are paying the price at the gas pump.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. 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. 8 OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. INSLEE. 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 4, line 19, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 19 insert the following new paragraph:

''(7) WASHINGTON STATE APPROVAL REQUIRED.—Under this section, the Secretary shall not make available for leasing for exploration, development, and production of oil and natural gas any area of the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Washington unless such leasing is approved by the Governor and legislature of the State of Washington.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to protect the beaches and shoreline and economy of the State of Washington. This amendment is quite simple. It would simply say that we will not allow the Federal Government to run over the State of Washington on issues of drilling off of our coastline, that we won't be shackled to this antiquated policy of drilling without first providing reasonable protection, without first addressing the issue of rampant speculation that is what is exposing my consumers to $4 a gallon gas in the State of Washington, and without freeing us to do what we should be doing, which is developing new, clean energy sources. I want to address each one of those.

Basically our position is we don't think in the State of Washington, or any State, and particularly the State of Washington, which is the Evergreen State, we ought to have this policy foisted upon us that is not an evergreen energy policy for this century for three reasons.

Reason number one: Despite the fact that we have had this enormous passage of time since this horrendous spill in the gulf, this Chamber has not passed into law one single safety provision to bring additional safety to anywhere on our coastline. My amendment would simply say that the people of the State of Washington and their elected officials ought to be able to make a decision that we have got adequate, reasonable safeguards for drilling before it happens off of the State of Washington. That has not happened, and it is inexcusable.

Second, before this happens, the people of the State of Washington ought to have reasonable protection against the rampant speculation that is going on that is driving up these prices. Even Goldman Sachs has recognized we have had four times the speculative positions taken and probably a $20 amount that has driven up these prices associated with this unchecked speculation. Yet this Chamber and my friends across the aisle have not done a single thing to address this speculation. Until we do that, we shouldn't have my neighbors and my constituents have foisted down their throats this policy of mandatory drilling without them first making a decision.

Third, the people of the State of Washington want to help in our energy crisis and they are capable of helping in this energy crisis if this Chamber will just free them to do it.

Here is how they want to help. They want to produce lithium ion batteries that can run electric cars so we don't have to start being shackled and just addicted to oil. But this Chamber hasn't done a single thing, a single thing this year, to help clean energy sources that Washington State business people want to produce.

I look at the EnerG2 company that is making ultracapacitors. This Chamber isn't helping them make electric batteries for electric cars.

I look at the REC company in Moses Lake, Washington, that is making the polysilicate cells for photovoltaic cells to produce the electricity for electric cars. This Chamber hasn't done a single thing to help that company advance.

I look at the Targeted Growth company and the Boeing company that are developing biofuels so that we can have a competitor to gasoline so we can drive those prices down. This Chamber hasn't done a single thing to help those companies develop Washington State jobs for a new energy future.

Now, we have got a lot of energy off of our coastline. It might be in assorted ways. But I know it is in offshore wind. But we aren't doing a single thing to help the offshore wind energy. All we are doing is trying to shackle an antiquated energy policy on the people of the State of Washington.

I would have liked this amendment to have helped all of my colleagues on the Pacific Coast, but because of some of the financial rules that we have, we have only been able to bring this involving the Evergreen State. But I would hope that all of my colleagues would join me in saying that before this gets forced on the citizens of Washington State, we adopt some reasonable measures.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1740

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, acting for Natural Resources Committee Chairman DOC HASTINGS of Washington State, I oppose this amendment.

As explained in the debate on the prior two amendments, this bill is focused on increasing American-made energy, creating new jobs, and decreasing our dependence on energy from foreign nations. Congress needs to focus on increasing energy production, and this amendment goes in the opposite direction. In fact, this amendment attempts to impose unprecedented and impossible obstacles to fostering more American energy in Federal waters.

It is stated that the purpose of the amendment is to give the State of Washington a say on leasing in Federal waters off the State's coast. However, multiple Federal laws already provide Washington State, and every State, the opportunity to participate in any such decisions. What this amendment would do is grant double veto power for Washington State to prohibit Federal activities in Federal waters outside the State's borders. The Interior Department provides repeated opportunities for public comment and participation throughout the planning and leasing process.

Furthermore, the Coastal Zone Management Act requires State consistency review with its State coastal zone management plan before the Federal Government takes action in Federal waters off of any particular State. On top of that, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act provides clear requirements for consultation and cooperation with affected State and local governments. Considerable care and protection is provided to each and every State, with extra consideration guaranteed to coastal States. This is as it should be.

What is particularly revealing about this amendment is that it only gives Washington State double veto power over certain types of offshore energy leasing. It singles out only oil and natural gas, but provides no such veto power over other forms of energy leasing. This includes wave energy, wind, solar, and other renewable forms.

This double standard exposes the real intent of this amendment. It's not truly aimed at ensuring a voice for Washington State; it's intended to score political points. But the political points the amendment attempts to score are entirely hollow. Why? Because there isn't estimated to be any recoverable oil or natural gas in Federal waters off of Washington State.

Again, this bill only goes into areas that have really large potential. Again, multiple Federal laws already guarantee all Americans have an opportunity to participate in an offshore planning process, especially the Governors, State and local officials, and citizens living in coastal States that will be impacted by leasing, should it take place.

For those reasons, I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. INSLEE. Thank you.

First, I wish my friend DOC HASTINGS from Washington was with us today. He's not feeling well. But Mr. YOUNG is doing an admirable job with a weak argument, and I'll report that they're getting represented.

I just want to point out we haven't seen horrendous damage to any ecosystem from a wind spill yet. If you spill a little wind, you don't end up covering large gulf areas with hydrocarbons or destroying oyster and shrimping grounds like have been in the gulf. There are differences from multiple sources.

We are simply saying that before we move forward with additional offshore drilling, we ought to have reasonable safety protocols, we ought to address speculation, and we ought to have an energy policy that looks at all of the above.

My friends across the aisle told us you were going to give us an all-of-the-above energy policy. All you have given us is an all-of-the-below energy policy. We need a little better than this.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alaska has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My good friend from Washington, they may not have a wind spill, but there's opposition to wind power. And wind is extremely expensive and only can be successful as long as it's subsidized by the taxpayer. As long as this administration keeps insisting on wind and solar power, they're doubly taxing our taxpayers of this Nation and hurting our economy. That's reality.

So they're doubly taxed because now they're paying taxes because of the high cost of oil, the high cost of gasoline. And $1,100 a year they have additionally been taxed this year versus last year. And yet we talk about wind power. They're taxed because that comes out of the general fund. We're borrowing money from the Chinese. That's reality.

Wind and solar are fine as long as they're subsidized. As long as you pay for them, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, they're fine. But that's an additional tax on you. If it was so economical, so well to be done, then we would have done it a long time ago. And I say it will work. It's like ethanol. It works. It's still not economical.

So we have to go back to what commerce is run by—and it's fossil fuels. We can have all those other forms of energy. I do not want them subsidized. We can have all those other forms of energy, but we have to have the ability to move product. I look at the Port of Seattle, the Port of Tacoma. Every one of those ships is burning a fossil fuel that deliver those goods. Every truck that leaves that port that goes out to deliver those to the people around this Nation is burning fossil fuels. Every train that leaves is burning fossil fuels. Every airplane that lands, built by Boeing, is driven by fossil fuels.

This is a chance for us to speak up in Congress and say we are going to develop our natural fuels in this country so we can compete legitimately. You cannot compete by borrowing money to buy foreign oil, and that's what that side wants to do. I'm saying that's wrong. And I will join hands with you if you vote for ANWR and you vote for other forms of energy, too. Let's get it all together, guys. Let's have an energy plan. All we're trying to do here is undo what the Obama administration did, and that's put a moratorium in.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. INSLEE. 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 Washington will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112–74 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. KEATING of Massachusetts.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) 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 193, noes 228, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

AYES—193

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—228

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

NOT VOTING—10

Fortenberry
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Hirono
Johnson, Sam
Marchant
Reed
Schwartz
Sullivan
Waters

□ 1814

Messrs. YOUNG of Indiana, RIGELL, and WEBSTER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. POSEY, ROONEY, JACKSON of Illinois, CRENSHAW, DIAZ-BALART, and FORBES changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 312, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 238, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

AYES—189

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus

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

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1822

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 240, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

AYES—186

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—240

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

NOT VOTING—5

Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Smith (NE)
Southerland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1830

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PEARCE. 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. DESJARLAIS) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL, 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. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMERICAN ANGELS ABROAD

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, they are America's angels abroad. They are ambassadors for America, and they are good folks that represent everything that is right about our country. They are the Peace Corps volunteers. And this is the 50th year of the Peace Corps. These are the most wonderful people I think I've ever met.

But there's a problem in the Peace Corps because many times these volunteers go overseas, they help out other countries, but they become victims of crime and victims of sexual assault. In fact, in 2009 there were 122 of them that were victims of sexual assault by predators in foreign countries.

And the problem is there's not much compassion, not much concern, and not much care with the Peace Corps about the plight of these victims according to the victims who testified today.

But those things are changing. Director Williams is committed to making the Peace Corps a safe place for our volunteers overseas. We're going to work with him and these victims to promote legislation so that we will have a protocol that is the law so that they are treated better.

We are the greatest human rights Nation in the world. We promote human rights, but human rights need to also apply to victims in the Peace Corps who are sexually assaulted overseas.

And that's just the way it is.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our Nation's law enforcement officers, the brave men and women who dedicate their lives to protecting our communities.

This week is National Police Week, and thousands of officers from across the country will gather here in Washington to pay tribute to those who have fallen in the line of duty. Sadly, in the past year, 162 officers have died in the line of duty, including two from Minnesota, Sergeant Joseph Bergeron of Maplewood and Mahnomen County Sheriff's Deputy Chris Dewey.

As we remember these officers, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to legislation that I have introduced that would help protect those who protect us. H.R. 1789, the State and Local Law Enforcement Discipline, Accountability, and Due Process Act, would guarantee law enforcement officers have basic rights during disciplinary actions.

I ask and urge my colleagues to sign on to this legislation so we can also help protect our law enforcement officers.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO GET OUR HOUSE IN ORDER

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine in your household, if, for every $1 you spent, 40 cents was borrowed?

That's the situation we're in with every dollar that we spend in the U.S. Congress today. And yet there are those who do not want to reform or change.

But if I brought in my family and said, listen, guys, for every dollar we spend, 40 cents is borrowed, we would say, okay, what can we cut out? Can we do with less travel? Can we do with fewer clothes? Can we cut back on the kitchen table a little bit? We would come up with some ideas. They might be tough choices, but it's the right thing to do.

It is time for Congress to get our house in order and to think about the next generation, not just the next election.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I can tell you, each and every day, people come to see me to ask for more money to be spent. We've got to change our culture of spending here and get the House under control.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize our men and women in uniform and join our community in celebrating National Military Appreciation Month. The month of May encompasses a number of celebratory days linked to our Armed Forces, their families, and our Nation's proud history. From Military Spouse Appreciation Day to Victory in Europe Day, and from Loyalty Day to Armed Forces Day and Memorial Day, the month of May is a time for our Nation to come together and give praise to our most heroic citizens.

Our Nation traditionally recognizes our troops' sacrifice in a somber manner on Memorial Day, but National Military Appreciation Month allows us to not only appreciate those who have given their lives for our freedom, but also to celebrate the resolve of our Nation through its most difficult times.

I welcome our Nation to join in recognizing the contribution of our servicemen and -women, past and present, for all that they have done to preserve our freedom and our way of life.

DIFFERING VIEWS ON IMMIGRATION

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest that the President announced this week he was going to give a major address on immigration. As one who's been involved in this issue for three decades, I was very interested to find out the approach the President was going to take.

So let me register my disappointment at the demonization of those who might have a disagreement with the President that was expressed by him in his speech yesterday. Talking about moats and talking about alligators and talking about intransigence on the other side of the aisle is not the way to attract bipartisan support to deal with one of the most difficult and important questions of our Nation. I wouldn't say I'm outraged. I would say I'm disappointed at the tone of those remarks of the President yesterday.

If, in fact, we're going to work together on issues as important as that, it would seem to me to be important for us to, in some way, at least accept the fact that there may be legitimate reasons for differences and try and bridge those differences, rather than expand them.

THE WESTERN CAUCUS

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, the Western Caucus has several members here tonight. We would like to talk about what is going on right now in the country. The administration seems to be waging a war on the western jobs, and that is carried out through a whole range of activities.

A couple of weeks ago, the administration and the President said that the administration is not doing enough to address the high gas prices. The President said in a speech at Georgetown that he would like to cut foreign oil by one-third by drilling at home. Well, we have been in the process of offering him the solution to what he said he would like to do.

Now, keep in mind that while the President is saying one thing, he's doing another.

□ 1840

While he says that we would like to drill for more oil here, understand that

he has increased the moratorium on the offshore drilling. They have made it more difficult to drill in on-land areas through the Rocky Mountains. Know that they rejected Shell Oil Company's $4 billion NEPA study because a paragraph was omitted.

So while we are hearing bold language from this administration about increasing the amount of oil that we are drilling here at home—and that would create American jobs but it would also create lower energy prices—understand that it appears that the President is not following through on what he said.

So in the past couple of days, this Congress, this House, has passed out H.R. 1229, which says that we are going to put the people back to work in the Gulf of Mexico.

I think everyone understands that BP is accountable and should be accountable for the problems that they caused, but we should not have killed 100,000 jobs offshore.

Our Nation is stuck at 9 percent unemployment. We are stuck with a deficit that is having to be financed by our own Federal Reserve. We are putting the Nation's economy at risk because of the way that we are treating jobs and because of our deficit.

So we are saying: Put the American workers back to work in the Gulf, produce American oil, produce American jobs, and bring lower prices of gasoline to the consumer.

The same bill improves the safety by reforming current law. It sets timelines for the Secretary to act on permits to drill. Right now, one of the things that the Secretary is doing is holding off approvals for those applications for permits to drill, the APDs. Know that the administration has within its power to improve the situation with jobs immediately, but instead they are doing the things that harm our work.

H.R. 1229 also establishes expedited judicial review processes.

We also have passed in this House H.R. 1230, which says we are going to restart the American Offshore Leasing Now Act. It passed last week. It requires that the four lease sales in the gulf and Virginia take place. Those lease sales were previously scheduled, but instead of going ahead with them, the administration has put them on hold. Let's simply produce the energy which has been verified to be there, which would create American jobs and which would aid American consumers by lower prices of gasoline.

H.R. 1231 has also been passed, which reverses President Obama's offshore moratorium. The President made a big deal just after he was sworn in 2 years ago about reversing the moratorium. But after one analyzed the moratorium that he reversed, we actually saw that he increased the moratorium, that more areas were put off limits to drilling rather than the message that he gave the American people.

So H.R. 1231 says to the President: We would like for you to join us in creating American jobs, jobs that the West would be proud of, jobs that would produce energy, jobs that would produce high-paying careers and not just jobs. We believe that these are the things that the American people are looking for. This is the leadership that they are asking for out of Washington.

H.R. 1231 requires each 5-year offshore leasing plan to include lease sales in areas containing the greatest known oil and natural gas reserves. Our offshore areas are tremendous reserves of energy. All we have to do is tap into them and use them. It requires that the Secretary establish a production goal when writing a 5-year plan.

I am joined tonight by several members of the Western Caucus. Each one has got their own particular interest area where the administration appears to be conducting a war on western jobs. So tonight, to lead off, I would like to yield time to my good friend CYNTHIA LUMMIS from Wyoming such time as she would consume.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding. I appreciate his leadership of the Western Caucus and look forward to this robust discussion tonight.

The West is rich in natural resources. And natural resources, their good stewardship and using them for the benefit of our country is what the West does best.

This administration is turning its back on the stewardship that is available in the West as we produce our natural resources and, instead, is taking away the jobs, the environmental progress, and replacing it with further dependence on foreign energy from places like Saudi Arabia and Venezuela.

We can produce our own energy in this country. Between the resources of Canada and the United States, we can produce enough energy for us to meet our foreseeable needs. But that requires us to use the technologies and the jobs associated with those technologies that will create tens of thousands of jobs, in fact, hundreds of thousands of jobs. Instead, we are actually going in exactly the opposite direction. Let me give you an example.

Fracking technology is advancing dramatically the ability of America to recover its rich natural gas resources, and it allows us to do so by casing a well with perforations. There is an explosion that cracks the tight sands or the rock. Then fluids are forced into these gaps in the rock, keeping the seams open, allowing this gas or oil to percolate back up the well casing and be produced, allowing Americans to use American-grown energy. But the attack on fracking technology is based not on science but on the idea that fracking could damage drinking water.

None of us want to see our precious drinking water polluted by contaminants that some people believe are being used in fracking fluids.

The States know their own geology better than anyone in Washington could and the very diverse geology that is different from State to State. You are going to be hearing later this evening from G.T. THOMPSON, a Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, where the Marcellus shale formation is being produced. I am going to talk about the use of fracking technology in my State, where the geology is very different from the Marcellus shale, but where it can be used in a responsible manner to produce American oil and gas with American jobs.

The Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission, recognizing the concern that our drinking water could be imperiled, set about and created a set of rules and regulations to disclose the contents of fracking fluids and the processes that are being used by companies that are fracking wells in the State of Wyoming. Those rules are being used to provide people with the information that is needed to assure them that fracking fluids are not contaminating our water.

Furthermore, there have been repeated stories, using an example from Wyoming, in Pavillion, Wyoming, of an area that some argue was fracked to the detriment of local water wells. Well, we are learning more and more about those water wells. And what we are finding is, out of over 100 water wells in the area, only about one-fifth of them are permitted, and some of them are not even cased. Well, this allows for the natural percolation of gas into water that has nothing to do with fracking.

If we look at the science and apply it correctly, using good stewardship principles, we can produce oil and gas and have good drinking water.

□ 1850

I even have a photograph from someone in my home State, Mr. Speaker, that has a flame coming out of a pond. The flame is a consequence of a natural methane seep coming out of the water that has been on fire as long as this gentleman can remember. These are natural phenomena.

We need to make sure that we are assuring people in this country that drinking water will be safe at the same time we recover these resources. Those very assurances require scientists, they require environmental companies, they require fracking experts; more jobs, more oil and gas, more diverse energy for the American economy.

Of course, clean burning natural gas provides us also an extension of the air quality that we value so well. These are American jobs that can be saved, nurtured and grown, and used successfully all over the United States, on and off shore.

Mr. Speaker, you just acknowledged a project in the Beaufort Sea, which is off of the coast of Barrow, Alaska, 87 miles. Shell has put $4 billion, as you pointed out, into preparing to produce that resource, and still does not have a permit to produce it. At some point, those investments begin to devalue

their sunken costs in a way that may make companies like Shell look elsewhere. That takes jobs away from America and into countries where we are competing for jobs, and in places that sometimes are not our best friends when it comes to foreign policy and human rights.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's produce oil and gas with American jobs, with good pay, with good benefits, and with the residual goal of having an all-of-the-above energy policy that benefits the West and the country as a whole.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentlelady for her comments.

We are joined tonight by my good friend Mr. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania. Before I yield time to him, I would like to walk through just a brief list of some of the other ways that the government conducts war on Western jobs.

Consider the listing of endangered species. No one of us wants to see a species be extinct or go extinct, but what we have seen is an extreme interpretation of the rules which kill jobs at the same time. I think there are ways that we could keep jobs and preserve species, yet we are not doing that right now.

The Coho salmon was listed as endangered. As a result, the farmers in the Klamath Basin in Oregon have been forced into bankruptcy due to prohibitions on water use by the listing of the salmon.

The Methow salmon, water rights holders in the Methow Valley of Washington lost the use of their water, and property owners and timber owners face restrictions on their properties because of the imposition of egregious stream buffers to protect the listed salmon.

The listing of the salmon in general, the court case over whether hydroelectric dam operators have done enough to prevent the death of salmon in Washington and Oregon, billions of dollars have been spent to accommodate, according to Bloomberg Business Week, but the environmental groups continue to sue.

The northern spotted owl, the listing has killed the entire timber industry in much of the West, especially in northern California and Oregon. The Mexican spotted owl, that listing also killed the timber industry in New Mexico and Arizona. Hundreds of thousands of jobs have been lost.

The Delta smelt, the listing of that species, a small 2-inch fish that lives in the San Joaquin Valley, killed 27,000 jobs there. The San Joaquin Valley was the source of 80 percent of our Nation's vegetables. Now those vegetable farms are gone. Bankruptcy. We are now importing food from countries that can spray pesticides that are outlawed in this country, so our food supply is less safe. Fewer jobs, bigger government deficit, greater cost of vegetables and unsafe food supply.

The gray wolf was listed by the Fish and Wildlife Service as endangered and has killed agriculture and mining jobs throughout the West. Still the list goes on and on. So it is not that these are just hypothetical ideas that the war on Western jobs is occurring by a government. These are ongoing processes.

One group, the Center for Biological Diversity, has declared they are going to list over 1,000 species this year, that they are going to petition for the listing of over 1,000 species this year. Understand that their lawyers get reimbursed at the rate of $350 to $500 per hour. For every lawsuit that they bring against the government, every lawsuit that kills jobs provides employment for lawyers in those groups, so know that the taxpayer is footing the bill but yet losing jobs in the meantime.

I would like to recognize Mr. THOMPSON now, and thank him very much for being here tonight.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend from Hobbs, New Mexico, for yielding. Representing part of Pennsylvania, it is an honor to be part of the Western Caucus. I represent western Pennsylvania and central Pennsylvania and a little bit of eastern Pennsylvania. My district is so large, so rural.

It has many of the same issues, Mr. Speaker, that fit very well within the Western Caucus. We have public lands. All of these issues you are hearing about tonight in terms of what government does as a huge barrier and to kill the jobs, they are the same things that we certainly experience in western Pennsylvania.

Now, I am proud. I chair the largest subcommittee of Agriculture, Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, so I want to go down another road in which how government kills jobs, western jobs, whether it is the West or western Pennsylvania or, frankly, throughout the United States.

We recently had a hearing reviewing the proposed United States Forest Service plan. Our National Forests, it is very clear they are not National Parks. Our National Forests were created to provide sustainable resources, predominantly timber, but timber is not the only thing. Our forests were created to provide us energy, access to oil, to natural gas, to coal, to minerals. So that is why they were put in existence.

As we look around the Nation, certainly in my congressional district, my National Forest is relatively small compared to I think some in the West, 513,000 acres, but it is profitable and home to the world's best hardwood cherry. It has a management plan that says in a sustainable way, to keep the forest healthy they are supposed to harvest over 90 million board feet a year. But yet for over a decade they have been doing 20 million. One of the members of my subcommittee, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, talked about his National Forest, they harvest zero board feet out of his National Forest.

Now, there are a lot of problems with that. First of all, if you don't harvest timber, if you don't manage that forest in a healthy way, you subject yourself to wildfires, to invasive species. It creates an unhealthy forest. But it also kills jobs, and that is what we have seen. We have seen that all across the Nation, in the West, frankly, all parts of the country with our National Forests where the Forest Service has failed to do its job in terms of managing the forests I think in a productive way. That point came out very clearly in the first of what will be I think a number of hearings that we are going to do on this issue.

Frankly, timber production is down. I am proud to say that it is up to 40 million board feet in the Allegheny National Forest, but that is only with the persistence of kind of being with the Forest Service almost on a constant basis. But it is still a long ways from 90.

The production of timber is down. That means timber jobs, first of all. Our sawmills, our timber industry, those jobs, in many parts of the country those jobs have gone away. They are extinct today. And the forest products jobs that come as a result of having that timber supply are going away.

□ 1900

And the economies. Our rural communities were taken in order to create these national forests by the Federal Government. And the economies of our rural communities that make up those forests depended on the promise that was made when the forests were formed that the timber industry, minerals, oil, gas, coal, all those sustainable resources would be provided, would be produced, and that would maintain the economies of those rural communities. Well, that's been a lie by the Federal Government. They haven't done that. They haven't met their responsibilities. And that has killed jobs and killed our economies in rural communities.

In terms of energy, in my district I was sworn in for the first time in Congress in January 2009. Within a week of when I was sworn in, the Forest Service chose to place a moratorium on any new drilling permits in my national forest.

Now, you have to understand, 93 of the subsurface rights are privately owned. So these are owned by private individuals. And they came in and imposed this moratorium because of some lawsuit, as my good friend talked about, and the taxpayers paid their lawyers and paid the organizations to file, basically, and we went over a year with people losing their jobs, families suffering for just that reason.

Thankfully, a Federal judge overturned that decision. Of course, the Forest Service appealed and the Federal judge threw it out again. And now the Forest Service has appealed again. They've taken it down to a different court, down to the Philadelphia court, and we'll see what turns out there. But that's just another example of just bad government.

My good friend Mrs. LUMMIS from Wyoming talked about the Marcellus natural gas. Let me just say that's all private sector. The government is not involved in it. Natural gas is mostly private lands. And it works. It has created over 88,000 jobs in Pennsylvania. I have counties that, for the first time in history, their unemployment rates are below both State and national averages.

Prosperity is a good thing, and everybody benefits—not just the people that are getting the royalties or the leases, but, frankly, the churches, the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the little leagues, the fire departments, the hospitals, because rural folks are generous and they support good causes.

And so the communities are growing. The annual average earnings are going up. Frankly, government is benefiting because local, State, and even the Federal Government is getting a little more tax revenue by all that economic activity. And unemployment is down and energy security is there, and it's lower energy costs for everyone, and it's private sector.

If the government owned that land, we'd never be experiencing those benefits. Though, despite that fact, despite these are private lands—and I'll end my comments with these, because I know we've got other Members that want to speak tonight—this administration is going after that natural gas production. They are. There are some in this body that are proposing Federal Government overreach.

We're accessing that energy as a good steward. We've got regulations. The Department of Environmental Protection in Pennsylvania is a tough agency, but they do a fair job. They're always looking at their regulations. But we've got this administration who wants the Federal Government to employ the EPA and to send them into Pennsylvania and other parts of our country where we're producing domestic energy, which will essentially shut down our energy production and will shut down this prosperity, will shut down these jobs that are being created, will shut down the movement that we're making towards energy security.

I want to thank my good friend from New Mexico for hosting this hour tonight. I'm proud to be a part of the Western Caucus and proud to be with you this evening.

Thank you.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments. So far, the quote of the night is ''prosperity is a good thing.'' Yet our government seems to have a war on prosperity. Why is our government trying to undermine the economy when we're struggling with high deficits and unemployment? It defies imagination that that's going on.

I would like to recognize now my good friend from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) for such time as he may consume. I appreciate your being here. Georgia and Pennsylvania in the Western Caucus, that's the way it should be. We're west of somewhere. Thank you for being here tonight.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. PEARCE. I appreciate your yielding me some time. Let me go forward with what Mr. THOMPSON was just saying and what you were just commenting on about prosperity.

Just today, I had a businessman in my office relaying to me a conversation he had with one of the liberal Democrat Senators, and he was talking about the issues that concerned him and his business. She was arguing over and over again about how government needs to do all the regulatory constraints on business and how businesses need to be taxed higher, and it's not fair for businesses to be making money at the levels that they are. In fact, just today, we saw some of our Democratic colleagues talk about the oil companies and the kind of money that they have been making with increased prices of gasoline. Finally, in frustration, this Democrat Senator said to this businessman: All you're concerned about is profit. You just want to make a profit.

Well, that's what business does. It makes a profit for its shareholders. If it's a corporation, it makes a profit for small businesses.

The policies of this administration, the policies that we've seen from our Democratic colleagues when NANCY PELOSI was running the House, now with HARRY REID running the Senate, and certainly the Obama administration, they're trying to destroy profits. They're trying to destroy our economy, in my opinion.

In fact, the President, himself, has said that he doesn't mind seeing gasoline prices go up as long as they go up incrementally. He doesn't want to see the massive increases, but as long as they keep going up. His own Energy Secretary, Dr. Chu, fairly recently said somehow we have to find a way to make gasoline in the United States at the same price that it is in Europe, which is roughly $8 a gallon today. The policies of this administration are doing just exactly that.

Today, in the Science, Space and Technology Committee, we were talking about fracking. The EPA scientist that is studying fracking admitted that there has not been one single incident—not one—where fracking has been implicated in contaminating drinking water. Not one.

But I believe this administration is doing everything it can to try to destroy energy production in this country and to try to destroy the free enterprise system. In fact, the President, himself, said that if his policies go into effect, to use his own words, energy prices will ''necessarily skyrocket.''

Well, who's going to be hurt? Who's going to be hurt when fuel prices go up and food prices go up, not only gasoline and diesel fuel?

I was talking to a manager in a restaurant just last week in Athens, Georgia, and was asking him about his food prices in his restaurant and what is going on because of the high cost of gasoline. He said his suppliers are adding a fuel surcharge onto the cost of the foods that he's buying and selling in his restaurant. And it's the policies of this administration that are doing that.

Just yesterday, I had a constituent of mine who's an egg producer in Georgia come in and talk about some of the issues that he faces. I am from Georgia. I'm a good southerner, and I love my grits and cornbread. For folks who are not southerners, grits are made from corn. Cornbread, obviously, that's self-explanatory where that comes from. I think even Yankees will know that cornbread comes from corn, too. The thing is that I, as a good southerner, cannot see driving down the road, burning up my grits and cornbread in the fuel tank of my GMC Yukon that I used as my office, actually, when I was making house calls as a medical doctor.

I hear our Democratic colleagues talk about we need to remove the subsidies for the oil companies. Well, the American people need to know that those subsidies are actually tax credits. They're not true subsidies as such. In fact, HARRY REID was recently wanting a subsidy for gold mining in his own State of Nevada. He also wanted us to continue funding the cowboy poetry festival in his home State.

We've got to stop spending these outrageous funds that the Federal Government has been spending, and we need to start creating jobs in a strong economy. The best way to do that is to get rid of the policies of this administration that are destroying jobs, destroying our economy, increasing the cost of gas and diesel fuel for farmers and everybody in this country.

But back to my egg producer friend. I've got a chart here that we made up in our office, a dozen eggs in Georgia. We have the subsidies—which are really not subsidies for the oil companies; they're just tax credits. But we have subsidies for ethanol production, which are true subsidies. Our administration has tried to pick winners and losers. One of the winners that they picked is the ethanol production.

□ 1910

That's been a total failure, and what that has done is increase the cost of gasoline. It's increased the cost of food across this country too. In fact, the major ingredient in feed for chickens is corn. Corn, when I when I was farming back a number of years ago, was $2.50 a bushel. Now it's approaching $8 a bushel. In 2005, before this ethanol subsidy, the total feed cost per dozen eggs—so when a consumer goes out and buys a dozen eggs—the food cost in that dozen eggs was 21 cents per dozen of eggs. Now, 2011, it's approximately 52 cents per dozen.

So who pays for that? Does the egg producer? No, it's the consumer. When

you go to the grocery store and buy a dozen eggs, you're paying more money for the failed policies of this administration, particularly when it has to do with energy.

If we start drilling for oil, tapping into our natural gas supplies, start producing coal, particularly doing the clean coal technology that we have, having an all-of-the-above energy policy, what's going to be the long-term outcome for the American consumer? For every single American, it's going to lower the cost of eggs and milk and bread because it's going to lower the cost of the production of all the foodstuffs. Every single good and service in this country is affected by these high costs of gasoline and fuel oil, diesel fuel, et cetera. The people who are going to be hurt the most are the poor people, those on limited incomes, our senior citizens.

I hear over and over again our Democrat colleagues say that Republicans are in the back pockets of Big Oil. Wrong. I would like to see us end all subsidies, all of them, but particularly the ethanol subsidy, which has not made any sense whatsoever. And let's start developing our own energy resources, which will create jobs here in America.

Just yesterday and today, we've been debating three bills that came out of our Natural Resources Committee. Those three bills will enable us to start tapping into the God-given energy resources that we have in this country, help us to be less dependent upon foreign sources for energy. If the President will ever sign those three bills into law, the short-term effect, I think it's been estimated, is that 200,000 new jobs are going to be created. So 200,000 new jobs will be created just with those three bills, just to be able to open up developing our own energy resources here in America that the President is blocking. Long term those three bills, it's estimated, will create 1.2 million new jobs here in the United States, American jobs, and help create a stronger economy.

The failed energy policies of this administration are hurting job creation. They are hurting our economy. They're raising the cost of gasoline. They're raising the cost of diesel fuel. They're raising the cost of fuel oil. They're going to hurt egg producers and thus egg consumers, consumers of all goods and services. Your food costs are going to go up. The cost of every good and service in this country is going to go up all because of the failed policies of this administration because we cannot develop our own energy resources, our God-given resources, that we have in this country. I submit if a nation is not energy independent, it's not a secure nation. And that's where we are today. We've got to become energy independent. And how is that going to happen?

Former U.S. Senator Everett Dirksen one time said when he feels the heat, he sees the light. The most powerful political force in America is embodied in the first three words of the U.S. Constitution: We the people. When we the people start contacting Members of Congress, particularly the Democrat Members of the House, and the Members of the U.S. Senate, and demand that we develop our own energy resources here in America, that we have an all-of-the-above energy policy that looks at everything—nuclear energy, alternative sources, clean coal, oil, gas—everything, which we must do, and that's what Republicans are fighting for, if enough people all over this country will contact their Senators and their Members of Congress and say, let's develop our own energy resources, let's develop American jobs, let's develop a strong economy here in America, then we can do so. But it's up to we the people to be able to demand that from your elected Representatives.

Thank you, Mr. PEARCE, for yielding to me. I appreciate the great job you're doing as chairman of the Western Caucus, and I'm honored to be a part of that caucus.

Before I close, I encourage people to go on my Web site, broun.house.gov, and they can actually look at all the things on this chart. They can look at it in fine detail and understand how high energy costs are creating high prices for eggs in the grocery store.

Thank you, Mr. PEARCE.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for his comments and his perceptions.

As he mentioned, it seems that Washington has a war on profits. I think that maybe our friends on the other side of the aisle don't understand that profits pay high salaries. If you work in an industry with no profits, you work at low salaries.

Profits pay to reinvest in new buildings, creating construction dollars in neighborhoods. Profits are put into youth training, baseball leagues, soccer leagues. Profits are reinvested into new equipment, causing manufacturing firms to thrive. Profits are invested in dividends, and they cause increased values of stocks, helping retirees.

And, finally, profits are the only thing that corporations pay tax on. They do not pay taxes on losses. So when we begin to talk about taking away the profits of companies, understand that we're talking about undermining the American way of life. This attack on profits is an attack on the American way of life.

I am pleased to be joined tonight by a good friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank Chairman PEARCE from New Mexico for using the Western Caucus to illustrate some of these ideas and situations that are here.

I'm also grateful that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) was just here and tried to show how whenever you have a policy that prohibits or discriminates or lessens the amount of energy that we have in this country, it has a direct impact on individuals and people. As he was showing, it has a direct impact on the cost of food. For every dime that diesel fuel increases, that's $400 million the agricultural industry has to put onto the cost of food. Not just in transporting the food but for the fertilizer to grow it, for the boxing, the shipping, the manufacturing of it—all of those things are added to it. For every penny that the cost of gasoline increases at the pump, that is $1 billion that's taken out of the household income of Americans.

And whom is that going to impact the worst? Obviously the people at the lower end of the economic scale, who have the most difficult time making their budget stretch to pay for higher transportation costs through fuel, for higher food costs because fuel goes up, for higher heating costs because fuel goes up. They're the ones who are hurt.

Now, I also appreciate Mr. PEARCE for illustrating that actually we have a situation in which the West, without trying to be specific to a region, but the West has been treated with the heaviest hand over the past few years and has suffered the greatest consequences of that heavy hand.

Last year, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, they simply said that the region that had the highest unemployment for last year and the year before happened to be the West. Six of the top 12 States that had the largest decline in employment-to-population ratio since the recession that began in 2007 are found in the West.

□ 1920

Three of the top five States showing the most stress last year in the summer were found in the West, and unfortunately, Washington's misguided policies over the last several years are simply making these situations worse.

Let me, if I could, talk about a couple of specific situations that I have found in my State that have added to this problem of what we call the ''war on the West,'' because they have had the dual whammy of not only increasing the price of energy, which is the price of living and the price of doing business, but at the same time of decreasing jobs in our particular area. Part of that is because the West simply has, as a region, over half of its land owned by the Federal Government. This government—it was not planned this way; it just kind of happened—owns 1 out of every 3 acres in the United States. Yet, west of Denver, it owns 1 out of every 2 acres in the United States, and we get to have the fun of working with the heavy hand of the Federal Government on all sorts of efforts, especially when the Department of the Interior has unlimited, arbitrary and capricious powers given to them.

For example, the Bureau of Land Management in the State of Utah went through what they call ''regional management plans.'' I have 16 areas. Half of them went through a regional management plan. The people on the ground,

who are working there, who live there and who know that area, spent 7 years in developing a regional management plan, which means simply: How will the land owned by the Federal Government—and remember, it's still half of it—be used for development purposes?

For 7 years, they held the public hearings, and they went through all the processes. They came up with their plan. The Secretary of the Interior came into office, and in the first few days, he simply said, Those plans don't fit the needs of this country because they authorize 77 oil and gas leases, places where the professionals on the ground determined that the best use of government land was used to develop oil and gas in the State of Utah. The Secretary simply said no. He believed the last administration had made a rush to judgment, and therefore it was his best decision to suspend not only those oil leases but also the land management plans at the same time. He did it simply by the stroke of his signature. There was no work with it. There was no counterbalance. There was no checks and balance system. He simply said, I think it was wrong. It was a rush to judgment. I'm going to stop it.

Now, like everything else, this situation went to court, and the judge ruled that, actually, the Secretary was wrong. There was not a rush to judgment by anyone other than the Secretary when he suspended those leases. However, because there was a timing element—one of those technicalities—and because those who were suing waited too long to file the lawsuit, the decision of the Secretary would stand. Now, what the Secretary said is, I'll be magnanimous, and of the 77, I'll let 17 go forward. The other 60, they stay off the table. I don't care what the regional management plan did.

The end result of that was simply that you don't have a whole lot of leases that will be put out for development. Unfortunately, it has a ripple effect through the community because not all leases are found on Federal land. There is also State land and very few pieces of private land; but oftentimes they abut one another, and if you block the leasing opportunity on this piece of land, it sterilizes the leasing development opportunity on its neighbor land at the same time. Plus, if all of a sudden the Department of the Interior is sending a message that they're going to be tough on this kind of development, industry gets the message, and they're not going to fight that kind of issue, and they will leave at the same time.

The net result of this one action by the Department of the Interior was that unemployment in one rural county in Utah was a loss of 3,000 jobs in a county that only has 30,000 residents. The unemployment tripled over a course of months and only and solely because of this one decision: that not only did we not have the ability of drilling on those Federal lands, but you also lost the opportunity for the private sector to go onto State lands and onto certain private lands. Then there was the ripple effect as they realized what simply happened, which is that the private sector said, I'm not going to put up with this. They took the investment capital that they were willing to put into the region of rural Utah and took it somewhere else where they didn't have to deal with the Department of the Interior.

We have the same situation in the West in another particular area, specifically with oil shale. The U.S. Geological Survey, which oddly enough is part of the Department of the Interior, has estimated that, in a 16,000-square mile area of Colorado, Utah and Wyoming, there are, roughly, 2 trillion barrels of oil that can be extracted from oil shale. That is more energy than we get from Canada. This is not a new and unusual process. Estonia, in the Baltic states, has been using this same process of extraction from oil shale for 80 years, and they have done it successfully and in an environmentally friendly manner.

We could copy that same proposal—but no. Once again, this administration has decided to slow-walk any development, slow-walk any allowance of projects to go forward to demonstrate what we can and cannot do. The net result of losing this opportunity for oil shale is at least $1.9 trillion added to the economy of this country, and there is projected to be up to 100,000 new jobs that would be lost simply by this one decision as well.

Now, this is a small area, but if you compound that fact of what is happening not just in my State of Utah but what is happening in Colorado and Wyoming and New Mexico and Nevada and the rest of the West and if you see the compounded problem we have, you truly can understand why in the recession the West was the hardest hit—because we were dealing with the Federal Government in a way that was certainly unfair.

I'd like to say one last thing before I yield back to the gentleman from New Mexico.

In the last days, as the gentleman said, we have been talking about the ability of trying to jump-start our energy portfolio, our energy self-dependence, our energy ability in three bills specifically dealing with offshore development. We have that same potential for energy development onshore as well that we need to talk about at the same time; but sometimes we also need to talk here simply about understanding how words have meaning. We have been throwing around words in the debate over the last couple of weeks in a way that, I think, has been somewhat unfair and somewhat dilatory, and it has clouded the actual issue of what is going on.

For example, there are those who are saying we don't need to actually develop any new oil or gas resources. There are plenty of leases out there that aren't being produced. I want you to know, when you deal with words, that ''lease'' is not the same thing as a permit to drill, and a ''permit to drill'' doesn't mean you're going to find anything for production. Just because there is a lease does not mean there is production. I had a company that was in my office today which has a lease in one of the Western States. They received the lease 6 years ago. Only this year did they finally check off all the boxes, run through all the bureaucratic hoops and do the environmental impact statements to get the permit 6 years later to finally start preparing to drill to see if it is actually productive. Those 6 years cost a lot of money to that company, money which could have gone to providing work, providing jobs, as well as resources to help grow the economy of this country. That's a real cost, and that is real and legitimate.

We've heard comments before about how this country doesn't have enough oil because we don't have enough reserves to make it worthwhile. According to the CRS, Congressional Research Study, we have $1.2 trillion worth of gas that is available for production here in the United States. That puts us in the top five countries in the world for oil. We are not an oil-poor country. However, when we talk about reserves, reserves are not the same thing as the amount of money that's available. Our reserves are a definition that is established by the SEC, and by the definition we use, we will always have fewer reserves than other countries, by definition.

In addition to that, a reserve can't count as a reserve until you can actually get to it. When we put parts of this country off, when we have a moratorium, by definition, that takes us out of the reserve. So, when someone says we don't have as many reserves as other countries, it's probably true. That doesn't mean we don't have enough oil that can be used and produced. It simply means it doesn't fit the definition. ''Reserve'' is not the same thing as ''amount of producible oil.''

Just like as the gentleman from Georgia said, a subsidy—and we talked about all the subsidies the industries are getting—is when the government actually pays cash to somebody. The oil companies are not getting cash from the government.

□ 1930

A subsidy should not be confused with a tax credit or a tax deduction. If it were, when I fill out my long form and I write down my charitable contributions and get to write them off, that means the Federal Government is subsidizing me or subsidizing the charity to which I'm giving. That doesn't make any sense.

What we need to do is talk about the words as the words really are meant to be and make sure that the words are used the proper way and not for some rhetorical effort to inflame the situation and reach some other result.

The last word we need to talk about is simply ''jobs.'' Right now, there are twice as many government jobs as in all of manufacturing combined. In 1960, those ratios were reversed. We have gone to a lot of effort over the last 2 years to pass jobs bills, all of which produced government jobs. What we need to do is look at jobs in the private sector, and the private sector which creates a reliable, long-term job, a job that also equates wealth that goes back into the system and helps to grow our economy and grow our country.

Those are the jobs we should be after, and those are the jobs we need to do. Unfortunately, we will never develop those jobs until we have a governmental energy policy that is reliable, that is not dependent on the whims of some foreign country, and that helps us develop the resources that we have in this country. We can do it and we need to do it, and I appreciate Mr. PEARCE from New Mexico for bringing up this issue because that's exactly what we need to do as a policy.

With that, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for his comments. He pointed out that this Nation is rich in shale oil. We do, in fact, have 2 trillion barrels in reserve in shale. That all was outlawed from use by the American consumers back in 2007 in a bill passed by NANCY PELOSI off the floor of the House.

To put that in perspective, what does 2 trillion barrels of shale oil mean? We have only used 1 trillion barrels of oil completely in our history in just shale oil. That's not natural gas. That's not normal petroleum. We have double in shale oil what we've consumed up to this point.

Another comment that was made earlier is that we subsidize and that consumers end up paying for things that they don't know they're paying. I just talked to a constituent last week. He said that he was given a tax credit for 40 percent of a solar facility that he put on his own home. That was from the Federal Government; from the State government, another 10 percent. So about 50 percent of the cost of the program was completely reimbursed by the government. But the big deal is they're paying him 22 cents per kilowatt hour of energy that he is able to sell back into the system. Now, that 22 cents needs to be compared to the 7 cents that electricity normally costs. So the consumer is tagged with three times the cost of electricity that is provided by solar power that is bought from individual producers. The consumer will pay more for the power. It is not an easy process to understand, but consumers will ultimately pay all of the higher energy costs.

We hear much today in Washington about the subsidies for Big Oil. Be aware that there are no subsidies for Big Oil. There are simply write-offs that every company is allowed to take legally; write-offs to encourage them to invest in machinery; write-offs that sound like depreciation, amortization; write-offs that are allowed by accounting techniques across the board in this country. Understand that when we begin to penalize these oil companies, we're going to cost America jobs.

So let's talk just a bit about the different supposed subsidies that are, in fact, legitimate write-offs that companies are given.

The suggestion was made that we repeal the expensing of the intangible drilling costs. The intangible drilling costs usually represent 60 to 80 percent of the cost of a well. Historic U.S. policy allows a deduction for development. That's since 1913 in this government's Tax Code; and yet, today, we're talking about reversing it at a time when we're starving for jobs, 9 percent unemployment, and we're going to talk about making it harder to employ people in this country.

Other businesses are able to expense their research and development projects. Pharmaceutical companies, IEC specifically targets U.S. oil and gas companies. It will discourage innovation in the energy sector at a time when we need more innovation, not less. Disallowing the expensing of intangible drilling costs will put the American consumer in a worse position and endanger American jobs.

The second idea that's talked about in raising taxes for oil companies is to do away with the write-off, the dual capacity rule. The dual capacity rule was to ensure that income that is taxed by another nation is not also taxed by the U.S. It's something that the U.S. has been alone on in taxing double. We tax not only the amount that is made here but the amount that is made in other countries, the profits made in other countries. That's a tax inversion that has cost us many jobs.

Now then, we have the allowance of dual capacity rule in place to stop that, and yet our friends on the other side of the aisle are saying that we must stop this practice. All it's going to do is make the U.S. more inhospitable for investment in energy resources. At a time when we're seeing $4 gasoline, at a time when our economy is struggling, when we need jobs, we're talking about making American businesses less competitive and making American jobs more scarce.

The final section is maybe the most egregious of all, that is, the repeal of section 199 manufacturing exemptions for oil and gas companies. In 2004, the Congress enacted section 199 for manufacturing companies to encourage them to bring jobs back to this country. From 2004 to 2007, the oil and gas industry was responsible for 2 million new jobs that were created. The oil and gas companies currently support 9.2 million jobs. Almost all manufacturers receive a 9 percent credit. That's, again, in order to encourage them to come back to this country.

The oil and gas companies have only been receiving a 6 percent credit because they've already been picked on by the people in this town. But now they're suggesting that we would want to completely do away with the manufacturing credit. Keep in mind, that's the refining of gasoline. That's the definition of manufacturing in oil and gas.

So at a time when we're starving for jobs, we're going to make U.S. manufacturers, the U.S. refineries, less competitive. We're going to encourage Venezuela and Hugo Chavez to send more jobs there, to take more jobs and to send more gasoline here. It just doesn't make sense.

Tonight, I'd like to wrap up with this one picture about the status that our country is in. Our country right now has a tremendous problem with its economy. The problem is this: in Washington, we spend $3.5 trillion. Our revenues to the government are $2.2 trillion. That's a $1.3 trillion deficit. The accumulated deficits over the lifetime of this country are almost $15 trillion.

I show those deficits running out the end of the pipeline into our debt barrel to show the accumulated debt to the Nation. I also show a green sludge pouring over the edge of the barrel because we've got $202 trillion of accumulated costs of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. These are the things that are wrecking our economy.

This chart given by OMB and CBO, the Congress, and the White House both show that our economy is going to fail in 2038 because of these practices. At a time when we're starving for jobs, this administration has a war on western jobs. It has a war on our energy. It has a war on the jobs in the timber industry. It has a war on our way of life.

This is not the time to be conducting partisan politics in this town. It's a time for us to create jobs. With each job created, the 2.2 is greater because each person pays in increment more taxes, but they also are no longer receiving welfare, unemployment, and food stamps. So the 3.5 decreases.

The path forward is simple. We simply ask that the President get on board.

□ 1940

LOST JOBS AND THE TRADE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, jobs need to be America's number one priority. When people go back to work, it seems fairly obvious that we'll not only balance family budgets, but we'll be able to balance America's budget. They're tied together. But for some reason, too many officials here in Washington, both elected officials and those who lobby, simply haven't gotten that message. At the end of last month, The Washington Post ran an excellent piece, asking, ''What is it about the word 'jobs' that our Nation's leaders

fail to understand?'' ''How has the most painful economic crisis in decades somehow escaped their notice?'' and ''Why do they ignore the issues that Americans care most desperately about?'' Very good questions. I tried to answer them myself, as I have fought the resistance to try to help reemploy those who seek work across our country.

I would have to say that, in some ways, some here in this city are privileged. They've really led very privileged lives. They've been insulated, insulated from living in a family that gets a pink slip, insulated from being in a family that knows what it's like to live on an unemployment check and wonder if you will ever be able to get regular checks again, insulated from families that desperately worry when their unemployment checks expire and there is no job.

A lot of people here inherited their wealth, and they truly are insulated, but for the rare few. Others had their educations paid for. They didn't work for them. It's unbelievable. There are a lot of people here just like that. Some of them always had enough to eat. They really never had to scrimp and choose whether they'd have milk, whether they'd have water, whether they'd split a cabbage in order to get their family through the weekend. So there really is a lot of distinction between what people have had to endure in their own lives. And frankly, there are a lot of people in this capital city that make a whole lot of money. I'm going to talk about some of them in a second.

But recent polls tell us what the majority of Americans are thinking about. And according to two recent polls, four out of 10 Americans believe our country is heading in the wrong direction. I agree with them. And as gas prices rise and have climbed to record levels, 71 percent of our citizens are experiencing financial hardship. More cars are along the roads in Ohio where people just simply run out of gas. Or you see them at the pump, and they only put in $20, and they hope that maybe a week from now, the price won't be as bad.

I want to dedicate my time this evening to talking about jobs, about America being held hostage to what the gentleman ahead of me was talking about, Big Oil, and policy changes we need to make to get our economy running strongly here at home. And I want to just point out a couple of measures of our predicament so that people are thinking about different aspects of what we face so that we can really fix it.

Now, this first chart up here shows that for the last quarter century or more, America has not had balanced trade accounts. What does that have to do with the budget deficit? When you are in the red and you are importing more than you are exporting, you are having to actually borrow money to pay the difference. Somebody else is making the money off of us. We have not had balanced trade accounts since the 1970s. Every single year, more and more of America's wealth has been outsourced to someplace else. Every American knows that. You see the jobs that have disappeared from your own community.

I use the Maytag Washer Company in Newton, Iowa. I'm not from Iowa. I'm from Ohio, but I still have my old Maytags, great product. Those jobs ended up in Mexico after they were actually outsourced because of a big buyout that happened in that company. And that's happened in company after company after company. That's what's happened to all of our manufacturing jobs. But this chart here shows the U.S. trade deficit, every single year. In 2010, last year, we had $500 billion more in imports into our country than exports going out. This is a serious part of the problem.

Now, those trade deficits result from agreements America has signed that were supposed to result in exactly the opposite, job creation in our country. Probably the best known is NAFTA. In 1993, this Congress passed an agreement called NAFTA, and the people who voted for it said, Oh, it's going to create all these jobs in the United States, and we won't have to worry. Relations with Mexico will be terrific. Well, guess what? Ever since NAFTA passed, there hasn't been a single year when we have had even a trade balance with Mexico. No. Every year, our deficit with Mexico—more imports coming in here from Mexico than exports going out—has gotten worse.

And what about in Mexico? In Mexico, over 35,000 citizens of that country were shot last year related to the illegal drug trade. We are receiving the reciprocal of that across our border as people flee just to try to have a better way of life. Because you see, the farmers in that country, the small holders, were thrown off their land as a result of NAFTA. Two million people desperate to earn a living. We said that would happen. People didn't care. They simply didn't care. And so we lost that vote on the margin of about 12 votes. But what we said would happen in '93 has happened, and we've had over $1 trillion of trade deficit with Mexico.

The balance of trade with South Korea. Knowing the terrible trade record that this country has had with every country we've signed one of these free trade agreements with, what is the administration proposing and the majority here proposing? They want to bring up more, more NAFTA-like agreements. They want to bring us Korea. They want to bring us Colombia. I don't know what else they're going to throw in. But you know what? We've already got a trade deficit with Korea. We take hundreds of thousands of their cars. They take a few, a few thousand from us. And the agreement that the last administration and this administration has reached with Korea won't bring us trade balance with Korea. There is no requirement that it's a tit for tat, a reciprocal agreement, or it's one car there for one car here. So we are going to lose more jobs if that agreement moves through here.

This is a pattern that Americans need to understand. And if you look at that overall trade deficit that's been going on and getting worse and worse every year, what is the top category of that deficit? The top category is imported oil. I agree with some of my colleagues who have pinpointed the problem, but we can't continue to hold ourselves hostage inside our own Nation on the spear of petroleum. We have to support additional exploration; and we are doing that on our own continent with the Alberta oil sands project, for example, in Canada, the largest construction project on our entire continent. But we also have to diversify. We have to be smart. Prior generations were smart. We need to be smarter.

Today, The Washington Post just published an article on the latest trade numbers. They tell us a lot about our economy. There was some good news. We sold more exports and services. And why wouldn't that happen? The value of the dollar has dropped as we've hemorrhaged jobs here in this country. But a funny thing happened—the trade deficit grew again. More imported oil. High-priced oil keeps pushing us further and further in the red. That $500 billion trade deficit from last year that I referenced, according to the Manufacturing Policy Project, represents a loss of 7 million American jobs. In other words, this hole that's been accumulated over the years, 7 million manufacturing and other jobs lost across our country. That means jobs outsourced someplace else, and then they're imported here. We keep shooting ourselves in the foot over and over and over again.

We can no longer afford to add hundreds of billions of dollars annually to our trade deficit. We need a different trade model that results in trade balances at a minimum and hopefully trade surpluses because you simply can't balance our Federal budget or family budgets when our trade accounts are so costly and so out of whack and so many jobs have been moved offshore.

□ 1950

We hear that the majority wants to bring up more NAFTA-like trade agreements, and one of the countries they're talking about is Colombia. They're talking about Korea; they're talking about Colombia. What Colombia is really about is oil, more imported petroleum, when you really get into the weeds and you look at what that agreement is about.

And the question for America really is, If this is the history of imported consumption of petroleum, is that really the future that we want for this generation and the next and the following?

The red lines here represent the growing share of petroleum consumption in our country that's represented

by imports. It's increased steadily over the last quarter century. That is not a path for American liberty nor American economic success.

We need a trade policy that is results oriented, that results in balance and energy independence here at home. We need to grow our exports, yes, and create jobs here in our country by moving our Nation toward energy independence here at home.

And we need for somebody in the executive branch to stand up and fight for reciprocal trade agreements. I said that to President Obama. What's wrong with a trade surplus? What's wrong with a trade balance? Why do we keep going in the red? Why would anyone accept that as a solution for America?

The unemployment rate rose this past month, I contend, because of rising gas prices. It was not good news for an economy that has been struggling to recover. And if we look back again at the last quarter century, and this chart looks a little complicated, but what it shows—the red line is oil prices—is that every time oil prices peak, what follows? Higher unemployment. It's a very predictable pattern. It happened in the 1970s twice. Here we go, high oil prices with the Arab oil embargo back in the '70s. What happened? Rising unemployment.

If you go back to the late 1980s, early 1990s, same thing. Higher oil prices, higher unemployment. And certainly, now, with the greatest recession since the Great Depression, an enormous rise in 2008 when the stock market crashed. What preceded it was an increase in oil prices to over $4 a gallon. And what happened? The crash. Yes, it's a housing crisis. Yes, it's an unemployment crisis. But what triggered it? Gas prices over $4 a gallon.

The American people, once they understand what's happened, will fix it. America really is a hostage in her own land as a result of imported petroleum.

Just as America is starting to regrow her economy now, Big Oil wants to steer our country back toward recession.

Now, look at this chart. In the first quarter of 2011, just one of the companies, ExxonMobil took in $10.7 billion—that's a B—in profits in one quarter. That's a 69 percent increase over last year.

Occidental, that's the group that wants to drill more in Colombia, and they need a free trade agreement to do that and bring it in here. Their profits are up $1.6 billion, 46 percent increase.

Conoco Philips, $2.1 billion. Their profits are up 43 percent in one quarter, and most of these profits are being pocketed tax-free.

While working Americans earning less than $20,000 paid 15 percent of their income in taxes, Chevron, which made $6.2 billion in one quarter—their profits went up 36 percent—they only paid 4.6 percent in taxes on their total of $32 billion in profits last year.

Now, I heard my colleague earlier talking about, oh, gosh, we should really feel sorry for them because, my gosh, they're making all this money, but they need more tax preferences because they won't invest. What are they doing with all this money? These are the largest profits in American history.

Oil companies aren't paying what they owe in taxes. I'll tell you one thing they are doing with their money. They're handing out handsome campaign contributions.

The Koch brothers of Texas, who made a whole lot of money in that industry, generously donated more than $2 million last year and recently bankrolled Governor Walker in Wisconsin and the anti-worker movement that they're pushing in that State.

Overall, the big oil and gas industry donated $27 million last year to political campaigns and, get ready, spent $146 million on lobbyists. That's over, gosh—for each Member of Congress it's like they've assigned one or two people to each one of us. No wonder Congress voted against closing $53 billion in tax loopholes to Big Oil. That's a 300 percent return on their investment, more than they can make searching for new sources of energy.

In 2010, the biggest oil company, ExxonMobil, paid only 2.3 percent of its profits to the United States. That's scandalous when businesses in my district are paying at a 35 percent corporate profit rate. And you know what? They don't ask me for all those special privileges. The businesses working hard in my region, gosh, I can think of bakeries and of factories and of machine tool companies. They don't ask for special privileges. They want to help America. They want to do their fair share.

But this group, they're wired in here.

The year before, ExxonMobil received an $838 million tax refund. Meanwhile, those in the majority would take away unemployment benefits for working Americans. And I can tell you what: you can go across this country in the food lines in community after community, and you know who's lined up? So many of our veterans who have come home to no work.

I say take some of this, create a civil works program, let our returning veterans lead it and improve communities across this country. Let them take unemployed Americans and move around this Nation, fixing up roads, fixing up bridges, painting up what needs to be done, reforesting, doing what Franklin Roosevelt knew how to do a century ago.

Of course, you know, looking at these numbers is British Petroleum. British Petroleum, over the last 5 years, instead of paying taxes, actually took over $48 billion in tax breaks. And in the first quarter of this year they've already made $7.2 billion more, a 16 percent increase over what they earned last year. That's despite the terrible oil spill down in Louisiana and along the gulf.

So it's clear who the winners are. Since January, crude output has actually risen slightly. And although demand has remained steady, prices have climbed by 23 percent. Meanwhile, oil stock prices have risen. Just at Chevron, the stocks have risen 14 percent.

Tax loopholes, corporate welfare, government subsidies, does this really sound like a free market to Americans who are listening tonight?

I urge my colleagues to reject more giveaways for oil companies who are raking in money by holding the American people hostage. It's time to hold them accountable. They ought to pay their fair share. Other businesses do. Americans do.

Let's cut the billions of dollars in corporate welfare and focus on getting hardworking Americans back to work. We need to create jobs in this country and close those trade deficits. We need to stop outsourcing our jobs through these so-called free trade agreements that really aren't free, and we need to move to balanced trade accounts.

We need to reform the NAFTA trade model and not pass the same kind of deal for Korea or Colombia. We need reciprocal trade, not trade deficits. Our country, for too long, has been held hostage to these agreements.

And we need energy independence to help restore our own liberty. Wouldn't it be great if we could put all Americans to work that need a job and helping to create these new sources of energy? And I know full well it is within the capability of American people to do this.

But we shouldn't put all our eggs in the basket of Big Oil. We ought to give them some competition on price. We ought to look at hydrogen-generation facilities across this country. We have the capability to do that.

We need to move into biofuels. Through the Department of Agriculture, working with our renewable energy community, we are fully capable of unlocking the power of the carbohydrate molecule in this century just as we did the hydrocarbon molecule in the last.

□ 2000

We need to bring our natural gas resources forward. We really need to crack the clean coal riddle and find a way to use our huge reserve of clean coal. We need to keep investing, yes, in solar and in wind power and in geothermal. We are just bringing up these technologies around the country and creating thousands and thousands of jobs.

I represent one of the three solar platforms on the continent, and for the last four decades those who have worked in the glass industry and the silicone industry have been transforming and creating companies like First Solar, which was the hottest stock on Wall Street a couple years ago, companies that are involved in green energy production.

Is it perfect yet? No. But neither was Edison's light bulb when he invented it in Milan, Ohio, where he did so much of

his work, a community that I represent, and we are about to put his statue over in Statuary Hall.

So America has to think about a full set of energy sources and not be so dependent on just one that, for whatever reason, lack of competition probably, but also abuse of power has just come to play too important a role in our economy and in our people. It hurts our people too many times over and over and over again.

Fifty percent of what we could actually save in energy comes through more judicious consumption. We have tried to provide incentives for Americans to insulate their homes, to put in new kinds of windows. There are new building materials coming on the market, new types of insulation, building your home in a manner that uses less energy in the way that it is sited on the spot, using the full energy of the sun where you can. We are much smarter about the way we are building than we were 30 or even 20 years ago, and those improvements need to continue.

Imagine an America where every roof was a solar producer where there is enough sunshine to make a difference. Imagine an America where we captured the power of the wind and properly stored it and moved it to grid. Imagine an America where what you put in your tank, if you even put something in your tank to fuel it, that it is grown and renewable in this country. Imagine an America where you could have plug-in hybrids that move around this country and our gas stations become a different type of fueling station. That is all possible.

We are working through the U.S. Department of Defense, and I will just sort of end with this, because I believe that the Department of Defense knows better than any aspect of our society what we are paying as an oil hostage. Our soldiers are deployed all over the world and very close to oil reserves. I think they are worth more than that. I think their genius can be used inside the boundaries of this country to make us energy independent again. Our energy dependence is our chief strategic vulnerability.

Go to the Marine Corps Web site. I salute the Marines. They are taking the lead inside the Department of Defense in trying to create new solutions, not just on their own bases, but as their troops move around the world.

I salute the Navy. Some of the incredible inventions that they are coming up with to move power from one point to another with not a loss of one kilowatt, are unbelievable, some of the superconducting work that is being done inside Navy today.

I congratulate the Air Force for trying new biofuels and helping to push America forward in terms of its ability to power itself internally.

And I salute the U.S. Army. Your work on solar tents, your work in trying to capture the power of the Earth, to power the systems that you are involved with today is something that is absolutely technologically amazing.

You inspire us all. And there is a way for America not to be so dependent on those who would extract from us but in fact use our genius to restore our liberty and independence again.

Imagine how many jobs we could create in this country if we could bring our military back home and could spend the trillions of dollars that have been spent in oil-producing foreign lands here, at home. Literally, we could rebuild the transmission grid of this country from one end to the other. We could bring up the genius of patent holders who, as we are here this evening, have ideas that can be brought to market and put that money to work for the American people. They deserve it.

God bless America. God bless the future of this country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for May 10 on account of official business in district.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha, to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 12, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1521. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Army Case Number 08-02, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1522. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter in response to Pub. L. 110-84 Sec. 708; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1523. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1524. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8175] received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1525. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to the Republic of Columbia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1526. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Decision and Order Granting 180-Day Extension of Compliance Date for Residential Furnaces and Boilers Test Procedure Amendments; Correction [Docket Number: EERE-2008-BT-TP-0020] (RIN: 1904-AB89) received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1527. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Occupational Radiation Protection [Docket No.: HS-RM-09-853] (RIN: 1992-AA-45) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1528. A letter from the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Kentucky; Approval of Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plans for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standards for the Edmonson County, KY; Greenup County Portion of the Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY; Lexington-Fayette, KY; and Owensboro, KY [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-1186-201114; FRL-9295-9] received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1529. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Interstate Transport of Pollution Revisions for the 1997 8-hour Ozone and 1997 PM 2.5 NAAQS: ''Interference with Visibility'' Requirement [EPA-R08-OAR-2007-1036; FRL-9297-1] received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1530. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Nevada; PM-10; Determinations Regarding Attainment for the Truckee Meadows Nonattainment Area and Applicability of Certain Clean Air Act Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0995; FRL-9296-9] received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1531. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision to the South Coast Portion of the California State Implementation Plan, CPV Sentinel Energy Project AB 1318 Tracking System [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-1078; FRL-9293-6] received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1532. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Policies to Promote Rural Radio Service and to Streamline Allotment and Assignment Procedures [MB Docket No.: 09-52]

received March 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1533. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1534. A letter from the Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) Report for FY 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1535. A letter from the Director, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1536. A letter from the Equal Employment Opportunity Director, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1537. A letter from the Equal Employment Opportunity Director, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1538. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communication Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2010 Annual Report pursuant to Section 203, Title II of the Notification and Federal Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1539. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2010 Annual Report pursuant to Section 203, Title II of the Notification and Federal Anti-discrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1540. A letter from the Director, EEO and Diversity Programs, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting a copy of the Administration's Fiscal Year 2010 Notification and Federal Employee Anti-Discrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act Annual Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1541. A letter from the Assosciate Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the Office's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with Title II of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1542. A letter from the Director, Adminsitrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the Office's report entitled, ''2010 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1543. A letter from the Clerk of the Court, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit (Groesch, et al., v. City of Springfield, IL., No. 07-2932 (March 28, 2011)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1544. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Boards's final rule — Solid Waste Rail Transfer Facilities [Docket No.: EP 684] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1545. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Safe harbor method of accounting for determining the recovery periods for depreciation of certain tangible assets used by wireless telecommunications carriers (Rev. Proc. 2011-22) received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1546. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Extension of Relief and Procedures Under Notice 2010-30 for Spouses of U.S. Servicemembers who are Working in or Claiming Residence or Domicile in a U.S. Territory Under the Military Spouses Residency Relief Act [Notice 2011-16] received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1547. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities Issued at a Premium [Notice 2011-21] received April 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1548. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Supplemental Notice to Notice 2010-60 Providing Further Guidance and Requesting Comments on Certain Priority Issues Under Chapter 4 of Subtitle A of the Code [Notice 2011-34] received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1549. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Clarification of Controlled Group Qualification Rules [TD 9522] (RIN: 1545-BG94) received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1550. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on two Agency's Drug-Free Workplace Plans, pursuant to Public Law 100-71, section 503(a)(1)(A) (101 Stat. 468); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Oversight and Government Reform.

1551. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ''Finalizing Medicare Regulations under Section 902 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA) for Calender year 2010''; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 264. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 754) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–75). 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. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1825. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve commuting and transportation options; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota):

H.R. 1826. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reinstate criminal penalties for persons charging veterans unauthorized fees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. SCHRADER (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1827. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a standard home office deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1828. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to the State of Louisiana for a pilot program to develop measures to eradicate or control feral swine and to assess and restore wetlands damaged by feral swine; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1829. A bill to provide for the eradication and control of nutria; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1830. A bill to authorize the interstate traffic of unpasteurized milk and milk products that are packaged for direct human consumption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 1831. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr.

KISSELL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 1832. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand the State licensure exception for certain health-care professionals, and for other purposes; 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. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WU, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 1833. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve mental and behavioral health services on college campuses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DOLD, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1834. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a temporary dividends received deduction for 2011 or 2012; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 1835. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to fly the flag of a State over the Capitol each year on the anniversary of the date of the State's admission to the Union; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1836. A bill to establish appropriate procedures and sanctions to ensure that unpaid parking fines and penalties owed to New York City by foreign countries are paid; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 1837. A bill to address certain water-related concerns on the San Joaquin River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HAYWORTH:

H.R. 1838. A bill to repeal a provision of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act prohibiting any Federal bailout of swap dealers or participants; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. WEINER:

H.R. 1839. A bill to ensure and foster continued patient safety and quality of care by making the antitrust laws apply to negotiations between groups of independent pharmacies and health plans and health insurance issuers (including health plans under parts C and D of the Medicare Program) in the same manner as such laws apply to protected activities under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER):

H.R. 1840. A bill to improve consideration by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 1841. A bill to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect computerized data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a security breach; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 1842. A bill to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain alien students who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Homeland Security, 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. BORDALLO:

H.R. 1843. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 489 Army Drive in Barrigada, Guam, as the ''John Pangelinan Gerber Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1844. A bill to amend the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 to clarify that a notice of arrival is not required for certain documented vessels unless arriving from a foreign port or place; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PAUL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KIND, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1845. A bill to provide for a study on issues relating to access to intravenous immune globulin (IVIG) for Medicare beneficiaries in all care settings and a demonstration project to examine the benefits of providing coverage and payment for items and services necessary to administer IVIG in the home; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 1846. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to repeal wage requirements applicable to laborers and mechanics employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 1847. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, and title 10, United States Code, to extend the number of years that multiyear contracts may be entered into for the purchase of advanced biofuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. MACK (for himself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. WEST, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia):

H.R. 1848. A bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. NORTON:

H.R. 1849. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to make the funding available for carrying out section 140 of title 23 mandatory instead of discretionary; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 1850. A bill to expand retroactive eligibility of the Army Combat Action Badge to include members of the Army who participated in combat during which they personally engaged, or were personally engaged by, the enemy at any time on or after December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1851. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements to compensate local educational agencies and units of local governments for tax revenues lost when the Federal Government takes land into trust for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian tribe or an individual Indian; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BURGESS, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 1852. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1853. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for deferred action and parole only in for urgent humanitarian reasons or to gain a significant public benefit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1854. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program of outreach for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALZ of Minnesota (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 1855. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of rehabilitative services for veterans with traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1856. A bill to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to strengthen the promotion of religious freedom in United States foreign policy and to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 58. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Major Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers and

Process Heaters''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 59. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 60. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 61. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Sewage Sludge Incineration Units''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H. Res. 263. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. WU, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Res. 265. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Asian and Pacific Islander HIV/AIDS Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY:

H. Res. 266. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should, without any further delay, submit the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement to Congress for its consideration and immediate approval under fast track procedures pursuant to the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority of 2002; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. CONYERS introduced a bill (H.R. 1857) for the relief of Bartosz Kumor; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding income taxes. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that ''Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . .'' (Section 8, Clause 1). Further clarifying Congressional power to enact an income tax, voters amended the Constitution by popular vote to provide that ''Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived. . . .'' (Sixteenth Amendment). The Commuter Relief Act modifies the income tax code in a manner that is consistent with these Constitutional authorities.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 1827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Congress has the authority to enact 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. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This act is justified by the Commerce Clause of the United States which, by granting Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states, allows Congress to prevent federal agencies from interfering in American's ability to buy or sell unpasteurized milk across state lines.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This act is justified by the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution that, by granting Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states, allows Congress to prevent the federal government from interfering in Americans' ability to grow and process industrial hemp and by the Ninth Amendment and Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution that recognizes that rights and powers are retained and reserved by the people and the states.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.''

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clause 1), which says, ''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. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 1835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution—Article 4 Section 4

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 1836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 1837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of section 8 and clause 7 of section 9 of article I, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. HAYWORTH:

H.R. 1838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 1839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 1840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rest is the power of Congress to regulate Commerce among the several states, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 1841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 1842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 1843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1845.

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 Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 1846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, the bill is authorized by Congress' power to 'provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.'

By Mr. INSLEE:

H.R. 1847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, which provides that Congress shall have the power to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; by Article 1, Section 8, which provides that Congress shall have the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof; and by Article 4, Section 3 which provides that Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 1848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 1 of article I, and clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 1850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 15 which grants Congress the power to make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 16 which grants Congress the power to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1851.

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, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 1852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WALZ of Minnesota:

H.R. 1855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 1856.

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 ''secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity,'' as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 and Amendment I, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 58.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to Amendment X of the United States Constitution.''

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 59.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to Amendment X of the United States Constitution.''

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 60.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to Amendment X of the United States Constitution.''

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 61.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to Amendment X of the United States Constitution.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 44: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 58: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FORBES, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 85: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 104: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 127: Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 177: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 198: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 303: Ms. SUTTON and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 333: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 396: Mr. JONES, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 401: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 421: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 440: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 452: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 459: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 463: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 466: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CRITZ, and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 470: Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 485: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 488: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 589: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 591: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 609: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 645: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 690: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 733: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 763: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 771: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 822: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 874: Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 886: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. CARTER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 892: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 912: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 937: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 949: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 962: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 964: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

H.R. 965: Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 972: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 998: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1006: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 1026: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1032: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1041: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1054: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1057: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1058: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1070: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1105: Mr. POLIS and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1113: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1121: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1126: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1130: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1145: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1176: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1191: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1193: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1195: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 1240: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1254: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1259: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1269: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1288: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1299: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1311: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1331: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1360: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1375: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1380: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1385: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1397: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1404: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 1407: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1418: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1431: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1441: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 1448: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 1451: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1466: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1479: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1489: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1498: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1515: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1523: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1529: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1536. Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1573: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1581: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 1585: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 1588: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1592: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1623: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1671: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1674: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1676: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1681: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 1684: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 1686: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1689: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1697: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 1705: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 1712: Mr. CANSECO, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. HALL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 1716: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1735: Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. HOLT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1744: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1748: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1777: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1781: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1797: Mr. POLIS.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GOWDY.
H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. MARCHANT.
H. Res. 60: Ms. NORTON and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H. Res. 95: Mr. COBLE and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H. Res. 137: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H. Res. 141: Mr. HOLT and Mr. FORBES.
H. Res. 180: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H. Res. 241: Mr. FORBES and Mr. BUCSHON.
H. Res. 244: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H. Res. 254: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. FORBES.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered to H.R. 754, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, by Representative ROGERS, or a designee does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2011 No. 64

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.

Almighty God, ruler of history and the nations, we praise You, we adore You, we magnify Your holy Name. May Your presence be felt in our midst today, guiding our thoughts and ordering our steps.

Permit the Members of this body to receive a fresh awareness of who You are and what You desire for them to do. Lord, the challenges they face are so great that they need Your wisdom to meet them. Use our Senators this day so that Your will may be done on Earth as it is done in heaven. Let Your peace come to them as they commit their responsibilities to You and then work with Your guidance and grace.

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, May 11, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m. today. Republicans will control the first 30 minutes and the majority will control the next 30 minutes. Following morning business, the Senate will be in executive session to consider the nomination of Arenda Wright Allen to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia. So at approximately 3 p.m., we will vote on confirmation of the Allen nomination.

There is a special caucus at the White House this afternoon, so we will close early today. The Republicans will have their meeting at the White House tomorrow.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 940

Mr. REID. Madam President, S. 940 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 940) to reduce the Federal budget deficit by closing big oil tax loopholes, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to this bill at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the measure will be placed on the calendar.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. REID. Madam President, I recognize we are in a partisan environment. In a partisan environment, there is temptation to turn every issue into a political issue. We certainly live in one of those environments today. That is regrettable but far from unfamiliar. Politics play a role in our representative government, of course, and they always have. The Founders created a system of checks and balances—three branches of government, for example, and two Chambers of the Congress—precisely because they anticipated these passions. Our Founding Fathers wanted to keep us from losing our way.

Long after that system was created, a new, independent Federal agency was created in the same spirit of checks and balances. That agency is the National Labor Relations Board and acts as a check on employers and employees alike. It safeguards employees' rights to unionize or not to unionize if they so choose. It mediates allegations of unfair labor practices. It does all this independent of any outside influence.

The Acting General Counsel of the NLRB is a man who is as nonpartisan and as independent as the agency for which he works. Last month, he issued a complaint against one of America's largest companies, Boeing. The complaint alleges that after Boeing workers in some States went on strike, the company retaliated by opening a new production line in a nonunion facility. That kind of retaliation, if that is what happened, is, of course, illegal.

That is just the background. I am not here to judge the merits of the case. In

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

fact, I am here to do the exact opposite—to remind the Senate that prejudging the case is not our job. That would overstep long-established boundaries and weaken our system of checks and balances. Lately, though, some of our Republican colleagues have attacked the NLRB and have tried to poison the decisionmaking process. They are interfering with the case pending before a legal body. For example, every Republican Senator on the HELP Committee—and let's remind everyone, the ''l'' in HELP stands for ''labor''—sent a letter to the Acting General Counsel defending Boeing. The letter itself, sent 6 weeks before a hearing even takes place, seems questionable at the very best, but these 10 Republicans went further. They went out of their way to link their request to the Acting General Counsel's pending nomination. If there were ever a case of intimidation, that sounds like it to me. But that is not all. Eight State attorneys general—all Republicans—also signed a letter to the Acting General Counsel calling on him to withdraw the complaint against Boeing—again, long before an administrative judge has had the opportunity to even look at the case, let alone review the case.

I strongly encourage all of them to take a step back, my Republican colleagues on the HELP Committee and these attorneys general. We all know Republicans dislike organized labor. We know they disdain unions because unions demand fairness and equality from the big businesses Republicans so often shield at all costs. So let's be honest—Republicans are threatened by unions. They are threatened because when a large organized group is so concerned with workers' rights, the members of that group vote in large numbers. And because Republicans and the big businesses they defend so often try to take away workers' rights, workers don't often vote Republican.

This kind of interference is inappropriate, it is disgraceful and dangerous. We wouldn't allow threats to prosecutors or U.S. attorneys trying to stop them from moving forward with charges they see fit to bring to the courts, and we shouldn't stand for this. It may not be illegal, but it is no better than the retaliation and intimidation that is the fundamental question in this case, and it should stop.

We need agencies such as the NLRB to be able to operate freely and without political pressures. We need to keep our independent agencies independent. This case is for them to decide, not for us to decide.

Would the Chair now announce morning business.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the first hour equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the next 30 minutes.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time run equally.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

ENERGY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday Democrats unveiled yet another attempt to slow American energy production, this time through a tax hike on American energy. They acknowledge, however, that this will not lower the price of gas, and they are right.

The Congressional Research Service tells us that raising taxes on American energy will do two things: It will increase the price of gas, and it will increase our dependence on foreign competitors. By taxing American energy production, they are also outsourcing American jobs. So let me get this straight: higher gas prices, fewer American jobs, and more dependence on foreign competitors at the expense of American energy? That is their plan? No thank you.

DRAFT EXECUTIVE ORDER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I was happy to see the No. 2 Democrat in the House yesterday take a stand against the President's proposed Executive order, a proposal disguised as increased ''transparency,'' which would allow the administration to review a company's political donations before deciding whether to award a Federal contract. That is right; the administration would be able to review a company's political donations before deciding whether to give them a Federal contract.

Here is how he put it: This is the No. 2 Democrat in the House:

> [The] White House plan to require federal contractors to disclose political contributions could politicize the bidding process and undermine its integrity.

Similar efforts have already been rejected by the Supreme Court, the Federal Election Commission, and the Congress during the last session of the Congress. Now there is bipartisan opposition to the administration's Executive order.

The White House is spinning this as ''reform,'' claiming the American people deserve to know how taxpayer money is being used by contractors. However, the proposed Executive order would exclude Democratic allies, including Federal employee labor unions, environmental groups, and, of course, Planned Parenthood.

As I have said, no White House—no White House—should be able to review a contractor's political party affiliation before deciding if they are worthy—worthy—of a government contract. No one should have to worry about whether their political support will determine their ability to get or to keep a Federal contract or to keep a job.

The issuing of contracts by the Federal Government should be based on the contractor's merits, bids, and capabilities. Under no condition—no condition—should political contributions play a role in that decision. However, the White House draft Executive order makes it crystal clear that if a contractor wants to do business with the government—if they want to do business with the government—they cannot contribute to the Republicans.

As Senator COLLINS recently pointed out, this Executive order would basically repeal the Hatch Act and inject politics back into the procurement process. This is simply unacceptable.

Democracy is compromised when individuals and small businesses fear reprisal or expect favor from the Federal Government as a result of their political associations. So the recent press reports about this unprecedented Executive order raise troubling concerns about an effort to silence or intimidate political adversaries' speech through the government contracting system.

The White House still has an opportunity to not go forward with this order, and you can rest assured we will be watching very closely because the proposed effort would represent an outrageous—a truly outrageous—and antidemocratic abuse of executive branch authority.

It is my sincere hope that the recent reports of the draft Executive order were simply the work of a partisan within the administration and not the position taken by the President himself. He should state his position.

Mr. President, we are waiting for your response.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

RAISING THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, since I first came to the Congress back in 1997 as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives, I have been talking about spending and debt and deficits, and that was a key, central element of my campaign for my first election to the House of Representatives way back in the day. Of course, at that time the numbers were a lot less daunting than they are today.

If we just look at even where we were 15 years ago in relative terms, the point at which we find ourselves today is almost overwhelming. The debt now is over $14 trillion. We are being asked to raise the debt ceiling even further. I would argue we can no longer afford to put these hard decisions off because these are serious times and these call for serious solutions and serious leadership. I hope we are up to that task.

For a long time we thought debts and spending and deficits and all those sorts of things could be acceptable up to a certain level, and I suppose to some degree that is true. Historically, if we look at our country in terms of revenue and spending, over time we have consistently had a certain amount of debt that we carried. But I think by any stretch, any American, any economist, anybody who watches this closely has to recognize the situation in which we find ourselves today is unprecedented in American history and cries out for action—immediate action and bold action.

This is something I would argue my constituents are very concerned about—I think all Americans are very concerned about—because, again, if we look at it in relative terms, where we are today—$14 trillion in accumulated debt—and we go back in the annals of history and look at from the formation of this country back in the late 1700s until 1849, our Federal Government spent—if you can imagine this—only about $1 billion over that 60-year time period.

Today, we will borrow $4 billion. Between today at 9:50 a.m. and this time tomorrow at 9:50 a.m., our Federal Government will borrow $4 billion, which, to put that into perspective, suggests we will borrow, in the next 24 hours, more than four times what we spent in our first 60 years as a nation.

Now, in fact, in 1835, under President Andrew Jackson, the government debt—for the only time in our Nation's history—was completely paid off. Since that time, our debts have been large and small, with large runups in the debt during times of war, while the debt largely declined during times of peace. Never, though, did our debt top even 50 percent of our entire economy, of our GDP, until the Great Depression.

At the end of World War II, debt topped 120 percent of GDP. But in the postwar period, debt steadily declined as a percentage of our economy, attributable to a couple factors: One was strong economic growth, and the second was a government that managed to keep spending relatively low.

When we look at the post-World War II time period, and we get into the 1960s and we reach the end of the 1960s, in that time period to 2008—from 1969 to 2008—on average government spending consumed about 20.6 percent of our entire economy while taxes during that time period on average were about 18 percent of our economy. That, in balance, led to a sizable but a manageable national debt. Debt held by the public just before this President took office was $6.3 trillion.

Now, to put it into perspective, during the previous 40 years the budget was balanced on five occasions. So if we look back, in the last 40 years of our Nation's history there were five occasions on which we were able to balance the budget. In each of these years—and those were 1969, 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001—spending was below the historical average.

In 1969 spending was just 19.4 percent of our GDP. In 1998 it was 19.1 percent of our GDP. In 1999 it was 8.5 percent of GDP. In 2000 and 2001 it was only 18.2 percent of our GDP. So when we look at the years when our budget was balanced, spending averaged just under 18.7 percent of GDP. So what are we set to spend this year? Madam President, 24.3 percent of our GDP—an astonishing 30 percent more than we have spent historically when our budget was balanced. Our debt held by the public at the end of this year will be nearly double what it was when this President took office.

So how did we get to such a high level of spending? Well, to be fair, I think we would have to say some of this is attributable to the economic downturn. Obviously, tax receipts, revenues, are down as a consequence of the economy being in a recession. We also have the ongoing conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, which have been expensive and, obviously, have required a large commitment of resources in order to conduct the operations that are necessary for success there. But I would also argue that a substantial chunk is due to the spending spree that Congress has been on since 2008.

Between 2008 and 2010 spending on nondefense discretionary programs went up more than 20 percent even though inflation over that same time period was around 2 percent. When we add in what eventually the bailouts of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are going to cost, which will be hundreds of billions of dollars, that adds significantly to the debt. Of course, the stimulus boondoggle cost us over $800 billion in the short term. When we add in the interest costs that are associated with that, it will be over $1 trillion—which was all borrowed, borrowed money, borrowed from our children and grandchildren.

When we look at the percentage, as I said before, of spending $1 trillion, literally, on that one program, that one policy, the stimulus program that went into effect a couple years ago, that is literally a thousand times more than what we spent as a nation in our first 60 years of its existence.

If we look at the projections included in the President's budget, it is revealing that it never balances, and that is due entirely to spending. Spending under the President's budget never falls below 23 percent of our entire economy, of our GDP. After 2015 it grows, and there is not a single year when the spending does not grow as a share of our economy. So we have this constant growth in overall spending as a percentage of our GDP that is way beyond the norm if we look at any sort of historical average.

So when the President submitted his initial budget to the Congress, I think we were all hopeful it would demonstrate an acknowledgement that he gets it; that he understands the dimensions of this problem and how serious our fiscal and financial straits are. But the budget he submitted to Congress a few months ago actually increased spending over the 10-year time period, massively increased the debt, and raised taxes on our small businesses at a time when, as I said earlier, we are hoping to get the economy growing and expanding again, which helps address many of the problems I just mentioned. We cannot have economic growth when we are raising taxes on the job creators in our economy, which is our small businesses.

I would argue the two things that are going to be necessary for us to get our economy back on track and to address this issue of spending and this out-of-control debt are to get spending under control, to make the hard decisions that have been put off for far too long; and, secondly, to put policies in place that will enable and create the conditions for economic growth and job creation.

Well, if we look at what the current administration is doing in terms of policies, what I hear as I travel in my State of South Dakota from small businesses—I hear it from agricultural producers—is that at almost every turn they are facing new regulations, new policies coming out of Washington that do not reduce the cost of doing business but actually increase the cost of doing business and drive down their margins, make it more difficult for them to invest capital, to hire new people, and to get this economy going and expanding again.

There are numerous examples of that. We have a number of agencies that are just issuing, promulgating regulations, pursuing an aggressive agenda, much of which cannot be accomplished in Congress because there are not the votes in the Congress to accomplish much of that agenda. So the administration has decided, by just sort of an executive power grab, to try to accomplish much of that agenda.

Well, as I said before, most of those policies are things that make it more

expensive to do business in this country and are going to make it more difficult for our small businesses to get back on track. I mentioned the tax increases the President has proposed, consistently proposed, not only in the budget he released to Congress several months ago but more recently, a couple weeks back, when he came out with his sort of new improved budget still loaded up with tax increases on small businesses—the very opposite of what we would want to do if we want to encourage small businesses to invest and create jobs.

The economic uncertainty that is created by tax policies which are not permanent, expire in a couple years, the economic uncertainty created by not knowing what the next regulation coming out of Washington, DC, is going to do to their bottom line is creating an anxiety out there among investors and keeping on the sidelines a lot of the capital that otherwise would be put to work and deployed in creating jobs.

So if we look at just a few examples—the EPA is probably the most notable one; that is the one I hear the most about—it does not matter whether I am talking to a small business group or whether I am talking, again, to farmers and ranchers, consistently, they say: These regulations coming out of Washington, DC—and specifically in this case, most of them are referring to policies that are coming out of the EPA—are making it very difficult for us to create jobs, to put people back to work, and to invest, reinvest in our businesses.

So we have these types of regulations that are coming out of these agencies. We also have, as I said, a runup in costs associated with many of the policies the Congress has enacted, the spending and debt issues that have been created by the stimulus bill, the new health care bill, which when it is fully implemented will cost $2.5 trillion or thereabouts, but it is going to pass on lots of new costs to businesses across this country not only in the form of tax increases but also in the form of higher insurance rates which they are going to be looking at.

I think you are going to see a continued period where businesses in this country—small businesses—because of this economic uncertainty, will continue to sit it out and don't do the things that are necessary to get people back to work and to deal with high unemployment. There is also the issue of a depressed economic downturn that will make it more difficult for us to expand the economy and address this issue of increasing revenues at the Federal level, which will help solve the problem we have with the deficit and debt.

Another issue that I think is significant now, but it is always an issue for the people I represent in South Dakota, is high energy costs. The Democratic prescription—the most recent one—is to tax energy companies. If you want to get lower cost energy, one of the things you would not do is raise taxes and make it more costly and expensive for people to do business. If you look at, again, EPA and their attempt to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act, which they don't have the authority to do but want to do anyway, has made it more difficult for energy companies to get permits, and a number of projects have been scratched across this country. I can think of a couple in South Dakota.

If you look at the fact that if we continue to get 60 percent of our fuel from outside the United States—we are literally sending $1 billion a day to foreign countries because of our addiction to foreign energy—and if you look at the policies here that we should be implementing if we are interested in getting to be energy independent and produce more American energy, you find a complete contradiction with what the President and his allies in Congress say. They all talk about energy independence, getting away from spending $1 billion a day on foreign oil. Yet, their policies tell another story, because we are limiting even more the amount of area in this country that would be open to energy exploration and production. We have enormous resources in the United States—oil and gas, clean coal, biofuels, and others that we can gain access to.

Right now, we have energy policies that seem more intent on and concerned with some other agenda rather than energy independence. If you are interested in energy independence, I would think you would put policies into place that encourage the production of more American energy. Exactly the opposite is occurring. We have more and more areas that have been taken off limits—public lands. We cannot get to the Outer Continental Shelf. A permatorium is in existence in the South. The North Slope of Alaska has tremendous energy resources. Much of this is off limits, and that will continue to drive us into the arms of foreign countries—many that don't have the best interests of this country in mind and, perhaps even worse, fund organizations that plan attacks against the United States and our allies.

It strikes me at least that if you are serious about getting deficits and debt under control, the one thing you would do is put policies into place that enable small businesses to do what they do best, and that is grow and create jobs. Secondly, you would put constraints on Federal spending in Washington, DC—this issue I mentioned earlier—so that the consistent runup in the amount we spend on our Federal Government as a percentage of GDP will start to not only taper off but come down.

There are a number of suggestions that have been made out there—certainly, perhaps, no perfect one. At least people are taking a legitimate shot at trying to address this issue. There has been a lot of discussion about the Ryan budget that was passed by the House of Representatives. That is already being immediately attacked. Perhaps it is not perfect, but it is a serious effort to control spending.

The only other suggestions we have seen, as I mentioned, are some statements made by the President about his proposals, again, all of which increase taxes, increase spending, and add massively to the Federal debt. It seems to me that we are not having a serious discussion about balancing our budget and paying off our debt, particularly, again, when you put into perspective where we are. Between now and 10 a.m. tomorrow, we will borrow another $4 billion, which, as I said before—I think it bears repeating—is literally four times the amount our entire country spent in the first 60 years of its existence. Again, that is $4 billion between now and this time tomorrow.

We are being requested to raise the debt limit, the amount we can borrow, raise the limits on our credit card in the next few weeks because we are up against that ceiling. We have hit the maximum. We have capped out our ability to borrow money. We are going to be asked to make a vote to increase that borrowing ceiling. I don't think that can occur honestly until such time as we are willing to put into place and take the necessary steps to get this issue of spending under control.

This is, by definition, a spending issue. Some people argue that we need tax increases and additional revenue. The observation I made about balancing the budget was that at the times we did that over the last 40 years—on those five occasions, in every case, we spent less than the average—in some cases significantly less—as a percentage of our GDP.

Clearly, the way to attack this issue is to get spending under control. That will require hard decisions, many of which have been postponed. We have been kicking the can down the road for a long time. We are out of road now. We have come up to the cliff. We cannot kick the can any further. The road is at an end. We are up against some very serious impediments if we don't take the necessary steps to fix the problem.

Again, when I talk about the seriousness of it, over the last few years we have paid lipservice to the issue of spending and debt. I maintain that you have to judge people by what they do and how they vote, not by what they say. We need to debate this issue. As we get into the discussion over raising the debt limit, it creates an opportunity for both sides—Republicans and Democrats—to come together behind a plan that will meaningfully reduce spending in this country, which will deal with entitlement reform, which is needed. We cannot solve this problem in the long term unless we address the issue of entitlement reform and get some limits on spending that will be binding, that we cannot get around.

It is too easy too waive things here and declare an emergency and continue to spend as if there is no tomorrow.

These are serious times. They require serious leadership and serious solutions. That point is no better made than by some of our leaders in this country. As we all know, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ADM Mike Mullen, has said in testimony before Congress that the greatest threat to America's national security is our national debt. I think that is a stunning and powerful statement about where we are and the importance of acting now. We had the former Federal Reserve Chairman, Alan Greenspan, say not too long ago that there is a 50-percent probability that we will face a debt crisis in the next 2 to 3 years. And then, of course, we had Standard & Poors provide a negative assessment to our credit rating in this country. That, too, is something we have not seen before. I hope we are willing to take the necessary steps to avoid our credit rating being downgraded. When you get an assessment such as that, it is not too long that a downgrade in your credit rating follows.

Those are not just anecdotal things, those are fact-based assessments and analysis of where we are. These are people who know the importance of dealing with these issues. If we continue to borrow more money from other places and don't take the necessary steps to fix this, we will continue to put our future of our children and grandchildren at greater risk and in greater jeopardy.

This will not be easy. Obviously, there will be political consequences to any decisions we make. But these decisions are more difficult because we have put them off for so long. The easy decisions, the low-hanging fruit is no longer out there. We have to decide now, are we going to continue to spend and spend and borrow and borrow, to the point where we head over the cliff because we ran out of road, or will we make these decisions now and get serious about providing a stronger and better and more prosperous future for our children and grandchildren?

We cannot act as though the Federal Government doesn't have a spending problem. Those days are gone. We no longer have that luxury; the numbers bear that out. So we need to look at the debt limit and the upcoming vote as an opportunity for Republicans and Democrats to come together behind a plan that will meaningfully address our spending problem.

The status quo is not acceptable. It is going to require leadership from the President, which has been nonexistent so far. I hope he will step forward. It will require leadership from Democrats in the Senate. They control the agenda here and they have the majority. I hope we do a budget this year. We didn't do one last year in the Senate. I think it is important to have that debate, so that the American people see us debating how we are going to spend their tax dollars. That is something every American should expect and deserves from their elected leaders.

I hope we will have a budget markup where we can get these issues out in front not only for us to discuss but also in front of the American people. This is their future we are talking about. If we don't act, we are putting in great peril and jeopardy the future for our children and grandchildren.

I wanted to point out where we have come from and where, in my view, we need to go if we are going to solve this problem. I hope my colleagues will join in that discussion, not only rhetorically but that their actions will follow. We cannot just talk about this; it is time for us to quit talking and start acting.

I yield the floor 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. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HIGH GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I rise to speak about an issue that is directly impacting each and every family, not just in West Virginia but throughout this whole country. It is the high gas prices. The truth is, in States all across this Nation, and particularly in West Virginia, countless families have to drive to survive. For these families, a jump in the gas price is not just an inconvenience or an annoyance, it is a threat that hits extremely hard in the pocketbook and could change their way of life.

But as every American knows, the cycle of high gas prices is not a new phenomenon with any of us. I still vividly remember waiting in line for gas in the early 1970s, when gas was rationed based on our license number—when we could buy gas. It is something I thought could never happen in America, and I am sure those whom it happened to felt the same.

This all came about because of our dependency on foreign oil. If we think back to the early 1970s, we were 28 percent dependent on foreign oil, which we thought was a high number at that time. But today we are more than 50 percent dependent on foreign oil, which has caused a massive transfer of American wealth to countries that do not like us that much and want to do us harm. We have seen this bad movie time and again. Yet somehow it seems Washington keeps thinking there is going to be a different outcome or a different ending. The right ending will only come when our Nation makes it a high priority to achieve energy independence within this generation.

While crafting such a bold plan will be difficult, I recognize—and the special interests that oppose using our own resources such as coal, natural gas, and oil in an environmentally responsible way will resist loudly—we can no longer allow this Nation and our hard-working families to be held hostage by high gas prices. We can no longer allow partisanship and politics to undermine the common ground that can be achieved if we work together with one goal in mind—true energy independence within this generation.

Let me make it perfectly clear, high gas prices are not the only high price we are paying as a nation. For decades, our great men and women who serve us so well have been called to action in defense of our vital interests in the Middle East and all around the world. Thousands have been killed and injured. Their families have suffered the incredible pain of loss. Our nations have spent trillions in the course of these missions. Yet too many of these oil-rich countries have and will continue to use against us our dependence on their oil.

For all these reasons and for the sake of our national security, it is time for our Nation to become truly energy independent within this generation. I believe we can do it, and I know we can because just this week in beautiful Mingo County, WV, my State took a major step to confront our gas prices head on. On Monday, West Virginia said enough is enough. On a sunny morning in the town of Gilbert, WV, I helped break ground on a promising new project that could help bring down the crushing gas prices our families are confronting. There, entrepreneurs and State and local governments are participating to create hundreds of jobs at a coal-to-gasoline plant that is at the forefront of any technology in the world.

The anticipated production of this plant is very impressive. It is projected to convert 7,500 tons of West Virginia coal into 756,000 gallons of premium gasoline each and every day, which can be used to run our cars and our trucks and even some of our military equipment.

Over a 4-year construction period, it is estimated that 3,000 skilled trade workers in America will be employed. When the plant is finished, it is expected to create 300 direct jobs and hundreds of more ancillary jobs in the community.

In West Virginia and Mingo County, the government is acting as a partner—and as a good partner, not an obstacle—and that is the role our Federal Government should take toward energy independence. This is exactly the kind of project the Federal Government should work on with us to make sure it succeeds. They should be our ally, not an obstacle or an adversary. If my little State has the courage to step out and invest in our independence, then the Federal Government should also have the courage to do the same. West Virginians are sending the right message for this country. We will not let ourselves be held hostage to foreign countries that want to see the United

States be financially crippled simply because those countries have oil.

My State of West Virginia also proves we can and we must use all our domestic resources to break our cycle of dependence on foreign oil within this generation. It doesn't matter whether your State has oil, coal, natural gas, geothermal, nuclear, biomass, wind, solar or hydro because we have to harness all the tremendous resources right here in America or we are going to continue to rely on countries that have contributed directly or indirectly to changing America for the worse.

At the end of the day, it is going to take everything we can do and every resource we have to become truly independent. That is one of the many reasons why I am cosponsoring the American Alternative Fuels Act with my colleague, JOHN BARRASSO, from Wyoming. Among other things, the bill would break down barriers to alternative energy fuels, including those from coal, biomass, algae, and waste.

There are other smart, targeted actions we can take in the short term to help reduce the price of gas for our families. I have signed on to an important piece of bipartisan legislation sponsored by my friend, Senator HERB KOHL, from Wisconsin. It is the No Oil Producing & Exporting Cartels Act, better know as NOPEC. This bill would finally allow the Department of Justice to go after foreign countries, such as the members of OPEC, because of their price-fixing behavior.

The other major issue we must address now is speculators and oil company subsidies. This is not a supply issue. The real problem is pure greed—some who are taking advantage of the instability in our world to line their pockets on the backs of American families—or a tax policy that does not make any sense at all, that continues to subsidize oil companies when the price of a barrel of oil is at the highest it has ever been and the profits are at a record high. This doesn't make any sense to American families.

Wouldn't it make more sense that these subsidies they now have should only be available when the cost of production exceeds the price of a barrel of oil? That would be a commonsense solution. It would ensure stability and steady production, and it does not force taxpayers to fill the bank accounts of major oil companies when they are already making record profits.

Because we must do so much more to protect American families, I have also encouraged the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to take aggressive steps in the short term to regulate and pursue the oil speculators who are driving the price of a gallon of gas through the ceiling.

While the most important thing our country can do is establish a national energy plan for independence, all of those actions are steps we can take to make sure we relieve the financial pressures on our families and help secure our country.

For all of the wonderful families of West Virginia, for the great people of the United States of America, and all of our children and grandchildren, this country must finally answer the call. It is time. It is truly time. It is time to free this Nation, put politics aside, and work together to make energy independence a national priority.

I truly believe that if we work together as Americans and focus on a commonsense approach, we can develop a strong bipartisan energy plan that will not only break the power of foreign oil countries and speculators, but use the resources that we have right here in America. We can chart a new and promising energy future for this great Nation and we must start today.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I want to thank the Senator from West Virginia for his comments on our dependence on foreign oil. We import about $1 billion worth of oil a day. That does not make our Nation any stronger. In fact, it makes us more dependent. For our economy to grow, we need to have good homegrown energy sources. We may never be totally independent, but if we do not move toward independence, then I am afraid we are going to continue to be victimized, as we have been recently, by not only oil companies but the greed the Senator mentioned that drives up gasoline prices every Spring. Just as sure as the baseball season is going to open, gasoline prices are going to go sky high. Then they are going to retreat, but they never retreat to where they started. They always end up higher as we go into the summer vacation season. The Senator from West Virginia has some thoughtful ideas here on how to address this. I share his support of HERB KOHL's legislation that deals with NOPEC, the OPEC cartel, and the fact that we have been victimized by them for way too long.

Like the Senator's State, we have a lot of coal in Illinois. We want to find an environmentally responsible way to use it, to take all of the energy out of the ground and put it to work for America so Americans can go to work. I thank the Senator for his leadership on this important topic.

ILLINOIS FLOODING

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, closer to home in Illinois, we are fighting the floods. It happens regularly, and we have had a tough time with it. The Ohio River, the Illinois River, and the Mississippi River have all been threatening communities such as Metropolis and Old Shawneetown. I was down in Cairo, IL, a couple of weeks ago and saw how bad it was. It was a scary situation in a very poor town.

The Corps of Engineers had a tough decision to make. They had to blow a levee, which means opening farm land to be flooded. To take the pressure off the rivers, they did it. I said to General Walsh when he was in the process of making the decision: Do what is right and I will stand by you. I know what I want you to do, but do what is right. I think he did the right thing, and I stand by him.

Now I stand by those living in Missouri who were affected by that decision. If they in any way suffered hardship or inconvenience or loss of income as farmers, we need to stand by them, as we do with so many across America in times of disaster.

I know we have had a big challenge in our State. Governor Quinn and I were on the phone the day before yesterday talking about the response. He was on his way down to Metropolis. A mutual friend of ours, Mayor Billy McDaniel, down there is working with Pulaski County Board Chairman Monte Russell to find places for people to stay as they wait for the flood waters to recede in Metropolis.

In Carmi, Mayor David Port and Golconda Mayor Bill Altman are working with our office to make sure that pumps and other supplies are there when they are needed. In Cairo, we had a change in administration. I worked with Judson Childs, the former mayor. He has now been replaced by Tyrone Coleman. We will continue to work with them. They vacated a lot of homes. People are staying in gyms and other places and waiting for a chance to go back home. We are going to do our best to make sure that happens.

A special salute to our Illinois National Guard. These men and women come to the rescue of our State every time we face a disaster. This is no different. They are putting in long hours. I thank them for their unselfish commitment. And GEN Bill Enyart can be proud of the men and women of the Guard units across the State of Illinois.

The Illinois Emergency Management Agency under Director Jonathon Luck has been in touch with our office every single day. They are assessing the damage that has been done. They will measure that damage, and at the appropriate moment—and I am sure it will be soon—will move forward with our congressional delegation to ask for Federal disaster status and Federal disaster assistance. That is something that I think will definitely be needed and is appropriate for the magnitude of this challenge.

I will work with my colleague Senator KIRK, who visited last week in this region. We are going to work together, in a bipartisan way, to make sure that our State and the people who are suffering under these flooding conditions have a chance to recover, get back to their homes and back to their businesses and back to work.

(The remarks of Mr. DURBIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 952 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

OIL COMPANY SUBSIDIES

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am here to call for the end of the $4 billion in giveaways that taxpayers are providing to big oil companies every year. At a time of skyrocketing gas prices and of record oil company profits and of difficult decisions about where and how to cut the Federal deficit, we should not be providing big oil with expensive and unnecessary taxpayer handouts.

Gas prices nationwide are averaging $3.96, up over a dollar from this time a year ago. In my home State of Rhode Island the average price per gallon is now over four bucks. These prices are putting a significant dent in family budgets across the country.

In the last 50 years prices in real terms have only been this high twice—in 1981 after the oil crisis and in parts of 2007 and 2008. High gas prices not only increase the cost of driving, but they leave families with less to spend on other basic necessities. They ripple throughout the economy as gas-guzzling buses strain school district and public transportation budgets, food prices increase from trucking costs, and wherever transportation is a factor it raises costs for American consumers.

The current price spike could not have come at a worse time. When gas prices last peaked in July 2008, unemployment nationally was 5.8 percent. Now unemployment nationally is 8.8 percent, and it is even higher in many States. In my home State of Rhode Island, we are still struggling under a staggering 11-percent unemployment rate.

I recently heard from Tony, a constituent in Wakefield, RI, about the impact rising gas prices have had on his wallet. He said:

> We have few options to offset the higher pricing and thus much less to spend.

Gas prices are forcing individuals such as Tony to make difficult choices about what to cut out of the family budget. Yet even as families are struggling, oil companies are once again reaping record profits.

Here are the earnings numbers the oil companies recently announced for this quarter: ConocoPhillips earned a first-quarter profit of $3 billion, up 44 percent from the period last year. Chevron earned $6.2 billion, a 36-percent increase in profit. Royal Dutch Shell earned $6.3 billion, a 30-percent increase in profit. BP earned $7.1 billion, a 17-percent increase in profit. And the big one, ExxonMobil, earned a profit in one quarter of $10.7 billion, a 69-percent increase from last year in quarterly profit.

These companies combined for a total profit of $33.3 billion in the first quarter. That is $370 million per day or more than $250,000 in profit every minute. I have probably been speaking for at least 4 minutes, so they have made 1 million bucks.

There is a direct correlation between how much consumers pay at the pump and how much oil companies rake in. As gas prices climbed from 2002 to 2008, so did profits. When gas prices fell in 2009, down went profits. Sure enough, as gas prices climb again to over $4 per gallon, oil profits are up sharply.

With people in Rhode Island and across the country being forced to tighten their budgets, and with the Federal Government working to reduce our deficit, it is all the more frustrating to read about these taxpayer-subsidized, sky-high profits. At the very least, when we are looking at cutting Head Start, for instance, we should not be wasting $4 billion per year in precious taxpayer dollars to help these big oil companies earn higher profits. They are doing wonderfully on their own.

So I am proud to join my colleagues in introducing the Close Big Oil Tax Loopholes Act to end some of these egregious subsidies for the big five oil companies. To highlight a few, the proposal would repeal subsidies to oil companies for producing oil overseas. It would repeal a deduction that can often eliminate Federal taxes for oil companies, and it would repeal the head-scratching classification of oil companies as manufacturers which allows them to take a tax credit aimed at getting our manufacturing industry back on its feet. It is time to close these loopholes and make sure oil companies are paying their fair share to help us lower our deficit.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an op-ed from Jacqueline Savitz which ran today in my hometown paper, the Providence Journal, calling on Congress to end these handouts.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From McClatchy-Tribune News Service, May 11, 2011]

JACQUELINE SAVITZ: MAKE CONGRESS END HANDOUTS TO BIG OIL: PROVIDENCE JOURNAL OP-ED

(By Jacqueline Savitz)

Maybe the Internal Revenue Service should rename its 1040 Form the WD–40. After all, after millions of Americans paid their taxes this year, a hefty chunk of their hard-earned pay went to grease the palms of some of the world's richest oil companies.

But these companies are already well lubricated. Despite profits that surged to nearly $80 billion in 2010, Big Oil will pocket nearly $5 billion in taxpayer handouts this year—even as gasoline prices soar and our national debt deepens.

One year after the Deepwater Horizon oil disaster in the Gulf of Mexico, it's time to ask whether we keep shoveling so much tax money to companies that need it so little—and seem to care even less about the long-term health of America's economy and environment.

Not surprisingly, in poll after poll, the American people are saying: ''No!'' A February NBC/Wall Street Journal survey found that a whopping majority of Americans—74 percent—support ending longstanding oil-industry tax credits worth tens of billions of dollars. President Obama has proposed a change designed to keep the engine of innovation humming. He has asked Congress to dispose of some grubby subsidies that have rewarded Big Oil for bad behavior. And he wants to replace them with more effective incentives for saving energy and shifting to cleaner, greener and safer energy choices.

It's a sensible plan for leveling a playing field too long tilted in Big Oil's favor. It recognizes that we can't just pump our way out of our energy problem. And it would provide the entrepreneurs who are creating tomorrow's energy sources with the same kind of help the nascent oil industry got more than a century ago but no longer needs.

The plan is also a welcome sign that, in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon disaster, we are recognizing the true costs of dirty energy. We don't pay just once for that gallon of gas or quart of oil. We pay at least three times: Once at the station; again on Tax Day for the subsidies; and again every time taxpayers have to help clean up the environmental and economic mess created by a leaking pipeline, smashed supertanker or burning offshore rig.

It's one thing to mourn the lost lives, oiled birds, fouled beaches and fishing grounds created by these catastrophes. It's quite another, however, to realize that billions of our tax dollars contributed to these disasters by cushioning these companies from the true costs of their mismanagement.

So what's the problem? Apparently, the WD–40 has made its way to Congress, and the well-lubricated process has so far ensured that oil-industry subsidies continue to slip through the legislative process.

At Oceana, we're calling on Congress to end this expensive, self-destructive coddling. Oil and natural-gas companies have already received at least $190 billion in subsidies since 1968, said a recent analysis by congressional staff. That could grow by an additional $36.5 billion over the next decade, if our laws aren't changed. And that doesn't count an additional $2 billion to $3 billion in royalties a year that companies aren't currently paying on the oil pumped out of certain federal leases offshore, due to sloppy lawmaking and political gridlock. A private company would never give that oil away for free. Why should we the people?

In these lean times, we can't afford to waste more money on further enriching the oil behemoths. Instead, we could: Pay down our debt. Help our kids become the next Thomas Edison or Bill Gates. Let today's small offshore-wind and ''smart power'' firms become tomorrow's Google—or even tomorrow's BP creating new jobs and big fortunes along the way.

Replacing oil won't happen overnight. But it won't happen at all unless we make smarter choices now about spending the public's money.

First, Congress should act now, as urged by President Obama, to end unnecessary handouts to Big Oil. Second, make sure that the companies pay fair royalties on the crude they pump from public lands and waters. Finally, invest in people and companies that will create the next energy revolution—building everything from better offshore wind turbines to electric cars. It's time we started using our scarce tax dollars for the benefit of all Americans—and stopped handing them over to a handful of rich oil executives. Come on Congress, it's time for an oil change.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I have also called on President Obama to release some of the oil stored in our Nation's Strategic Petroleum Reserve. History has shown that releasing some of this oil into the market can have a short-term impact on prices. When President George H.W. Bush announced he was authorizing a

drawdown in 1991, oil prices fell by nearly $10 per barrel the next day. There is not much we can do to reduce oil prices in the near term, but this action could bring some relief to American consumers.

We must also clamp down on excessive oil speculation. I joined 47 of my colleagues in opposing a Republican proposal to cut one-third of the funding for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the cop on the beat, for improper speculation. The Commission is responsible for cracking down on illegal speculative activities that artificially inflate the price of oil. We need to make sure Wall Street is not unfairly gouging and hurting middle-class families. We should not be taking this cop off that beat.

I am joining Senators CANTWELL and WYDEN in sending a letter calling on the Commission to impose position limits on oil trading that were required by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street reform bill. This congressionally imposed deadline has already passed, and the Commission should act swiftly to protect consumers by helping to restrain speculation. I am glad President Obama has directed an investigation into the role of speculation in our current gas prices.

In the long run, we must invest in electric vehicles, alternative fuels, public transit, high-speed rail, and freight rail. Each of these transportation methods can significantly reduce our reliance on oil in the transportation sector. Indeed, moving freight by rail is three times more fuel efficient than by truck.

If we do not take long-term action, these price spikes we are seeing now are going to keep on coming. We have seen them before, and we will see them again. As President Obama said, the United States keeps going ''from shock to trance on the issue of energy security, rushing to propose action when gas prices rise, then hitting the snooze button when they fall again.'' Let's not hit the snooze button after this one. Let's take the long-term action necessary to get our country off of foreign oil. But in the meantime, let's work together to end the unnecessary and costly $4 billion giveaway to these highly profitable oil companies and promote instead long-term solutions to move us off oil and to protect American consumers from the harmful price shocks they are now experiencing.

I would leave with this question: Can the deficit be at once the most important challenge facing our Nation, as many of my colleagues say it is, and at the same time less important than protecting big oil subsidies? I think not.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to speak in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, a headline in the Hill today reads ''Budgets everywhere, but not [a single] one has votes to pass.'' Well, that is not exactly correct. In reality, there is only one budget that has been presented, publicly debated, worked on in committee, shared with the American people, and passed on the floor in one house, and that is the budget of the Republican House. PAUL RYAN led the fight on that, and it is a courageous, serious budget that would restore fiscal sanity and prosperity to this Nation.

It deals with our short-term funding crisis and the long-term ability of our financial system. We had another budget presented by President Obama. It was an irresponsible budget. The budget presented by the President to the Senate is about this thick. It is required by law that the President submit one every year. He has around 500 people in the budget office who help prepare that. That budget—analyzed by the CBO, our independent group of analysts—was found to not reduce the debt path we are on but to actually increase the debt over 10 years more than would occur based on the Congressional Budget Office baseline we are already on—substantially, $2 trillion more. It has tax increases in it too. This is not a responsible budget. It was never received responsibly in the Senate and not by the independent commentators. They all said it fails to do the job we have to do.

I have to say, by contrast to the House, that there still is no Senate Democratic budget—a budget set up to be passed by a majority. The majority party always has the responsibility—and sometimes they meet it and sometimes not—to present a budget. No action has even been scheduled in the Budget Committee. No plan or resolution has been brought up for a vote. In fact, it has been 742 days since the Senate passed a budget—2 years. The Democratic-led Senate has missed the statutory deadline of April 15 to produce a budget for the second year in a row. In fact, as a statutory requirement, the committee is to start work on it by April 1. We have not begun it yet and it is mid-May. Is it any wonder that this country is in a financial crisis, that we are not containing spending, when we don't even have a budget and we didn't even bring one to the floor last year? Majority Leader REID chose not to bring a budget to the floor for debate or to even attempt to pass a budget.

We are in the middle of a fiscal crisis. There is no doubt that the single greatest threat to America at this point in time is the financial situation in which we find ourselves. This year, we will spend, by September 30—and we are moving on to that date—$3.7 trillion. We will bring in revenue of $2.2 trillion. Forty cents of every dollar we are spending this year is borrowed. It is an unsustainable path, as every expert has told us in the Budget Committee, where I am ranking Republican.

We have heard witness after witness, Democratic and Republican, and the President's own debt commission tell us we are on an unsustainable path. Erskine Bowles, the man chosen by President Obama to head the fiscal commission the President established, told us—along with Alan Simpson, his co-chairman—that this Nation has never faced a more predictable financial crisis. We are heading right to it. It is going to hammer us, our children, and our grandchildren. If we don't get off this course, the bond markets are going to revolt, and we are going to have a serious financial crisis of some kind that will not be good for this economy.

When asked when such a crisis could occur, Mr. Bowles said 2 years, maybe a little less or a little more, and Alan Simpson said he thought it would be 1 year. These are independent people who love America. They are warning us to take action now. The President's budget simply doesn't get it.

The American people are not happy with us. They think we are not meeting our responsibilities.

Are they right? They hammered a lot of big spenders in the last election. Were they right? I totally believe they are right. I totally believe that. I am of the view that there is no way this country should be in the present debt situation. It should never, ever have happened. I opposed a lot of the spending. I would like to think I was more vigorous than most in warning against it. But I don't think I have done enough. There is no reason to borrow 40 cents out of every dollar we spend; it threatens our future.

We will double the entire debt of our country in 4 years under this President's watch. When he leaves office, completes his 4-year term, he will have doubled the entire debt of America, and we are on a course that continues to be dangerous.

As we know, Budget Committee Chairman CONRAD has been meeting privately with his Democratic caucus—it has been in the press—to try to finally bring some sort of budget forward. The Democrats apparently have been unable to do so, from reports we see, because the big spenders in their caucus cannot support a plan that would actually get the job done and put us on a sound financial path, and they can't produce a plan that will withstand public scrutiny, apparently, and that the American people would support. So they have a difficult problem.

This was shown, as reported in The Hill, because Chairman CONRAD—who served on the debt commission and I believe fully understands the dangers this country faces—has repeatedly acknowledged that. I really respect Senator CONRAD's insights into the challenges this country faces. Apparently, his proposal, which was going to be somewhat better than President Obama's, I assume, failed to win the support of his conference and of Senator BERNIE SANDERS, who is a gutsy Senator and is open about what he believes. But he has described himself as a Socialist and is the Senate's most powerful advocate for bigger government. He is a member of the Budget Committee. The reason Senator SANDERS' vote became important is because the Democrats have apparently been working to pass a budget through committee without a Republican vote. They don't expect to get any Republican votes. The committee only has one more Democrat than Republicans, so the chairman needs Senator SANDERS' vote if he wants to get the budget out of committee.

Here is an excerpt from The Hill:

> Reid said Senator Conrad presented to the [Democratic] Caucus a 50/50 split when asked about the preferred ratio of spending cuts to tax increases. . . . Conrad has moved his budget proposal to the left in order to gain the support of Senator Bernie Sanders, an outspoken progressive on the budget panel.

You know, ''progressive'' is a word they are using now for big government types. They want to take more money from the American people because they believe they know better how to spend it than the American people who earn it. They want to spread it around the way they want to spend it.

This is a remarkable turn of events. It is particularly stunning because the President's budget—repudiated for its dramatic levels of spending and taxes—claimed there was a 3-to-1 ratio of spending cuts to tax hikes. ''We cut spending $3 for every $1 in tax hikes'' is what the President said. Chairman CONRAD has indicated that would have been his choice. He praised that. He said he favored that same ratio. I don't think that is necessarily a good ratio. We need to reduce spending more than that.

Taken literally, what this means is that Senator CONRAD has, in a fundamental respect, moved his plan to the left of the President and the fiscal commission, which also proposed a plan that actually did reduce spending $3 for every $1 in tax increases or pretty close to that, pretty fairly, without gimmicks, and came close to achieving that. The President's budget was so gimmicked that it really didn't achieve $3 in spending cuts for every $1 of tax increases. It did not. It wasn't correct for him to say that.

It is important to note that the President and the fiscal commission use a baseline that assumes tax rates will go up. Fairly analyzed, those plans rely much more heavily on taxing than those ratios indicate, as I said, and I fear that the composition of this new Democratic budget proposal may not even meet the 50–50 plan. The others have it in terms of taxes and spending cuts.

The merits of this 50–50 split between savings and taxes are both a question of philosophy and economics. Philosophically, the American people don't want Washington to continue raising taxes to pay for larger and larger spending. American families should not be punished for the sins and excesses of Washington.

According to the CBO, we are going to spend $45 trillion over the next 10 years. The Senate Democratic plan, which no one is likely to see until after the committee meets—that is what we have been told, that we won't see it until it is plopped down at the beginning of the committee markup, where amendments are supposed to be offered soon thereafter—their own plan, at least from what we read about it, says it will cut or save just $2 trillion out of $45 trillion over the next 10 years.

The American people know there is much more we can and must do to bring this government under control and to achieve real balance in this country. What kind of balance? Between raising taxes and cutting spending, 50–50? No. The balance we need is one that respects the American people, that reduces the growth in spending and wealth taken by Washington and allows it to be kept by the American people, who earn it.

There is also a question of economics. Our committee has conducted an exhaustive survey of available research which conclusively shows that debt reduction plans that rely equally on saving money, reducing spending, and raising taxes are far less successful and result in far weaker economic growth than those plans that rely on cutting spending. We will release a white paper very soon that will share these findings with my colleagues and the country. It is very important that we understand this. What history is showing us is that when you reduce spending, you get more growth and prosperity than increasing spending and taxes.

Here is one example of the many studies we analyzed. This is a Goldman Sachs study by analysts Ben Broadbent and Kevin Daly. The report resulted from a cross-national study of fiscal reform that:

> In a review of every major fiscal correction in the OECD—

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, the world's major developed economies—

> since 1975, we find that decisive budgetary adjustments that have focused on reducing government expenditure have (i) been successful in correcting fiscal imbalances; (ii) typically boosted economic growth; and (iii) resulted in significant bond and equity market outperformance.

In other words, the stock market and the bond market improved, and both of those are a bit shaky now after some rebound.

> Tax driven—

''Tax driven,'' that means tax increases—

> fiscal adjustments, by contrast, typically fail to correct fiscal imbalances and are damaging for growth.

That is the Goldman Sachs study. Half of our U.S. Treasury Department has been manned by people who served at one time or another at Goldman Sachs. They are not considered a right-wing group. That is what their analysts have said to us.

The Democratic Senate, I believe, should heed the large body of research showing that spending cuts on a basic economic level work better than trying to drain more out of the economy by way of taxes. In other words, the Senate should produce a budget based on facts. They should produce a budget that grows the economy, that imposes real spending discipline on Washington. They should produce a budget without gimmicks and empty promises. They should produce this budget publicly, openly, and allow the American people to review and consider it before the committee meets in 72 hours, as my colleagues have pleaded with the chairman twice to do but he will not do. They should produce a budget the American people deserve—an honest budget that spares our children from both the growing burden of debt and the growing burden of an intrusive big government.

I hope we can continue to have the opportunity to talk about this issue. It is right that the American people be engaged in it. I have to say, I feel as though we failed in our responsibility to conduct open hearings and markups on a budget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The Senator from Iowa.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, recently the National Labor Relations Board general counsel issued a complaint against the Boeing Company alleging that the company had violated the National Labor Relations Act. This routine administrative procedure has set off what I call a melodramatic outcry from Boeing, the business community, the editorial writers of the Wall Street Journal, the National Chamber of Commerce, and, of course, our friends on the Republican side of the aisle.

A headline in the Wall Street Journal editorial page calls it: ''The death of right to work.''

South Carolina Gov. Nikki Haley declared that it was ''government dictated economic larceny.''

At a press conference held at the Chamber of Commerce yesterday morning, Senator DEMINT from South Carolina referred to it as ''thuggery.''

The senior Senator from Utah warned that foot soldiers of a vast and permanent bureaucracy were trying to implement a ''leftist agenda.''

One would think this one decision by an administrative arm of an independent agency was surely going to bring about the death of capitalism in the world today. This has taken on incredible proportions in terms of the outcry and the mischaracterization of what has happened.

Instead of talking about how we get Americans working again, get the middle class on its feet, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are taking their time on the Senate floor and in press conferences downtown attacking the handling of a routine affair—an unfair labor practice charge.

I do not think it is worth the time of the Senate to debate this issue. However, because of this huge outcry and the fact that the Wall Street Journal has chosen to editorialize on this issue and because of the disturbing misinformation that has distorted public discussion of this case, I am going to take some time on the Senate floor to try to, as they say, set the record straight.

I have said before this Boeing case is a classic example of the old saying that a lie is halfway around the world before the truth laces up its boots. I would say, in this case, Senate information travels even faster than that. So it is time to set the record straight.

Here are the facts in the case. It is undisputed Boeing recently decided to locate a production facility for the new Dreamliner planes in South Carolina. They decided to do that. Many statements were made by executives of Boeing, publicly stated, that the decision to move there was based in whole or in large part on the fact that there had been work stoppages, strikes in the last few years at the Boeing plant in Everett, WA. The NLRB's complaint alleges that this decision was unlawful retaliation against the Boeing workers in Washington State.

This has been put into a political context, but let's again be clear about how this happens. The National Labor Relations Board is an independent agency set up under the Wagner Act 75 years ago. There are two branches of the NLRB. One is the Board, the NLRB, the national board. It is a five-member board appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. On the other hand, there are the career service people, outside of the General Counsel, the civil servants who are not appointed. They are nonpolitical. They carry out the day-to-day functions of the National Labor Relations Act. If I may say, it is similar to the Food and Drug Administration. The Food and Drug Administration has an Administrator appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, as do a lot of other independent agencies. But then there is a civil service side of it that is professional—professional people not appointed by the President. They have career civil service status.

The general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board is appointed, but the rest of the staff in the area of the career civil service. The acting general counsel now has been a civil servant for 30 years.

What happens is, a business or a union—it does not have to be them; it can be anybody—can file a complaint with the NLRB, alleging that certain actions were in violation of the National Labor Relations Act. One of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act says it is unlawful for a company to retaliate against workers for a protected activity conducted by those workers—protected activity.

One of the protected activities under the National Labor Relations Act is, of course, the right to organize, the right to join a union, and, of course, under the Taft-Hartley bill, some years later, the right not to join a union if you do not want to, so-called right-to-work States.

The protected activity in this case is the right to strike. The National Labor Relations Act protects that activity. Organized workers in a union have the right to strike. It is a protected activity. A company cannot retaliate against workers for exercising that right.

So if—if, I say ''if''—if the Boeing Company did, in fact, move a production line to another State in retaliation against the workers who exercised their right to strike in Washington, that would be illegal for Boeing to do that—unlawful. I said ''if'' because I am not here taking a side in the case. I am not certain where the truth lies. This is for the trier of fact and the trier of law.

When a complaint such as this comes to the National Labor Relations Board, they investigate it. The National Labor Relations Board investigated, under the general counsel's office, the civil service part. They did an investigation. They took affidavits. They talked with people to find out whether there was any cause to move forward.

Again, whether it is right or wrong, I do not know, but this independent civil servants decided there was enough evidence for them to warrant taking this case to an administrative law judge. That is the process. Boeing then can make its case before the administrative law judge. The general counsel's office can make its case. The administrative law judge then makes a decision. As I understand it, the administrative law judge can find for the general counsel, it can uphold their theory or it can modify it.

After that is done, either side can appeal it. That appeal then goes from the civil service part over to the National Labor Relations Board. After the Board then reviews it, they make a decision. They either uphold what the administrative law judge said or they do not uphold it.

From there, either side can appeal to the circuit court of appeals, and from the circuit court of appeals, they can appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. That is the process. That process has been followed now for 75 years.

We follow similar processes in other independent agencies of the Federal Government. I mentioned the Federal Food and Drug Administration, the Federal Trade Commission. A lot of other independent boards and agencies have that same process.

What has happened now is, many of our friends on the Republican side and in the business community have now taken up the hue and cry that this process should be interfered with, that this process should somehow be stopped politically. I do not think it is our right, our job here to interfere in something such as that politically. If my friends on the Republican side do not like the provision of the National Labor Relations Act which says it is illegal to take retaliation against workers for protected activity, if my friends on the Republican side want to change that law, offer a bill, offer an amendment. That law can be changed. With both bodies—the House and the Senate—and the President signing it, we can change it. But it is wrong for, I believe, elected officials, such as myself or anyone else, to interfere in that process and to cast it as a political decision. But that is what is being done by so many Republican Senators and people in the business community.

They have alleged that President Obama was behind this, that somehow because he has appointed a couple members of the National Labor Relations Board that he is behind this issue. President Obama had nothing to do with it. This was a complaint filed by the Machinists Union, the International Association of Machinists, with the NLRB. President Obama has nothing to do with this whatsoever, and he should not have anything to do with it. But, again, people on the Republican side are alleging—again, misinformation, misinformation, misinformation going out—that somehow this is being orchestrated out of the White House.

Again the facts: The facts are there was a complaint filed. The National Labor Relations Board is doing exactly what they have done for the last 75 years. It is going to go before an administrative law judge and then find out how it works its way through the courts at that time.

I would ask my friends on the Republican side, if in, fact—if, in fact—the Boeing Company did retaliate against workers because of a protected activity, do my friends on the Republican side say that should be OK? Is that what they are saying; that if workers exercise a legally protected right and a company retaliates against those workers anyway they ought to be able to do that?

I can take all kinds of cases. Let's say a company decides to move a plant from Southern California to, let's just say Fargo, ND, and the reason they state they moved it was because there were too many Hispanics working in their plant in Southern California and they didn't like that. They wanted to

move it to Fargo, ND, because there are not that many Hispanics there.

Guess what, folks. That is illegal. That is illegal. Do my friends on the Republican side say they ought to be able to do that in violation of all our civil rights laws in this country? Of course not.

People say: Of course, they can't make that kind of decision based on that. They can't make a decision to move a plant where there are more men than women so they won't have to hire more women; or less African Americans so they don't have to hire more African Americans. We can carry this on and on.

So I hope my friends on the Republican side are not saying a company can retaliate and then just walk away without any penalties, without even any recourse by the workers to have their cases heard. That is what I am here defending. I am defending the rights of the workers in the plant in Everett, WA, to have their complaints heard.

Now, I don't know the facts. I know a little of the law, but I don't know the facts. That is for the trier. That is for the administrative law judge and the NLRB and the appeals court and the Supreme Court. That is their jurisdiction. But for us to say it shouldn't even go there; that these workers can't even bring a case—and I might add, there are a lot of cases that are filed with the NLRB that don't go there because the NLRB investigates; they do their due diligence; and they find out there is not even enough evidence to warrant going forward.

So all I can assume is here there was enough evidence to warrant going forward. Whether there is enough to actually find that Boeing did retaliate, again, I don't know. That is up to the trier of fact—the administrative law judge. But I am hearing from these dramatic outcries that somehow we are destroying the right to work. This case has nothing to do with right to work—nothing—zero. It has nothing to do with right-to-work laws. This case has nothing to do with the outcry that somehow this is destroying the essence of a business to be able to decide, in its best economic interest, where to locate.

If Boeing wants to open their plant in Timbuktu, they can do that. If they want to open a plant in South Carolina, they can do that. What they can't do is open a plant someplace in retaliation against the workers exercising their legally protected rights; that, they can't do.

Now, again, this is an evidentiary-type hearing. So the evidence will have to come forward as to just what decisions were made, why they were made. Quite frankly, there are executives of Boeing who have publicly stated—publicly—that one of the reasons they moved was because of the work stoppages at the Everett plant—work stoppages, strikes. Is that enough evidence? I don't know. Maybe it is enough evidence to warrant going forward. Obviously, the general counsel's office decided there was.

I would also point out, Mr. President, the general counsel's office in cases such as this works long and hard to try to settle the case—to get both sides to settle. I know the general counsel's office in this case did try to do that, but they were unsuccessful; therefore, the case goes forward.

So I want to point out again—just to reiterate, Mr. President—this is not about doing away with the right-to-work laws. It has nothing to do with that. It has nothing to do with interfering with businesses' making decisions on where to locate their plants or anything such as that. It has nothing to do with that. It has nothing to do with destroying capitalism. It has to do with whether workers have a right—first of all, can they exercise their legally protected rights, and then can they make a case to the NLRB they were retaliated against because they exercised their legal rights. That is what this case is about. That is what this case is about.

Again, I understand the desire of certain people to raise money for political campaigns. I understand that. I understand how one might exaggerate things a lot of times in direct mail and in the press. I am sure there will be a lot of businesses that will hear: You have to contribute to this campaign or that campaign to stop President Obama or to stop the National Labor Relations Board from taking your business decisions away from you.

Well, that is misinformation. I know it can be used to raise a lot of campaign money, but it is not right. It is not right to deceive and to misinform the American people about a basic right that protects middle-class workers in America. Americans understand fairness, and they resent it when the wealthy and the powerful manipulate the political system to reap huge advantages at the expense of working people.

I think I have always been a pretty good friend of the Boeing Company. I have been a big supporter of Boeing in so many things, going back in my 30 years in the Congress. It is a great company. They provide a lot of great jobs for American workers. They build great airplanes—better than Airbus, I might say. But it is wrong for them now to come in and try to get the political system to undo a legal administrative procedure the workers at that Boeing plant have instigated and have asked for the NLRB to investigate and to charge Boeing with retaliation.

What is happening in this case is that the powerful and the big are trying to manipulate the political system. Powerful corporate interests are pressuring Members of this body to interfere with an independent agency rather than letting it run its course.

We should not tolerate this interference. We should turn our attention to the issues that matter to American families—how we can create jobs in Washington, and, yes, in South Carolina, in Iowa, and across the country; how we can rebuild the middle class, how we can ensure that working hard and playing by the rules will help rebuild a better life for families and for their children. Playing by the rules is what the workers did. They played by the rules. They exercised their legal rights, and now there is a complaint filed. I say it is wrong for us to interfere in that.

Again, if we don't like the law, if we don't like the administrative procedures that undergird this, it can be changed. It can be changed. But I daresay we have had 75 years of the Wagner Act—of this process, and I will close on this: Sometimes businesses file a complaint with the NLRB against a union activity, and that is investigated. That goes before administrative law judges, too. So both sides use this.

I think it is unbecoming for us now to try to turn this into some kind of a political maelstrom, a political tornado, when it shouldn't be that. Let's let the law and let's let the administrative procedure do its job. Then, if corrective action needs to be taken, then it is the purview of Congress to deal with it at that time. Not now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

ALLEN NOMINATION

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I would like to express my appreciation to the leadership in the Senate of both parties for scheduling a vote today on Arenda Wright Allen's confirmation for a seat on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

All of us in this body know how important it is to fill the vacancies on our Federal bench, and particularly when we have highly qualified nominees who have no particular issues that need to be discussed in a political sense, and Virginia is no exception in this matter. The sheer volume of our Federal court workload demands we appoint dedicated, qualified jurists.

In that regard, Senator MARK WARNER and myself were very pleased to have recommended Arenda L. Wright Allen to the President in June of last year for this position on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. President Obama nominated Arenda Wright Allen last December. She was renominated this year. She was reported out of the Judiciary Committee without opposition on March 10 of this year, and I believe the President has made an extraordinary choice in nominating Ms. Wright Allen.

Whenever a vacancy has occurred on the Virginia Federal bench, Senator WARNER and I have very carefully conducted thorough and extensive reviews of candidates for the position. This review process includes interviews and recommendations by the bar associations and in-person interviews with

many of the candidates. I am proud to say the Virginia candidate pool from which we had to choose on this particular occasion was excellent. It was deep. It included judges, legal scholars, and skilled trial attorneys.

From this very competitive field, Senator WARNER and I moved for the nomination of Ms. Wright Allen. She distinguished herself as the premier candidate in a very competitive field for this vacancy.

Ms. Wright Allen has displayed during her career the highest degree of integrity, competence, and commitment to the rule of law. She exemplifies the best of the Virginia Bar and, in fact, received the highest ranking from the Virginia State Bar.

As one who was privileged to serve as Secretary of the Navy and also as a combat marine, I personally understand the sacrifices that veterans have made to their country. Ms. Wright Allen is a veteran of the U.S. Navy. She served for 5 years as an Active-Duty JAG officer, and she continued her service as a Reserve JAG officer until her retirement from the Navy as a commander in 2005.

Her record of military service is excellent. Given the huge military presence in the Eastern District of Virginia, I believe this military experience will be valuable to her in her capacity as a Federal judge.

Ms. Wright Allen has dedicated her civilian career to serving her community, first as a Federal prosecutor and since 2005 as a Federal public defender. Unanimously, prosecutors and defenders who have worked with or have been on the opposing side to Ms. Wright Allen have attested to her talent, her dedication, and above all her exceptional character. Upon meeting her, it was clear to me she possesses the correct judicial temperament and dedication to make an excellent judge.

I have also had the pleasure of meeting her family and a number of her friends. Her dedication to her family, her church, and her community is clearly evident. I am proud Virginia has such an exemplary individual to put forward as a Federal district court judge nominee, and I urge all my colleagues to support Ms. Wright Allen today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

NEW START IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators MCCAIN, SESSIONS, CORNYN, VITTER, WICKER, and INHOFE—and probably others before the end of the day—I am going to introduce legislation called the New START Implementation Act, which I would like to describe briefly. This legislation is nearly identical to a companion bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. TURNER, the chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. He has been a leader in the House on nuclear and missile defense issues. I understand many of the provisions have been included in the chairman's mark of the National Defense Authorization Act in the House and that the remainder will be introduced as amendments later today at a full committee level. I specifically wish to thank Chairman TURNER for his leadership.

Nuclear deterrence issues are among the most complicated and technical issues that we in the Congress are confronted with, and he deserves full credit for tackling them with vigor and for mastering them so quickly.

Similar to the House legislation, it is my hope that the Senate bill will be incorporated into the Senate version of the National Defense Act for fiscal year 2012. Let me now explain a little bit why I think this legislation is necessary at this time.

I voted against the New START treaty for reasons I have made clear previously on the floor. But I recognize the President's stated commitment to the modernization of our nuclear deterrent is necessary and is important and that Congress needs to codify the commitments made during the debate on the New START ratification process as well as the agreements the President has indicated through his comments and letters to us. This is important for the future, for future Congresses and future Presidents, because this process is going to take place over a period of at least 10 to 12 years. Modernization of our nuclear weapons facilities and the strategic delivery systems all will require commitments over the space of another decade or more. Memories fade, people's interpretations may change over time, circumstances change, and what we want to make sure of is that over the time period involved during which this modernization process must occur, the understandings that were agreed to at the time of the START treaty ratification will be memorialized in statute and complied with by the Congress and by the administration as time goes on.

The five key features of the legislation are these. First, it would link the funding of the administration's 10-year nuclear modernization program with any U.S. nuclear force reductions during the implementation phase of the treaty. What that means is, as in the later years of the treaty, funding is necessary for the demobilization, the dismantling of some of the weapons that are called for to be dismantled under the treaty but that funding is coordinated with the funding for the modernization program which is going on at the same time. It urges the President to stand by the timelines he pledged on warhead modernization in the revised plan he submitted in November of 2010. This is key to ensuring that Congress will support these modernization efforts that were deemed necessary in conjunction with the New START treaty.

The second thing the bill does is to ensure that nuclear doctrine and targeting guidelines and the New START force levels that the former STRATCOM commander, GEN Kevin Chilton, said were ''exactly what is needed'' are not arbitrarily cut by the administration that seems eager now to go to even lower levels, perhaps even unilaterally, than were negotiated in the START treaty. The President has indicated his desire for a world without nuclear weapons and said he would like to do new things in the future to reduce the numbers of these weapons. We simply want to make certain the guidelines that are militarily necessary reference points for the number of weapons we have, the types we have, how they are deployed and so on, are not modified in order to be a reason for or an excuse for reducing strategic weapons thereafter.

I think this is necessary because the President's National Security Adviser said on March 29 that, even as ''we implement New START, we're making preparations for the next round of nuclear reductions.'' In developing options for further reductions, he said: ''We need to consider several factors, such as potential changes in targeting requirements and alert postures that are required for effective deterrence.''

We were told the New START force levels were exactly what is needed for deterrence. Yet now the administration may seek to alter deterrence requirements in order to justify further reductions. My view is, the administration cannot use one set of facts to ratify the treaty and then immediately change those facts in order to suit its Global Zero agenda. Forty-one Senators made clear in a letter to the President on March 22 that we expect the administration to consult with Congress before directing any changes to U.S. nuclear weapons doctrine or proposing further strategic nuclear reductions with Russia. No consultations have occurred to date, and we expect that those consultations would occur before any discussions with Russians take place.

Third, the legislation would ensure that the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems—that is to say, the bombers, cruise missiles, ICBMs and ballistic missile submarines—are modernized and that their reliability is assessed each year. Even today, we are still uncertain about the administration's plans to modernize the ICBM leg, nor do we know if the new bomber will be nuclear certified upon its deployment. For example, according to an April 22, 2011, press account in the Global Security Newswire, ''The US Airforce cannot say exactly how much it will spend to explore options for modernizing its ICBM fleet, nor where the money will come from.''

Obviously, if we are currently planning the modernization of these fleets, but we do not even know where the money is going to come from for the planning, we have a problem that needs to be resolved now rather than later.

That is what the third requirement of the legislation would require.

Fourth, the bill would affirm that the New START treaty contains no limitation on U.S. missile defense beyond the language in article V, section 3 and that any future agreement with Russia that would attempt to limit U.S. missile defenses could only be done by a treaty that would require the Senate's advice and consent. This is no different than what we all talked about on a bipartisan basis when the New START treaty was ratified, but we think these commitments should actually be codified to ensure they are kept.

Finally, the bill would counsel against unilateral reductions or withdrawal of U.S. nonstrategic nuclear weapons in Europe without the unanimous approval of NATO's members. Obviously, in NATO, one State should not be permitted to end NATO's successful article V policy, the policy that an attack on one is an attack on the others and will be met with resistance from the other NATO allies.

In conclusion, I think this bill should enjoy broad congressional support, given the fact that it merely builds on what the Senate and the administration agreed to in the New START resolution of ratification with respect to nuclear modernization and our freedom of action to develop and deploy missile defenses. It ensures that a future Congress and a future President understand and support the current commitment to nuclear modernization and ensures that there will be no further limitations on our missile defense efforts.

Finally, it builds in vital checks to permit congressional oversight of impending activities by the administration that portend significant changes to U.S. nuclear doctrine, further strategic nuclear reductions and potential activities with, and possibly concessions to, Russia with regard to missile defense and tactical nuclear weapons in Europe—all of which might be counter to U.S. security.

I will be pleased to add other colleagues as cosponsors to the legislation. As I said, I intend to actually introduce this toward the end of the day, and I am sure we will have additional cosponsors by that time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. AYOTTE. 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 New Hampshire is recognized.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. AYOTTE pertaining to the introduction of S. 944 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALLEN NOMINATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Arenda Wright Allen to serve as the next U.S. district court judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

I am very pleased to see that our leadership came together to move this nomination forward. I want to recognize Chairman LEAHY and Ranking Member GRASSLEY for holding the nomination hearing and reporting this nomination by unanimous consent.

Senator WEBB and I had the privilege of interviewing several candidates to fill this vacancy on the bench. Ms. Wright Allen stood out for her exceptional qualifications and impressive record in the Norfolk community.

She has spent her entire legal career in public service, beginning with her service as a JAG officer in the Navy.

She also has the unique perspective of having served as both a prosecutor and a public defender. She spent 14 years serving as an assistant U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia and 1 year in the Western District of Virginia. Today, Ms. Wright Allen is a Federal public defender in Norfolk. Without a doubt, her extensive trial experience will go a long way on the bench.

While I was considering Ms. Wright Allen's record, I read several letters of support for her nomination. In addition, the Virginia State Bar ranked Ms. Wright Allen as ''highly qualified,'' and she came ''highly recommended'' by the Virginia Bar Association and the Virginia Women Attorneys Association.

I would also be remiss not to mention the historic nature of this nomination. Ms. Wright Allen would be the first African-American woman to serve as a Federal district court judge in Virginia. I know she will serve with distinction and make all Virginians proud.

Mr. President, President Obama nominated Ms. Wright Allen in January of this year. The time is now to confirm her nomination so that she can begin to serve the people in the Eastern District of Virginia.

I look forward to casting my vote in support of Ms. Wright Allen's nomination and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

I hope the Presiding Officer, who has spent extensive time as a great attorney general, lawyer, and attorney of great repute and respect, will be able to join us in this effort.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withdraw his request?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, I will be happy to withdraw my request.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. It is my understanding we are in morning business until 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

ENERGY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, yesterday, I spent some time on the floor talking about the recoverable reserves in the United States of America. I was shocked so many Senators—first of all, I was shocked that many listened but more shocked they came up to me and said: We were not aware we have this opportunity.

I have, from the Congressional Research Service, a breakdown of where all of it is. I wish to share that breakdown and get it into the RECORD. I applaud Senator MURKOWSKI and others for trying to open and fully develop the resources in the Gulf of Mexico. That is very significant. I applaud their effort, and I join them in their effort.

We need to go further than that because in the Gulf of Mexico are—these are figures of the Congressional Research Service—undiscovered, technically recoverable resources. Our resources, according to CRS, are greater than any other country in the world in oil, gas, and coal. I am going to talk just about gas right now because one of the big issues, of course, not just with my wife but with others, is the price of gas at the pumps.

If we look at the undiscovered, technically recoverable resources just onshore, in the United States—some actually would be on public lands—it is 37.8 billion barrels of oil. Throw in Alaska and that would be 26.6 billion barrels; the Atlantic, 3.8 billion barrels; the Pacific, 10.5 billion barrels; the Gulf of Mexico, as I already said, 44.9 billion barrels. The total U.S. endowment—our endowment—of technically recoverable oil is 162.9 billion barrels.

We have talked about this before and talked about the fact that we have all these resources, but our problem is a political problem because the politicians will not let us reach these reserves. We are talking about the fact that they are hardly able to reach them in the Atlantic and the Pacific, and we know what has happened on the North Slope, ANWR. We have talked about that for a long time.

People do not realize public lands—90 percent—are off-limits, off-limits politically.

I have to correct some of the statements some people have made that conveniently misrepresented what our

reserves are. Instead of using ''recoverable reserves,'' they use ''proven reserves.'' That is a technical term. In order to prove a reserve, you have to drill and analyze and core and see how much oil there is. Obviously, if we will not let anyone drill, they cannot prove it.

When they say we only have 2 percent of the world's proven reserves, that is absurd because we have to drill to determine what that is. Other countries do not have that problem. We are the only country in the world that does not exploit our own resources.

People are going to have to realize that if you want to do something, it is such a simple thing to do deal with. It is supply and demand. There is not a person here or a person listening today who has not gone through the elementary experience in school of learning supply and demand. We have the supply in America and we have the demand. The politicians will not let us exploit our own resources. That is the problem we have. You do not have to overly complicate this issue.

It is interesting—and I hate to say it; I am not pointing fingers in a partisan way—when Democrats and the administration say: We are going to tax big oil, they say actually they are going to do away with some of the benefits big oil has. They are not benefits. These would be four huge tax increases the Democrats are doing on big oil. That is not big oil. That is oil, period. I will not go into the details of depletion allowances and percentages. It is not important.

The point is, they have the same benefit every other manufacturer has, and to single them out and say: We are going to punish big oil, all that is going to do is make the price at the pumps skyrocket. It gets right back to supply and demand.

By the way, those who are trying to use the argument that this somehow is going to produce revenue that is going to be used, I suggest even the White House's figures, the maximum revenue generated would be $4 billion. Keep in mind, they lose all the benefits, so that is not a net of $4 billion.

Take the State of Texas, for example. They do not have an income tax. They have the oil tax that has run that State very well for a long period of time. Senator MENENDEZ made a statement and said taxing the oil companies is not going to bring down the price of gas. They are not even claiming it will. I just think that when one sees such an obvious solution to the problem—just exploit our own resources—we are very foolish not to do that.

We all talk about the solutions to the problem. We talk about the spending of this administration, more debt increases in just the first 2 years of the Obama administration than the entire debt since George Washington, in the history of this country, the huge spending, the $5 trillion in the President's three budgets of deficit—I remember coming down and complaining in 1995, at this very podium, when the Clinton administration came out with a budget for fiscal year 1996 and it was $1.5 trillion. I said: We cannot sustain that level. Now it is $1.5 trillion in each of the three budgets, just the deficit. That is more than the entire United States of America back in 1996.

I suggest that when people say there are only two solutions to this problem, either reduce spending, which would be my choice, or increase taxes, which I would not do, I say there is a third option. That option is to do something about the cost of regulation. Right now, if we just take what the EPA is doing in five—in fact, I will say three of the major overregulations we are going over right now—people in the Senate know we have defeated cap-and-trade legislatively by massive percentages five times since 2003. This administration says: If we cannot have cap and trade, we are going to do it, not legislatively, we will do it through the EPA. That is what is going on now with greenhouse gases.

If you add up what the administration is doing in terms of the cost of greenhouse gas regulations, that is between $300 billion and $400 billion; on ozone, if they choose—and they said they are going to choose—the 60-parts-per billion standard, that would be $676 billion; the boiler MACT would be something in excess of $1 billion. Throw in utility MACT and cement MACT, it comes to $1 trillion. This is what I am trying to get at. I used the figure that for every 1 percent increase in economic activity, it produces new revenue of $42 billion. That has changed. According to the Congressional Research Service—they are bipartisan, they are factual—for every 1 percent increase in GDP, it produces $50 billion additional revenues.

If we just take these regulations and add them up, all the increase of costs to GDP of the three regulations I mentioned, that is $1 trillion. If we take the fact it is $14 trillion GDP in a given year, this would be 7 percent of that $14 trillion. For each 1 percent, it would be $50 billion. We could generate new revenue of $350 billion just by taking this overregulation out of our society.

One can argue: INHOFE, that is not true because these regulations have not passed yet. That is right, so it would probably right now be about half that. When the Obama administration came in and announced these regulations were coming, the manufacturers, the producers, those who are driving the economic ship were the ones who said that because of the uncertainty of these regulations, we are going to slow down what we are doing. If we were to lift all these regulations, I assure my colleagues we would be approaching, at least by 1 year, $350 billion. That is without a tax increase. That is without reducing spending.

We need to look at this realistically because this is an opportunity we have. A lot of people remember back in the days of Ronald Reagan. I can say the same thing back in the days of President Kennedy. Of course, he was a Democrat. They felt overregulation and high taxation was an inhibiting factor to slow down revenue. Of course, in the case of Ronald Reagan, the total revenue coming from the marginal rates of 1980 was $244 billion. In 1988, it was $466 billion. That was at a time when we had the largest reduction of taxes and regulations in this society. It is shown to be true over the years.

My bottom line is this: People know about spending. People know about taxes. They do not know about regulations. The people who are affected directly—the manufacturers—understand it. The figures I am using are actual figures we have gotten with which no one argues. The fact that $50 billion of increased revenue comes from each 1 percent increase in GDP is a fact that is supported by the CRS.

I offer that, along with our opportunity to become totally independent from the Middle East, with regard to our ability to run this machine called America.

Before I yield the floor, I see the Senator from Alaska. I hope he was listening to what I was talking about because the opportunities in Alaska are tremendous—26.6 billion barrels of oil. I am sure he understands that. I wish to make sure everybody else does.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ARENDA L. WRIGHT ALLEN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Arenda L. Wright Allen, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Arenda L. Wright Allen, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour of debate with respect to the nomination, with the time equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for scheduling today's vote on the nomination of Arenda

L. Wright Allen to fill a vacancy on the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. This is the fifth judicial nomination the Senate has considered since returning from the Easter recess. I hope this is a sign of progress. Another 11 judicial nominations are pending on the Senate's Executive Calendar, and with judicial vacancies around the country remaining above 90, we still have a long way to go to address the needs of the Federal judiciary.

Arenda Wright Allen's nomination has the strong support of both of her home State Senators, Senator WEBB and Senator WARNER. When she is confirmed, Ms. Wright Allen will become the first African-American woman to serve as a district court judge in Virginia. Her nomination was reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee over a month ago, along with that of another Virginia nominee, Michael Francis Urbanski, who has been nominated to the Western District of Virginia.

In her 25-year legal career, Ms. Wright Allen has served as a Federal defense attorney, a Federal prosecutor, and a military attorney. She is currently a supervisory assistant Federal public defender in the Eastern District of Virginia having previously served as an assistant U.S. attorney and in the U.S. Navy's Judge Advocate General's Corps. It is vital to have men and women serve as judges who have been prosecutors and defense attorneys. This nominee has been both, and I am sure her experience will serve her well when she is confirmed.

Recently, Republican Senators have tried to twist qualified nominees' litigation experience against them. Their partisan attacks are not consistent. Republicans oppose some nominees by saying that they do not have sufficient litigation experience. When a nominee has extensive experience and is a successful trial lawyer, they reverse themselves and complain that the nominee has too much experience and will be biased by it. They opposed Judge McConnell of Rhode Island on this supposed ground. They opposed Judge Chen of California despite his 10 years as a fair and impartial Federal magistrate judge. I hope they will not now oppose Ms. Wright Allen because she served as a Federal public defender. All of these nominees have assured us that they understand the difference between being an advocate for a client and serving as a judge. I have no doubt that they do.

With continued cooperation from both sides of the aisle, the Senate should also consider the other 11 judicial nominees ready for final Senate action. We should certainly proceed with the judicial nominees for whom there is no opposition and no reason for delay. That would allow us to confirm another seven nominees. They have all been thoroughly reviewed by the members of the Judiciary Committee and have all been recommended to the Senate unanimously. They are Judge Urbanski; Clair C. Cecchi to fill a vacancy in New Jersey; Esther Salas to fill another vacancy in New Jersey; Paul Oetken and Paul Engelmayer to fill vacancies in the Southern District of New York; Ramona Manglona to fill a vacancy in the Marianas Islands; and Bernice Donald of Tennessee, to fill a vacancy on the Sixth Circuit.

I also hope that we can soon consider two of the nominees currently awaiting a Senate vote who have twice been considered by the Judiciary Committee and have twice been reported with strong bipartisan support, first last year and again in February. They are Susan Carney of Connecticut to fill a judicial emergency vacancy on Second Circuit and Michael Simon to fill a judicial emergency vacancy on the District Court in Oregon. We should also consider the nomination of Goodwin Liu to fill a judicial emergency vacancy on the Ninth Circuit, a nomination we have reported favorably three times, and the nomination of Caitlin Halligan to fill a judicial vacancy on the DC Circuit, which we reported favorably over 2 months ago.

All these nominees have a strong commitment to the rule of law and a demonstrated faithfulness to the Constitution. They should have an up-or-down vote after being considered by the Judiciary Committee and without additional weeks and months of needless delay.

Federal judicial vacancies around the country still number too many, and they have persisted for too long. Whereas the Democratic majority in the Senate reduced vacancies from 110 to 60 in President Bush's first 2 years, judicial vacancies still number 91 over 27 months into President Obama's term. By now, judicial vacancies should have been cut in half, but we have barely kept up with attrition. If we join together to consider all of the judicial nominations now on the Senate's Executive Calendar, we would be able to reduce vacancies to 80 for the first time since July 2009.

Regrettably, the Senate has not reduced vacancies as dramatically as we did during the Bush administration. In fact, the Senate has reversed course during the Obama administration, with the slow pace of confirmations keeping judicial vacancies at crisis levels. Over the 8 years of the Bush administration, from 2001 to 2009, we reduced judicial vacancies from 110 to a low of 34. That has now been reversed, with vacancies staying above 90 since August 2009. The vacancy rate—which we reduced from 10 percent at the end of President Clinton's term to 6 percent by this date in President Bush's third year and ultimately to less than 4 percent in 2008—is now back to more than 10 percent.

We have a long way to go to do as well as we did during President Bush's first term, when we confirmed 205 of his judicial nominations. We confirmed 100 of those judicial nominations during the 17 months I was chairman during President Bush's first 2 years in office. So far, well into President Obama's third year in office, the Senate has only been allowed to consider 82 of President Obama's Federal circuit and district court nominees, well short of 205.

The last 2 weeks are a sign that the Senate can consider these nominations. We must work together to ensure that the Federal judiciary has the judges it needs to provide justice to Americans in courts throughout the country. Judicial vacancies throughout the country hinder the Federal judiciary's ability to fulfill its constitutional role. That is why Chief Justice Roberts, Attorney General Holder, and the President of the United States have spoken out and urged the Senate to act.

I congratulate Ms. Wright Allen and her family on her confirmation today.

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business and that the time be counted against the Democratic side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY SECURITY

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Oklahoma, absolutely, I am aware of the quantity and value of Alaska oil and gas today. I rise to discuss this issue, as well as a few others related to the issues of oil and gas.

I rise to discuss an issue foremost on the minds of my constituents and a concern to all Americans: the rising cost of energy. I wish to outline the proposals aimed at providing short-term relief for high prices at the pump and to ensure America's long-term energy security. These are the issues which have been discussed many times in this Chamber. The time for talk has passed. The time to act is now. High energy prices today already are pinching the pocketbooks of families and crippling our small businesses across my State and across this country.

When I was home over the recess, I visited the roaded areas of Alaska. These are communities connected by our highway road system, from Kenai Peninsula to Fairbanks, where gas prices are well over $4 a gallon. As one can see on the poster next to me, they range from $4.15 to $4.45 a gallon. These prices might look good to some of my colleagues who saw gas prices over $5 a gallon in their States, but off the road system in Alaska prices are much higher. The fact is prices for gasoline and home heating oil never came down in rural Alaska. They have been well over $5 a gallon for years. Some places, such as Anaktuvuk Pass are nearly $10 a gallon.

I started a discussion with Alaskans on Facebook to just see how these high prices are affecting their budgets.

Some families are already facing tough choices to make their budgets balance. For families commuting into Anchorage from the Mat-Su Valley every day, they are forced to pay more than $100 a week to fuel up. That is

more than a pocketbook pinch, it is a punch.

Even worse, families know the price isn't coming down anytime soon. Even though speculation ranges all over the place, prices are expected to rise still another 30 to 40 cents by July.

Mr. President, families know the price of fuel is not coming down anytime soon. As I mentioned, it is continuing to rise. It is not just affecting families but businesses. They feel the sticker shock also at the pump. We are seeing businesses through rising food and delivery prices making up the difference. These families and businesses expect us to act now. No more excuses.

Energy is one place where we should be able to find bipartisan common ground. I have been calling for a comprehensive energy bill from day one in the Senate. Our lack of progress is frustrating. We were real close last spring, but now here we are again.

We need to provide Americans with reliable and affordable energy in three ways: short-term relief for consumers, new renewable energy sources for reliable electricity prices and keep strong investment in alternative transportation systems, and increase domestic oil and gas production so we are not dependent on unfriendly foreign sources.

First, the short term, which I call the pocketbook relief. We must help families keep their budgets balanced and help ensure that increasing consumer confidence doesn't falter. To do that, I have introduced the Family Account to Save on Transportation—or the FAST Act—to help families get through high gas prices over the next 2 years.

This bill will allow us to set up pretax transportation savings accounts—just like medical savings accounts—to help offset the pain of high gas prices on the family pocketbook. The bill would sunset in 2 years, so it would have no long-term burden on the Federal budget.

Second, we have to bring online alternative power sources to buffer power companies from price shocks of rising oil and gas prices. No matter where you are in Alaska, you don't have to go far to find alternative energy sources—wind, tidal, geothermal, and hydro. Even in these tough budget times, this is a good investment to strengthen our economy far into the future.

The same is true for alternative transportation systems and fuels. We must fully support efforts to develop electric, hybrid, and highly efficient vehicles. At the same time we must recognize most working families cannot afford to purchase a new vehicle. So we need to find other ways to reduce their transportation costs, such as greater investment in city-to-city commuter services.

The recent investment in high-speed rail is positive but is not reaching most of the country, and will not. Even in Alaska we have the potential for commuter rail. It is critical to move commuters from city to city and cut the $100-a-week gas prices folks from Mat-Su pay as they drive into Anchorage for employment.

Solving our energy security challenge cannot just focus on reducing consumption. Yes, it is important. But we must cut the use of fossil fuels in all sectors—as identified through consumption, especially transportation—but we also need to increase our domestic production.

Every new oil and gas development buys our country more energy and national security while also creating American jobs. Unfortunately, we are going in the wrong direction. Thirty years ago, 28 percent of our oil was imported; today it is 60 percent.

While our largest share of oil imports comes from Canada, too much is coming from unstable countries or those openly hostile to the United States. Not only will we become increasingly dependent on these countries for our oil, we are exporting over $1 billion a day. Let me repeat that: We export $1 billion a day.

In my home State of Alaska we have vast potential to increase America's energy security. The fact is, developing Alaska's oil and gas resources buys our country decades of energy security by offsetting foreign imports from unfriendly countries.

Consider a few examples which I have reflected on the board next to me.

Developing offshore resources in the Chukchi and the Beaufort Sea will produce 1.8 million barrels of oil a day. This is easily enough to offset oil imports from Saudi Arabia. We could even cover Iraq too. Developing the oil beneath the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, ANWR, could offset imports from Nigeria. Developing the CD–5 project in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska—the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska, set up for petroleum products and production—and BP's Liberty project could replace daily imports from Libya.

This does not even include the tremendous onshore and offshore natural gas resources we have in Alaska. One-third of the country's supply is in Alaska. So why aren't we developing these enormous resources in my State? Two words: politics, bureaucrats.

Mr. President, earlier this year President Obama went to Brazil where he declared that America wants to be a customer for Brazilian oil and natural gas. I have to say, we don't need to go to Brazil to do that. We can do it right here in Alaska, with our people, our resources and our opportunities. I reminded the President of that, and I will remind him on a regular basis. To his credit, I will say later in the month he did mention Alaska. In his call for energy and domestic energy independence, he mentioned Alaska.

Unfortunately, the bureaucrats in his administration are not listening. They are tossing up barriers to additional Alaskan oil and gas production every chance they get. Sadly, some of my colleagues in this body are not much better. Instead of addressing the problem with specific solutions, they are going for headlines by dragging energy company executives before committees or proposing the rollback of incentives for increased domestic energy production, some of which have been on the books for decades.

Let's stop the headline grabbing and get serious about energy security. I have three ideas: First, better coordinate the Federal offshore permitting process. I introduced legislation before our recess to create the Arctic OCS Coordinator, modeled after legislation the late Senator Ted Stevens passed establishing a Federal gas pipeline coordinator. My bill addresses the problem too many projects are caught up in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BEGICH. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. Too many projects are caught up in what I call the ''regulatory whack-a-mole.'' You think you have smacked down one regulatory hurdle and another one pops up. My bill would give authority to work across the agencies causing companies so much heartburn today—the EPA, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Department of the Interior, just to name a few.

Second, let's align the clean air standards for offshore drilling permits among the affected Federal agencies. We must have a level playing field whether you are in Alaska or the Gulf of Mexico or the Eastern United States.

As my colleague from Louisiana knows—who is here joining me on the floor—Louisiana has one rule, and Alaska has another rule for the same issue.

Third, let's invest in American transportation and safety infrastructure to develop oil and gas resources in frontier areas. The fact is, we need a far greater Coast Guard presence in the Arctic for oilspill prevention and response.

We also need to invest in our pipeline infrastructure, including the Alaskan Natural Gasoline, to move oil and gas resources from the Arctic to other U.S. regions.

There is a lot of talk right now about ending tax incentives for the oil and gas industry. With the high profits right now, these companies are easy targets. But one thing every Alaskan knows—just because you have an easy target doesn't mean it is the right thing to shoot. It would not decrease gas prices at the pump for our families and our small businesses. It will discourage companies, especially the independents, from domestic investment and job creation.

As someone who represents a State with the highest energy prices in the country, and some of the best renewable and traditional energy resources, I am ready to join my colleagues on both

sides of the aisle to address America's energy needs now. We need to set a hard target. That is why I am asking my colleagues to get serious about a real energy plan and give Americans freedom from high gas prices by the Fourth of July.

Let's work together, roll up our sleeves and pass a real comprehensive energy plan our families and our small businesses can get behind. Let's finally invest in our energy future and put the reforms in place for our long-term energy security.

Mr. President, I recognize my colleague from Louisiana—another great State for oil and gas development—is on the floor with me, and I yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Alaska for asking me to join him in a general presentation and potential colloquy between the two of us about the importance of continuing our support for oil and gas production in the United States by the large international companies that have operated in our country and around the world now for many years, as well as by the hundreds, if not thousands, of independents that operate doing the same.

There is going to be a bill that will be debated in the Senate Finance Committee tomorrow. It is S. 940, sponsored by the Senator from New Jersey, our colleague, Senator MENENDEZ. I want to go on record in strongly opposing it, and I will give some reasons why, and I urge my colleagues, when this bill comes up—which I understand it will come directly to the floor of the Senate without being heard, as is tradition, in the committee—to vote it down.

I doubt the bill, in its current form—or in any form that it could be modified—can get the 60 votes necessary for passage, but I would like to add my strong voice in urging my colleagues to read this bill, to look at it and understand the inherent unfairness in it, the lack of significant deficit reduction, and the fact that it will not—although it is being touted to do so—reduce gasoline prices by one penny.

Mr. President, I want to start with some facts that people might find very interesting, or hard to believe, based on the political rhetoric they have been hearing from the sponsors of this bill and others in the Senate. The story line goes something like this: Big oil makes huge profits at the expense of everyone. They pay virtually nothing in taxes, and we subsidize them. Why are we doing this? Why don't we stop?

I think it would be good to get a few things clarified for the record. It may be surprising to American taxpayers to know that of the $16.6 billion spent on U.S. energy subsidies over the course of 1 year, oil and gas subsidies account for less than 13 percent. I want to say that again. Of the $16.6 billion spent on U.S. energy subsidies over the course of 1 year, fuels such as renewables, refined coal, nuclear, solar, hydro, et cetera, account for 85 percent. Oil and gas is less than 15 percent—actually, 13 percent.

Now, you would think because of this bill, S. 940, that big oil and gas companies are getting all the subsidies, making all the profits, paying no taxes, and the rest of us are suffering. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Let me repeat: This bill, S. 940, is going to repeal virtually all subsidies from one industry, and one sector of one industry—oil and gas companies—but they only get 13 percent of all the energy subsidies.

Why aren't we talking about the other 85 percent? Some of them—in some people's minds—create some harm to the environment, whether it be dams blocking up rivers so fisheries are extinct or whether it is coal that has its own issues. Of course nuclear doesn't have any problems. We must not be paying attention to what is happening in Japan. Why are we singling out one sector of one part of the energy industry to repeal the subsidies when it will, in fact, have the opposite effect of reducing gasoline prices? Even one of its cosponsors said publicly for us not to be fooled, this will not reduce gasoline prices. Why are we doing it? Will it create jobs? No. It will actually hurt job production in the United States.

According to the EIA study—which is the U.S. Government, not a company—published in 2008, the oil and natural gas industry received 13 percent of the subsidies while producing 60 percent of the energy. Let me repeat. This industry got only 13 percent of the subsidies but produced 60 percent of the energy. But the bill, S. 940, is going to be debated in the Finance Committee where the industry leaders are going to be called to talk about this gimmick, 940, but the oil and gas industry, with their independent counterparts, produced 60 percent of the energy.

I would like to say where exactly that energy comes from because it really is a bone of contention. The Senator from Alaska will appreciate this. The sponsor of this bill represents a State that is one of the highest deficit energy-producing States in the Nation because some of us do this better than others. Louisiana produces a lot of energy. Alaska produces a lot of energy. Texas produces a lot of energy.

Some States like to consume a lot and produce nothing. That would be like some of our States that put some of their land in agriculture so they can produce food—other States saying: We don't want to produce food, but we expect you to provide it to us—provide it to us when we want it, how we want it, and for the price we want it. And I am tired of it, and so are the people I represent.

I want to put this deficit chart up here. We have seen a lot of deficit charts about deficits of infrastructure, real deficits of money, debt. Let me talk to you about the deficit and the debt owed by some States in this Union that consume a lot, talk a lot, and produce nothing.

California has the greatest deficit. It consumes a tremendous amount of energy, and the imbalance is the highest. It produces the least, consumes the most. To California's benefit, before Senators FEINSTEIN and BOXER run down here to argue this point, I want to concede this one point: California has been on the forefront of energy conservation and efficiency. This chart does not recognize them for that, but I will concede that point, and I am going to have some further data to explain that. California, while it doesn't produce a lot of energy—it consumes a tremendous amount—at least California has been in the forefront of savings and efficiency because there are a lot of States up here that don't produce, don't conserve, are not efficient, and all they want to do is yell about high gas prices. Why don't you do something about it?

Florida is a perfect example. Florida has a net deficit in Btu's. I guess it is 3.889 billion. Florida is a great example. I don't think Florida does much in nuclear. I don't think they do much in hydro. They have a lot of Sun; I don't know how much solar they are doing. They will not let anybody produce oil and gas on or off their shores, but they sure fill up a lot of their gas tanks every day. They sure fire up those hotels and those restaurants with that energy. Where do they get their energy from? If it weren't so serious, it would be laughable. They have a gas line that goes from Mobile, AL, to the Florida peninsula. We pump the gas out of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, put it in a pipeline, and ship it under the Gulf of Mexico so they can light up their State. Would they ever think of putting in an oil and gas well or building a nuclear powerplant? If they can't do that, why don't they conserve their energy?

New York is another user of energy which produces very little; Ohio, Georgia, New Jersey, North Carolina, Michigan, and Illinois. Some of these States, such as New Jersey and Michigan—think about what they look like. They have big factories, they have big industries. Michigan is home to the automobile industry, so they use a lot of gas in producing things we all use, so we want to give them credit for that. But still the fact remains that Michigan uses a lot more energy than it produces.

Then you get down here to what I call the gold-star States.

We get criticized so much, we are treated like we are some sort of pariah sometimes, but I think we do a great job—Kentucky, Alaska, New Mexico, Louisiana, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Alaska is up here somewhere—Alaska is right here. Kentucky, Alaska, New Mexico, Louisiana, West Virginia, and Wyoming. We produce enough energy for everybody in our State, what we need, and we export it to everyone else in America who needs

it. And what do we get? We get bills like this that go after, directly, the big companies in our State, that work in our State, to somehow put them in a position to make them feel as if they are not really good companies, they are not American companies, they don't pay tax, they get all these subsidies. I am going to read into the record what taxes they pay. It is going to surprise you. Then, on top of that, we get moratoriums, we get permatoriums. We can't even drill for the oil we have. We can't even look for the oil we might have.

When I go home, my people ask me—and it is a very hard thing for me to answer, and maybe they ask Senator BEGICH the same thing—they say: Senator, since we do so much to produce energy for the country, why do we pay $4 a gallon for gasoline and sometimes we pay a little bit more than everybody else? They don't produce anything, Senator. Why do we pay so much?

Can the Senator tell me what he answers his people because I don't know what to tell them other than this place is a little screwed up. Until I get an answer for that, and I will ask the Senator—go ahead, what do you tell them?

Mr. BEGICH. That is a hard one to answer because they see the oil flowing. As I mentioned, we have $10-a-gallon gas in some of our communities—$10 a gallon. So it is hard to explain that, yes, we are the big producer, but the rest of the country then picks on us.

I am just listening, and it is unbelievable, the green slice you have there.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I say to the Senator, because he raises an excellent point, President Obama is not the first President to go overseas and ask them to produce more oil to send it to us. This goes on—President Clinton did it. President Bush did it. We beg Saudi Arabia to produce more energy. We ask OPEC to please don't tighten it so much so our prices—why don't you go to the local OPEC or the local producers, which are Kentucky, Alaska, New Mexico, West Virginia, Louisiana, and Wyoming? Why don't you help us produce more, because we can do it. But we get shut down by bureaucracy, moratoriums, permatoriums, rules, regulations, EPA, refuges. We can't even get free to produce the energy that we can produce for this country. Then you have all these middle States that do a fairly good job on balance.

But I tell you, if we passed a law here that said every State in America had to produce the energy it needed, we would have an energy policy all right, Senator BEGICH knows. I don't know what it would be, but it would be an interesting rule, you know, just like in the old days—if you wanted food, you produced it. It would be a great law. Every State in America, all 50, if you consume energy, you need to produce something. You could produce it by wind; you could produce it by hydro; you could produce it by nuclear; you could stop driving your automobiles and have everybody walk; you could give everybody a bicycle. We don't care. Just eliminate the energy deficit. That would be a very interesting discussion to have, and I might even file a bill like that because this one is so ridiculous, people might actually read the one I would file.

Let me give a couple of other stats, and then I know I am exceeding my time. I want to ask for 2 more minutes. I want to put to rest this issue that the big oil companies don't pay any taxes.

This is from Forbes magazine, so take it as it is. It is slanted toward industry, I give you that. It is not left of center, it is right of center, sometimes very right, but I think you can check these figures with anybody else. I am assuming they are accurate. This is for the top 20 most profitable U.S. corporations in 2010.

ExxonMobil's net income was $30 billion. Their tax rate was not 10 percent, not 15 percent, not 25 percent, not 35 percent—a 45-percent tax rate. Their estimated worldwide tax bill was $90 billion. Of $10 billion in total taxes paid in the United States, $3 billion was income tax. Let's go on. ConocoPhillips' tax rate was 42 percent; pre-income tax, $19.8 billion; net, $11.4; tax rate, 42. Chevron was 40 percent.

So let's review: Exxon, 45 percent; Conoco, 42; and Chevron, 40. Do you want to know what Google was? Google is a pretty big company. They don't produce oil and gas. They have another line of business. Their tax rate was only 21 percent.

Let's take Hewlett-Packard—not in my State, in other parts of the country. Their headquarters is not in the South. Their tax rate was 20 percent. Apple Computer's tax rate was 24 percent.

People will say: It is not just the rate; it is what you paid. But I think if you look—Coca-Cola, very big company, their tax rate was down to 16.7 percent.

Does this make sense? No. So that is why we need tax reform, significant transformational tax reform, so all big companies pay similar in taxes and we eliminate some of these loopholes that don't make sense. I could be for that. I could be for that when we are talking about Google, Apple, GM, GE, ExxonMobil, and Chevron. But if you are going to ask me to stand here and pick on one industry that pays billions of dollars in taxes, that only gets 13 percent of the energy subsidies, that hires—350,000 people in my State are hired by oil and gas companies or their contractors or affiliates, large and small, not just the large. And when I see what our people produce and these States produce nothing, or virtually nothing, and you ask me can I vote for a bill like this? No. Not only can I not vote for it, it is laughable.

I hope the Senator from Alaska and I—I know we are going to be the skunks at the garden party because, as Democrats, to be against this bill, it is going to be because we just have to coddle this industry. I don't coddle this industry. I am holding BP's feet to the fire. I want Exxon to pay the tax they owe. I want Chevron to pay the tax they owe. I want this President and this administration to stop the moratorium and the permatorium in the gulf. I want to get our people back to work.

I would much love to reduce gasoline prices, and one way we could do it is if cars did not have to be so dependent on gasoline. Why don't we give a significant subsidy to produce different kinds of automobiles? I would vote for that. I have voted for that. If you had a car right now running on natural gas, you would be paying the equivalent of $2 a gallon for gasoline at the pump. That is much better, I say to the Senator, than $10. Why don't we take some money and invest in natural gas vehicles or more incentive for electric vehicles? If people are really serious about breaking the back of OPEC, then start building the kinds of automobiles and infrastructure in this country necessary to do it and stop introducing gimmicks such as this that might get you a few political points in the short run, but it is not leading us in the right direction.

Having beat up on the Democrats, let me say something about the Republican side.

All they want to talk about is drill, drill, drill. We cannot drill our way out of the situation we are in. Do I want to drill more? Yes. Do I think there is more than 2 percent of the world's oil and gas in America? Yes. But you know what? You have to look for it in order to find it.

We are under certain provisions—the Senator knows in Alaska, we cannot even go look for the oil and gas we might have. The Senator might want to talk about that, and I am going to close in a minute.

Mr. BEGICH. To the Senator from Louisiana, let me say, when you describe the moratorium or whatever they call it in the gulf, it is even worse in the Arctic, or even on, as I mentioned when I had the map and I showed the National Petroleum Reserve. That is not a name picked out of the sky by the industry. That was set aside by the government to prepare our country for more energy independence decades ago.

We cannot even get a permit to go across—in some places, they call it a stream. But everyone else now calls it a big river. It is not. It is a very small area. But a bridge to go over to explore for what you described—we cannot even get onto the land the government set aside that would then determine if we have oil and gas. We believe there is, because obviously they have—it is set aside as the National Petroleum Reserve.

But the other piece to this—the Senator hammered away on it and I agree with her—if we are skunks at the garden, so be it, because it is a question of

fairness. As the Senator described the 13 percent of the subsidies or incentives they receive, they produce 60 percent of the energy. But her other statistic is even more dramatic.

Of the remaining 87 percent of those subsidies, they only produce 40 percent of the energy. If this were a business, you would eliminate that part of the equation because it does not give a good return on investment. But we are still doing that, because there is a lot of politics being played.

The point on the tax issue. Like the Senator, I think there should be an overhaul to this tax system. But picking on one industry because it sounds good, rates good in the polls, gets you a couple of headlines, is not what the American people want us to do here. If anything, they are getting fed up with that.

What they want us to do is sit down and, as you have described so eloquently in the description of the country, you bet, I would love every State to do it, produce. Then they would see what we go through. Because we are a collective group of States, we do our part, but we should not be picked up because we do more than our share, because we are trying to help out States that are producing vehicles or producing, you know, a lot of chemical industry, and other things, or the pharmaceutical industry. We can go through those lists that somehow do not end up on these, getting rid of their subsidies.

Your point is right on. If there is anything we should be doing right now—I agree with the Senator—it is the issue of—when I open the paper and I see administration officials, current and past, saying the way we are going to control our energy cost is talk to Saudi Arabia. Is that our energy policy? Because that sure the heck is one that, one, does not create one job here; two, is the worst national policy from a national security perspective; and, three, it is foolish, as I mentioned earlier, that we export $1 billion a day out of this country to buy from countries—and in some cases good allies. Canada is a good example. Some of these countries are not our friends, but we are giving them cash so they can then use it against us. It does not make any sense. You are right, this piece of legislation they have put down without a committee process on it is a gimmick; a gimmick to get the next week of activity, get some press out there. But we have to be serious.

I appreciate the Senator yielding for me to rant a little bit. I am glad you said the part too, the assumption is that these companies pay no taxes, that somehow they get the subsidies and they pay nothing. You bet you they are profitable. They are big companies. They are huge companies. But they pay taxes in the billions to the Treasury of this government. When you listed out all of those differential rates, that is again why we need tax reform. Then I am happy to have this discussion, but not singling out an industry because it is a good political score and good fodder for the newsprint and everything else. I appreciate the Senator yielding me a few more minutes to ramble there a little bit.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator. I wish to ask the Senator a final point. We are going to hear tomorrow speeches given about America is at the highest production levels ever. That may be true. But it is true for a very short period of time—maybe the next month or two—because as you can see, there is going to be a precipitous fall. Why? Because of the Deepwater Horizon, the shutdown in the Gulf of Mexico. Even though people say we are at the highest production levels we ever have been, it is going to be temporary. Then the production levels are going to decline down to the lowest level since 1997.

I want people to understand, we are not on a path to produce more in America. We are on a path to produce less. And taking all subsidies away from the five major international oil companies is not going to change this line. It is going to make it continue to go down. It is not going to reduce the price of gasoline at the pump, not by one penny. It is not going to get us on the path to a strong, sound energy policy.

I will say in conclusion, should some of these subsidies and tax credits be looked at? Yes, in a comprehensive format. And I will say, I will be open to the ones that are the least effective, the least necessary, and are fairly applied across companies such as Google, AT&T, GE, and other companies. I will be happy to do my part. People in Louisiana will do our part.

But we are not, along with Texas and Oklahoma and Alaska, going to take it all on our shoulders. We have had enough. We have had high water. We have had high wind. We now have a high river. We have a moratorium. We have a permitatorium, and now we have no more subsidies.

At least they left the independents out. I want to thank them for not putting independent oil and gas companies in this bill. But still, the big five pay a significant amount of tax. They take a smaller percentage of the overall subsidy. I think we need to do this in a fairer way.

I am yielding my time.

Mr. BEGICH. If I can make one last comment, the chart that you have up there, there is one other piece on there. It is the Alaska oil pipeline. We are at a little over 600,000 barrels a day going through there. We are losing 6 to 7 percent a year in volume, and it will not be a question—somebody will say: Well, you will get down to zero and then you will stop the pipeline. No. No. When we get down to a level of 300,000 or 400,000 barrels, then it will be questionable if we can even run the line. Then you can actually potentially shut off the whole volume. So the chart there is important because we have to look at the long term. Because if we decide today to have a comprehensive energy plan that includes conservation, alternative energy, renewable energy and, yes, domestic production, the Senator from Louisiana knows, as I know, you cannot walk down the street and say, we are going to start drilling tomorrow and suddenly, voila, there is fuel. It is a 7- to 10-year process. So that chart is a critical chart, because in order to reach that decline, you have to start doing something today. Unless we decide the policy of this country, what the energy policy of this country is, we will pick up the phone and we will call Saudi Arabia, Nigeria, Iraq, Iran, Libya—that is the list, that is our policy—then so be it. I think that is the worst policy we could have ever for this country.

Again, thank you to the Senator from Louisiana. Again, if we are skunks at the garden, my view is we will be good-smelling skunks.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today the Senate continues its very rapid pace to confirm another of President Obama's judicial nominees. The Judiciary Committee's workload has not slowed since this Congress convened. I am pleased to report we are ahead of the pace of the 108th Congress. With this vote, the Senate will have confirmed 22 nominees in just 47 days. That is a rate of one judge almost every other day of Senate session. We have confirmed 32 percent of President Obama's judicial nominees this Congress compared to only 29 percent of President Bush's confirmed during the same time period.

We have also reported out of committee another 11 nominees. We have reported out of committee 46 percent of President Obama's nominees sent to the Senate this year. That exceeds the 38 percent of President Bush's nominees reported out during a comparable period.

Furthermore, we have held hearings on 10 nominees. Some of those, I expect, will be reported out of committee at our markup scheduled for tomorrow. In total, we have taken positive action on 43 of 71 judicial nominees submitted this Congress or approximately 61 percent of all nominees. I hope these facts will put to rest, once and for all, any complaints that we are delaying or obstructing judicial nominees.

There are currently 89 vacancies before the courts. Yet the President has not sent nominees for 51 percent of those vacancies. He has, however, sent the Senate four nominees for seats which are not yet vacant. This is perplexing to me since the current vacancy rate is 10 percent. I would think

the White House would concentrate on current vacancies. Nevertheless, we simply cannot confirm nominees who do not exist.

I have a few remarks regarding the nomination we are voting on today—Arenda Lauretta Wright Allen, who is nominated to be U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Virginia. Mrs. Allen received her B.A. from Kutztown State College in 1982 and her juris doctorate from North Carolina Central University School of Law in 1985. Following law school, she was commissioned into the U.S. Navy as an ensign. She served there as legal intern in the Naval Legal Service, Office of Judge Advocate General's Corps. In the same year, she was promoted to lieutenant and became a defense attorney for the Navy. In 1988, the nominee became the staff judge advocate at the Naval Air and Engineering Center, where she was the sole legal advisor to the commanding officer.

Leaving the Navy in 1990, Mrs. Allen joined the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Virginia as an assistant U.S. attorney. In 1991, she moved to the Eastern District of Virginia, where she remained for the next 15 years as an assistant U.S. attorney. In 2005, the nominee left the U.S. Attorney's Office to become an assistant Federal public defender with the Federal Public Defender's Office for the Eastern District of Virginia. The American Bar Association Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has given her the rating of majority ''qualified'', minority ''well qualified.''

I congratulate the nominee and her achievement and public service. I urge my colleagues to support this nomination. Hopefully, it will be supported unanimously.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. I understand we are in the time of our Republican colleagues, so I would just indicate that if we have a Republican who comes to the floor during that time, I will certainly be glad to stop and yield to them.

GAS PRICES—PAYING TWICE

Mr. President, I wish to speak about something that is incredibly important to the families and businesses of Michigan—I am sure it is true in Pennsylvania as well—and that is the great concern about what is happening in terms of gas prices going through the roof right now. We have families that are paying as much for gasoline at the pump as they are paying for their health care and almost as much as they are paying for groceries right now to put food on the table for their families.

What adds insult to injury is that we are seeing an industry, the top five companies with the highest profits ever, also receiving taxpayer subsidies. So we pay twice. We pay at the pump in outrageous prices, and we pay again when we are paying as taxpayers to support an industry that clearly does not need to be subsidized.

We are involved in a major debate right now about what to do about a very large deficit. I was here when we balanced the budget in 1997, when I was in the House, and I was proud to do that. I was here when we had the largest surplus in the history of the country. In 2001, a number of things happened, including policy decisions that put us back into a deficit. So we have to dig out again, and it is very serious.

So the question is, What are our priorities? Our Republican colleagues in the House have said their priority is to eliminate Medicare as we know it—eliminate Medicare and balance the budget on the backs of tens of millions of seniors in our country. In the Senate we are saying: Wait a minute. Let's start with taxpayer subsidies, some of which have gone on for 70 or 80 years that are now being given to an industry that is the most profitable in our country and probably the world and that clearly do not need taxpayer subsidies. Why don't we start there. By the way, let's make sure we are sending a clear message that we don't appreciate paying twice. We don't appreciate paying at the pump and at the same time paying through our taxpayer dollars.

When we look at the numbers, just in the first quarter of this year, it is staggering. We certainly don't begrudge industry profits, although with the gas prices going up, what we are talking about now are consumers getting gouged in the face of these numbers. But we are talking about $35.8 billion in total profits in just 3 months for the top five oil companies in America. These folks are asking us to subsidize them on top of that. So our message, and what we will be voting on next week, is a message that says: That check for $4 billion a year, we are going to void it. We are done with that—no more taxpayer subsidies for an industry that clearly does not need it.

What we need to be doing are a couple things. First of all, we need to create real competition at the pump. We need to create competition that maybe doesn't require a pump or at least not very often. In my great State of Michigan, we are making new, terrific, award-winning automobiles that are electric vehicles—the Chevy Volt, the Ford Focus, other hybrids—that are winning awards, top-quality vehicles that are going 100 miles or 200 miles on a gallon of gas. Real competition is what we need, investing in alternative vehicles, alternative fuel vehicles for the future, including jobs. I am very excited about the announcements being made now—in fact, on Friday by General Motors about expanding their operations—and to see what Chrysler and Ford are doing is very exciting. It is jobs for us, and it is real competition for the oil companies that know right now the only choice we have is to pay whatever price they put up at the pump.

We have begun to create some other choices, and we need to continue to support those. I find it so interesting that we are going to be debating shortly whether to support ethanol and EA5 and the ability to create some alternative to gasoline at the pump. There will be those who will argue: Well, we have supported them for a few years now. They are a maturing industry. They no longer need support; that is, maybe 5 years, 6 years, 8 years, 10 years. We are talking 70 or 80 years, a subsidy that is now going to the largest, most profitable companies in our country and probably the world. Yet because of sheer politics and nothing else, we have not been able to get these subsidies stopped.

Taxpayers in our country are saying we need to make better choices to balance the budget. We need to decide what is important, what is not important, and we need to cut the things that are not important. Clearly, subsidizing the top five big oil companies in this country is not a priority when they are making huge profits. We should be investing in what will, first of all, bring down the debt because we are taking away this $4 billion and using it to pay down the debt. We should then make choices about how we do create jobs and create alternatives in clean energy manufacturing, alternative fuel vehicles, whether it is advanced biofuels, natural gas, clean diesel, electric vehicles. We have a lot of choices we need to present to consumers so they can get off the price-gouging efforts that are going on at the pump.

There is another issue as well. We have heard from the companies that they need to be able to drill more. Yet at the same time, we know there are 60 million acres under lease by the oil companies. They hold on to 60 million acres right now that are oil and gas leases where they are not drilling. They hold on to them, maybe because they don't want their competitors to get them, but they are not drilling. So I strongly support, and I am pleased to cosponsor, Senator MENENDEZ's legislation that simply says use it or lose it—use the leases you have for domestic drilling in America or lose it.

I also held hearings, as chair of the Senate Agriculture Committee, to focus on and investigate how much market manipulators are driving up prices and to explore ways to strengthen Americanmade biofuels industries and other alternatives to foreign oil because our farmers are very much a part of the solution for the future.

So there is much we can do to create real consumer choice, get off of foreign oil. But part of our deficit reduction effort should start by eliminating the outrageous subsidies that are going to the top five oil companies in America. We should stamp this check ''null and void.''

Mr. President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Arenda L. Wright Allen, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 69 Ex.]

YEAS—96

Akaka	Franken	Menendez
Alexander	Gillibrand	Merkley
Ayotte	Graham	Mikulski
Barrasso	Grassley	Moran
Baucus	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Bennet	Hatch	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Heller	Paul
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Portman
Blunt	Hutchison	Pryor
Boozman	Inhofe	Reed
Boxer	Inouye	Reid
Brown (MA)	Isakson	Risch
Brown (OH)	Johanns	Roberts
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Cantwell	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Cardin	Kerry	Schumer
Carper	Kirk	Sessions
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kohl	Shelby
Coats	Kyl	Snowe
Coburn	Landrieu	Stabenow
Collins	Lautenberg	Tester
Conrad	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Lugar	Warner
DeMint	Manchin	Webb
Durbin	McCain	Whitehouse
Enzi	McCaskill	Wicker
Feinstein	McConnell	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran	Rockefeller
Murkowski	Vitter

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WOMAN'S CLUB OF BETHESDA

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I invite my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 100th anniversary of the Woman's Club of Bethesda, MD. The club, a nonprofit organization, was organized on May 27, 1911. It was founded by seven women for the purpose of promoting civic activities and welfare in the neighborhood. Those activities included assistance and fundraising for schools, churches, and hospitals. Club members selected the American Beauty Rose as their flower; ''An Earnest Club for Earnest Women'' as their motto; and American Beauty Red and green as their colors. Before a clubhouse was built, meetings were held at various members' homes, limiting membership to 35 and allowing only a cup of tea and a cracker to be served.

During World War I, from 1914 to 1916, the members sold over $10,000 worth of Liberty Bonds, raised funds for French orphans, worked with local merchants to beautify the roads into the Nation's Capital, and worked to secure a new fire truck for the community that was capable of fighting chemical fires.

In 1925, club members raised $1,500 to purchase three lots at the corner of Sonoma Road and Old Georgetown Road for construction of a clubhouse. On May 27, 1927, the club laid the cornerstone for the clubhouse, which is still in use today. In 1948, the mortgage was burned—quite a feat for women who began the club without the right to vote.

During World War II, the clubhouse was used to host USO entertainment. Today, the club continues its philanthropic efforts by raising money for local charitable organizations—Friends of the Maryland Library; Mobile Medical Care, Inc., Montgomery; Crisis Center of Montgomery County; Bethesda Cares; and Manna Food Banks—and by supporting national and international efforts to curb homelessness and domestic violence, and promote access to health care and clean water.

There is no doubt that the Woman's Club of Bethesda has made significant contributions to the betterment of the surrounding community and is a valuable asset to the people of Montgomery County and the State of Maryland. I would ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the past and present members of the Woman's Club of Bethesda on their century of service.•

TRIBUTE TO LARRY KELLY

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today I congratulate and honor Larry Kelly, who is retiring from his position as executive director for Tri- County Community Action Program, CAP, which serves New Hampshire's North Country.

Larry's career has been one of admirable service to New Hampshire and his community. Through various roles, including positions at the Community Services Administration in Boston, Federal Regional Council of New England, and other CAP agencies, Larry's career has been dedicated to helping others and serving the less fortunate.

In 1984, Larry joined Tri-County CAP. Larry's dedication to the greater Berlin community and the entire State of New Hampshire, coupled with his decades of volunteer service, is a testimony to his character. His kind and gentle disposition is complemented by a passion and drive to make his community a better place in which to live and work. Always putting the community's interests above his own, Larry has been a champion for the neediest among us, advocating on behalf of those without a voice and without hope. He has been rightly recognized as a leader among his peers throughout his professional life, receiving national awards such as the Community Action Foundation's Executive Director of the Year Award.

On a personal note, I am very grateful to Larry for his support and counsel during my years in public office. Whether it was a CAP-related matter or not, Larry was always ready and willing to assist in whatever capacity he could. I consider Larry a friend, and I know his contribution to the North Country will be missed. Please join me in congratulating Mr. Larry Kelly of Berlin, NH, on his retirement.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Neiman, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:16 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1016. An act to measure the progress of relief, recovery, reconstruction, and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1016. An act to measure the progress of relief, recovery, reconstruction, and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 940. A bill to reduce the Federal budget deficit by closing big oil tax loopholes, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 953. A bill to authorize the conduct of certain lease sales in the Outer Continental Shelf, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to modify the requirements for exploration, 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–1579. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Saflufenacil; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 8872–7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1580. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Propiconazole; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 8873–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1581. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL No. 8872–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1582. A communication from the Regulatory Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Export Inspection and Weighing Waiver for High Quality Specialty Grains Transported in Containers'' (RIN0580–AB18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1583. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Conversions of Insured Credit Unions, 12 CFR Parts 708a and 708b'' ((RIN3133–AD84)(RIN3133–AD85)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1584. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to the United Arab Emirates; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1585. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts'' (RIN1904–AB99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1586. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''TSCA Inventory Update Reporting Modifications; Submission Period Suspension'' (FRL No. 8874–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1587. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Adoption of Control Techniques Guidelines for Large Appliance Coatings'' (FRL No. 9304–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1588. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of the Significant New Uses of 2-Propen-1-one, 1-(4-morpholinyl)-'' (FRL No. 8871–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1589. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, California Air Resources Board—Consumer Products'' (FRL No. 9278–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1590. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of the Government of Cuba's compliance with the United States-Cuba September 1994 ''Joint Communique'' and on the treatment of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 ''Joint Statement''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1591. A communication from the Deputy Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Devices; Immunology and Microbiology Devices; Classification of Ovarian Adnexal Mass Assessment Score Test System; Correction'' ((21 CFR Part 866)(Docket No. FDA–2010–N–0026)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1592. A communication from the Deputy Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Devices; Reclassification of the Topical Oxygen Chamber for Extremities'' ((21 CFR Part 878)(Docket No. FDA–2006–N–0045)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1593. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Labor's fiscal year 2009 Office of Workers' Compensation Programs annual report; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1594. A communication from the Executive Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's financial statement for the period of October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2010; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1595. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Self-Certification and Employee Training of Mail-Order Distributors of Scheduled Listed Chemical Products'' (RIN1117–AB30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1596. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Bluefin Tuna Bycatch Reduction in the Gulf of Mexico Pelagic Longline Fishery'' (RIN0648–BA39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1597. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protective Regulations for Killer Whales in the Northwest Region Under the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act'' (RIN0648–AV15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 26, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1598. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska License Limitation Program'' (RIN0648–AY42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1599. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XA275) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1600. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone

Off Alaska; Pollock in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA331) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1601. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Octopus in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XA322) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1602. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish Fishery; Annual Quota Harvested'' (RIN0648–XA333) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1603. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA337) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 19, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1604. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure'' (RIN0648–XA01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1605. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trip Limit Adjustments for the Common Pool Fishery'' (RIN0648–XA304) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1606. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XA347) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1607. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer'' (RIN0648–XA338) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 20, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1608. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Limited Access for Guided Sport Charter Vessels in Alaska'' (RIN0648–BA96) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 20, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1609. A communication from the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's decision to enter into a contract with a private security screening company to provide screening services at Kansas City International Airport; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1610. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules (4); Amdt. No. 492'' ((RIN2120–AA63)(Docket No. 30778)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1611. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the Pilot, Flight Instructor, Ground Instructor, and Pilot School Certification Rules (Part 61); Technical Amendment'' ((RIN2120–AI86)(Docket No. FAA–2006–26661)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1612. 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 VOR Federal Airways V–1, V–7, V–11, and V–20; Kona, Hawaii'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket No. FAA–2011–0009)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1613. 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 Federal Airways; Alaska'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket No. FAA–2011–0010)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1614. A communication from the Deputy Chief Counsel for Regulations and Security Standards, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reporting of Security Issues'' (RIN1652–AA66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1615. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard—2012 Light Duty Truck Lines Subject to the Requirements of This Standard and Exempted Vehicle Lines for Model Year 2012'' (RIN2127–AK91) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1616. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Public Road Mileage for Apportionment of Highway Safety Funds'' (RIN2125–AF42) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1617. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Pipeline Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pipeline Safety: Completing Regulation of Hazardous Liquid Pipelines Operating at Low Stress'' (RIN2137–AE36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1618. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Track Safety Standards; Concrete Crossties'' (RIN2130–AC01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1619. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Appliance Standards, Miscellaneous Revisions'' (RIN2130–AB97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1620. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA362) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 20, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1621. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Highway Systems Technical Correction'' (RIN2125–AF35) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1622. 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; B–N Group Ltd. Model BN–2, BN–2A, BN–2A–3, BN–2A–6, BN–2A–8, BN–2A–9, BN–2A–20, BN–2A–21, BN–2A–26, BN–2A–27, BN–2B–20, BN–2B–21, BN–2B–26, BN–2B–27, BN–2T, and BN–2T–4R Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2010–1255)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1623. 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 737–600, –700, –700C, –800, –900, and –900ER Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2009–1253)) received during adjournment of

the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1624. 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 Model A310 Series Airplanes, and Airbus Model A300 B4–600, B4–600R, and F4–600R Series Airplanes, and Model C4–605R Variant F Airplanes (Collectively Called A300–600 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2010–1162)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1625. 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 JT8D–209, –217, 217A, –217C, and –219 Series Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2010–0452)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1626. 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. (Type Certificate Previously Held by The New Piper Aircraft, Inc.) Models PA–46–310P, PA–46–350P, and PA–46R–350T Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2010–1295)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1627. 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. Model CL–600–2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 and 440) Airplanes, CL–600–2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700, 701, and 702) Airplanes, CL–600–2D15 (Regional Jet Series 705) Airplanes, and CL–600–2D24 (Regional Jet Series 900) Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2010–0703)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1628. 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 Model A340–200 and –300 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2011–0256)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1629. 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. Model BD–100–1A10 (Challenger 300) Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2010–1200)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1630. 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 Model A340–541 and –642 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2011–0263)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1631. 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; Honeywell International Inc. LTS101 Series Turboshaft Engines and LTP101 Series Turboprop Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2009–1185)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1632. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc (RR) RB211-Trent 768–60 and Trent 772–60 Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2011–0233)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1633. 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. Model CL–600–2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700, 701, and 702) Airplanes, Model CL–600–2D15 (Regional Jet Series 705) Airplanes, and Model CL–600–2D24 (Regional Jet Series 900) Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2009–0703)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 21, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 943. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to implement policies to prevent assistance under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program from being used in strip clubs, casinos, and liquor stores; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. WEBB):

S. 944. A bill to reaffirm the authority of the Department of Defense to maintain United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as a location for the detention of unprivileged enemy belligerents held by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 945. A bill to save at least $5,000,000,000 by consolidating some duplicative and overlapping Government programs; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BENNET, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 946. A bill to establish an Office of Rural Education Policy in the Department of Education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHANNS (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 947. A bill to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 948. A bill to promote the deployment of plug-in electric drive vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. REED, Mr. BURR, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 949. A bill to amend the National Oilheat Research Alliance Act of 2000 to reauthorize and improve that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 950. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to repeal a prohibition on allowing States to use toll revenues as State matching funds for Appalachian Development Highway projects; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts):

S. 951. A bill to improve the provision of Federal transition, rehabilitation, vocational, and unemployment benefits to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KERRY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 952. A bill to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain alien students who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. 953. A bill to authorize the conduct of certain lease sales in the Outer Continental Shelf, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to modify the requirements for exploration, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 954. A bill to promote the strengthening of the Haitian private sector; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KERRY:

S. 955. A bill to provide grants for the renovation, modernization or construction of law enforcement facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERRY:

S. 956. A bill to establish a pilot program for police departments to use anonymous texts from citizens to augment their anonymous tip hotlines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 957. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of rehabilitative services for veterans with traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 179. A resolution to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KYL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. Res. 180. A resolution expressing support for peaceful demonstrations and universal freedoms in Syria and condemning the human rights violations by the Assad regime; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 164

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 164, a bill to repeal the imposition of withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities.

S. 217

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 217, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to ensure the right of employees to a secret ballot election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 260, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 300

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 300, a bill to prevent abuse of Government charge cards.

S. 390

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 390, a bill to ensure that the right of an individual to display the Service Flag on residential property not be abridged.

S. 414

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 414, a bill to protect girls in developing countries through the prevention of child marriage, and for other purposes.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 225th anniversary of the establishment of the Nation's first Federal law enforcement agency, the United States Marshals Service.

S. 504

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 547

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 547, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish an award program recognizing excellence exhibited by public school system employees providing services to students in pre-kindergarten through higher education.

S. 576

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 576, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve standards for physical education.

S. 595

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to complete payments under such title to local educational agencies eligible for such payments within 3 fiscal years.

S. 603

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 603, a bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 641, a bill to provide 100,000,000 people with first-time access to safe drinking water and sanitation on a sustainable basis within six years by improving the capacity of the United States Government to fully implement the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005.

S. 643

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 643, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to direct Medicaid EHR incentive payments to federally qualified health centers and rural health clinics.

S. 658

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 658, a bill to provide for the preservation of the Department of Defense of documentary evidence of the Department of Defense on incidents of sexual assault and sexual harassment in the military, and for other purposes.

S. 671

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 671, a bill to authorize the United States Marshals Service to issue administrative subpoenas in investigations relating to unregistered sex offenders.

S. 725

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 725, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage, as supplies associated with the injection of insulin, of containment, removal, decontamination and disposal of home-generated needles, syringes, and other sharps through a sharp container, decontamination/destruction device, or sharps-by-mail program or similar program under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 734

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 734, a bill to provide for a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application in vehicle technologies at the Department of Education.

S. 737

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 737, a bill to replace the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection with a 5-person Commission, to bring the Bureau into the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 738

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 738, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of comprehensive Alzheimer's disease and related dementia diagnosis and services in order to improve care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias by improving detection, diagnosis, and care planning.

S. 755

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 755, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an offset against income tax refunds to pay for restitution and other State judicial debts that are past-due.

S. 778

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 778, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 906

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 906, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide for conscience protections, and for other purposes.

S. 931

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 931, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the rules relating to fractional charitable donations of tangible personal property.

S. 940

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 940, a bill to reduce the Federal budget deficit by closing big oil tax loopholes, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 12

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 12, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should take certain actions with respect to the Government of Burma.

S. RES. 80

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 80, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. WEBB):

S. 944. A bill to reaffirm the authority of the Department of Defense to maintain United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as a location for the detention of unprivileged enemy belligerents held by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, nearly 10 years after the September 11 terrorist attacks, our country remains at war with violent extremists who want to kill Americans. Yet the administration has not designated a secure location for detaining, interrogating, and trying current and future terrorist detainees. Rather than seeking to address this problem, the administration continues to insist on closing Guantanamo Bay.

Earlier this week, Attorney General Holder in Paris reiterated the administration's determination to ultimately close the Guantanamo Bay facility. This determination to close Gitmo represents a misguided view that treats terrorism like everyday crime, hesitates to call this war on terrorism what it is, and places the perceptions of others over the safety of Americans.

I believe this desire to close Guantanamo represents an unacceptable abrogation of the Federal Government's most important responsibility: providing for the common defense. Therefore, today I rise to introduce and to urge my colleagues to support Senate bill 944, the Detaining Terrorists to Secure America Act of 2011.

Our diligent intelligence professionals and our brave special operations forces who brought bin Laden to justice don't need to be reminded that the United States and our international partners remain engaged in a war with violent Islamist extremist groups, including al-Qaida and associated terrorist groups that are committed to killing Americans and our allies. Indeed, in the treasure trove of information our forces gathered at bin Laden's compound, we have learned the terrorist groups are actively plotting new attacks against our country. This is the latest in a long string of attacks, or planned attacks, against our country in the last 2 years alone.

Just some of the examples of what we have seen: In September 2009, the plot to conduct a suicide bomb attack on the New York subway system; to the November 2009 attack on Fort Hood that killed 13 people and wounded 32; to the Christmas Day 2009 attempted bombing on an international flight to Detroit; to the May 2010 attempt to bomb Times Square; to the October 2010 attempt to send explosives to Jewish centers in Chicago; to a February 2011 plot to manufacture explosives and to conduct attacks in Texas and in New York. Al-Qaida and their fellow terrorists continue to threaten our country. Bin Laden's death is a significant blow to al-Qaida and associated terrorist organizations and a great accomplishment for our country, but the threat continues and our detention policies must reflect that reality.

Since 2001, we have captured and detained thousands of terrorists who have planned and conducted attacks and who have served as terrorist trainers, financiers, bomb makers, bodyguards, recruiters, and facilitators. Interrogations of these terrorists, including those at Guantanamo, have provided valuable intelligence that has prevented attacks, saved lives, and helped locate other terrorists. Detention and interrogation of terrorists at Guantanamo not only protects American lives which is the core function of our federal government, but detention and interrogation of terrorists at Guantanamo also protects our allies. Of course, the most recent and noteworthy example that demonstrates the value of intelligence gleaned from detainee interrogations is the case of Osama bin Laden. Our intelligence community would never have found bin Laden if it weren't for the intelligence gleaned from the interrogation of terrorist detainees.

Not only have interrogations of detainees helped us track down other terrorists, but detaining terrorists helps prevent future attacks. Unfortunately, as Secretary Gates confirmed in response to my question during an Armed Services Committee hearing in February, approximately 1 out of 4, or 25 percent of the Guantanamo detainees who have been released, have reengaged or we suspect have reengaged in hostilities against the United States and our allies. I can tell my colleagues, as a former prosecutor that is an unacceptable reengagement rate.

Former Guantanamo detainees are conducting suicide bombings, recruiting radicals, and training them to kill Americans and our allies. Said al Shihri and Abdul Zakir represent two examples of former Guantanamo detainees who have returned to the fight and assumed leadership positions in terrorist organizations that are dedicated to killing Americans and our allies. Said al Shihri is now working as the No. 2 in al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula. After a recent promotion, Abdul Zakir now serves as a top Taliban military commander and a senior leader in the Taliban Quetta Shura. In the world of terrorists, it has become a badge of honor to have served at Guantanamo, and then to have been released, and then to get back into the fight against us.

It is unacceptable for even one released detainee to reengage in the fight against our country. As a military spouse and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I find it sickening that our country has released dangerous prisoners who are

now actively plotting to kill Americans and our allies.

Some have expressed concerns regarding the legality of long-term detention for these terrorists, or expressed concerns about the conditions at Guantanamo. I wish to address both of those concerns.

First, as the former Attorney General of the State of New Hampshire, I am as eager as anyone to ensure that our detention policies conform to the rule of law and reflect our core values. Some have questioned the legality of detaining terrorists. Yet we should be very clear that, according to the law of war, detention is a matter of national security and military necessity and has long been recognized as legitimate under international law.

Second, some have expressed concerns about the conditions at Guantanamo. In March, I visited the Guantanamo Bay detention facility. Gitmo now represents the most professionally run detention facility in the world. International human rights activists, reporters, Members of the Congress and the Senate, constantly stream through Guantanamo checking on the conditions and holding the Department of Defense accountable. Guantanamo is no Abu Ghraib. Detainees are treated in a manner that conforms to international law and honors our values. Guantanamo detainees receive three meals a day tailored to the preferences of each detainee. They also have access to topnotch health care facilities. Their religion is respected. They have television, newspapers, books, English classes, and art classes. In fact, the officials at Guantanamo bend over backwards to respect the cultural and religious preferences of the detainees who are held there. Don't get me wrong; Guantanamo is no Club Med, but the terrorists who are detained there, most of whom would undoubtedly kill Americans if they were given the chance, are getting much better treatment than they deserve.

As a former prosecutor, I have been in a few prisons in my time, and I can tell my colleagues the detention facility at Gitmo is much nicer than some that our common criminals are in, in the United States of America. I was also impressed with the state-of-the-art courtroom at Guantanamo which would rival any Federal courtroom in the United States. However, unlike your average courtroom, it is set up to address the special security concerns associated with trying terrorists and it is also especially designed to enable the judge to ensure that classified information will not be compromised or leaked. This courtroom is the appropriate courtroom and venue for Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and the other 9/11 conspirators to be held accountable for their roles in the horrific attacks on our country on September 11. And after almost 10 years, the victims of September 11 have waited much too long for justice.

I believe our country stands on a solid legal framework in detaining terrorists according to the law of war, and I also believe Guantanamo represents the ideal facility for detaining, interrogating, and trying current and future terrorist detainees.

Some may ask, Why introduce this legislation now? Why is it needed? In February, during a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, I asked Secretary Gates where we would detain high value terrorists that we capture in the future if the President goes forward with his plan to close Guantanamo. Secretary Gates candidly said to me: ''I think the honest answer to that question is we don't know.''

I was encouraged by President Obama's decision to resume military commissions at Guantanamo. Yet the administration was careful to reiterate its determination to ultimately close Guantanamo. Unfortunately, as I previously mentioned, on Monday Attorney General Holder, in Paris, reiterated the administration's desire to close Guantanamo. But we know intelligence gathered at Guantanamo played a valuable role in helping to ultimately find Osama bin Laden. We know there are other terrorists out there who want to do us harm, and we need to keep this facility open. For this reason, I believe Congress must pass this legislation without delay.

Before concluding, let me briefly summarize what S. 944 will do.

This legislation reaffirms the authority to maintain Gitmo as an operating facility for the detention of current and future unprivileged enemy belligerents.

It directs the Secretary of Defense to take actions to maintain Gitmo as an operating facility for the detention of current and future unprivileged enemy belligerents.

It extends permanently the limitation of transfer of detainees to foreign entities and the prohibition of construction or modification of facilities in the United States of America for detaining terrorists. We have heard loud and clear from the American people that they do not want terrorists detained on American soil.

Finally, it supersedes sections of President Obama's Executive order that he issued shortly after he got into office on January 22, 2009. He issued an Executive order saying that Guantanamo would be closed. This legislation will supersede the portions of that Executive order related to the closure of Gitmo, the determination of transfer, the prosecution of terrorists in article III courts and the military tribunals.

In short, this legislation would establish Gitmo as the permanent location for detaining, interrogating, and trying unprivileged enemy belligerents or terrorists. To accomplish this, we will permanently limit the transfer of detainees to foreign entities because what has happened is that terrorist detainees have been transferred to foreign countries and then the foreign countries release the former detainee. That is how so many former detainees have made there way back to the battlefield. So we have to stop that. And this legislation will prohibit the construction or modification of facilities in the United States of America for detaining terrorists, to make sure we keep detained terrorists at Gitmo and off U.S. soil.

I am proud to introduce this bipartisan legislation called Detaining Terrorists to Secure America Act of 2011, S. 944. I am especially proud that many friends and colleagues have decided to support this bipartisan legislation, including Senators GRAHAM, LIEBERMAN, CHAMBLISS, BROWN, RUBIO and WEBB, all of whom have been leaders when it comes to fighting terrorism and protecting Americans.

Everything we do in this Chamber must be guided by our Constitution, and the Federal Government must fulfill its most important constitutional duty of protecting the American people. Pretending we are not at war with terrorists will not change the fact that terrorists continue to plot against us and to attack Americans. Consistent with our values and the rule of law, we must establish the Guantanamo detention facility as the permanent location for detaining, interrogating, and trying terrorists.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I thank the Presiding Officer.

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. 944

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Detaining Terrorists to Secure America Act of 2011''

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following finding:

(1) The United States and its international partners are in an armed conflict with violent Islamist extremist groups, including al Qaeda and associated terrorist organizations, that are committed to killing Americans and our allies.

(2) In the last 2 years, terrorists have repeatedly attempted to kill Americans both here at home and abroad, including the following attacks, plots, or alleged plots and attacks:

(A) A September 2009 plot by Najibullah Zazi—who received training from al Qaeda in Pakistan—to conduct a suicide bomb attack on the New York, New York, subway system.

(B) A November 2009 attack by Nidal Malik Hasan at Fort Hood, Texas, that killed 13 people and wounded 32.

(C) A Christmas Day 2009 attempt by Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab to detonate a bomb sewn into his underwear on an international flight to Detroit, Michigan.

(D) A May 2010 attempt by Faisal Shahzad to bomb Times Square in New York, New York, on a crowded Saturday evening, an attack that was unsuccessful only because the car bomb failed to detonate.

(E) An October 2010 attempt by terrorists in Yemen to send, via commercial cargo flights, 2 packages of explosives to Jewish centers in Chicago, Illinois.

(F) A February 2011 plot by Khaled Aldawsari, a Saudi-born student, to manufacture explosives and potentially attack New York, New York, the Dallas, Texas, home of former President George W. Bush, as well as hydroelectric dams, nuclear power plants, and a nightclub.

(3) Since the September 11, 2001, attacks on our Nation, the United States and allied forces have captured thousands of individuals fighting for or supporting al Qaeda and associated terrorist organizations that do not abide by the law of war, including detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, who served as planners of those attacks, trainers of terrorists, financiers of terrorists, bomb makers, bodyguards for Osama bin Laden, recruiters of terrorists, and facilitators of terrorism.

(4) Many of the detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay provided valuable intelligence that gave the United States insight into al Qaeda and its methods, prevented terrorist attacks, and saved lives.

(5) Intelligence obtained from detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay was critical to eventually identifying the location of Osama bin Laden.

(6) In a February 17, 2011, hearing of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Secretary of Defense confirmed that approximately 25 percent of detainees released from the detention facility at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay are confirmed to have reengaged in hostilities or are suspected of having reengaged in hostilities against the United States or our allies.

(7) Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, an organization that includes former detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay among its leadership and ranks, has claimed responsibility for several of the recent plots and attacks against the United States.

(8) Detention according to the law of war is a matter of national security and military necessity and has long been recognized as legitimate under international law.

(9) Detaining unprivileged enemy belligerents prevents them from returning to the battlefield to attack United States and allied military personnel and engaging in future terrorist attacks against innocent civilians.

(10) The Joint Task Force-Guantanamo provides for the humane, legal, and transparent care and custody of detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, notwithstanding regular assaults on the guard force by some detainees.

(11) The International Committee of the Red Cross visits detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay on a quarterly basis.

(12) The detention facility at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay benefits from robust oversight by Congress.

SEC. 3. REAFFIRMATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAINTAIN UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, AS A LOCATION FOR THE DETENTION OF UNPRIVILEGED ENEMY BELLIGERENTS HELD BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REAFFIRMATION OF AUTHORITY AS LOCATION FOR DETENTION OF UNPRIVILEGED ENEMY BELLIGERENTS.—United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, is and shall be a location for the detention of individuals in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense who have engaged in, or supported, hostilities against the United States or its coalition partners on behalf of al Qaeda, the Taliban, or an affiliated group to which the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40) applies.

(b) MAINTENANCE AS AN OPERATIONAL FACILITY FOR DETENTION.—The Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate actions to maintain United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as an open and operating facility for the detention of current and future individuals as described in subsection (a).

(c) PERMANENT EXTENSION OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS RELATING TO DETAINEES AND DETENTION FACILITIES.—

(1) LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF DETAINEES TO FOREIGN ENTITIES.—Section 1033(a)(1) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4351) is amended by striking ''during the one-year period'' and all that follows through ''by this Act'' and inserting ''the Secretary of Defense may not use any amounts authorized to be appropriated''.

(2) PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION OF DETENTION FACILITIES IN UNITED STATES.—Section 1034(a) of such Act (124 Stat. 4353) is amended by striking ''None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act'' and inserting ''No funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense, or to or for any other department or agency of the United States Government,''.

(d) SUPERSEDURE OF EXECUTIVE ORDER.—Sections 3, 4(c)(2), 4(c)(3), 4(c)(5), and 7 of Executive Order No. 13492, dated January 22, 2009, shall have no further force or effect.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BENNET, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 946. A bill to establish an Office of Rural Education Policy in the Department of Education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, Mike Mansfield once said, ''Knowledge is essential for acceptance and understanding.''

This statement is all too true for the students and educators residing in rural areas. While rural education is becoming an increasingly large and important part of the U.S. public school system, the unique challenges and circumstances within these rural communities are often misunderstood or overlooked. According to the Digest of Education Statistics reported annually by the National Center for Education Statistics, the number of students attending rural schools increased by over 11 percent, from 10.5 million in 2004 to nearly 11.7 million by 2008. Rural students now comprise almost ¼ of the Nation's public school enrollment. And nearly one-third of all schools in the nation are located in rural areas.

Rural is also becoming increasingly diverse. According to NCES, the increase in rural enrollment between 2004 and 2009 was disproportionally among students of color. And in the 2007–2008 school year the national average rate of student poverty in rural school districts, as measured by the rate of participation in federally subsidized meals programs, was almost 40 percent.

Yet despite the significant percentage enrolled in rural schools, the importance of rural education is often obscured by the fact that rural students are, naturally, widely-dispersed, located in small, geographically isolated school districts. The size, diversity, and complexity of rural education support a greater policy focus on the unique challenges and solutions for rural education.

Montana is the fourth largest state by land mass, totaling over 147,000 square miles. More than half of Montana's 830 schools enroll less than 100 students. From Eureka to Ekalaka, from Scobey to Darby, these small schools dot the landscape, providing not only a learning environment but often a community center.

Montana's rural communities are doing an excellent job educating Montana's next generation. Overall, Montana graduation rates are higher than the national average. Montana students taking the National Assessment of Educational Progress, NAEP, in 2009 scored higher than the national average in both reading and math.

But despite the success of Montana's rural schools, these schools face a unique set of challenges that their urban-centric peers may not even comprehend. In 2004, the U.S. Government Accountability Office released a report highlighting the needs and distinctive challenges of rural schools and districts across this nation.

For example, rural schools report greater difficulties in recruiting and retaining qualified teachers, due to inability to offer competitive salaries, geographic isolation, and for some, severe weather. Rural districts often have fewer personnel. The district superintendent is often also the high school principal. He or she may also be the Title I coordinator, math curriculum specialist, and sometimes also the head of transportation services! In isolated areas, schools face challenges in providing professional development and training for teachers and principals. Small rural districts are often located long distances from other districts, towns, and universities, drastically reducing opportunities to partner or collaborate. Additionally, the long distances students must travel between school and home make it more difficult to participate in traditional remedial services, mentoring, and after school programs.

I commend the Secretary for efforts he has taken to try to address concerns of rural areas. However, these efforts have fallen short, and in some cases, even good intentions have created adverse consequences. Most recently, the Investing in Innovation, i3, competitive grant program provided ''competitive preference points'' for applicants serving at least one rural district, in an effort to encourage and support rural applicants. However, the department's lack of guidance and independent scorers' lack of understanding of rural areas still left authentically rural programs at a clear disadvantage. The Rural School & Community Trust highlighted in its report Taking Advantage that this ''rural preference'' instead had the effect of inducing

urban applicants to include minimal rural participation merely in order to gain the additional scoring points for primarily urban projects.

I am joined today by my colleague from West Virginia, Senator ROCKEFELLER, in introducing the Office of Rural Education Policy Act. This bill will establish the Office of Rural Education Policy, housed at the Department of Education's Office of Elementary & Secondary Education. This office and its director will be tasked with coordinating the activities related to rural education and advising the Secretary on issues important to rural schools and districts. The legislation requires the department to consider the impact of proposed rules and regulations on rural education and to produce an annual report on the condition of rural education. The Office of Rural Education Policy will be tasked with establishing a clearinghouse for collecting and disseminating information related to the unique challenges of rural areas, as well as the innovative efforts under way in rural schools to tackle these challenges.

The strong list of supporters of this bill further solidifies the need for an Office of Rural Education Policy. We have received strong support from: American Association of Community Colleges, American Association of School Administrators, Alliance for Excellent Education, Association of Educational Service Agencies, Center for Rural Affairs, Coalition for Community Schools, Council for Opportunity in Education, Montana School Board Association, Montana State Superintendents Association, Montana Rural Education Association, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Association of Development Organizations, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, National Education Association, National Congress of American Indians, National Farmers Union, National Indian Education Association, National Rural Education Association, National Rural Education Advocacy Coalition, National School Board Association, Organizations Concerned about Rural Education, Public Education Network, Rural School and Community Trust, and Save the Children. I want to thank all the supporters of the bill, and want to particularly thank the efforts of the Rural School and Community Trust for its steadfast commitment to this proposal.

Mike Mansfield was right. ''Knowledge is essential for acceptance and understanding.'' I look forward to working with my colleagues here in the Senate to move this legislation, to bring about greater knowledge of rural schools and ensure they are both accepted and understood.

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. 946

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Office of Rural Education Policy Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Secretary of Education has recognized that ''[r]ural schools have unique challenges and benefits'', but a recent report by the Rural School and Community Trust refers to the ''paucity of rural education research in the United States''.

(2) Rural education is becoming an increasingly large and important part of the United States public school system. According to the Digest of Education Statistics reported annually by the National Center for Education Statistics, the number of students attending rural schools increased by more than 11 percent, from 10,500,000 to nearly 11,700,000, between the 2004–2005 and 2008–2009 school years. The share of the Nation's public school enrollment attending rural schools increased from 21.6 percent to 23.8 percent. In school year 2008–2009, these students attended 31,635 rural schools, nearly one-third of all schools in the United States.

(3) Despite the overall growth of rural education, rural students represent a demographic minority in all but 3 States, according to the National Center for Education Statistics.

(4) Rural education is becoming increasingly diverse. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, the increase in rural enrollment between the 2004–2005 and 2008–2009 school years was disproportionally among students of color. Enrollment of children of color in rural schools increased by 31 percent, and the proportion of students enrolled in rural schools who are children of color increased from 23.0 to 26.5 percent. More than one-third of rural students in 12 States are children of color, according to research by the Rural School and Community Trust (Why Rural Matters 2009).

(5) Rural education is varied and diverse across the Nation. In school year 2007–2008, the national average rate of student poverty in rural school districts, as measured by the rate of participation in federally subsidized meals programs, was 39.1 percent, but ranged from 9.7 percent in Connecticut to 71.9 percent in New Mexico, according to the National Center for Education Statistics.

(6) Even policy measures intended to help rural schools can have unintended consequences. In awarding competitive grants under the Investing in Innovation Fund program under section 14007 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5), the Secretary of Education attempted to encourage and support rural applicants by providing additional points for proposals to serve at least 1 rural local educational agency. But according to research by the Rural School and Community Trust (Taking Advantage, 2010), this ''rural preference'' mainly had the effect of inducing urban applicants to include rural participation merely in order to gain additional scoring points for primarily urban projects.

(7) Rural schools generally utilize distance education more often for both students and teachers. A fall 2008 survey of public schools by the National Center for Education Statistics found that rural schools were 1½ times more likely to provide students access for online distance learning than schools in cities. A September 2004 study from the Government Accountability Office reported that rural school districts used distance learning for teacher training more often than nonrural school districts.

(8) The National Center for Education Statistics reports that base salaries of both the lowest and highest paid teachers are lower in rural schools than any other community type.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to establish an Office of Rural Education Policy in the Department of Education; and

(2) to provide input to the Secretary of Education regarding the impact of proposed changes in law, regulations, policies, rules, and budgets on rural schools and communities.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF RURAL EDUCATION POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Department of Education Organization Act (20 U.S.C. 3411 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 221. OFFICE OF RURAL EDUCATION POLICY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be, in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education of the Department, an Office of Rural Education Policy (referred to in this section as the 'Office').

''(b) DIRECTOR; DUTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall be headed by a Director, who shall advise the Secretary on the characteristics and needs of rural schools and the effects of current policies and proposed statutory, regulatory, administrative, and budgetary changes on State educational agencies, and local educational agencies, that serve schools with a locale code of 32, 33, 41, 42, or 43, as determined by the Secretary.

''(2) ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR.—In addition to advising the Secretary with respect to the matters described in paragraph (1), the Director of the Office of Rural Education Policy (referred to in this section as the 'Director'), through the Office, shall—

''(A) establish and maintain a clearinghouse for collecting and disseminating information on—

''(i) teacher and principal recruitment and retention at rural elementary schools and rural secondary schools;

''(ii) access to, and implementation and use of, technology and distance learning at such schools;

''(iii) rigorous coursework delivery through distance learning at such schools;

''(iv) student achievement at such schools, including the achievement of low-income and minority students;

''(v) innovative approaches in rural education to increase student achievement;

''(vi) higher education and career readiness and secondary school completion of students enrolled in such schools;

''(vii) access to, and quality of, early childhood development for children located in rural areas;

''(viii) access to, or partnerships with, community-based organizations in rural areas;

''(ix) the availability of professional development opportunities for rural teachers and principals;

''(x) the availability of Federal and other grants and assistance that are specifically geared or applicable to rural schools; and

''(xi) the financing of such schools;

''(B) identify innovative research and demonstration projects on topics of importance to rural elementary schools and rural secondary schools, including gaps in such research, and recommend such topics for study by the Institute of Education Sciences and other research agencies;

''(C) coordinate the activities within the Department that relate to rural education;

''(D) provide information to the Secretary and others in the Department with respect

to the activities of other Federal departments and agencies that relate to rural education, including activities relating to rural housing, rural agricultural services, rural transportation, rural economic development, rural career and technical training, rural health care, rural disability services, and rural mental health;

''(E) coordinate with the Bureau of Indian Education, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of the Interior, and the schools administered by such agencies regarding rural education;

''(F) provide, directly or through grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts, technical assistance and other activities as necessary to support activities related to improving education in rural areas; and

''(G) produce an annual report on the condition of rural education that is delivered to the members of the Education and the Workforce Committee of the House of Representatives and the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee of the Senate and published on the Department's website.

''(c) IMPACT ANALYSES OF RULES AND REGULATIONS ON RURAL SCHOOLS.—

''(1) PROPOSED RULEMAKING.—Whenever the Secretary publishes a general notice of proposed rulemaking for any rule or regulation that may have a significant impact on State educational agencies or local educational agencies serving schools with a locale code of 32, 33, 41, 42, or 43, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary (acting through the Director) shall prepare and make available for public comment an initial regulatory impact analysis. Such analysis shall describe the impact of the proposed rule or regulation on such State educational agencies and local educational agencies and shall set forth, with respect to such agencies, the matters required under section 603 of title 5, United States Code, to be set forth with respect to small entities. The initial regulatory impact analysis (or a summary) shall be published in the Federal Register at the time of the publication of general notice of proposed rulemaking for the rule or regulation.

''(2) FINAL RULE.—Whenever the Secretary promulgates a final version of a rule or regulation with respect to which an initial regulatory impact analysis is required by paragraph (1), the Secretary (acting through the Director) shall prepare a final regulatory impact analysis with respect to the final version of such rule or regulation. Such analysis shall set forth, with respect to State educational agencies and local educational agencies serving schools with a locale code of 32, 33, 41, 42, or 43, as determined by the Secretary, the matters required under section 604 of title 5, United States Code, to be set forth with respect to small entities. The Secretary shall make copies of the final regulatory impact analysis available to the public and shall publish, in the Federal Register at the time of publication of the final version of the rule or regulation, a statement describing how a member of the public may obtain a copy of such analysis.

''(3) REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS.—If a regulatory flexibility analysis is required by chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, for a rule or regulation to which this subsection applies, such analysis shall specifically address the impact of the rule or regulation on State educational agencies and local educational agencies serving schools with a locale code of 32, 33, 41, 42, or 43, as determined by the Secretary.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 221(c) of the Department of Education Organization Act, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to regulations proposed more than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I am proud to join Senator BAUCUS from Montana and my colleagues Senator BEGICH of Alaska, Senator BENNET of Colorado, Senator FRANKEN of Minnesota, Senator JOHNSON of South Dakota, Senator LEAHY of Vermont, Senator SANDERS of Vermont, and Senator UDALL of Colorado, in introducing legislation today to establish an Office of Rural Education Policy at the Department of Education. Senator BAUCUS's leadership in bringing attention to education in our rural areas is remarkable, and I am proud to work with him on this increasingly important issue.

In addition to my colleagues who are cosponsoring this legislation, I want to acknowledge the many organizations who have already announced their support for it. Their concern for the students living in rural America is greatly appreciated. These organizations include American Association of Community Colleges, American Association of School Administrators, Alliance for Excellent Education, Association of Educational Service Agencies, Center for Rural Affairs, Coalition for Community Schools, Council for Opportunity in Education, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Association of Development Organizations, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, National Congress of American Indians, National Education Association, National Farmers Union, National Indian Education Association, National Rural Education Association, National Rural Education Advocacy Coalition, National School Board Association, Organizations Concerned about Rural Education, Public Education Network, Rural School and Community Trust, and Save the Children.

We rightly focus quite a bit on education around here—the future success of our nation depends upon today's students. Since nearly one quarter of the students in America are at rural schools and the share of students in rural schools has been increasing, our Nation's success depends considerably on success in rural schools. Over half of the schools in West Virginia are in rural areas. This legislation will create an Office at the Department of Education to make sure the programs there are working for students in schools in rural areas.

Rural schools are not just miniature versions of their urban counterparts. They face special challenges and they have unique capabilities. Among the challenges faced are shrinking local tax bases, recruiting and retaining teachers and principals, limited access to advanced courses, and proportionally higher transportation costs. At the same time, rural communities, and I am very proud of the communities in West Virginia often provide a strong foundation for support and improvement. They are leaders in the use of distance learning. While smaller schools lack an economy of scale, they often profit from this small size and their closeness to community. Parental involvement and support is typically high. Rural schools can be very innovative, and research on what works in rural schools needs to be completed and disseminated.

The Office of Rural Education Policy is modeled after the successful Office of Rural Health Policy at the Department of Health and Human Services which Congress established in 1987. The office will be led by a director charged with coordinating the activities of the Department of Education concerning rural education. It will establish and maintain a clearinghouse for issues faced by rural schools, such as teacher and principal recruitment and retention; partnerships with community-based organizations; and financing of rural schools.

The office will identify innovative research and demonstration projects on rural schools, and recommend research to bridge any gaps. It will issue an annual report on the condition of rural education, and an analysis of the impact on rural education from proposed regulations and other activities will be made public.

Rural schools have been a part of our national fabric since its very beginning. Their students deserve the focus this legislation will provide. It has been said that education in rural America is ''too large to be ignored but too small and diverse to be highly visible.'' We need to establish this office so that it is not ignored and so that its successes are made more visible. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 950. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to repeal a prohibition on allowing States to use toll revenues as State matching funds for Appalachian Development Highway projects; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today Senator CASEY and I are introducing a bill to help facilitate the completion of critically important transportation infrastructure to the Appalachian region of the United States. The Appalachian Development Highway System, ADHS, is designed to alleviate Appalachia's isolation from major commercial corridors and create better transportation connectivity between communities within the Region and to destinations outside of Appalachia.

According to the Appalachian Regional Commission, ARC: ''Because the cost of building highways through Appalachia's mountainous terrain was high, the Region had never been served by adequate roads. Its network of narrow, winding, two-lane roads, snaking through narrow stream valleys or over mountaintops, was slow to drive, unsafe, and in many places worn out. The Nation's interstate highway system had largely bypassed the Appalachian Region, going through or around the Region's rugged terrain as cost-effectively as possible.''

That's why in 1964, ARC recommended that investments in improving Appalachia's highways were essential to economic growth of this historically economically depressed region of the country. The ADHS is currently authorized at 3,090 miles and is nearly 88 percent complete or under construction. The remaining miles left to be built are located in some of the more difficult places to build located near the mid-Atlantic portion of Appalachia.

The difficulty of construction in this region makes these stretches of the ADHS more expensive to build as well. The legislation I am filing today will provide Appalachian States with greater flexibility on how they may raise and their portion of matching funds that are used towards ADHS projects.

Toll credits, first authorized in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), are being used extensively by States with toll facilities. As of May 31, 2007, over $18 billion in toll credits had been approved in 22 States and Puerto Rico. Toll credits are designed to encourage States to increase capital investment in transportation infrastructure and enable States to simplify program administration. However, there is an interesting exception for how and where toll credit may be used.

SAFETEA–LU included a modification to the toll credit requirements as codified in Section 120(j) of Title 23, United States Code, U.S.C., prohibiting the use of toll credits on the Appalachian Development Highway System program under Section 14501 of Title 40.

Our legislation, quite simply, repeals this prohibition against States using toll credits as their state matching funds for ADHS projects.

Given these particularly difficult economic times that have presented exceptional budgetary challenges for States to revenue adequate revenues to pay for essential infrastructure projects, I believe States need the flexibility to use highway revenues as they see fit regardless of the means in which those revenues are raised. The SAFETEA–LU prohibition against the use of toll credits on the ADHS is discriminatory against a particular revenue mechanism.

Allowing a State to use toll credits towards an ADHS project does not require that State to raise the tolls revenues on the ADHS road that the toll credits were used towards.

I urge my colleagues to join Sen. CASEY and I in repealing SAFETEA–LU's prohibition against one particular revenue stream that could be used to complete an incredibly important system of transportation infrastructure designed to serve a historically underserved region of rural America.

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. 950

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

SECTION 1. MATCHING FUNDS FOR APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAY PROJECTS.

Section 120(j)(1)(A) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and the Appalachian development highway system program under section 14501 of title 40''.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the development of the Appalachian Development Highway System, ADHS. The completion of this highway system, which connects 13 States from New York to Mississippi, is critical to the economic development of the region as a whole.

Despite the significant progress Appalachia has made over the past few decades, the region has continued to face economic challenges. In the 420-county region, approximately one fourth of these counties are designated as having high poverty, meaning that the poverty rate is 1.5 times the U.S. average. According to the Appalachian Regional Commission, two thirds of the Appalachian counties have unemployment rates that are higher than the national average.

Completion of the Appalachian Development Highway System will spur economic development in the region and create much needed jobs. The Federal Government has played a significant role in the development of this initiative and I urge my colleagues to renew this commitment.

Today, my colleague Senator CARDIN from Maryland and I introduced a bill that will help the continued development of this highway system. Our bill will reverse language in the 2005 Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, SAFETEA–LU, that prohibits the use of toll credits for the non-federal share for ADHS projects. This legislation would allow States to unlock existing unspent balances and make it easier for States to access and leverage additional funding. Our bill will allow ADHS projects to move forward, such as Route 219 in my home State of Pennsylvania. In addition, this change would eliminate a disparity that does not exist for the vast majority of other Federal transportation programs.

I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS. Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts)

S. 951. A bill to improve the provision of Federal transition, rehabilitation, vocational, and unemployment benefits to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am proud to introduce the Hiring Heroes Act of 2011.

My colleagues, including Senators MURKOWSKI, LEAHY, BAUCUS, ROCKEFELLER, AKAKA, BOXER, SANDERS, BROWN of Ohio, CASEY, TESTER, BEGICH, COONS, and BROWN of Massachusetts join me in introducing this important legislation. I appreciate their continued support of our Nation's veterans. I also want to thank the veterans service organizations and their representatives, who have supported this legislation, including Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Military Officers Association of America, The American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Today, we are taking a huge step forward in rethinking the way we treat our men and women in uniform after they leave the military. For too long in this country we have invested billions of dollars in training our young men and women with new skills to protect our nation, only to turn our backs once they have left the military. For too long, at the end of their career we patted these troops on the back for their service and then pushed them out into the job market alone. Where has that left us today?

Today, we have an unemployment rate as high as 27 percent among young veterans coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan. That is over one in five of our Nation's heroes who cannot find a job to support their family; who do not have an income that provides stability; and do not have work that provides them with the self-esteem and pride that is so critical to their transition home.

All too often we read about the results of veterans who come home—often with the invisible wounds of war—who cannot find the dignity and security that work provides. We read about it in skyrocketing suicide statistics; problems at home; substance abuse problems, and even in rising rates of homelessness among our young veterans.

I frequently hear from veterans that we have failed to provide adequate job support. I have had veterans tell me that they no longer write the fact that they're a veteran on their resume because they fear the stigma that employers might attach to the invisible wounds of war. I have heard from medics like Eric Smith, a former Navy Corpsman who returned home from treating battlefield wounds and could not get certifications necessary to be an emergency medical technician or to drive an ambulance.

I have heard from veteran after veteran who said that they did not have to go through the military's job skills training program or that they were never taught how to use the vernacular of the business world to describe the benefits of their experience. These stories are as heartbreaking as they are frustrating, but more than anything they are a reminder that we have to act now.

The bill we are introducing today allows our men and women in uniform to capitalize on their service, while also ensuring that the American people capitalize on the investment we have made in them. For the first time, it would require broad job skills training for every servicemember as they leave the military as part of the military's Transition Assistance Program. Today, nearly ⅓ of our servicemembers do not get this training.

This bill would also allow servicemembers to begin the federal employment process prior to separation in order to facilitate a truly seamless transition from the military to jobs at the VA, Homeland Security or many of the other federal agencies in need of our veterans.

In addition, this bill also requires the Department of Labor to take a hard look at what military skills and training should be translatable into the civilian sector, and will work to make it simpler to get needed licenses or certifications.

Finally, this bill will allow for innovative partnerships with organizations that provide mentorship and training programs that are designed to lead to job placements. All of these are real, substantial steps to put our veterans to work, and all of them come at a pivotal time for our economic recovery and our veterans.

I grew up with the Vietnam War and I have dedicated much of my Senate career to helping to care for the veterans we left behind at that time. The mistakes we made then have cost our nation and our veterans dearly and have weighed on the conscience of this nation; yet today we stand on the brink of repeating those mistakes.

We cannot let that happen. Our Nation's veterans are disciplined, team players who have proven they can deliver under pressure like no one else. It is time for us to deliver for them.

This is not a full summary of all the provisions within this legislation. However, I hope that I have provided an appropriate overview of the major benefits this legislation would provide for America's servicemembers as they transition into civilian life. I also ask our colleagues for their continued support for the Nation's veterans.

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. 951

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Hiring Heroes Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO PROVIDE REHABILITATION AND VOCATIONAL BENEFITS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH SEVERE INJURIES OR ILLNESSES.

Section 1631(b)(2) of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of Public Law 110–181; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2012'' and inserting ''December 31, 2014''.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO PAY EMPLOYERS FOR PROVIDING ON-JOB TRAINING TO VETERANS WHO HAVE NOT BEEN REHABILITATED TO POINT OF EMPLOYABILITY.

Section 3116(b)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''who have been rehabilitated to the point of employability''.

SEC. 4. TRAINING AND REHABILITATION FOR VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES WHO HAVE EXHAUSTED RIGHTS TO UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS UNDER STATE LAW.

(a) ENTITLEMENT TO ADDITIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3102 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking ''A person'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A person''; and

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

''(b) ADDITIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAMS FOR PERSONS WHO HAVE EXHAUSTED RIGHTS TO UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS UNDER STATE LAW.—(1) A person who has completed a rehabilitation program under this chapter shall be entitled to an additional rehabilitation program under the terms and conditions of this chapter if—

''(A) the person is described by paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a); and

''(B) the person—

''(i) has exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law or under Federal law with respect to a benefit year;

''(ii) has no rights to regular compensation with respect to a week under such State or Federal law; and

''(iii) is not receiving compensation with respect to such week under the unemployment compensation law of Canada; and

''(C) begins such additional rehabilitation program within six months of the date of such exhaustion.

''(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(i), a person shall be considered to have exhausted such person's rights to regular compensation under a State law when—

''(A) no payments of regular compensation can be made under such law because such person has received all regular compensation available to such person based on employment or wages during such person's base period; or

''(B) such person's rights to such compensation have been terminated by reason of the expiration of the benefit year with respect to which such rights existed.

''(3) In this subsection, the terms 'compensation', 'regular compensation', 'benefit year', 'State', 'State law', and 'week' have the respective meanings given such terms under section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note).''.

(2) DURATION OF ADDITIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM.—Section 3105(b) of such title is amended—

(A) by striking ''Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section,'' and inserting ''(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and in subsection (c),''; and

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

''(2) The period of a vocational rehabilitation program pursued by a veteran under section 3102(b) of this title following a determination of the current reasonable feasibility of achieving a vocational goal may not exceed 24 months.''.

(b) EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF ELIGIBILITY.—Section 3103 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''in subsection (b), (c), or (d)'' and inserting ''in subsection (b), (c), (d), or (e)'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

''(e)(1) The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to a rehabilitation program described in paragraph (2).

''(2) A rehabilitation program described in this paragraph is a rehabilitation program pursued by a veteran under section 3102(b) of this title.''.

(c) EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION ON RECEIPT OF ASSISTANCE UNDER CHAPTER 31 AND ONE OR MORE PROGRAMS.—Section 3695(b) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking ''No person'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (2), no person''; and

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

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to a rehabilitation program described in section 3103(e)(2) of this title.''.

SEC. 5. ASSESSMENT AND FOLLOW-UP ON VETERANS WHO PARTICIPATE IN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TRAINING AND REHABILITATION FOR VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3106 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) For each rehabilitation program pursued by a veteran under this chapter, the Secretary shall contact such veteran not later than 180 days after the date on which such veteran completes such rehabilitation program or terminates participation in such rehabilitation program and not less frequently than once every 180 days thereafter for a period of one year to ascertain the employment status of the veteran and assess such rehabilitation program.''; and

(2) in the section heading, by adding ''**; program assessment and follow-up**'' at the end.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 31 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 3106 and inserting the following new item:

''3106. Initial and extended evaluations; determinations regarding serious employment handicap; program assessment and follow-up.''.

SEC. 6. MANDATORY PARTICIPATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN THE TRANSITIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1144(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''shall encourage'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall require the participation in the program carried out under this section of the members eligible for assistance under the program.''.

(b) REQUIRED USE OF EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE, JOB TRAINING ASSISTANCE, AND OTHER TRANSITIONAL SERVICES IN PRESEPARATION COUNSELING.—Section 1142(a)(2) of such title is amended by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''.

SEC. 7. FOLLOW-UP ON EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WHO RECENTLY PARTICIPATED IN TRANSITIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

For each individual who participates in the Transitional Assistance Program (TAP) of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Labor shall contact such individual not later than 180 days after the date on which such individual completes such program and not less frequently than once every 90 days

thereafter for a period of 180 days to ascertain the employment status of such individual.

SEC. 8. COLLABORATIVE VETERANS' TRAINING, MENTORING, AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 41 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 4104 the following new section:

"§ 4104A. Collaborative veterans' training, mentoring, and placement program

''(a) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants to eligible nonprofit organizations to provide training and mentoring for eligible veterans who seek employment. The Secretary shall award the grants to not more than 3 organizations, for periods of 2 years.

''(b) COLLABORATION AND FACILITATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the recipients of the grants—

''(1) collaborate with—

''(A) the appropriate disabled veterans' outreach specialists (in carrying out the functions described in section 4103A(a)) and the appropriate local veterans' employment representatives (in carrying out the functions described in section 4104); and

''(B) the appropriate State boards and local boards (as such terms are defined in section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801)) for the areas to be served by recipients of the grants; and

''(2) based on the collaboration, facilitate the placement of the veterans that complete the training in meaningful employment that leads to economic self-sufficiency.

''(c) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a nonprofit organization shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. At a minimum, the information shall include—

''(1) information describing how the organization will—

''(A) collaborate with disabled veterans' outreach specialists and local veterans' employment representatives and the appropriate State boards and local boards (as such terms are defined in section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801));

''(B) based on the collaboration, provide training that facilitates the placement described in subsection (b)(2); and

''(C) make available, for each veteran receiving the training, a mentor to provide career advice to the veteran and assist the veteran in preparing a resume and developing job interviewing skills; and

''(2) an assurance that the organization will provide the information necessary for the Secretary to prepare the reports described in subsection (d).

''(d) REPORTS.—(1) Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Hiring Heroes Act of 2011, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes the process for awarding grants under this section, the recipients of the grants, and the collaboration described in subsections (b) and (c).

''(2) Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Hiring Heroes Act of 2011, the Secretary shall—

''(A) conduct an assessment of the performance of the grant recipients, disabled veterans' outreach specialists, and local veterans' employment representatives in carrying out activities under this section, which assessment shall include collecting information on the number of—

''(i) veterans who applied for training under this section;

''(ii) veterans who entered the training;

''(iii) veterans who completed the training;

''(iv) veterans who were placed in meaningful employment under this section; and

''(v) veterans who remained in such employment as of the date of the assessment; and

''(B) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes—

''(i) a description of how the grant recipients used the funds made available under this section;

''(ii) the results of the assessment conducted under subparagraph (A); and

''(iii) the recommendations of the Secretary as to whether amounts should be appropriated to carry out this section for fiscal years after 2013.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $4,500,000 for the period consisting of fiscal years 2012 and 2013.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'appropriate committees of Congress' means the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

''(2) the term 'nonprofit organization' means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.''

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 4103A of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and facilitate placements'' after ''intensive services''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) In facilitating placement of a veteran under this program, a disabled veterans' outreach program specialist shall help to identify job opportunities that are appropriate for the veteran's employment goals and assist that veteran in developing a cover letter and resume that are targeted for those particular jobs.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 41 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4104 the following new item:

''4104A. Collaborative veterans' training, mentoring, and placement program.''.

SEC. 9. INDIVIDUALIZED ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDER TRANSITION ASSISTANCE ON EQUIVALENCE BETWEEN SKILLS DEVELOPED IN MILITARY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALITIES AND QUALIFICATIONS REQUIRED FOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

(a) STUDY ON EQUIVALENCE REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly enter into a contract with a qualified organization or entity jointly selected by the Secretaries, to conduct a study to identify any equivalences between the skills developed by members of the Armed Forces through various military occupational specialties (MOS) and the qualifications required for various positions of civilian employment in the private sector.

(2) COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Office of Personnel Management, the General Services Administration, the Government Accountability Office, and other appropriate departments and agencies, shall cooperate with the contractor under paragraph (1) to conduct the study required under that paragraph.

(3) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study conducted under paragraph (1), the contractor under that paragraph shall submit to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Secretary of Labor a report setting forth the results of the study. The report shall include such information as the Secretaries shall specify in the contract under paragraph (1) for purposes of this section.

(4) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly transmit to Congress the report submitted under paragraph (3), together with such comments on the report as the Secretaries jointly consider appropriate.

(b) INDIVIDUALIZED ASSESSMENT OF CIVILIAN POSITIONS AVAILABLE THROUGH MOS SKILLS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each member of the Armed Forces who is participating in the Transition Assistance Program (TAP) of the Department of Defense receives, as part of such member's participation in that program, an individualized assessment of the various positions of civilian employment in the private sector for which such member may be qualified as a result of the skills developed by such member through such member's military occupational specialty. The assessment shall be performed using the results of the study conducted under subsection (a) and such other information as the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Labor, considers appropriate for that purpose.

(c) FURTHER USE IN EMPLOYMENT-RELATED TRANSITION ASSISTANCE.—

(1) TRANSMITTAL OF ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall transmit the individualized assessment provided a member under subsection (a) to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Labor.

(2) USE IN ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Labor may use an individualized assessment with respect to an individual under paragraph (1) for employment-related assistance in the transition from military service to civilian life provided the individual by such Secretary and to otherwise facilitate and enhance the transition of the individual from military service to civilian life.

SEC. 10. APPOINTMENT OF HONORABLY DISCHARGED MEMBERS AND OTHER EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF HONORABLY DISCHARGED MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES TO CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3330c the following:

"§ 3330d. Honorably discharged members of the uniformed services

''The head of an executive agency may appoint a member of the uniformed services who is honorably discharged to a position in the civil service without regard to sections 3301 through 3330c during the 180-day period beginning on the date that the individual is honorably discharged, if that individual is otherwise qualified for the position.''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 3330c the following:

''3330d. Honorably discharged members of the uniformed services.''.

(b) EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE: OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term ''agency'' has the meaning given the term ''Executive agency'' in section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) the term ''veteran'' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES OF OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

(A) designate agencies that shall establish a program to provide employment assistance

to members of the armed forces who are being separated from active duty in accordance with paragraph (3); and

(B) ensure that the programs established under this subsection are coordinated with the Transition Assistance Program (TAP) of the Department of Defense.

(3) ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM.—The head of each agency designated under paragraph (2)(A), in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and acting through the Veterans Employment Program Office of the agency established under Executive Order 13518 (74 Fed. Reg. 58533; relating to employment of veterans in the Federal Government), or any successor thereto, shall—

(A) establish a program to provide employment assistance to members of the Armed Forces who are being separated from active duty, including assisting such members in seeking employment with the agency;

(B) provide such members with information regarding the program of the agency established under subparagraph (A); and

(C) promote the recruiting, hiring, training and development, and retention of such members and veterans by the agency.

(4) OTHER OFFICE.—If an agency designated under paragraph (2)(A) does not have a Veterans Employment Program Office, the head of the agency, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall select an appropriate office of the agency to carry out the responsibilities of the agency under paragraph (3).

SEC. 11. OUTREACH PROGRAM FOR CERTAIN VETERANS RECEIVING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall carry out a program through the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training, the disabled veterans' outreach program specialists employed under section 4103A of title 38, United States Code, and local veterans' employment representatives employed under section 4104 of such title to provide outreach to covered veterans and provide them with assistance in finding employment.

(b) COVERED VETERANS.—For purposes of this section, a covered veteran is a veteran who—

(1) recently separated from service in the Armed Forces; and

(2) has been in receipt of assistance under the Unemployment Compensation for Ex-servicemembers program under subchapter II of chapter 85 of title 5 for more than 105 days.

SEC. 12. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PILOT PROGRAM ON WORK EXPERIENCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ON TERMINAL LEAVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may establish a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing to covered individuals work experience with civilian employees and contractors of the Department of Defense to facilitate the transition of the individuals from service in the Armed Forces to employment in the civilian labor market.

(b) COVERED INDIVIDUALS.—For purposes of this section, a covered individual is any individual who—

(1) is a member of the Armed Forces;

(2) the Secretary expects to be discharged or separated from service in the Armed Forces and is on terminal leave;

(3) the Secretary determines has skills that can be used to provide services to the Department that the Secretary considers critical to the success of the mission of the Department; and

(4) the Secretary determines might benefit from exposure to the civilian work environment while working for the Department in order to facilitate a transition of the individual from service in the Armed Forces to employment in the civilian labor market.

(c) DURATION.—The pilot program shall be carried out during the two-year period beginning on the date of the commencement of the pilot program.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 540 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program that includes the findings of the Secretary with respect to the feasibility and advisability of providing covered individuals with work experience as described in subsection (a).

SEC. 13. ENHANCEMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON CREDENTIALING AND LICENSING OF VETERANS.

Section 4114 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking ''Assistant Secretary shall'' and inserting ''Assistant Secretary of Veterans' Employment and Training shall, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training,'';

(B) by striking ''10 military'' and inserting ''five military''; and

(C) by inserting ''of Veterans' Employment and Training'' after ''selected by the Assistant Secretary''; and

(3) by striking subsections (d) through (h) and inserting the following:

''(d) PERIOD OF PROJECT.—The period during which the Assistance Secretary shall carry out the demonstration project under this section shall be the two-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Hiring Heroes Act of 2011.''.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KERRY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 952. A bill to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain alien students who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. We had a historic vote in the Senate last December on the DREAM Act. Senator HARRY REID, the majority leader, promised that we would bring this measure for consideration on the floor of the Senate. Some people on both sides of the aisle said, it is a bad idea, do not do it. But he kept his word, and I am glad he did.

We called it. We had three Republican votes, and we fell short. Oh, we had a majority. It seems as if we always have a majority when we call this bill. But because of the threat of a Republican filibuster, we needed 60 votes, and we did not reach the 60 votes necessary. So 55 Senators, a bipartisan majority, voted for the DREAM Act. I have reintroduced it today. By way of background, this is a simple piece of legislation, but it is one that affects thousands of people across America. It came to my attention 10 years ago when a Korean-American woman called me in my Chicago office and told me she had a problem.

She had come to the United States about 18 years before and brought her little girl with her. She had raised a family. She was now a naturalized citizen. The children who were born in the United States were citizens. But her older daughter was in a different status. Her older daughter was a special person. Her older daughter was a concert pianist who had been accepted at the Julliard School of Music in New York, the best. As she filled out the application form, and they asked for her citizenship, she turned to her mom and said: USA, right?

And her mom said: You know, we never filed any papers for you.

So the little girl said: What should we do?

And her mom said: We ought to call DURBIN.

So they called my office, thinking I could solve this. I found out the awful truth. Our laws currently say the only recourse for that little girl—who came here at the age of 2, who grew up in the United States, going to school here, saying the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag every morning, singing the only national anthem she knew, speaking the only language she knew—under our law could never be a U.S. citizen and had to leave our country.

What is wrong with this? Well, it is unfair. That is what is wrong. At 2 years of age, she had no voice in the decision of her family to come here. She had done everything right. All she was asking for, all she continues to ask for, is a chance to be part of the only country she has ever known, a country she dearly loves.

The DREAM Act gives young people that chance. It says: You can have a chance if you graduate high school, have no criminal record involving anything of a serious nature, if you are prepared go through and prove that you have been in the United States, came before the age of 16, been here at least 5 years, then you will have a chance to apply. If you apply, you have two ways that you can reach legal status in our country: Serve in our military, or complete at least 2 years of college. For thousands of young people across America, this is the only way to get them out of their current situation.

We just had a press conference with Senator HARRY REID and Senator BOB MENENDEZ, as well as Senator BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut to reintroduce this DREAM Act. At that press conference was a young woman who

told her story. Like thousands of others it is a compelling personal story. Her name is Tolu Olubunmi. She was born in Nigeria and brought to the United States as a child. She graduated her high school with honors. She was awarded a full scholarship to one of the Nation's top universities. In college, she was a leader: a peer counselor, a resident assistant, a volunteer in an abused women's shelter, and a research analyst in the department of engineering.

Tolu received a bachelor's degree in chemical engineering in 2002. But she has never been able to work 1 day as a chemical engineer in America because she is undocumented.

She cannot leave this country, because she could not return. She cannot get a job in this country because she is undocumented. Her whole life is focused on America. She is asking for a chance to be an engineer, to be a productive part of America, to move us forward as a nation. The DREAM Act would give her that chance.

When we introduced the bill today, we have 32 original cosponsors. We are hoping for more. We have the Democratic leadership, the Chairs of the Judiciary, Armed Services, and Homeland Security Committees, and all 10 Democratic members of the Judiciary Committee. I want to thank the lead sponsors over in the House: HOWARD BERMAN of California, LUIS GUTIERREZ, from my State of Illinois, and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida. Thanks to their leadership last year, the House passed the DREAM Act.

I want to especially thank the President. As a Senator and my colleague from Illinois, he was a cosponsor of this bill. He has been a strong supporter ever since. He never fails to mention the DREAM Act in his conversations with America about immigration. Yesterday, he said:

> These are kids who grew up in this country, love this country, and know no other place as home. The idea that we should punish them is cruel and it makes no sense. We are a better nation than that.

The President is right. This is a matter of simple justice. Thousands of immigrant students in America were brought here as children. It was not their decision to come here. But they grew up here and they called it home. The fundamental premise of the DREAM Act is an American premise. We do not hold children responsible for the wrongdoings of their parents.

These young people do not want a free pass. They do not want amnesty. All they want is a chance to earn their place in America. That is what the DREAM Act would give them. The DREAM Act would strengthen our national security, making thousands of young people eligible to serve. That is why the Department of Defense and Secretary Gates support it.

In fact, the Secretary said:

> There is a rich precedence supporting the service of non-citizens in the U.S. military. . . . The DREAM Act represents an opportunity to expand this pool to the advantage of military recruiting and readiness.

The first casualty in the war in Iraq was a Hispanic who was not a citizen of the United States, was not even a permanent resident of the United States. But he had volunteered to serve his country and gave his life. I think that shows the level of commitment these young people have to this great Nation.

A recent study at UCLA found that allowing the DREAM Act to pass would put so many productive young people into our economy, they will generate jobs, they will build businesses, they will help our economy grow.

I want to salute in your home State of New York, Madam President, Mayor Michael Bloomberg who has spoken out in support of the DREAM Act, and said:

> They are just the kind of immigrants we need to help solve our unemployment problem. Some of them will go on to create new small businesses and hire people. It is senseless for us to chase out the home-grown talent that has the potential to contribute so significantly to our society.

When you take a look at the supporters of the DREAM Act, they have such diverse backgrounds. They include business leaders such as Rupert Murdoch, and the CEOs of companies such as Microsoft and Pfizer.

There are some who oppose the DREAM Act and argue that we need to enhance border security first. I can certainly make the argument, as the President did yesterday, that we have done extraordinary things, more than doubling the number of people at the border, adding technical devices there to detect people who are trying to cross, using drones, building fences.

We have gone, I think, as far as I can imagine, but I am open—I told a Republican Senator this morning: I am open to any reasonable suggestion to make the border safer. But I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, if we show good faith in border enforcement, can you join us by showing good faith in helping to pass the DREAM Act? I do not think that is an unreasonable exchange. I am open to their ideas. I hope they are open to the idea of the DREAM Act.

I also have to say that many of the young people who are affected by this have been dramatically positive in their contribution to America. There are restrictions in the DREAM Act that prevent abuse. The DREAM Act students would not be eligible for Pell grants or other Federal grants, which means they are going to pay more to go to school.

DREAM Act students will be subject to tough criminal penalties for fraud, including a prison sentence of up to 5 years. No one is eligible for the DREAM Act unless they arrived in the United States at least 5 years before the bill becomes law, and there is no exception and no waiver.

Also the DREAM Act specifically includes a 1-year application deadline. An individual would be required to apply for conditional nonimmigrant status within 1 year of obtaining a high school degree or GED, or within 1 year of when the bill becomes law.

This is not an amnesty. On many occasions I have come to the floor to tell the personal stories of people who are involved. Their lives speak more eloquently than anything I can say on the floor. Let me tell you about Nelson and Jhon Magdaleno. They are brothers who came to the United States from Venezuela when Nelson was 11 and Jhon was 9. They were both honor students at Lakeside High School in Atlanta, GA. This is a picture of Nelson Magdaleno at graduation. Jhon, his brother, served with distinction in the Air Force Junior Officer Reserve Corps. He was the fourth highest ranking officer in a 175-officer cadet unit and commander of the Air Honor Society. Here is a picture of Jhon in his ROTC uniform in high school.

Both Jhon and Nelson are honor students at Georgia Tech University, a great school. It is one of the most selective engineering schools in America. Nelson, who is now 21, is a junior. He is a computer engineering major with a 3.6 GPA. Jhon, 18, is a freshman. He is a biomedical engineering major with a 4.0 GPA.

Let me ask my colleagues, can we afford to lose these two young people? Well, I guess we could but at great expense because their talent, their energy, their determination to make a contribution to America can make us a better nation. I don't think returning them to Venezuela, a country they have never called home, is going to be good for the United States.

John David Bunting, Nelson and Jhon's uncle, wrote me a letter about his nephews. Here is what he said:

> They will be able to give back so much to our country if they are allowed to stay. I am overwhelmed by my pride in them and how they have managed to persevere and even flourish under these circumstances. . . . I also have two young sons and I teach them about the incredible history of the United States and the way that our country can address wrongs committed in its name and come out of the process even stronger. Please help us.

Nelson and Jhon asked the Department of Homeland Security to stop their deportation proceedings. After I received their uncle's letter, I contacted the Department and asked them to consider this case. The Department has decided to grant a stay to Nelson and Jhon to give them a chance to continue their education. That was clearly the right thing to do.

Some have criticized the Obama administration for granting this kind of deferral action to a small number of DREAM Act students, but this is exactly what the Bush administration did. I wish to commend President George Bush, who was steadfast and consistent in his support of immigration reform.

It is a waste of limited resources to deport two fine engineering students from the United States, and it is entirely consistent with the law to grant them deferred action.

Let me tell my colleagues about another student, Pedro Pedroza. Here is his photograph. Pedro was brought to Chicago from Mexico when he was 5 years old. He graduated from St. Agnes Catholic School in Little Village, a great part of our city of Chicago. He was an honor student at St. Ignatius College Prep, one of the best schools in Chicago. He is now a student in New York at Cornell University in Ithaca. His goal is to become a teacher.

Do we need teachers with his qualities? You bet we do, not just in New York but in Illinois and across America. But, unfortunately, Pedro is in deportation proceedings. He was riding a bus from Chicago back to school in New York when immigration agents arrested him. He has asked the Department of Homeland Security to grant him a stay, and I hope they will. It makes no sense to send someone like Pedro, who has so much to contribute, to a country he barely remembers.

Here is what he wrote to me in a letter:

> Mexico is not only unfamiliar to me, but leaving the U.S. means leaving everything and everyone I know. I only hope I can have a future in the U.S. for as long as I am here. Even if I am left no choice but to leave for Mexico, I would still strive to adjust my status and return to a place I consider home—The United States of America.

The last photograph I wish to show is Steve Li. This is his photograph. His parents brought him to the United States when he was 11 years old. He is a student at the City College of San Francisco where he has majored in nursing and is a leader in student government. He wrote a letter:

> My dream is to become a registered nurse at San Francisco General Hospital and be a public health advocate. I want to give back to my community by raising awareness about preventive care and other health care issues. I am well on my way to achieving that dream. By passing the DREAM Act, I will be able to achieve these goals and contribute to the growing health care industry.

So can we use more health care professionals? You bet we could. Nurses, we need a lot of them. In fact, the United States imports thousands of foreign nurses each year in this country because we just don't have enough.

Unfortunately, Steve Li is also in deportation proceedings. His case is especially complicated because while his parents are Chinese, he was born in Peru. So he could be deported back to Peru where he knows no one and has no family members.

Senator FEINSTEIN asked the Department of Homeland Security to consider his case. They have given him a temporary stay, for now.

I first introduced the DREAM Act 10 years ago. Since then, I have met so many immigrant students who would qualify for it. When I first brought up this bill I used to have meetings in Chicago. After the meetings, without fail there would be someone waiting for me outside. Sometimes in the dark of night they would be standing by my car. They were always young and most of them had tears in their eyes, and they would say to me: Senator DURBIN, please pass the DREAM Act. It is my life.

Times have changed. Ten years of effort, even passing it with a majority, hasn't resulted in this becoming a law because of the Republican filibuster. Times have changed to the point where the DREAM Act students are now stepping up and saying: Here we are. This is who we are. We are not going to hide in the shadows anymore.

When we debated that bill on the floor of the Senate last December, the galleries were filled with students wearing graduation gowns and caps, waiting, praying for the vote, and it failed. They left, many of them crying. They went downstairs, and I met with them. They couldn't have felt worse. They just don't know where to turn. They are being rejected by the only country they have ever known, the only place they have ever called home.

I said to them: I am not giving up on you. Don't give up on me. We are going to keep working on this.

We reintroduced the bill today. I thank my colleagues who have already cosponsored it. I urge and plead with others who have not for simple justice and fairness. Give these young people a chance. That is all they are asking for.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me express my great appreciation to Senator DURBIN of Illinois for his many years of leadership on this issue. I am very proud to be a cosponsor of his legislation, and I look forward to passing this bill.

I am reminded of the story in the Bible of Joshua at Jericho. It was not the first time around Jericho that the horns of Joshua and his Israelite Army brought down the walls. If I recall the Bible correctly, it was seven times around those walls before they came tumbling down, but tumble down is what they did.

I look forward to joining the Joshua of this crusade, Senator DURBIN, to go around those walls as long as it takes in order to get the DREAM Act passed.

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. 952

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 ''Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act of 2011''or the ''DREAM Act of 2011''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Sec. 3. Conditional permanent resident status for certain long-term residents who entered the United States as children.
Sec. 4. Terms of conditional permanent resident status.
Sec. 5. Removal of conditional basis of permanent resident status.
Sec. 6. Regulations.
Sec. 7. Penalties for false statements.
Sec. 8. Confidentiality of information.
Sec. 9. Higher education assistance.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, a term used in this Act that is used in the immigration laws shall have the meaning given such term in the immigration laws.

(2) IMMIGRATION LAWS.—The term ''immigration laws'' has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17)).

(3) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002), except that the term does not include an institution of higher education outside the United States.

(4) SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(5) UNIFORMED SERVICES.—The term ''Uniformed Services'' has the meaning given the term ''uniformed services'' in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR CERTAIN LONG-TERM RESIDENTS WHO ENTERED THE UNITED STATES AS CHILDREN.

(a) CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR STATUS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an alien shall be considered, at the time of obtaining the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence under this section, to have obtained such status on a conditional basis subject to the provisions of this Act.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may cancel removal of, and adjust to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence on a conditional basis, an alien who is inadmissible or deportable from the United States or is in temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a), if the alien demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence that—

(A) the alien has been continuously physically present in the United States since the date that is 5 years before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) the alien was 15 years of age or younger on the date the alien initially entered the United States;

(C) the alien has been a person of good moral character since the date the alien initially entered the United States;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), the alien—

(i) is not inadmissible under paragraph (2), (3), (6)(E), (6)(G), (8), (10)(A), (10)(C), or (10)(D) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a));

(ii) has not ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; and

(iii) has not been convicted of—

(I) any offense under Federal or State law punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of more than 1 year; or

(II) 3 or more offenses under Federal or State law, for which the alien was convicted on different dates for each of the 3 offenses and imprisoned for an aggregate of 90 days or more;

(E) the alien—

(i) has been admitted to an institution of higher education in the United States; or

(ii) has earned a high school diploma or obtained a general education development certificate in the United States; and

(F) the alien was 35 years of age or younger on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) WAIVER.—With respect to any benefit under this Act, the Secretary may waive the grounds of inadmissibility under paragraph (6)(E), (6)(G), or (10)(D) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)) for humanitarian purposes or family unity or when it is otherwise in the public interest.

(3) SUBMISSION OF BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC DATA.—The Secretary may not grant permanent resident status on a conditional basis to an alien under this section unless the alien submits biometric and biographic data, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide an alternative procedure for applicants who are unable to provide such biometric or biographic data because of a physical impairment.

(4) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

(A) REQUIREMENT FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Secretary shall utilize biometric, biographic, and other data that the Secretary determines is appropriate—

(i) to conduct security and law enforcement background checks of an alien seeking permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section; and

(ii) to determine whether there is any criminal, national security, or other factor that would render the alien ineligible for such status.

(B) COMPLETION OF BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The security and law enforcement background checks required by subparagraph (A) for an alien shall be completed, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, prior to the date the Secretary grants permanent resident status on a conditional basis to the alien.

(5) MEDICAL EXAMINATION.—An alien applying for permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section shall undergo a medical examination. The Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall prescribe policies and procedures for the nature and timing of such examination.

(6) MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE.—An alien applying for permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section shall establish that the alien has registered under the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.), if the alien is subject to such registration under that Act.

(c) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PRESENCE.—

(1) TERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PERIOD.—Any period of continuous physical presence in the United States of an alien who applies for permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section shall not terminate when the alien is served a notice to appear under section 239(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229(a)).

(2) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN BREAKS IN PRESENCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An alien shall be considered to have failed to maintain continuous physical presence in the United States under subsection (b)(1)(A) if the alien has departed from the United States for any period in excess of 90 days or for any periods in the aggregate exceeding 180 days.

(B) EXTENSIONS FOR EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary may extend the time periods described in subparagraph (A) for an alien if the alien demonstrates that the failure to timely return to the United States was due to extenuating circumstances beyond the alien's control.

(d) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien seeking lawful permanent resident status on a conditional basis shall file an application for such status in such manner as the Secretary may require.

(2) DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.—An alien shall submit an application for relief under this section not later than the date that is 1 year after the later of—

(A) the date the alien earned a high school diploma or obtained a general education development certificate in the United States; or

(B) the effective date of the final regulations issued pursuant to section 6.

(e) LIMITATION ON REMOVAL OF CERTAIN ALIENS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary or the Attorney General may not remove an alien who—

(A) has a pending application for relief under this section; and

(B) establishes prima facie eligibility for relief under this section.

(2) CERTAIN ALIENS ENROLLED IN PRIMARY OR SECONDARY SCHOOL.—

(A) STAY OF REMOVAL.—The Attorney General shall stay the removal proceedings of an alien who—

(i) meets all the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (F) of subsection (b)(1);

(ii) is at least 5 years of age; and

(iii) is enrolled full-time in a primary or secondary school.

(B) ALIENS NOT IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—If an alien is not in removal proceedings, the Secretary shall not commence such proceedings with respect to the alien if the alien is described in clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (A).

(C) EMPLOYMENT.—An alien whose removal is stayed pursuant to subparagraph (A) or who may not be placed in removal proceedings pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall, upon application to the Secretary, be granted an employment authorization document.

(D) LIFT OF STAY.—The Secretary or Attorney General may lift the stay granted to an alien under subparagraph (A) if the alien—

(i) is no longer enrolled in a primary or secondary school; or

(ii) ceases to meet the requirements of such paragraph.

(f) EXEMPTION FROM NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this section or in any other law may be construed to apply a numerical limitation on the number of aliens who may be eligible for adjustment of status under this Act.

SEC. 4. TERMS OF CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.

(a) PERIOD OF STATUS.—Permanent resident status on a conditional basis granted under this Act is—

(1) valid for a period of 6 years, unless such period is extended by the Secretary; and

(2) subject to termination under subsection (c).

(b) NOTICE OF REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) AT TIME OF OBTAINING STATUS.—At the time an alien obtains permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this Act, the Secretary shall provide for notice to the alien regarding the provisions of this Act and the requirements to have the conditional basis of such status removed.

(2) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICE.—The failure of the Secretary to provide a notice under this subsection—

(A) shall not affect the enforcement of the provisions of this Act with respect to the alien; and

(B) shall not give rise to any private right of action by the alien.

(c) TERMINATION OF STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall terminate the conditional permanent resident status of an alien, if the Secretary determines that the alien—

(A) ceases to meet the requirements of subparagraph (C) or (D) of section 3(b)(1); or

(B) was discharged from the Uniformed Services and did not receive an honorable discharge.

(d) RETURN TO PREVIOUS IMMIGRATION STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an alien whose permanent resident status on a conditional basis expires under subsection (a)(1) or is terminated under subsection (c) or whose application for such status is denied shall return to the immigration status the alien had immediately prior to receiving permanent resident status on a conditional basis or applying for such status, as appropriate.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS.—In the case of an alien whose permanent resident status on a conditional basis expires under subsection (a)(1) or is terminated under subsection (c) or whose application for such status is denied and who had temporary protected status immediately prior to receiving or applying for such status, as appropriate, the alien may not return to temporary protected status if—

(A) the relevant designation under section 244(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(b)) has been terminated; or

(B) the Secretary determines that the reason for terminating the permanent resident status on a conditional basis renders the alien ineligible for temporary protected status.

(e) INFORMATION SYSTEMS.—The Secretary shall use the information systems of the Department of Homeland Security to maintain current information on the identity, address, and immigration status of aliens granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this Act.

SEC. 5. REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS OF PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may remove the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status granted under this Act if the alien demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence that—

(A) the alien has been a person of good moral character during the entire period of conditional permanent resident status;

(B) the alien is described in section 3(b)(1)(D);

(C) the alien has not abandoned the alien's residence in the United States;

(D) the alien—

(i) has acquired a degree from an institution of higher education in the United States or has completed at least 2 years, in good standing, in a program for a bachelor's degree or higher degree in the United States; or

(ii) has served in the Uniformed Services for at least 2 years and, if discharged, received an honorable discharge; and

(E) the alien has provided a list of each secondary school (as that term is defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)) that the alien attended in the United States.

(2) HARDSHIP EXCEPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, in the Secretary's discretion, remove the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status if the alien—

(i) satisfies the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (E) of paragraph (1);

(ii) demonstrates compelling circumstances for the inability to satisfy the requirements of subparagraph (D) of such paragraph; and

(iii) demonstrates that the alien's removal from the United States would result in extreme hardship to the alien or the alien's spouse, parent, or child who is a citizen or a lawful permanent resident of the United States.

(B) EXTENSION.—Upon a showing of good cause, the Secretary may extend the period of permanent resident status on a conditional basis for an alien so that the alien may complete the requirements of subparagraph (D) of paragraph (1).

(3) TREATMENT OF ABANDONMENT OR RESIDENCE.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(C), an alien—

(A) shall be presumed to have abandoned the alien's residence in the United States if the alien is absent from the United States for more than 365 days, in the aggregate, during the alien's period of conditional permanent resident status, unless the alien demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the alien has not abandoned such residence; and

(B) who is absent from the United States due to active service in the Uniformed Services has not abandoned the alien's residence in the United States during the period of such service.

(4) CITIZENSHIP REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status may not be removed unless the alien demonstrates that the alien satisfies the requirements of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a)).

(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an alien who is unable because of a physical or developmental disability or mental impairment to meet the requirements of such subparagraph.

(5) SUBMISSION OF BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC DATA.—The Secretary may not remove the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status unless the alien submits biometric and biographic data, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide an alternative procedure for applicants who are unable to provide such biometric data because of a physical impairment.

(6) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

(A) REQUIREMENT FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Secretary shall utilize biometric, biographic, and other data that the Secretary determines appropriate—

(i) to conduct security and law enforcement background checks of an alien applying for removal of the conditional basis of the alien's permanent resident status; and

(ii) to determine whether there is any criminal, national security, or other factor that would render the alien ineligible for removal of such conditional basis.

(B) COMPLETION OF BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The security and law enforcement background checks required by subparagraph (A) for an alien shall be completed, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, prior to the date the Secretary removes the conditional basis of the alien's permanent resident status.

(b) APPLICATION TO REMOVE CONDITIONAL BASIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien seeking to have the conditional basis of the alien's lawful permanent resident status removed shall file an application for such removal in such manner as the Secretary may require.

(2) DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An alien shall file an application under this subsection during the period beginning 6 months prior to and ending on the date that is later of—

(i) 6 years after the date the alien was initially granted conditional permanent resident status; or

(ii) any other expiration date of the alien's conditional permanent resident status, as extended by the Secretary in accordance with this Act.

(B) STATUS DURING PENDENCY.—An alien shall be deemed to have permanent resident status on a conditional basis during the period that the alien's application submitted under this subsection is pending.

(3) ADJUDICATION OF APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make a determination on each application filed by an alien under this subsection as to whether the alien meets the requirements for removal of the conditional basis of the alien's permanent resident status.

(B) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS IF FAVORABLE DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary determines that the alien meets such requirements, the Secretary shall notify the alien of such determination and remove the conditional basis of the alien's permanent resident status, effective as of the date of such determination.

(C) TERMINATION IF ADVERSE DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary determines that the alien does not meet such requirements, the Secretary shall notify the alien of such determination and, if the period of the alien's conditional permanent resident status under section 4(a)(1) has ended, terminate the conditional permanent resident status granted the alien under this Act as of the date of such determination.

(c) TREATMENT FOR PURPOSES OF NATURALIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), an alien granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this Act shall be considered to have been admitted as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence and to be in the United States as an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

(2) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION FOR NATURALIZATION.—An alien may not apply for naturalization during the period that the alien is in permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this Act.

SEC. 6. REGULATIONS.

(a) INITIAL PUBLICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish regulations implementing this Act. Such regulations shall allow eligible individuals to apply affirmatively for the relief available under section 3 without being placed in removal proceedings.

(b) INTERIM REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the regulations required by subsection (a) shall be effective, on an interim basis, immediately upon publication but may be subject to change and revision after public notice and opportunity for a period of public comment.

(c) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Within a reasonable time after publication of the interim regulations in accordance with subsection (b), the Secretary shall publish final regulations implementing this Act.

(d) PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—The requirements of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Paperwork Reduction Act'') shall not apply to any action to implement this Act.

SEC. 7. PENALTIES FOR FALSE STATEMENTS.

Whoever files an application for any relief or benefit under this Act and willfully and knowingly falsifies, misrepresents, or conceals a material fact or makes any false or fraudulent statement or representation, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

SEC. 8. CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no officer or employee of the United States may—

(1) use the information furnished by an individual pursuant to an application filed under this Act in removal proceedings against any person identified in the application;

(2) make any publication whereby the information furnished by any particular individual pursuant to an application under this Act can be identified; or

(3) permit anyone other than an officer, employee or authorized contractor of the United States Government or, in the case of an application filed under this Act with a designated entity, that designated entity, to examine such application filed under such sections.

(b) REQUIRED DISCLOSURE.—The Attorney General or the Secretary shall provide the information furnished under this Act, and any other information derived from such furnished information, to—

(1) a Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency, intelligence agency, national security agency, component of the Department of Homeland Security, court, or grand jury in connection with a criminal investigation or prosecution, a background check conducted pursuant to section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Protection Act (Public Law 103–159; 18 U.S.C. 922 note), or national security purposes, if such information is requested by such entity or consistent with an information sharing agreement or mechanism; or

(2) an official coroner for purposes of affirmatively identifying a deceased individual (whether or not such individual is deceased as a result of a crime).

(c) FRAUD IN APPLICATION PROCESS OR CRIMINAL CONDUCT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, information concerning whether an alien seeking relief under this Act has engaged in fraud in an application for such relief or at any time committed a crime may be used or released for immigration enforcement, law enforcement, or national security purposes.

(d) PENALTY.—Whoever knowingly uses, publishes, or permits information to be examined in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $10,000.

SEC. 9. HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), with respect to assistance provided under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), an alien who has permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this Act shall be eligible only for the following assistance under such title:

(1) Student loans under parts D and E of such title IV (20 U.S.C. 1087a et seq. and 1087aa et seq.), subject to the requirements of such parts.

(2) Federal work-study programs under part C of such title IV (42 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), subject to the requirements of such part.

(3) Services under such title IV (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), subject to the requirements for such services.

(b) RESTORATION OF STATE OPTION TO DETERMINE RESIDENCY FOR PURPOSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 505 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1623) is repealed.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal under paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Illegal Immigration

Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–546).

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 954. A bill to promote the strengthening of the Haitian private sector; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation that will lead to the establishment of the Haitian-American Enterprise Fund. The Haitian-American Enterprise Fund bill authorizes the Administration to allocate, from existing resources, such sums as required to create the Fund. The mission of the Fund will be to help empower Haiti's private sector to create jobs, which will contribute towards achieving long-term social stability and economic growth.

Last month, I asked six of the most distinguished directors of the former enterprise funds in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union to travel to Haiti to evaluate the current status of Haiti's private sector, the scope of U.S. Government efforts targeting sustainable job creation, and the role, if any, an enterprise fund might play there in promoting economic growth. Led by Kim Davis, a founder of the private equity firm Charlesbank Capital Partners, each member of the Delegation has had a very successful private sector career and each traveled to Haiti, at his or her own expense, in order to provide the Congress an experienced perspective as to whether proven economic growth strategies they employed to strengthen other fragile countries might work in Haiti. They were also asked to describe what immediate actions they would recommend, if any, to jump-start Haiti's private sector, with a particular emphasis on entrepreneurship, and other initiatives that could assist Haiti in its necessary transition to a nation with a middle class and a market economy.

In a recent letter to me, Haitian President-elect Michel Martelly noted he is fully supportive of efforts to create an enterprise fund for Haiti. Enterprise funds have historically filled important voids in the nascent capital markets of fragile economies. President-elect Martelly has indicated a keen interest in creating an enterprise fund in order to generate lending vehicles for mortgages and agricultural loans—as housing and agricultural production rank among his top priorities. There are many other voids in Haiti's economy that have been identified, which previous enterprise funds have effectively worked to address in other countries.

The Delegation's report makes clear that enterprise funds are not silver bullets. However, at a time when we face significant domestic and global economic challenges, the enterprise fund model, if implemented effectively, provides a proven vehicle by which the U.S. Government can leverage the extensive intellectual and financial capital of the American business community in order to help address these challenges in underdeveloped economies such as that of Haiti. As an example, the Polish Fund received a USG grant of $240 million in 1990 and used that to attract more than $2.3 billion to Poland over the next several years.

Since Senator LEAHY and I introduced legislation authorizing the creation of an enterprise fund for Haiti in April 2010, the Administration has requested that enterprise funds also be created for Pakistan, Egypt, Tunisia and Jordan. Such keen interest in utilizing the enterprise fund model for advancing sustainable economic growth is welcomed. Empowering a group of U.S. citizens who understand democratic capitalism to help translate our foreign assistance strategies into practical actions will complement the important work performed by our capable diplomats and development experts.

The May 14, 2011 inauguration of Mr. Martelly as President of Haiti provides an opportunity to start anew. Congress should aide the President-elect in this important effort by honoring his request for the creation of a Haitian-American Enterprise Fund. I ask for your support on passage of this bill.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 957. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code to improve the provision of rehabilitative services for veterans with traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, traumatic brain injury, TBI, is becoming an increasingly common injury on the modern battlefield. Thankfully, because of advances in medicine, servicemembers who would not have been expected to survive catastrophic attacks in previous conflicts are returning home today from combat in Iraq and Afghanistan with unprecedented severe and complex injuries. Since 2001, over 1,500 service members have suffered from a severe TBI, many of whom require rehabilitative programs ranging from total care for the most basic needs to semi-independent living support. A restrictive approach to rehabilitation puts these wounded warriors at risk of losing any progress they made towards recovery. For this reason, my colleague, Senator MARK BEGICH of Alaska, and I are introducing the Veterans' Traumatic Brain Injury Rehabilitative Services' Improvements Act of 2011. I would also like to thank my House colleagues, Rep. TIM WALZ of Minnesota and Rep. GUS BILIRAKIS of Florida, for their support and leadership on the House companion version of this legislation.

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. 957

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Veterans' Traumatic Brain Injury Rehabilitative Services' Improvements Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. REHABILITATIVE SERVICES FOR VETERANS WITH TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

(a) REHABILITATION SERVICES IN PLANS FOR REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION.—Section 1710C of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting before the semicolon the following: ''with the goal of maximizing the individual's independence and quality of life'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting after ''improving'' the following: ''(and sustaining improvement in)'';

(ii) by inserting ''behavioral,'' after ''cognitive'';

(iii) by inserting ''and mental health'' after ''functioning''; and

(iv) by inserting '', quality of life,'' after ''independence'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''rehabilitative services and'' before ''rehabilitative components''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''treatments'' the first place it appears and inserting ''services''; and

(ii) by striking ''treatments and'' the second place it appears; and

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

''(h) REHABILITATIVE SERVICES DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, and sections 1710D and 1710E of this title, the term 'rehabilitative services' includes—

''(1) rehabilitative services, as such term is defined in section 1701 of this title;

''(2) services (which may be of ongoing duration) to sustain, and prevent loss of, functional gains that have been achieved; and

''(3) any other services or supports that may contribute to maximizing an individual's independence and quality of life.''.

(b) REHABILITATION SERVICES IN COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM FOR LONG-TERM REHABILITATION.—Section 1710D(a) of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and rehabilitative services (as defined in section 1710C of this title)'' after ''long-term care''; and

(2) by striking ''treatment''.

(c) REHABILITATION SERVICES IN AUTHORITY FOR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS FOR USE OF NON-DEPARTMENT FACILITIES FOR REHABILITATION.—Section 1710E(a) of such title is amended by inserting '', including rehabilitative services (as defined in section 1710C of this title),'' after ''medical services''.

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 1710C(c)(2)(S) of such title is amended by striking ''opthamologist'' and inserting ''ophthalmologist''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 179—TO CONSTITUTE THE MINORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 179

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mrs. Hutchison, Ms. Snowe, Mr. DeMint, Mr. Thune, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Ayotte, and Mr. Heller.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Risch, Mr. Lee, Mr. Paul, Mr. Coats, Mr. Portman, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Heller, and Mr. Corker.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Hatch, Mr. Grassley, Ms. Snowe, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Coburn, Mr. Thune, and Mr. Burr.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Ms. Collins, Mr. Coburn, Mr. Brown (Massachusetts), Mr. McCain, Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin), Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul, and Mr. Moran.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Sessions, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Graham, Mr. Thune, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin), and Ms. Ayotte.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Mr. Corker, Ms. Collins, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Heller, Mr. Moran, Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin), Mr. Shelby, Mr. Graham, and Mr. Chambliss.

SENATE RESOLUTION 180—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR PEACEFUL DEMONSTRATIONS AND UNIVERSAL FREEDOMS IN SYRIA AND CONDEMNING THE HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS BY THE ASSAD REGIME

Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KYL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 180

Whereas, in March 2011, large-scale peaceful demonstrations began to take place in Syria;

Whereas the Government of Syria, led by President Bashar al-Assad, responded to protests by launching a violent crackdown, committing human rights abuses, and violating its international obligations, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;

Whereas demonstrations have now spread to more than a dozen towns and cities across all parts of Syria;

Whereas demonstrators initially demanded political reform, but under violent attack by the Government of Syria, have increasingly demanded a change in the Syrian regime;

Whereas Insan, a respected international nongovernmental organization, has documented more than 600 deaths since demonstrations began in Syria, and reported that ''arbitrary detained and enforceable disappearance in the country easily exceeds 8,000 people'';

Whereas the Government of Syria has deployed tanks and snipers against civilian population centers, including the cities of Daraa and Baniyas, and the Damascus suburbs of Douma, Harasta, Saqba, and Zabadani;

Whereas the Government of Syria has cut off civilian population centers from access to food, water, electricity, mobile and land lines, Internet, and medical services;

Whereas several respected international human rights organizations, including Human Rights Watch and the Damascus Center for Human Rights Studies, have documented a nationwide campaign of arbitrary arrests and enforced disappearances of activists, protesters, and their family members, by the Government of Syria;

Whereas the International Crisis Group, an independent international nongovernmental organization, reported on May 3, 2011, that there is ''ongoing, credible evidence'' in Syria of ''abundant instances of excessive and indiscriminate state violence. . . including arbitrary arrests, torture and firing into peaceful crowds'';

Whereas the International Crisis Group has also reported a ''determined and cynical attempt to exploit and exacerbate'' sectarian tensions by the Government of Syria;

Whereas, despite sectarian provocations by the Government of Syria, demonstrations have maintained a message of national unity and solidarity;

Whereas, on April 15, 2011, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial executions, Christof Heyns, stated that live ammunition has been used by the Syrian regime against demonstrators ''in clear violation of international law'';

Whereas international organizations, including Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, have documented evidence that peaceful protestors detained by Government of Syria security forces are being subjected to torture, including with electroshock devices, cables, sticks, and whips, and are being held in overcrowded cells, deprived of sleep, food, and water for days at a time;

Whereas international non-governmental organizations, including the International Committee on the Red Cross and Human Rights Watch, have reported that Government of Syria security forces have prevented injured protesters from accessing hospitals and have denied medical personnel and humanitarian relief organizations access to those in need of medical attention;

Whereas the Government of Iran is providing material support to assist the Government of Syria in its efforts to suppress peaceful protestors, including the transfer of equipment to help security forces crack down on protests and curtail and monitor protesters' use of the Internet, cell phones, and text-messaging;

Whereas the White House Press Secretary has repeatedly condemned the Government of Syria's brutal crackdown, including on May 6, 2011, when he stated, ''The Syrian government continues to follow the lead of its Iranian ally in resorting to brute force and flagrant violations of human rights in suppressing peaceful protests.'';

Whereas the Department of State has repeatedly condemned the Government of Syria's brutal crackdown, including on May 6, 2011, when Secretary of State Hillary Clinton condemned ''in the strongest possible terms'' the Government of Syria's continued use of force and intimidation against peaceful protestors and pledged to ''hold to account senior Syrian officials and others responsible for the reprehensible human rights abuses'';

Whereas, on April 29, 2011, President Obama issued an Executive Order authorizing targeted sanctions against individuals and organizations responsible for the human rights abuses in Syria;

Whereas President Obama on April 29, 2011, designated 3 individuals pursuant to the Executive Order issued that same day: Mahir al-Assad, the brother of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad and brigade commander in the Syrian Army's 4th Armored Division; Atif Najib, the former head of the Political Security Directorate for Daraa Province and a cousin of Bashar al-Assad; and Ali Mamluk, director of Syria's General Intelligence Directorate;

Whereas, on May 6, 2011, envoys of the European Union's 27 nations agreed to impose sanctions on the Government of Syria for the human rights abuses it is perpetrating, including asset freezes and visa bans on 13 members of the Government of Syria and an arms embargo on the country;

Whereas, on April 29, 2011, the United Nations Human Rights Council passed Resolution S-16/1, which condemns the Syrian regime for its human rights abuses and establishes a mandate for an international inquiry led by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to investigate all alleged violations of international human rights law in Syria ''with a view to avoiding impunity and ensuring full accountability'';

Whereas the Government of Syria, prior to March 2011, had a well-documented track record of human rights abuses against its own citizens and violations of international agreements and international law;

Whereas, in February 1982, the Syrian army, under the orders of then-Syrian President Hafez al-Assad, killed at least 10,000 civilians in the city of Hama in an effort to quell an uprising there;

Whereas, according to the Department of State's most recent Human Rights Country Report, published on April 8, 2011, the Government of Syria commits unlawful killings against civilians; has severely and systematically restricted basic freedoms of speech, press, assembly, association, and religion; is responsible for ongoing politically motivated arrests, detentions, and disappearances; lacks an independent judiciary system; and maintains prisons where torture and physical abuse are widespread and where detainees lack access to food, proper clothing, and medical treatment;

Whereas the Department of State has designated Syria since 1979 as a ''state sponsor of terrorism'' and according to the Department of State's most recent ''Country Reports on Terrorism,'' published in August 2010, the Government of Syria provides ''political and material support to Hizballah in Lebanon and allowed Iran to resupply this organization with weapons'';

Whereas the Government of Syria's transfer of weapons to Hizballah in Lebanon is in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701 (2006), which established an arms embargo requiring all states to prevent the supply of arms and weapons to militias and terrorists in Lebanon;

Whereas the Government of Syria has violated the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon in contravention of United Nations Security Council resolutions, including Resolution 425 (1978), Resolution 520 (1982), and Resolution 1701 (2006);

Whereas Syria, as a party to the Treaty of the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, is legally bound to declare all its nuclear activity to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and to place such activity under the monitoring of the IAEA;

Whereas the IAEA issued a report on February 25, 2011, criticizing Syria's implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement, concluding that ''Syria has not cooperated with the Agency since June 2008'' in connection with the Agency's investigation of the Dair Alzour site and 3 other locations'' and warning that ''the Agency has not been able to make progress towards resolving the outstanding issues related to those sites'';

Whereas it has been widely reported that the Government of Syria was developing a covert nuclear program, in violation of its international obligations under the NPT, until that site was bombed by Israel in September 2007; and

Whereas, on December 12, 2003, Congress passed the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–175) in order to, among other purposes, hold the Government of Syria accountable for its actions and as expression of support consistent with these aims: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses solidarity and support for the people of Syria as they seek to exercise universal rights and pursue peaceful democratic change;

(2) strongly condemns and deplores the human rights abuses of the Government of Syria, including the use of arbitrary and lethal violence and deployment of military forces against peaceful demonstrators;

(3) strongly condemns and deplores the Government of Syria's extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, torture, and arbitrary and mass arrests against civilians in Syria;

(4) strongly condemns and deplores the deliberate cut-off of water, electricity, food, telecommunications, and other basic services to civilian population centers in Syria;

(5) strongly condemns the Government of Iran for assisting the Government of Syria in its campaign of violence and repression against the people of Syria;

(6) warns that international crimes are being committed by the Government of Syria against its people, for which the responsible officials must be held accountable;

(7) finds that the Government of Syria, led by Bashar al-Assad, through its campaign of violence and gross human rights abuses, has lost legitimacy and expresses support for the people of Syria to determine their future for themselves;

(8) commends President Obama for authorizing targeted sanctions on human rights abusers in Syria, including United States visa bans and asset freezes, and using that authority to designate 3 individuals;

(9) urges the President to act swiftly to expand the list of sanctioned persons to include all individuals responsible for gross human rights abuses in Syria, including Bashar al-Assad;

(10) urges the President to speak out directly, and personally, to the people of Syria about the situation in their country;

(11) urges the President to work, in conjunction with international partners, to ensure access of humanitarian relief organizations, medical workers, and international media to affected areas of Syria, and to impose consequences on the Government of Syria and its leaders if access by these organizations continues to be impeded;

(12) urges the President to work, in conjunction with international partners, to ensure access by the people of Syria to accurate news and information, as well as information and social networking technologies;

(13) urges the President to continue to work with the European Union, the Government of Turkey, the Arab League, the Gulf Cooperation Council, and other allies and partners to bring an end to human rights abuses in Syria, hold the perpetrators accountable, and support the aspirations of the people of Syria;

(14) encourages United States officials, including through the United States Embassy in Damascus, to engage with civil society in Syria, including human rights and democracy activists, political dissidents, and opposition leaders;

(15) urges the President to work with our allies and partners at the United Nations Security Council to condemn and hold accountable human rights abusers in Syria and to support the human rights of the people of Syria; and

(16) urges the United Nations Human Rights Council—

(A) to swiftly implement United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution S-16/1 and to ensure that the international investigation into violations by the Government of Syria of international human rights law called for in the resolution is undertaken immediately; and

(B) reinforce the crucial need for the United Nations General Assembly to reject Syria's candidacy for membership on the Human Rights Council and terminate the consideration of Syria's candidacy.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 11, 2011, at 2 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 11, 2011, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Diverting Non-urgent Emergency Room Use: Can It Provide Better Care and Lower Costs?'' on May 11, 2011, at 10 a.m., in 430 Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. HARKIN. 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 May 11, 2011, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 11, 2011, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH AND CENTRAL AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 11, 2011, at 10 a.m., to hold a Near Eastern and South and Central Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, ''Human Rights and Democratic Reform in Iran.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy, and Consumer Rights be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 11, 2011, at 10:15 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The AT&T/T-Mobile Merger: Is Humpty Dumpty Being Put Back Together Again?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 11, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 11, 2011, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 11, 2011, at 1:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1 p.m., Thursday, May 12, 2011, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 47 on the Executive Calendar; that there be 1 hour for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote, without intervening action or debate, on Calendar No. 47; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 179, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 179) to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, or until their successors are chosen.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 179) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 179

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mrs. Hutchison, Ms. Snowe, Mr. DeMint, Mr. Thune, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Ayotte, and Mr. Heller.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Risch, Mr. Lee, Mr. Paul, Mr. Coats, Mr. Portman, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Heller and Mr. Corker.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Hatch, Mr. Grassley, Ms. Snowe, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Coburn, Mr. Thune and Mr. Burr.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Ms. Collins, Mr. Coburn, Mr. Brown (Massachusetts), Mr. McCain, Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin), Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul and Mr. Moran.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Sessions, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Graham, Mr. Thune, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, and Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin), and Ms. Ayotte.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Mr. Corker, Ms. Collins, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Heller, Mr. Moran, Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin), Mr. Shelby, Mr. Graham, and Mr. Chambliss.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 953

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that S. 953, introduced earlier today by Senator MCCONNELL, is at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 953) to authorize the conduct of certain lease sales in the Outer Continental Shelf, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to modify the requirements for exploration, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for its second reading but object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy: the Honorable JOHN HOEVEN of North Dakota (Committee on Appropriations) and the Honorable LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina (At Large).

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 12, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, May 12, at 9:30 a.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for debate only until 1 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the first hour divided and controlled between the leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the next 30 minutes; and that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be a rollcall vote around 2 p.m. tomorrow on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 47, the nomination of Michael Urbanski, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Virginia.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:34 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 12, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

RICHARD G. ANDREWS, OF DELAWARE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE, VICE JOSEPH J. FARNAN, JR., RETIRED.

CATHY ANN BENCIVENGO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE JEFFREY T. MILLER, RETIRED.

JEFFREY J. HELMICK, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO, VICE JAMES G. CARR, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WILLIAM J. BURNS, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE WITH THE PERSONAL RANK OF CAREER AMBASSADOR, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE, VICE JAMES BRAIDY STEINBERG.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING CANDIDATES FOR PERSONNEL ACTION IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE COMMISSIONED CORPS OF THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFORE AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS:

To be senior assistant surgeon

MANISHA PATEL

To be nurse officer

LISA L. GILLIAM

To be senior assistant nurse officer

DEANA M. FOSTER
CHRISTOPHER P. HAYNES
FRANCISCO J. MARI-LASSALLE
SONYA L. MCNEIL
LINSEY M. MILLER
FILITA O. MOORE
KRISTINA D. SERBY

To be assistant nurse officer

SARAH K. BREWSTER
JEREMIE D. GREGORY
MATTHEW A. MADRID
SUDHIR S. PERAKATHU

To be junior assistant nurse officer

HAYDEE C. CRUZ
JACQUELINE S. GARDINER
CRYSTAL J. HOWARD
AMANDA J. RAMIREZ
JUSTIN D. TAFOYA

To be senior assistant engineer officer

STANLEY B. EUGENE

To be junior assistant engineer officer

CHRISTOPHER J. PELTIER

To be scientist officer

RAGHU N. SAMY

To be senior assistant scientist officer

IRAM R. HASSAN
TAMARA J. HENDERSON
DAVID T. HUANG
MICHELLE RODRIGUEZ

To be senior assistant environmental health officer

DANIEL D. ADAMS

To be junior assistant environmental health officer

ALEXA M. DEPTOLA
CYRAJ M. EL-BAKOUSH
KRISTA S. TUGGLE

To be pharmicist officer

ELENI Z. ANAGNOSTIADIS
MARIA D. ANTONUCCI
JUDY J. PARK
MELINDA M. WILSON

To be senior assistant pharmacist officer

JORI L. BAILEY
RAICHELL S. BROWN
ANDREW J. FINE
NIKI S. HANEY
MARK A. LIBERATORE
ISAIAH W. LITTON
HANNAH E. MCMILLAN
STEPHEN J. MOTTOLA
AYANA K. ROWLEY

To be assistant pharmacist officer

AMANDA R. BONNER
DAVID G. ENG
LEVI C. HALL
MICHELLE R. HATCHER
MEGAN C. HOSTETTER
MARCUS K. LOCKHART
GRANT A. MCELWEE
OGECHI C. OLUMBA
DAVID C. STECCO
DANIEL J. TRUE

To be senior assistant dietitian officer

THELMA M. LUCERO
ALYSIA M. SALONIA

To be assistant therapist officer

MICHAEL P. ANDERSON

To be health services officer

DENISE DURAN
STEPHANIE M. LOVELL

To be senior assistant health services officer

OLUYEMISI O. AKINNEYE
ALEXIA D. BUTLER
MARJORIE CEANT
SIMLEEN KAUR

To be assistant health services officer

NICOLE M. BELL

KHATEEJA T. BRAHIM
KATHLEEN A. SCHELBLE
NORMA A. SHARPE
CULLEN T. WILSON

To be junior assistant health services officer

ERIK D. SANDVIG
CHRISTOPHER M. SHEEHAN

THE FOLLOWING CANDIDATES FOR PERSONNEL ACTION IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE COMMISSIONED CORPS OF THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFORE AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS:

To be surgeon

ALICE Y. GUH
WILLIAM T. HANCOCK
ADOLPH J. HUTTER
NEENA JAIN
ROBERT G. MARIETTA
GEORGE E. MILES
SATISH K. PILLAI
GREGORY A. RACZNIAK
TIMOTHY S. STYLES
SAYEEDHA UDDIN
BRENDAN M. WEISS
KRISTIN YEOMAN

To be nurse

BRENDA M. HOLBROOK
HABIBA B. SEIDU-FUSEINI

To be engineer

THOMAS R. ARMITAGE
BRIAN G. BEARDEN
VICTOR J. CAMELLO

To be scientist

ERIC X. ZHOU

To be veterinarian

KERRY R. PRIDE

To be pharmacist

JENNIFER A. SHEPHERD

To be health services officer

JOHN D. STANSON
FRANKEENA L. WRIGHT

To be senior assistant surgeon

KRISTIE E. APPELGREN
SARA AULD
NAHID BHADELIA
MARGARET M. BREWINSKI
GENEVIEVE L. BUSER
GRACE CHEN
KEVIN R. CLARKE
RAYMUND B. DANTES
STEPHANIE DAVIS
VINCENT DEGENNARO
MARIE A. DEPERIO
KAINNE E. DOKUBO
DAVID L. FITTER
PAUL A. GASTANADUY
ADENA GREENBAUM
STEPHANIE E. GRIESE
MICHAEL GRONASTAJ
JAMES C. HOUSTON
CAMILLE E. INTROCASO
MATTHEW JOHNSON
MICHAEL H. KINZER
SONALI P. KULKARNI
ROBERT F. LUO
SARAH A. MEYER
CHRISTINA A. MIKOSZ
IAN A. MYLES
MARIA A. SAID
ISAAC SEE
RACHEL M. SMITH
AMITA TOPRANI
JOYANNA WENDT
KAREN K. WONG
JONATHAN M. WORTHAM

To be assistant senior dental officer

DERRICK R. CHAMPION
ROXANA MIRABAL
RODICA M. POPESCU

To be assistant senior nurse officer

CATHERINE L. BURGESS
LAKEETA A. CARR
LORI O. GONZALES
KRISTI B. HENAGHAN
JOHANNES M. HUTAURUK

To be assistant senior engineer officer

SAYWARD H. FEHRMAN

To be assistant senior scientist officer

ALEXANDER S. CAMACHO
TIANA A. GARRETT
YORAN G. GRANT
TERRENCE Q. LO
ERIN M. PARKER
HEATHER M. SCOBIE
MAROYA D. SPALDING
EBONI M. TAYLOR
JULIE K. YAEKEL-BLACK-ELK

To be assistant senior veterinary officer

RACHAEL H. JOSEPH

To be assistant senior pharmacist officer

DWAYNE K. DAVID
MEGHAN M. WILLIAMS
JIN K. YANG

To be assistant senior health services officer

SOLITA J. CUTHRELL
VICKIE R. ELLIS
THOMAS E. GERA
JUNE GERMAIN
TRACY L. GLASCOE
JANET L. HAYES
MEREDITH E. PYLE
MEGHAN E. REILLY

To be assistant dental officer

BRIAN C. DROUILLARD
ELEANOR B. FLEMING
HYEWON LEE

To be assistant nurse

SAMUEL N. CARDARELLA
ELIZABETH GEEST
TRISHA L. WRIGHT

To be assistant engineer

MAXWELL GOGGIN-KEHM

To be assistant scientist

RACHEL R. BAILEY
CARA N. HALLDIN
KEISHA A. HOUSTON
ALISON S. LAUFER

To be assistant environmental health officer

CHRISTOPHER J. FISH
ANDREW M. KUPPER

To be assistant veterinary officer

STEPHANIE J. YENDELL

To be assistant pharmacist

WILLIAM ALBANESE III
SALMAH ARSHAD
TRISTA L. ASKINS
RICHARD D. BLYTHE
JENNIFER L. BONGARTZ
LAURA E. BOTKINS
BROOKE J. BRELSFORD
MELISSA J. BREWSTER
CLEVELAND BROWN
MICHELLE L. BRYSON
RYAN J. BUCKNER
ROSEMARY J. CALL
CHRIS J. CAMPBELL
MICHELLE J. CHANDLER
WILLIAM C. CHARLES
CHEMA CHARLESMAGNE
RUBY CHASE
SAOMONY CHEAM
MELISSA M. CHIANG
NICHOLAS M. CHUNG
BENJAMIN J. CLOUD
LAURA J. COKER
JUSTIN K. CONSTANTINO
VALERIE L. COOPER
EMILY T. CORGAN
BRIAN D. COX
JOSHUA CROWE
JOHN C. DARNELL
EMILY E. DAVIES
MELANEE M. DAVIS
RUSSELL D. DEVOLDER
TESSA B. DEYLE
KIM T. DINH
BRENDAN J. DORAN
MATTHEW F. DUFF
KENDRA N. ELLIS
LAURA ENMAN
DAVID F. FOSS
LARISSA N. FOSTER
SACHOY C. FOWLER
JESSICA M. FOX
SHERRI E. FULTON
DEBORAH A. GALLO
ROVIGEL J. GELVIRO
KAREN D. GERDE
STEPHANIE E. GLESSING
JOSEPH W. GLOVACZ
MAUREEN E. GRIMM
MICKEY HA
JAMES M. HALEY
RANIA K. HAROUN
DANITA D. HENLEY
NAZAREE HINES-STARR
LINDSEY B. HONEA
BRANDON D. HOWARD
SAMUEL J. HUFF
TESSA M. HUFF
SARAH W. HUMES
AMANDA K. HUNT
CRYSTAL R. HUNTRODS
JONATHAN C. JOHNANSEN
MISTY D. JOHNSON
MARIE E. JOHNSTON
KOKUGONZA KAIJAGE
SARAH L. KANEY
SAMINA S. KHAN
MEGAN E. KULTGEN
OLGA P. KURDELCHUK
DAVID D. LEEDAHL
ANDREA L. LEONE
SHI (ISABELLE) LI
SHELLY X. LING
OMAR LOAZANO
JANICE M. LOUIE
SARA M. LOUT
CRYSTAL P. LUI
MELANIE A. MCCALL
CANDICE J. MERCADEL
MATT W. MILLER
KELLY L. MONOSKI
JESSICA L. MOORE
WHE C. MUFICH
CLAYTON F. MYERS
CHRISTA R. NANCE
EMILY M. NESLON
SAVANNA N. NEWLON
HOAIBAC B. NGUYEN
TAMMY T. NGUYEN
ERIN O'ROURKE
CHRISTY PENNINGTON
CODY R. PLAISTED
AIMEE M. POSIVAK
EMILY C. PRABHU
JULIANNE RAMIREZ
MICHELLE ROBERTS
JAYSON ROBERTSON
TIMOTHY M. ROCKEY
JAMES T. ROSE
LANDON C. SAMS
MARTINE M. SAV
JANET E. SHAW
JEREMIAH B. SMITH
KARSTEN T. SMITH
BRANDON S. SNEDEGER
KYLE T. SNYDER
ANGELA D. STEPHAN
LEE H. STRINGER
CHRISTOPHER P. STROUD
CHRISTI L. SWABY
BRIEN B. THOMPSON
ELIZABETH H. TRANG
JAYSON L. TRIPP
JOSHUA D. VALGARDSON
RICHARD S. WALULU
GWENDOLYN A. WANTUCH
TABATHA M. WELKER
EVAN M. WILLIAMS
GLADYS A. WILLIAMS
PORSHIA M. WILLIAMS
TASHA R. WOODALL
RYAN R. ZETTLE
CARLA ZORETTI
STACY N. ZULUETA
MATTHEW WALLIS

To be assistant therapist

LISA M. MAYS
LAUREN A. RICHARDS

To be assistant health services officer

MICHAEL A. BAKKER
KIMBERLEY A. GORDON
OLUWAMUREWA A. OGUNTIMEIN

To be junior assistant health services officer

AKHTAR IMRAM
KENIA P. ALTAMIRANO
MATTHEW BELTON
MICHAEL BROWN
EMILY CISNEY
DEVIN S. COOPER
FRANK DICKER
ASHLEY HENRY
CHRISTINE O. KANG
REBECCA M. KIBEL
HYUNTAE KIM
PHILLIP LAM
PAUL LE
PHILIP LOZIUK
TREVOR MATTOX
HEATHER L. MCCAFFREY
DANIELLE MCQUINN
ENUDIO MERCADO-GONZALEZ
NEH D. MOLYNEAUX
LINH T. NGUYEN
NIH NGUYEN
TIMOTHY N. ONSERIO
JOSHUA PAUL
JUSTIN R. PLOTT
RAVI RAJMOHAN
ELI RHOADS
JOSHUA T. ROMAIN
RYAN S. SUTHERLAND
BRANDY TORRES
UKEGBU J. UGOCHI

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271:

To be rear admiral upper half

REAR ADM. (LH) VINCENT B. ATKINS
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT E. DAY, JR.
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN H. KORN
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM D. LEE
REAR ADM. (LH) STEPHEN E. MEHLING
REAR ADM. (LH) CHARLES D. MICHEL
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL N. PARKS
REAR ADM. (LH) SANDRA E. STOSZ

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 brigadier general

COL. DAVID J. BUCK

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) CYNTHIA A. COVELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ANNIE B. ANDREWS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ROBERT V. HOPPA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MARK R. WHITNEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CINDY L. JAYNES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

THOMAS P. FANTES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

CYNTHIA E. WILKERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

DAVID T. CARPENTER

To be lieutenant commander

TIMOTHY M. CHEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

ROBERT D. PAVEL

To be lieutenant commander

JULIE H. BALL
SHAUN C. SHILLADY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN RICHARD W. BUTLER
CAPTAIN MATTHEW J. CARTER
CAPTAIN LAWRENCE E. CREEVY
CAPTAIN MARK W. DARRAH
CAPTAIN CHRISTOPHER W. GRADY
CAPTAIN MICHAEL E. JABALEY, JR.
CAPTAIN COLIN J. KILRAIN
CAPTAIN DAVID M. KRIETE
CAPTAIN JOSEPH W. KUZMICK
CAPTAIN WILLIAM C. MCQUILKIN
CAPTAIN VICTORINO G. MERCADO
CAPTAIN DEWOLFE H. MILLER
CAPTAIN STUART B. MUNSCH
CAPTAIN KENNETH M. PERRY
CAPTAIN FERNANDEZ L. PONDS
CAPTAIN JOHN C. SCORBY, JR.
CAPTAIN DWIGHT D. SHEPHERD
CAPTAIN MICHAEL E. SMITH
CAPTAIN RICHARD P. SNYDER
CAPTAIN SCOTT A. STEARNEY
CAPTAIN HUGH D. WETHERALD

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 11, 2011:

THE JUDICIARY

ARENDA L. WRIGHT ALLEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1229.

H.R. 1229 is important because while the moratoria on shallow water drilling and deep water drilling were lifted on May 28, 2010 and October 12, 2010 respectively, since that time, BOEM has only issued 51 permits for new shallow water wells and only a handful of permits for deepwater activities that were subject to the moratorium. This is in comparison to an average of 10 permits issued per week prespill.

While I support the safety requirements that the Department of the Interior has put into place since the Macondo Spill, I continue to hear from companies that the BOEM is rejecting drilling applications without providing adequate guidance as to what is needed to get the application approved. This is getting us nowhere. We need this production.

America's offshore, primarily the Gulf of Mexico, supplies 30% of American oil and 10% of American natural gas. Yet, a recent study done by Wood Mackenzie concluded that nearly one third of American deepwater production would become uneconomic if the Department of the Interior increases the time spent reviewing and permitting drilling permit applications. Based on these figures, some estimate as many as 125,000 jobs could be lost in 2015.

That is why I support H.R. 1229 and why it is desperately needed. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING ANNE FULTON

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Anne Fulton from Greeley, Colorado.

Anne's story reminds us that out of tragedy, opportunity is born. One August 16, 2003, Anne lost her 19-year-old son Judd Fulton in a fatal automobile accident. Judd was an exemplary student and athlete. He was a graduate of the inaugural class at Northridge High School in Greeley in 2003. Not only did Judd excel in the classroom, he was a phenomenal student athlete. It was his skill on the football field that earned him a scholarship to Black Hills State University in Spearfish, South Dakota. Judd was returning to the University from his home in Colorado at the time of the accident.

Out of this horrible tragedy Anne Fulton, Judd's mother, saw opportunity. In 2005, Anne started a Memorial Scholarship Fund in her son's name. The Judd Kazuto Fulton Memorial Scholarship is a dedicated scholarship fund for Northridge High School students and Black Hills State University football players.

Every year, Anne holds a fundraiser for the scholarship by holding a Golf Tournament in Eaton, Colorado. This tournament happens every May and raises money and increases awareness for this memorial scholarship. Anne describes her son as unassuming, dedicated, hard working team player, with a willingness to do whatever it took to get the job done. Students who receive this scholarship exemplify the same characteristics.

It is my honor to remember Judd Fulton today, and to recognize Anne Fulton for her never-ending dedication, hard work, and for improving the lives of students in Greeley, Colorado. She has provided many with opportunities they could have only dreamed about. Thanks to Anne's generosity and tireless effort, the dream of these students has become reality.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COMMUTER RELIEF ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce the Commuter Relief Act, legislation that will expand the popular transit benefits program to provide commuters with options to avoid high gas prices, make it easier for companies to provide transportation benefits for all employees, and spur public-private partnerships for commuting purposes.

Americans have made it clear that they want transportation options. In a recent study by the Pew Charitable Trusts, 52 percent of Americans support increased funding for bike, pedestrian and public transportation programs. On average, transportation costs are now Americans' second largest expense after housing. As gas prices increase, many Americans are already changing their daily behaviors to decrease fuel costs: taking fewer trips, keeping their cars tuned, even trading in their gas guzzlers for more fuel-efficient models. As we search for solutions to our congested roadways, increasing gas costs and expanding waistlines, it's time for the federal government to become more aggressive in helping to provide choices.

For too long, the federal government has supported commuters who drove to work, but has not helped those who use other methods of transportation. Through the incentives in this bill, the federal government can support consumers who wish to use environmentally friendly, active transportation modes that save them money in the long run, such as public transit, carpooling, biking, walking and telecommuting. This not only makes environmental and public health sense, it makes economic sense: at $4 a gallon gasoline, American families can save $5.6 billion each year on gasoline costs by using transit. Bicycle commuters annually save an average of $1,825 in auto-related costs, conserve 145 gallons of gasoline, and avoid 50 hours of gridlock traffic.

The Commuter Relief Act will provide consumers with commuting choices, and make it easier for companies to implement commuting programs that benefit all employees. It ensures that the federal government is a better partner as we work to provide Americans with transportation choices, reduce congestion and decrease our dependence on foreign oil.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation to support businesses in their effort to provide choices for commuting employees.

ELEVATING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues legislation I am introducing to amend the International Religious Freedom Act (IRFA), including reauthorizing the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF). Religious freedom, often referred to as the first freedom, is of central import to the American experiment. As such it should feature prominently in U.S. foreign policy.

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

Since the passage of this legislation, religious freedom has been elevated within U.S. foreign policy. But it still does not enjoy the preeminence it deserves. And sadly, a strong U.S. voice on this critical issue has arguably never been more needed.

According to a Pew Research Study released in December 2009, one-third of all nations, containing 70 percent of the world's population, severely restrict religious freedom. We need look no further than the daily newspapers to know that these statistics are not

mere numbers. Rather, they are sobering realities for millions of people of faith around the globe. Consider the following headlines from recent weeks alone: ''Chinese Christians Face Tense Easter in Beijing,'' ''Egyptian Copts, Reeling From Violence, Want Protection,'' ''Baha'i Citizens Are Forced to Leave Iran,'' ''Pakistan's Other Blemish: Anti-Religious Violence,'' ''Indonesia Pressured Over Ahmadiyah Muslim Sect Killings,'' and ''Thousands of Cameras Watch China's Uighurs, Inhibiting Discourse.''

The bill I introduce today will make a number of strategic improvements to the Religious Freedom Office at the State Department. To start, it places the ambassador-at-large in the office of the Secretary of State as opposed to burying it within the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor. This change is more in keeping with the original intent of the legislation that Congress passed. Over successive administrations this critical position has not been treated with the seniority it deserves and this revised language will help rectify this problem.

The legislation also provides the ambassador with oversight and management authority of the IRF Office and other religiously oriented positions and programs at the State Department and carves out funding in the larger Human Rights and Democracy Fund to enable the IRF office to promote religious freedom through advocacy, reporting and programming. The legislation requires the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Department of Defense, Homeland Security, the Treasury and the U.S. Agency for International Development to issue a one-time report to Congress on the best uses of foreign assistance to promote religious freedom and religious engagement.

In addition the legislation requires religious freedom training for every Foreign Service Officer (FSO) and states that USCIRF must be involved in that training. American embassies abroad must be islands of freedom. Whether in Vietnam, China, Pakistan or Iraq—every FSO should be trained and committed to advocating for those whose voices have been silenced by their own governments. This mandatory training will help ensure that our diplomatic corps is equipped in this regard.

My legislation also strengthens the ''Countries of Particular Concern'' (CPC) designation process and effectiveness. CPCs are countries whose governments are found to have engaged in or tolerated particularly severe violations of religious freedom. The amended language will require that CPC designations are made 90 days after the issuance of the State Department's annual religious freedom report. One hundred and twenty days after a country has been designated a CPC, the Secretary of State must submit a report to Congress that identifies the action taken, the purpose of the action, and an evaluation of its effectiveness and impact. Also included is language tightening the President's waiver authority, so that indefinite waivers are not an option.

Very significantly, this legislation will reauthorize the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom until September 30, 2018. USCIRF, unlike the State Department, is unencumbered by the impulse to maintain good bilateral relations above all else—an impulse which sadly can result in critical issues of religious freedom being sidelined in the pursuit of broader foreign policy goals.

USCIRF, as an independent, bipartisan Federal Government commission, has been a reliable voice for the world's persecuted people. It monitors and reports on religious freedom abroad and makes informed policy recommendations to Members of Congress, the President and the State Department, based in part on information gathered during extensive travel and meetings with senior foreign officials.

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

Just in the last year the Commission has taken a leadership role on a series of key issues. It was quick to recognize the strategic importance and courageous voice of the late Shahbaz Bhatti, Pakistan's federal minister of Minorities Affairs, an outspoken critic of his nation's draconian blasphemy laws. During a critical time for the people of Sudan, it also issued special recommendations on the implementation of the historic Comprehensive Peace Agreement. It has made a series of policy recommendations aimed at preserving and protecting Iraq's besieged religious minorities. It also has actively worked with dozens of Hill offices on combating the ''defamation of religions'' resolution before the United Nations.

In short, ensuring that the commission is reauthorized is of paramount importance. In a Constitution Day speech, President Ronald Reagan famously described our founding documents which enshrine basic liberties, among them religious freedom, as a ''covenant we have made not only with ourselves, but with all of mankind.'' Passage of this legislation will go a long way in helping us keep that covenant. I urge my colleagues' support.

A TRIBUTE TO THE IOWA ENERGY

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize the Iowa Energy, the 2011 Champions of the National Basketball Association's Developmental League and pride of Iowa.

The Energy captured the crown on Friday, April 29th, before an enthusiastic home crowd at the Wells Fargo Arena, where they defeated the defending NBA D-League champions the Rio Grande Valley Vipers by a score of 119–111.

This is the first league championship for the Iowa Energy, which is affiliated with the Chicago Bulls and the Phoenix Suns. The team's establishment took place in 2007, inspired by the vision of Jerry Crawford, Gary Kirke, Sheldon Ohringer and Paul Drey to bring quality basketball to the heart of the heartland. The franchise has continually grown in stature and success, culminating this year with not only the team's first championship of many to come but also the D-League's MVP, Iowa State University Alumni Curtis Stinson. The Energy can also boast that the two largest crowds in the entire NBA D-League's history are solely the product of this franchise and the incredible basketball sporting event just concluded in Des Moines.

There can only be one champion at the end of any sport's season, and I am honored to represent the great state where the Iowa Energy play and win. This feat marks years of unwavering commitment by the players, management and fans of the team and represents the best of Iowa's people and their well known work ethic.

Mr. Speaker, all Iowans should take heart in MVP Curtis Stinson's proclamation after the championship game: ''We're certified; we're champions. They can't ever take this away from us.'' I know that all members of this body join me in congratulating the Iowa Energy and the tradition of basketball excellence that I expect to continue well into the future.

TRIBUTE TO RIDGECREST ARMED FORCES DAY 2011

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. McCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts by many in the community of Ridgecrest to honor our service men and women on Armed Forces Day 2011.

The City of Ridgecrest is home to the Naval Air Weapons Station (NAWS) China Lake. NAWS China Lake was established during World War II for the purpose of weapons testing. Since then, NAWS China Lake has become the premier weapons development laboratory for the United States Navy. Many of my constituents living in Ridgecrest work at NAWS China Lake and take great pride in the support they provide to our Nation and they are properly recognized for their efforts on this day.

The 2011 Armed Forces Day is especially significant to the community of Ridgecrest because this year marks two significant anniversaries for NAWS China Lake and the United States. This year marks the centennial anniversary of Naval Aviation. In this anniversary, the Navy will be commemorating 100 years of Naval Aviation and honoring a century of mission-ready men and women and their many aviation achievements. Additionally, this year is significant for veterans of World War II because it will mark the 70th anniversary of our Nation's entry into that war.

There have been many significant achievements by the scientists and engineers at China Lake. For example, they developed the air-intercept missile 9 Sidewinder in 1950. This has become the world's most used air-to-air missile technology. Additionally, other rockets and missiles developed or tested at China Lake include the Mighty Mouse, Zuni, Shrike, Joint Stand-off Weapon and Joint Direct-Attack Munition.

Considering these two significant anniversaries and their importance to the City of Ridgecrest it gives me great pleasure to recognize the Ridgecrest community and their efforts there to pay tribute to the dedicated men and women who devote their lives to military service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE POMPEO

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, on May 5th, I missed Rollcall vote numbered 295 because I was unavoidably detained in an Energy and Commerce hearing.

Rollcall No. 295 was a vote on the Holt Amendment to H.R. 1230, Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

HONORING THE REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN ON ''REPUBLIC DAY''

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Republic of Azerbaijan in celebration of the 93rd anniversary of Republic Day on May 28th. Later this year, Azerbaijan will also celebrate the 20th anniversary of its freedom from the Soviet Union and the start of diplomatic relations with the United States.

Located in a geopolitically dynamic region between Europe and Asia and sandwiched between Russia and Iran, Azerbaijan is a secular county with a predominantly Muslim population that has also been home for more than a millennia for vibrant Christian and Jewish communities.

Azerbaijan has opened Caspian energy resources to development by U.S. companies and has emerged as a key player for global energy security. The Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline project is the most successful project contributing to the development of the South Caucuses region and has become the main artery delivering Caspian Sea hydrocarbons to the U.S. and our partners in Europe. Notably, in 2009 Azerbaijan provided nearly one quarter of all crude oil supplies to Israel and is considered a leading potential natural gas provider for the U.S. supported Nabucco pipeline.

On the security front, immediately after 9/11 Azerbaijan was among the first to offer strong support and assistance to the United States. Azerbaijan participated in operations in Kosovo and Iraq and is actively engaged in Afghanistan, having recently doubled its military presence there. Azerbaijan has extended important over-flight clearances for U.S. and NATO flights to support ISAF and has regularly provided landing and refueling operations at its airports for U.S. and NATO forces. Also, Azerbaijan, as highlighted by Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, plays an important role in the Northern Distribution Network, a supply route to Afghanistan by making available its ground and Caspian naval transportation facilities. Moreover, Azerbaijan provides vital support for U.S. nonproliferation efforts.

Again, as the Co-Chairman of the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, it is my distinct pleasure to honor the Republic of Azerbaijan in celebration of the 93rd anniversary of Republic Day and to recognize the valuable bilateral relationship between the United States and Azerbaijan. I also encourage my colleagues who are interested in supporting Azerbaijan to join me as a member of Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, a bipartisan group of nearly 40 Members of Congress working to help foster the growing partnership between the United States and Azerbaijan and to advance U.S. interests in this pivotal region.

HONORING ASTON PARK HEALTH CARE CENTER OF ASHEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA

HON. HEATH SHULER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Aston Park Health Care Center of Asheville, North Carolina during this year's National Nursing Home Week.

For over 30 years, Aston Park Health Care Center has treated residents and their families with respect, support, and friendship. They recognize that these values, along with high quality medical care, ensure the dignity of life for their residents. The Aston Park Health Care Center has earned a five star rating from the U.S. News & World Nursing Home Rankings for their holistic approach to Alzheimer's care, adult home care, assisted living, skilled nursing care, and short-term rehabilitation. That is how they do their part to carry out this year's National Nursing Home Week theme, ''Fulfilling the Promise.''

I would like to commend and thank all of the skilled and trained staff members at Aston Park Health Care Center who strive to ensure a proud life for Aston Park residents. Their warm, friendly, sincere, and comfortable atmosphere allows their residents to continue to live life to the fullest.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of their excellence in care, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the staff and residents of Aston Park Health Care Center.

RECOGNIZING YOM HA'ATZMA'UT, ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of Israel on their Independence Day. On this very special day, we recognize and celebrate 63 years of Israel's independence as the national homeland of the Jewish people. This is a time to commemorate the rich history and journey from a scattered and persecuted Diaspora to the thriving modern nation we see today in the state of Israel.

Throughout their challenging history and against all odds, Israel has become a prospering democracy whose groundbreaking contributions in technology, medicine, agriculture, and environmental innovation have truly been a beacon to the world.

Since 1948, when the United States became the first country to recognize the Jewish State of Israel, we have always stood by her side as a strong ally and friend. As each day brings a new set of complex changes to the Middle East, it is more vital than ever that we protect and strengthen that friendship. I am deeply committed to ensuring that Washington's steadfast support of Israel will continue to grow over the years, and I am honored to serve as a Member of Congress so I can bring my unwavering support for Israel to work every day.

This Congress must continue to show Israel the love and support that we have provided for more than six decades. There is much to rejoice on this momentous anniversary. Mazel tov, and may you continue to go from strength to strength.

IN CELEBRATION OF ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Israel's Independence Day. For 63 years and counting, Israel continues to be a valuable ally and friend. From fighting global terrorism, to containing the threat of Islamic radicalism, to impressive scientific research, Israel and the United States have developed a unique bond that is based upon shared visions, democratic values, and foreign policy goals.

Still, significant challenges remain for our close ally. Citizen uprisings in nations such as Egypt, Libya, and Syria have changed the political landscape of that region. While there is potential for positive political change, as citizens speak out and demand their rights, there is also increased uncertainty that threatens the stability of the already volatile region.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Israel's independence this year, let's give them a gift they surely deserve—the full-faith assurance that this Congress will continue to robustly aid and assist its most trusted ally in the region.

I wish President Peres, Prime Minister Netanyahu, and the people of Israel all the best on this very important occasion.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 2011

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3, the ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.''

The title of this bill is misleading. This is not about funding abortions; it's about restricting a woman's right to choose. This bill is not necessary—the Hyde Amendment already prohibits federal funds from being used for abortion. This bill also raises taxes and penalizes individuals and small businesses that chose health plans that include abortion care.

The majority is using this bill as a tool to push the abortion debate into the tax code. H.R. 3 would increase taxes in order to prevent women from obtaining abortion care. Under the confines of the bill, rape victims could be subject to invasive IRS audits to

prove that their assault qualifies for abortion care. The same lawmakers who campaigned on growing our economy and cutting taxes are now trying to impose new tax penalties on individuals who happen to choose a procedure that they do not agree with.

The majority campaigned on a promise of job creation. Instead the majority is pushing H.R. 3 which would make it more difficult for women to obtain reproductive healthcare services. Judging by the number of this bill, it is the third highest priority for the majority. At a time when America is digging itself out of a recession, and nearly 14 million people are out of work, we should not be prioritizing bills that limit and restrict a woman's access to health care services. We should be focusing on growing the economy and creating jobs. I am ready to get to work and move legislation that would create jobs and revitalize the economy, not restrict women's healthcare coverage.

This bill is nothing more than a mean-spirited attack on women's healthcare. It targets women, many of whom are low-income and women of color, and seeks to permanently deny them coverage for a pregnancy-related healthcare benefit. Then, under the misleading guise of protecting tax-payer dollars, it manipulates the tax code to advance the majority's ideological agenda.

I cannot vote for a bill that punishes women for making their own private healthcare decisions and subjects them to government intrusion.

Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

A TRIBUTE TO JOAN BALLANTYNE

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievement of one of my constituents, Joan Ballantyne of Cherokee, Iowa. Joan was recently honored by the National Association of Realtors with their ''Meritorious Service Award''.

The National Association of Realtors is America's largest trade association with more than a million members nationwide. The Association developed the Meritorious Service Award as a way to provide recognition to those who go above and beyond in their service to NAR. The presentation of this award to Joan embodies the long-standing tradition that its recipients are not only experts of their industry, but also effective educators for me and other Members of Congress on the issues of concern to realtors across this great nation.

This national award is only bestowed upon two Realtors in America annually. This achievement requires a demonstrable history of dedication and commitment to the Association while understanding, and advocating for, the most important issues facing the real estate industry and realtors in Iowa and across the nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to know and to work with Joan and I am proud to represent such an exemplary and dedicated Iowan. Her passion has taken her all around Iowa, and all around the country, to promote the ideals in which she believes. I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress will join me in congratulating Joan on her well deserved recognition of a job well done. Again, I thank Joan for her continued, unwavering commitment to her passion, her career and her fellow realtors and I offer her my best wishes for continued success in the future.

DOMESTIC FUEL FOR ENHANCING NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 2011

HON. JAY INSLEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the bipartisan Domestic Fuel for Enhancing National Security (D–FENS) Act of 2011, which will allow Civilian Agencies and Military Agencies to extend multiyear contracts from the current limit of 5 years to up to 15 years for the purchase of advanced biofuels. I thank my colleague Mr. JONES of North Carolina for working with me on this issue, which will increase our national security and help build an American industry.

Accounting for about 2 percent of U.S. energy consumption, the Department of Defense is the largest single consumer of energy in the country. According to Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ''[the Department of Defense] is using 300,000 barrels of oil every day. The energy use per soldier creeps up every year. And our number-one import into Afghanistan is fossil fuel.''

U.S. Navy Secretary Ray Maybus has outlined several goals to lead the Navy toward a more energy-secure fleet. By 2015, the Navy will reduce petroleum use in the commercial fleet by 50 percent. By 2020, the Navy will produce at least 50 percent of shore-based energy requirements from alternative sources and 50 percent of total energy consumption will come from alternative sources.

No one knows better than the Department of Defense that energy supplies are critical to combat troops and our national security. To ultimately realize these goals, we must dramatically scale-up advanced biofuel production in the United States. With added Congressional authority to purchase longer-term contracts, our defense sector could adopt domestically produced sustainable fuels for the security of our troops.

Companies already have developed technologies to produce ''drop-in'' ready fuels, meaning our military could use these fuels in existing infrastructure, aircraft and ships. The longer-term contracts provided by this bill will not only increase our energy security, but can ultimately help unlock private investment for construction and development of large advanced biofuel refineries in the United States. In states like Washington, North Carolina, California, Montana and others, interests from the private sector, universities, ports and major airports are already working to bring the first generation of biofuels to the market, and their efforts can be greatly enhanced by this legislation.

Washington state and the Pacific Northwest are well-positioned to commercialize aviation biofuels—all elements of the supply chain are feasible, and the region has come together to map out a strategic and sustainable path to bring advanced bio-based jet fuels to market. Already in the Northwest, 40 public and private stakeholders from academic research institutions, environmental advocacy, and government, and the aerospace and aviation, biofuels, and agriculture and forestry industries have formed the Sustainable Aviation Fuels Northwest (SAFN) initiative. This effort was convened by regional aviation leaders Boeing, Alaska Airlines, the region's largest airports—Port of Seattle, Port of Portland and Spokane International Airport—as well as Washington State University, a center of advanced biofuels research. Stakeholders include fuel producers, farm and forest managers, non-governmental organizations and key government leaders, including representatives from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Defense Logistics Agency. This diverse group representing all points along the supply chain is working to create a ''flight path'' that will overcome challenges to deploying advanced aviation biofuels. This legislation will support Washington's effort to make the Northwest region a market leader in the advanced biofuel industry.

With our nation's security and energy independence in mind, I urge my colleagues to support the Domestic Fuel for Enhancing National Security (D–FENS) Act of 2011.

VIETNAM HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 17th anniversary of Vietnam Human Rights Day.

The inspiring images of young people fighting for democracy in the Middle East remind us of the ongoing struggles around the world for the basic human rights that we've enjoyed in America for so long. It's a struggle that has been going on in Vietnam for far too long. Journalists, bloggers, whistleblowers, and religious communities face harassment, abuse, and imprisonment for speaking out.

Pro-democracy activists are arrested and jailed under draconian and wide-reaching anti-propaganda laws, often without due process. The U.S. Commission on Religious Freedom (USCIRF) released its 2011 Annual Report two weeks ago, on April 28, and it states that ''[t]he government of Vietnam continues to control religious communities, severely restrict and penalize independent religious practice, and brutally repress individuals and groups viewed as challenging its authority.''

Despite consistent pressure from Congress and human rights organizations, the Vietnamese government continues to violate its international human rights obligations, silencing the voices of its citizens through repression.

On this May 11th, I ask my colleagues to reflect on the struggles of the courageous Vietnamese citizens who are striving to implement change in an authoritarian society. I would also ask my colleagues to urge the State Department to redesignate Vietnam as a Country of Particular Concern, as USCIRF has recommended every year since 2001.

IN HONOR OF DR. JANOS HORVATH AND THE WILLIAM PENN ASSOCIATION

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Dr. Janos Horvath and the William Penn Association for the tireless work they do on behalf of Hungarians and the Hungarian-American community in Cleveland, Ohio and across the nation.

Dr. Janos Horvath was born on November 7, 1921 in Hungary. He studied economics at the Palatine Jozsef University of Technology and Economic Sciences. In November of 1956, he left Hungary. While in exile in Strasbourg, he became a leader of the Hungarian Revolutionary Council in 1957. Later, while in New York, he became a founding member of Kossuth Foundation. He received his PhD from Columbia University in 1966. He taught at various American universities until he moved back to Hungary in 1997, after 41 years. In 1998, Dr. Horvath became the Chairman of the Economic Policy Committee of Fidesz—Hungary's Civic party. He has been a Member of Hungary's parliament since 1998 and is currently the Doyen of the Hungarian Parliament.

The William Penn Association was founded on February 21, 1886 in Hazleton, Pennsylvania by thirteen Hungarian coal miners under the name ''Verhovay Aid Association.'' The goal of the founders was to extend a helping hand to each other and to the many Hungarian immigrants who worked and suffered in the mines and industrial centers of America. The Verhovay Aid Association has grown into the largest of all the Hungarian American fraternal organizations. In 1972 the organization's name was changed to ''William Penn Association.''

The Hungarian American Coalition is a Washington based non-profit organization founded 20 years ago to coordinate the talents and resources of its members in promoting the interests of the Hungarian American community. Its goals include: to foster a deeper understanding and appreciation of the history, culture and scientific achievements of both the United States and Hungary through cultural and educational exchanges; to protect and preserve the human and minority rights and cultural heritage of Hungarians throughout the world; and to support democratic institutions and economic development in Hungary. Every year the Coalition honors outstanding members of the Hungarian-American community in recognition of their extraordinary contributions to both Hungary and the United States.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Dr. Janos Horvath and the William Penn Association and the work they do on behalf of the Hungarian and Hungarian-American community.

HONORING MARTIN ''CHIP'' DOORDAN

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Martin ''Chip'' Doordan for his nearly forty years of outstanding service to the people of Anne Arundel County, Maryland, culminating in his leadership role as President and Chief Executive Officer of Anne Arundel Health System. Chip first joined Anne Arundel Medical Center (AAMC) in 1972 as a graduate student, became President of AAMC in 1988 and, in 1994, the Board of Trustees named him president and CEO of the Health System. Under Chip's leadership, this downtown Annapolis hospital was transformed into a regional medical center on a 100-acre campus.

The center boasts a highly qualified staff and has grown to include a diagnostics and imaging company, a foundation, a research institute, a freestanding substance abuse inpatient treatment center and many other centers of excellence. Chip also positioned AAMC as a leader in Maryland on joint replacement and started an affiliation with Johns Hopkins for cancer services. In April 2011, Chip opened a new patient tower that expands the emergency department, adds more private beds and has a dedicated pediatric emergency department. All of these achievements are the culmination of many years of hard work and Chip's strong dedication and commitment to the people of Maryland and improving our health care system.

Throughout his career, Chip has been recognized as a quiet and thoughtful leader who strives to find new and creative ways to give back to his community. You can often find Chip walking the halls of AAMC day and night, ensuring that patients are getting the care that they need and staff have the tools to carry out their critical mission. Chip has made an enormous impact on Anne Arundel County and has changed the lives of countless families in the State of Maryland and beyond. I am proud to call him a friend and I thank him for his vision, leadership and commitment to public service.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PRE-APPRENTICE AND APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING ACT OF 2011

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Pre-Apprentice and Apprenticeship Training Act of 2011 requires states to use the one half of one percent of funds now available under 23 USC 140(b) for federal highway construction training, which is necessary to combat a serious skills shortage as the current cohort of journeymen and other skilled workers is retiring, and also counters the effects of past discrimination in the construction industry. The current surface transportation law, TEA–21 (23 USC 140), permits states to use one-half of one percent of highway funds to administer highway construction training, but the states are not required to do so. In fact, most states do not commit transportation and infrastructure funds to training, and training that does occur is spotty. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has already set an important precedent for my bill by specifically including training funds, at my request, in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), with $3 million specifically targeted for training in the General Services Administration section of the bill. Also included in ARRA was $20 million for federal highway training programs.

The bill is also necessary to finally afford minorities and women the opportunity to gain a first foothold in the high-wage construction industry, as part of the cohort replacing retiring construction workers. Although deliberate exclusion has largely receded, a significant training deficit in the skilled construction trades remains.

As the large cohort of baby-boom construction workers begin to retire, the bill will help meet the nation's need to train a new generation, from every race and background. At the same time, the bill also will ensure compliance with the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which bar discrimination in the use of government dollars.

35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONTRA COSTA CHILD CARE COUNCIL

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY and Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI, to recognize the tremendous work of the Contra Costa Child Care Council as the organization celebrates its 35th anniversary of invaluable service to our communities.

With its inception on August 11, 1976, the Contra Costa Child Care Council began to develop and promote quality child care through a multitude of nonprofit programs and services. Over the years, the Council has increased public awareness of the benefits and significant impact of early care and education to the success of our children, the economic vitality and well being of families and neighborhoods, and the future promise for California.

This organization reflects the well known fact that early childhood education and quality run child care are important and integral parts of Contra Costa's economy, contributing at least $2.66 billion value added to the gross product of the County and generating $225 million in direct tax revenues, as well as supporting 35,600 jobs. This service has also been proven to be an essential component of the infrastructure of the entire State of California.

Since its inception, the Child Care Council has been true to its mission to ''Help Parents Put the Pieces Together''. Over 265,000 parents have accessed the free referral service of the Council to find care that meets the specific needs of their families and tens of thousands of Contra Costa early educators and child care providers have received free training, technical assistance and support through the Council's

many programs. Throughout the county, thousands of low income families have received financial assistance from the Council to pay for child care so parents can work, knowing their children are not only in good hands but are truly thriving.

We salute the tireless work of the members of the Council's Board of Directors, Administration, and staff, both past and present and thank them for the enormous contribution to our community their efforts have made.

Today, we invite our colleagues to join us in honoring the Contra Costa Child Care Council on its 35th anniversary and on behalf of our children, families and communities, wish all continued success.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION ALLOWING INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF UNPASTEURIZED MILK

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation that allows the shipment and distribution of unpasteurized milk and milk products for human consumption across state lines. This legislation removes an unconstitutional restraint on farmers who wish to sell or otherwise distribute, and people who wish to consume, unpasteurized milk and milk products.

Hard as it is to believe, the federal government is actually spending time and money prosecuting small businesses for the ''crime'' of meeting their customers' demand for unpasteurized milk! Recently the Food and Drug Administration conducted a year-long sting operation targeting Rainbow Acres Farms in Pennsylvania. As a result of this action, Rainbow Acres' customers will no longer be able to purchase unpasteurized milk from this small Amish farm.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans who the government wishes to deny the ability to purchase unpasteurized milk have done their own research and come to the conclusion that unpasteurized milk is healthier than pasteurized milk. These Americans have the right to consume these products without having the federal government second-guess their judgment about what products best promote health. If there are legitimate concerns about the safety of unpasteurized milk, those concerns should be addressed at the state and local level.

I urge my colleagues to join me in promoting individual rights, the original intent of the Constitution, and federalism by cosponsoring my legislation to allow the interstate shipment of unpasteurized milk and milk products for human consumption.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, today Members of this House took part in a debate that addressed the issue of using taxpayer dollars to fund abortions. As an original cosponsor of this legislation, I commend Mr. SMITH from New Jersey for his conviction in bringing this bill to the floor and for his leadership in the pro-life movement. Today, our debate extends the legacy of Congressman Henry J. Hyde, who was passionately pro-life and helped lay the foundation for the victory we celebrate today with the passage of H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

In light of this debate, I think we should all take time to reflect on a bold statement made by Mr. Hyde, a statement that was printed in the program at his funeral. I attended Congressman Hyde's funeral and was touched by the wisdom of his words. He said, ''When the time comes as it surely will, when we face that awesome moment, the final judgment, I've often thought, as Fulton Sheen wrote, that it is a terrible moment of loneliness. You have no advocates, you are there alone standing before God, and a terror will rip through your soul like nothing you can imagine. But I really think that those in the pro-life movement will not be alone. I think there will be a chorus of voices that have never been heard in this world but are heard beautifully and clearly in the next world, and they will plead for everyone who has been in this movement. They will say to God, 'Spare him because he loved us,' and God will look at you and say not 'Did you succeed?' but 'Did you try?'" I hope we find comfort in knowing that yes, we are trying. We are fighting to defend and protect innocent human life, and we will not stop until every life—born and unborn—is protected.

DR. ISRAEL ZOBERMAN

HON. E. SCOTT RIGELL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter a statement into the RECORD on behalf of my constituent, Dr. Israel Zoberman. Dr. Zoberman is the Founding Rabbi of Congregation Beth Chaverim in Virginia Beach, Virginia. He is also the president of the Hampton Roads Board of Rabbis and Cantors.

Dr. Zoberman asked me to enter the following remarks into the RECORD regarding the 63rd anniversary of the State of Israel. Dr. Zoberman's statement follows:

The 63rd Anniversary of the State of Israel is celebrated against the backdrop of the monumental eruptions of Biblical proportions in the Arab world, further highlighting the uniqueness of the Jewish state in the Middle East where the historical Jewish people came to make a difference for the entire human family, through its transforming gifts of the spirit and unparalleled endurance.

The unfolding events make it amply clear that Israel is a flourishing and enviable democratic oasis surrounded by a vast wilderness that is crying for change. We are witness to an amplified echo of the ancient Israelites' inspiring saga of the Exodus, ironically from Egypt's House of Bondage, instructing humanity through the ages to uphold freedom and responsibility as non-negotiable divine gifts worthy of sacrifice.

This most noble mandate of replacing degradation with dignity is reverberating throughout a troubled and stagnant Arab world that has for so long been lagging behind the West's progress, suffering from long-standing neglect manifested in poverty, illiteracy, and the lack of economic and social mobility, under authoritarian rule of fear and intimidation with corrupt leaders unaccountable for the public welfare. All that is being challenged in a world becoming an interconnected and interdependent global village with sophisticated communication that can mobilize the masses like never before.

However, there is a looming threat that extreme groups such as the Muslim Brotherhood and Al Qaeda will take advantage of the unrest for their own purposes, for they loathe a representative democracy and the West as a whole, rejecting the idea and presence of a Jewish state. After all, democracy thrives best with well-developed democratic institutions requiring time and experience, which rely upon progressive education that respects and fosters human rights as well as women's rights anchored in law.

The peace treaties that Israel established with both Egypt and Jordan should be enhanced and fortified by responding to Israel's yearning for closer cooperation in all endeavors in a context of a''warm'' peace. This historic crossroads is an opportune and urgent time for all Arab and Muslim states to finally join Israel in peace to transform in tandem the Middle East, that the cradle of Western civilization may be renewed as a flowing source of Shalom's blessings. Let the campaign cease to de-legitimatize and demonize the only sovereign Jewish state in the world through economic and culture boycotts, utilizing the twin evils of anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism. The attempt to thus divert attention from the Arab states' dire predicaments of bankrupt regimes has pointedly proven fruitless and counter-productive.

It should be amply clear now that Israel is the only democratic and stable ally that the United States enjoys in a critical part of the world, through a special bond reflecting shared values and commitments, and whose steadfast preservation and cultivation is essential for both model free nations with heroic legacies leading pluralistic societies.

In the present complex scenario Iran's dangerous role should not be lost as it is poised to take advantage of the transitional uncertainty of the Arab world. Iran's tyrannical theocracy, whose leaders are Holocaust deniers, remains a mortal threat to the free world, still insisting on acquiring a nuclear capability to conclude what Pharaoh began and Hitler almost accomplished.

Iran's proxy, Hamas, refusing to release Israeli soldier Gilad Shallot who is both an Israeli and French citizen, after more than five years in isolated captivity, the cold-blooded murder of five members of the Fogel family in Itamar, including an infant, the bombing in Jerusalem, and the relentless rocket and mortar, also on a school bus, from Gaza, do not reflect peaceful Palestinian intentions. Let Hezbollah, Iran and Syria's proxy in Lebanon, know along with all of Israel's adversaries, that the Jewish state will fight to ensure that its divine promise of survival is never withdrawn, even as it struggles for Shalom's sake of healing, hope and harmony.

IN TRIBUTE TO KATHERINE HALEY AND NORMA LAGOMARSINO

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to the Norma Lagomarsino and the late Katherine ''Kay'' Haley, who were honored recently by the Livingston Memorial Visiting Nurse Association for their decades of philanthropic work in Ventura County.

Norma Lagomarsino is the wife of former U.S. Rep. Bob Lagomarsino and a true force in making Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties strong, vibrant communities. I am blessed to have Bob Lagomarsino as one of my trusted mentors and to have Bob and Norma count as among my wife, Janice, and my closest friends.

Norma Lagomarsino has been a member of the Congressional Club in Washington, D.C., since 1974 and served as its president from 1981–1983. Among her many community activities, Norma Lagomarsino serves on the Santa Cruz Island Foundation Advisory Council, is a long-standing member of the Assistance League, is a member of the Board of Directors for Interface Children and Family Services and the National Institute of Mental Health, and was honored as a ''Champion of Mental Health'' by the Turning Point Foundation.

Norma and Bob also are major donors to California State University, Channel Islands, where they created the Robert J. and Norma M. Lagomarsino Archives. They also co-chair the San Buenaventura Mission School Building Campaign.

Kay Haley, another longtime friend, was born in the Ventura County city of Oxnard to Walter H. Hoffman Jr. and Edith Hobson Hoffman, who owned Rancho Casitas, a thoroughbred breeding farm. As an adult, Kay Haley raised champion shorthorn cattle and quarter horses on her own ranch, Rancho Mi Solar. Her most famous horse, Mr. Spats, was Ronald Reagan's favorite mount.

Kay Haley had a long relationship with President Reagan, having raised funds for him during his campaigns for California governor and president. In addition to raising funds for President Reagan and other Republicans, Kay raised many thousands of dollars for the Ventura County Museum of History and Art and served on Community Memorial Hospital's Board of Trustees for 30 years.

In 1986, she was given the Milton M. Teague Award for Outstanding Volunteerism. She was grand marshal of the Ventura County Fair parade in 1987.

When Ronald Reagan was governor, Haley was appointed vice chairwoman of the California State Fair Board, vice president of the board of directors of Cal Expo and served as founding chairwoman of California's Racing Hall of Fame. After eight decades of life and service, Kay passed away in 1999.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join the Livingston Memorial Visiting Nurse Association and me in honoring the philanthropic and voluntary contributions of Norma Lagomarsino and Kay Haley and in thanking them for making our community vibrant and strong.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I was not recorded as voting for final passage of H.R. 3 on May 4, 2011. I am a cosponsor of this bill and would have voted for final passage of the bill.

HONORING SHARON K. FAWCETT

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Sharon K. Fawcett, the Assistant Archivist for Presidential Libraries, who is retiring after more than 34 years of outstanding public service to the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

On February 28, 2011, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure held a joint hearing with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to highlight the importance of our presidential libraries to our nation's history. Following the hearing, I was pleased to host a luncheon and symposium to further discuss how we can ensure these national treasures can be preserved efficiently. Ms. Fawcett was instrumental in helping to make that day productive and successful and her insight at the symposium added a tremendous amount of knowledge to our discussion.

Her love and commitment to the Presidential Library system developed at an early age: she was born in Abilene, Kansas in a house that is now part of the campus of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library. In 1969, Ms. Fawcett started working at the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library. After raising her young children, she returned to the National Archives in Washington, DC, to be Chief of the Reference Service Branch and later the Director of User Services. In these jobs she was responsible for the overall planning, development, direction, coordination, staffing and control of all research rooms in both the National Archives building in downtown Washington, DC, and at Archives II, NARA's state-of-the-art facility in College Park, Maryland. She returned to the Office of Presidential Libraries in 1997.

Ms. Fawcett has served as Assistant Archivist for Presidential Libraries for the past seven years and as Deputy Assistant Archivist for Presidential Libraries for seven years before that. In both roles she led the Library system in the development of award-winning educational programs, web sites, and exhibits. Under her leadership, the Libraries continued to open key Presidential materials—such as the Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon tape recordings—that help the public understand Presidents and Presidential decision-making. The multi-library conferences on such topics as Vietnam and the Nuclear Age have become a mainstay of C–SPAN programming. She also developed innovative initiatives to start staffing early for a Presidential Library, and to add additional staffing for the newer Presidential Record Act Libraries to try to meet the growing demand for their records. When she returned to Presidential Libraries in 1997, there were no women serving as library directors and almost no representation by minorities in library positions. She pursued a goal of building a more representational work force in the libraries, hiring a more diverse and representative workforce.

I congratulate Sharon K. Fawcett for her dedication in building strong and productive relationships with a variety of stakeholders that includes the White House, Congress, and Presidential Library foundations. I thank her for her service to the National Archives and to the Nation and I wish her a very happy and fulfilling retirement.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 2011

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3 and the ongoing Republican war against women's health care in America. H.R. 3 continues the Tea Party Republican's extreme social agenda to pursue unprecedented attacks on women's health and economic security.

The Republican majority passed H.R. 1 and slashed billions of dollars from programs that allow women to provide and care for their families such as Head Start, Women, infants and children (WIC), Community Service Block Grants (CSBG), and the Maternal and Child Block Grant. Clearly their efforts targeted vulnerable women and their children—people who do not have high-paid, high-powered lobbyists, as the victims of budget cuts.

Their bill H.R. 2 repealed the Affordable Care Act, which ensures women have greater access to affordable health coverage and recommended preventative care. The Republican repeal of the Affordable Care Act would strip 32 million Americans of health insurance coverage, again making families vulnerable.

Now, H.R. 3 seeks to place unprecedented restrictions on a woman's ability to receive and pay for a legal medical procedure. This Republican bill places the federal government directly between a woman and her doctor.

H.R. 3 is not about ''codifying the Hyde Amendment'' as my colleagues have stated. Federal law already prohibits even a single federal dollar from being used to pay for abortion services, except in the cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother. Instead, this legislation furthers a radical agenda that seeks to limit a woman's right to access comprehensive reproductive medical care.

Exploiting the federal tax code for ideological purposes, this bill enacts new restrictions on a woman's ability to pay for legal medical services with private insurance, a health savings account, or private funds. A responsible small business owner that includes comprehensive reproductive care in their company's insurance policy will be denied their federal health care tax credit. A survivor of rape or incest may have to prove to an IRS agent with a detailed account of her brutalization in order to use her health savings account to pay for the procedure or qualify for an itemized medical deduction on her taxes.

These restrictions allow politicians and IRS bureaucrats to influence medical decisions that should be made by a woman, her physician, family, and often with support and guidance from a spiritual leader. I strongly oppose any effort in Congress that creates government interference with private decisions that should be made between a doctor and a patient. I strongly oppose this war on women in America that threatens our freedoms and our rights.

Instead of focusing on this divisive agenda, we should be focusing on policies that will improve the lives of America's women and girls such as addressing the quality of women's health care, fighting gender discrimination, increasing economic opportunities, and providing them with the education and support to succeed.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill and fight to keep safe, comprehensive reproductive and family planning services accessible to all Americans.

IN HONOR AND REMEMBRANCE OF MAYOR RALPH J. PERK

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of Mayor Ralph J. Perk, the 52nd mayor of the City of Cleveland, as he is posthumously inducted into ClevelandPeople.com's International Hall of Fame.

Mayor Perk was born on January 19, 1914 in Cleveland, Ohio to Mary and Joseph Perk. He attended elementary school at Our Lady of Lourdes School. After earning his high school diploma, Mayor Perk studied history, political science and mathematics at Case Western Reserve University and St. John College. Throughout his adolescence Ralph worked as a pattern maker and later an ice peddler with his brother, George, at Perk Coal & Ice Co. In 1940, Perk married Lucille Gagliardi; they had seven children and were together for 59 years.

At the age of 20, Perk joined the 13th Ward Republican Club and in 1953 was elected as the ward's council member. During his five terms as the Broadway-E.55th Street councilman, Perk organized the American Nationalities Movement, an agency that represents 35 ethnic and nationality groups. Mayor Perk was an outspoken proponent of human rights and is well known for his celebration of cultural diversity. In 1962, Perk was elected as Cuyahoga County Auditor, and became the first Republican elected to county office since the 1930s. He was reelected twice and served as a county official until 1970.

Mayor Perk became the 52nd mayor of the City of Cleveland in 1971 and was reelected in 1973 and 1975. While in office Mayor Perk was instrumental in the creation and establishment of the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District, the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority, the Office of International Trade at Cleveland's City Hall and the U.S. Conference of Mayors' Republican Mayors caucus. After serving as the Mayor of Cleveland, in 1978, Mr. Perk began a consulting business, Ralph Perk & Associates Inc. Mayor Perk was a political figure and prominent businessman in the City of Cleveland until his death on April 21, 1999.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and remembrance of Mayor Ralph J. Perk as he is celebrated at ClevelandPeople.com's International Hall of Fame ceremony.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL KENT A. D. CLARK'S 24 YEARS OF SERVICE TO OUR NATION

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Lieutenant Colonel Kent A. D. Clark for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to the United States of America. Lieutenant Colonel Clark will retire from active military duty in May 2011 after 24 distinguished years of service to the United States Army and of those years over 43 months were spent in combat.

Lieutenant Colonel Kent A. D. Clark is a resident of Florida and entered the United States Army in April 1987. He entered the Army and while serving his first enlistment decided to pursue a career in the United States Army by entering the Special Forces. He has served in every enlisted leadership position through the rank of Sergeant First Class and then pursued a career as a Commissioned Officer by attending Officer Candidate School at Fort Benning, Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, It has been a pleasure to work closely with Lieutenant Colonel Kent Clark over the last several years of his career. He has proven himself to be a tremendous wartime leader who demonstrated unselfish devotion to the Nation and the soldiers he led. He has been a friend and trusted advisor to my colleagues and I on the Appropriations Committee as he worked tirelessly to restore balance to a force stressed by the demands of the war on terrorism. He was instrumental in significantly improving our Armed Forces equipment modernization and funding of critical systems affecting the Department of Defense while he served here on Capitol Hill. In 2010 Kent went back to the United States Army and Represented the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Staff of the Army as a liaison officer with the United States Congressional Appropriations Committees for Defense and Military Construction. Prior to his retirement he was the principal point of contact for Members of Congress and staff on matters concerning the Wheel Track Combat Vehicle Program, Brigade Combat Team Modernization, and Other Procurement Army One & Three Appropriations; He provided direct interface between Congress and the Army; Integrated the Office of the Chief Army Reserve staff and Congress for all United States Army Reserve related issues and questions; Gathered information, prepared strategies and recommended Army positions for corresponding with the Congress on appropriation issues; Organized briefings and responded to requests for information across all appropriations for Congressional Members, their staff and Professional Staff Members; Coordinated Congressional travel for fact-finding opportunities and education on Army programs. The impact of his efforts will benefit the United States Army for decades to come.

Lieutenant Colonel Kent A. D. Clark's observations and advice to the Army leadership have impacted the decisions to implement the most comprehensive transformation of the Army since World War II, building versatile and modular units capable of conducting a full-spectrum of operations. This Commissioned Officer has continued the traditions of the United States Army and is an American hero who has been selfless in his service to the Nation through war, peace, and personal trial. His performance and accomplishments throughout his long and distinguished career have left a legacy of trained, disciplined professional leaders at all levels and care for families that is without equal. When history looks back at this leader and his legacy it will be clear that his abilities as a trainer, leader, advisor, Commander and Soldier produced the best Army in the world.

Mr. Speaker, On behalf of a grateful Nation, I join my colleagues today in saying thank you to Lieutenant Colonel Kent A. D. Clark for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to this country throughout his distinguished career in the United States Army and we wish him, his wife Nicole, and his daughter Kaitlyn Grace all the best in his well-deserved retirement.

ST. RAPHAEL CATHOLIC SCHOOL 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge St. Raphael Catholic School, located in Garden City, Michigan, as they celebrate 75 years of commitment to the education of the youth of our community and our country.

Established in 1936 upon land generously donated by Ms. Florence Cowperthwithe, the meeting hall which became the first school was built using primarily donated materials, contributions and volunteer labor. The original windows were donated by the Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary Convent. Undoubtedly, this demonstrates a literal truth; it is the people who build a parish.

Father Anthony Kirchner, the second pastor of the fledging St. Raphael the Archangel parish, led the effort to convert the hall into a four-room school. Again, the labor and materials used were largely donated. The IHM sisters could no longer stay on and the Sisters of St. Francis agreed to take on responsibility for the school. They have remained diligent in their commitment. As the parish and the community grew, additional school buildings were built in 1950 and 1956. In its 75-year history, St. Raphael's School has grown from a converted hall serving a handful of students to a campus with a capacity of 500.

Mr. Speaker, for 75 years St. Raphael School has provided a Catholic education for students ranging from pre-kindergarten through eighth grade. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the students, parents, faculty and alumni of St. Raphael Catholic and in recognizing their years

growing in friendship, knowledge and God's spirit as part of our community and our country.

HONORING DR. JAMES P. COMER AS HE IS RECOGNIZED WITH THE NAACP LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker I am deeply honored to rise today to join the Greater New Haven Branch of the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People as they recognize the invaluable contributions of an outstanding member of our community, Dr. James P. Comer. Dr. Comer is an internationally renowned psychiatrist, social scientist, and author whose work in early childhood development has changed the way that we, as a society, have approached early learning and education. This year, the Greater New Haven NAACP has named Dr. Comer the recipient of their Lifetime Achievement Award—only the second time in its history that such a recognition has been bestowed.

Like so many of us, the importance of education was instilled into Dr. Comer at a young age by his parents. His mother had less than 2 years of formal schooling and his father only six, but they understood that their children's future success would depend on a quality education. They worked hard and ensured all five of their children had the opportunity not only to finish their elementary and secondary education but to attend college as well. Indeed, in a recent interview Dr. Comer remarked that ''they gave us the developmental experience we needed''—a lesson that has guided his career.

Dr. Comer is currently the Maurice Falk Professor of Child Psychiatry at Yale University School of Medicine's Child Study Center and he has been a faculty member since 1968. Over the course of his career, his focus on child development as a means of improving schools has earned him a distinguished reputation as well as international recognition. He is perhaps best known for founding the Comer School Development program—a concept that promotes the collaboration of parents, educators, and community to improve social, emotional, and academic outcomes for children that, in turn, helps them to achieve greater success in school. This model has become a national model, implemented in more than five hundred schools across America where its goals of improving the educational environment and student achievement have exceeded expectations. Its remarkable success has impacted the lives of millions of our young people—providing them the educational building blocks that have allowed them to realize their dreams.

A prolific writer, Dr. Comer has published nine books and countless articles on children's health and development as well as race relations. He has also served as consultant to the Children's Television Workshop, the producer of Sesame Street and The Electric Company, as well as to the Public Committee on Mental Health, a group chaired by Roslyn Carter. He has been a member of the National Commission on Teaching and America's future since 1994 and a myriad of other national committees and commissions which have led to changes in how our country crafts public policy concerning education. In addition to all of this, he has also somehow found the time to serve on the boards of a multitude of educational institutions and community organizations.

Dr. Comer's work and scholarship has been recognized across the country with forty-seven honorary degrees and innumerable awards, commendations, and honors including the John P. McGovern Behavioral Science Award from the Smithsonian Institution and the prestigious Heinz Award in the Human Condition from Heinz Family Philanthropies. His visionary leadership and exceptional contributions have changed the face of education in America. There are few have had such an extraordinary impact on our way of life which is why I can think of no one more deserving to receive the NAACP's Lifetime Achievement Award.

Over my years in Congress, I have had the unique opportunity to work closely with Dr. Comer and I could not be more proud to stand today to recognize him for all of his good work and congratulate him on this very special occasion. His is a legacy that will continue to make a difference in the lives of our young people for generations to come. I wish him, his wife, Bettye, and their family many more years of health and happiness.

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NORTON MALE CHORUS

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the Norton Male Chorus of Flint, Michigan will celebrate 90 years of singing together by holding an anniversary concert on May 14th in Flint.

In 1921 a group of men affiliated with Buick Motor Division organized the Buick Male Chorus under the direction of Dr. W.W. Norton. Two years later the Industrial Mutual Association became the sponsor and the group was renamed the IMA Glee Club. This relationship lasted until 1939 when the Chorus became an independent organization named the Norton Male Chorus. Dr. Norton continued as the director until 1951 when he left for a new position in California. The group has had 3 directors since that time, Arthur McCombie, C.L. Bergman, and currently, Dan Hill. The group has performed throughout the United States and Canada including a performance at the 1964 World's Fair in New York City. The group annually awards a scholarship to a male vocal student and the 2011 winner, Matthew Mitchell, will also perform at the anniversary concert.

Currently the group includes: director, Dan Hill; accompanist, Margaret Meade; first tenors, Terry Powell, Matt Brown, Matt Jackson, Jack Smith; second tenors, Don Chambers, Mike Dumanois, Paul Brown, Jim Segar, Don Wagle, Don Hetherington; baritones, Don Gerger, Sam DeLorenzo, Jerome Wolbert, John Roach; bass singers, Dennis Cavanaugh, Bob Maupin, Don Russell, Don Coolich, Adam Coolich, and Len Posio.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the Norton Male Chorus for 90 years of music and goodwill. I wish them the best in the coming years and many, many more years of performing and entertaining audiences.

RECOGNITION OF PHILIP T. INGLIMA—2011 JOHN CARROLL AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on April 30th in San Francisco, the 2011 John Carroll Awards were presented to five exceptional individuals whose achievements exemplify the ideals and traditions of Georgetown University. Named after the University's founder, Archbishop John Carroll, the John Carroll Award was established by the Georgetown University Alumni Association in 1951 and is the highest honor awarded by the alumni association. Recipients have distinguished themselves through achievement and unparalleled service to Georgetown University, and the 2011 recipients embody the true meaning of Magis. Magis is a Jesuit phrase that means ''the more.'' It is taken from Ad majorem Dei gloriam, a Latin phrase meaning ''for the greater glory of God.'' It is an expression of an aspiration and inspiration. Magis reflects the Jesuit concept of a continuous commitment to excellence, grounded in gratitude.

The 2011 John Carroll recipients are Mary Taylor Behrens, Philip T. Inglima, the Honorable M. Margaret McKeown, Paul F. Pelosi, and Michael L. Vespoli. I congratulate them all on their achievements. All five of them are esteemed members of the Georgetown community, but today, I rise to give special recognition to Philip Inglima, known as Phil, to his friends.

An exemplar of the Jesuit tradition of women and men for others, Phil Inglima has found no shortage of ways to give back to the alumni community. It would be hard to find a volunteer post at Georgetown that Phil hasn't occupied. As an undergraduate, he served as the co-chair of his senior class gift committee. He has chaired many of his undergraduate and law classes' reunion committees, served on the board of regents and worked as vice chair of the law annual fund. A member of the board of governors since 1997, Phil served as president of the alumni association and was a well-respected member of the board of directors for two years.

After graduating in 1984 with a degree in English, Phil remained at Georgetown as an assistant to the Rev. Timothy S. Healy, S.J., then president of the university. He spent two years working closely with Father Healy while studying at the Georgetown University Law Center. His dedicated work for the Juvenile Justice Clinic earned him the honor of being named ''Outstanding Advocate.''

Phil began his law career as a clerk to the Honorable June L. Green of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia before entering private practice with criminal defense legend Plato Cacheris (F'51, L'56). Since then, he has amassed more than two decades of experience as a litigator specializing in white

collar criminal law, including two years as a special prosecutor.

Now a partner at Crowell & Moring LLP, Phil defends criminal and civil matters in trial and appellate courts. He has been recognized repeatedly in the premier legal review guide, Chambers USA, as well as in Super Lawyers and The Best Lawyers In America, as a leading lawyer in white collar criminal defense.

Georgetown University with its rich, Jesuit tradition runs through Phil's veins. In addition to serving the alumni community, Phil teaches a course in federal white collar crime at the university's Law Center.

Phil met his beautiful wife, Elizabeth Wieser (C'86, L'92), at Georgetown. They have three children—Joseph, Rosalia and Paulina—who were all born at the Georgetown University Hospital. Phil Inglima is a great friend, father, husband as well as one who excels professionally. He makes those individuals and institutions that he touches better.

HONORING JUDGE HENRY HAYWOOD TURNER, III

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Judge Henry Haywood Turner, III, a man of many talents and interests who sadly, passed away on May 8, 2011 at the age of 67.

Judge Turner was born in El Paso, Texas, on May 3, 1944. His father served as a Navy Corpsman physician in the South Pacific during World War II. Judge Turner graduated from Columbus High School in 1962, and earned a BA in math and history from Mercer University.

Inspired by his father, he served in the U.S. Navy as a radioman for the USS Charles R. Ware, DD–865 Destroyer. After completing his naval service, he managed the Texas Native Inertia Nutcracker Company, a business started by his father that held several U.S. patents for their inventions. He later went on to teach math and physics at Columbus Technical College.

Judge Turner earned a law degree from the University of Georgia in 1977, and was one of nine students who former Secretary of State Dean Rusk advised. This was the start of a very distinguished legal career that would include practicing general law, doing appellate work for the city of Columbus, and most notably, serving as an Assistant District Attorney, and Judge of the Municipal Court for 20 years.

The great Irish poet Brendan Francis once said, ''If you have a talent, use it every way possible. Don't hoard it. Don't dole it out like a miser. Spend it lavishly like a millionaire intent on going broke.'' Judge Turner was a man of many diverse interests and talents, who went broke sharing them with the world. He rebuilt engines, made his own diesel fuel and knives, gardened, and became well versed in geology, history, and music composition. He was a well-read man who loved stray cats,, and spoke several different languages.

The last skill served him very well when people who were unable to speak English came to his court. Judge Turner could communicate with the common person, but he could also communicate with the most sophisticated of individuals. This made him respected and loved by those who truly knew him who have described him in recent days as a: gentleman, a scholar, a man of his word, and a man of honor.

Judge Turner understood the importance of service and helping other people as evidenced by his involvement in numerous community organizations. Judge Turner and my wife Vivian worked together for many years on the Municipal Court, and we are both thankful for his service and friendship over the years. Vivian and I extend our deepest condolences to his mother, Rebecca Sellers Turner, his daughter Clisby Cox and his many other relatives and friends.

Mr. Speaker, we are all put here for a season to try to make the world a better place to live. I can truly say that Judge Henry Haywood Turner, III used his season to make this world more hopeful and less fearful because he travelled here.

HONORING ANNE MARIE BERGEN

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Anne Marie Bergen of Oakdale, California. Ms. Bergen was selected to receive the 2010 Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. She has made outstanding contributions to the teaching and learning of mathematics and science.

Ms. Bergen has spent 24 years teaching in Oakdale and has played an influential source in improving the education for students in Stanislaus County. She has served as the Gifted and Talented Teacher and Coordinator, Science Mentor, Science Olympiad Coach and District Science Fair Coordinator. As the District Science Teacher, she developed and created a laboratory and field-based science program. This program has helped to educate 2,000 students and train 120 teachers annually. Since 2009, Ms. Bergen has served as the chair of CalTAC, a STEM teaching advisory council.

Currently, Ms. Bergen is a Teacher in Residence at the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo in the Biological Sciences Department. She works to train Liberal Studies undergraduate students, seeking to become K–12 teachers, on how to effectively instruct science classes and laboratory experiments. Additionally she is working to reshape the curriculum in several courses targeted to future classroom teachers.

Ms. Bergen's teaching philosophy is ''Active Learning, Meaningful Experiences, and Compassionate Teaching.'' The unique teaching style Ms. Bergen uses the natural connection students have with experiential learning and has incorporated it into successful education programs. Through using hikes, nature and the outside world, she has created an effective curriculum that has led her students to excel in the areas of science and mathematics. Additionally, Ms. Bergen actively works to share her successful educational methods so that other teachers can effectively teach their students using her experiential learning model. It is without question that Ms. Bergen is compassionate and dedicated to providing quality education for our youth.

In addition to receiving the 2010 Presidential Award for Excellence, Ms. Bergen has been a recipient of many awards for her dedication to teaching. These awards include the Amgen Award for Science Teaching Excellence in 2006, Stanislaus County Teacher of the Year in 2002 and Woman of Distinction in Education by Soroptimist International in 2002 and 2003. Additionally she was awarded the distinguished California Teacher of the Year Award in 2003.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in honoring Anne Marie Bergen on receiving the 2010 Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching.

SCIENCE EDUCATION IN FREDERICK COUNTY

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize The Frederick County Public School District for its pursuit of bettering its science education programs. I visited Sherando High School in Stephens City on April 19 and saw firsthand how the school and its students are improving and excelling the fields of math and science.

Kelley Aitken, the Frederick County Public Schools Supervisor of Science and Visual Arts, explained that ''the school division's science curriculum is moving from a fact/knowledge level of thinking to one which is based on conceptual understanding and application.'' The teachers have been provided with information from the University of Virginia's faculty on how to develop inquiry-based lesson plans.

The school district has also changed its curriculum requiring students in grades six through eight to complete inquiry-based science projects every year. It is the district's hope that by engaging the students in middle school they will be able to carry that understanding and passion for science throughout their education. Mrs. Aitken also explained a number of community partnerships that the school district has developed. These include DuPont, the Blandy Experimental Farm, the Alice Ferguson Foundation, and Valley Health, which provide students with hands-on instruction in science.

After Mrs. Aitken's presentation I was honored to meet with and learn about the students who have excelled in the district's science programs. I heard from three high school students and one middle school teacher about their experiences. The first student was a senior who worked with the Pulsar Search Collaboratory (PSC), where he discovered a pulsar, a highly neutralized neutron rotating star. The senior along with the high school's Astronomy Club, analyzed data from the National Radio Astronomy Observatory in West Virginia. The student is going to pursue his interest in science at James Madison University.

The next student, a sophomore, explained her project, which examined the effect of chemicals and pesticides on the regeneration

of planaria. The student will be competing in the International Science Engineering Fair (ISEF) in Los Angeles, California, in May. The next student, a junior, will also be competing in the fair for her second year in a row. The student used the Eratosthenes's Theory, to determine the diameter of the earth.

A sixth grade teacher in the district's Robert E. Aylor Middle School, in Stephens City explained the Discovery Education online science module, which is used throughout the district in the middle schools. He explained that the program is used to let the students interact and manipulate investigations as they are learning science material.

At the end of my visit, Superintendent Patricia Taylor was awarded the Discovery Education's Visionary District Award by the Vice President for Discovery Education. I am proud to have such an outstanding school in my district. I congratulate the school for recognizing the importance of providing our youth with the tools to pursue careers in science, technology, engineering and math.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 10, 2011, I unfortunately missed a series of votes. If I was here, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 299, "no" on rollcall No. 300, and "no" on rollcall No. 301.

U.S.-KOREAN RELATIONS

HON. KAREN BASS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to represent the people of California's 33rd congressional district, which is a microcosm of America. The cultural and economic vibrancy of the communities in our district is possibly matched only by its vast diversity.

I am proud that the 33rd district includes Koreatown, the home to many Korean-Americans and recent immigrants from Korea. By some estimates, there are more Americans of Korean descent living in this neighborhood than anywhere else in the United States.

It should come as no surprise, then, that my constituents and I have strong concerns about U.S.-Korean relations. We celebrate the military and diplomatic alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea that has entered its seventh decade. We encourage Korean students who come to American colleges and universities to pursue their educational goals, and we welcome Korean businesses that invest in the United States and engage in trade with American businesses and consumers.

It was with great interest that I was able to travel to the Republic of Korea last month through their Congressional Member Exchange Program. Over the short course of three days, I participated in a packed itinerary of meetings with Korean government officials, business leaders, American diplomats, and members of the U.S. armed forces stationed in Korea.

One truly powerful moment came on my first full day, when I visited the Demilitarized Zone, DMZ, including the Joint Security Area. Gazing out over the barren border area into North Korea was a truly eye-opening experience for me.

In addition to meeting with Korean executive branch officials—including Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade Sung-Hwan Kim, Deputy Minister for Trade Seok-Young Choi, and National Security Advisor Yung-Woo Chun—I was also able to meet with our legislative counterparts in the Korean National National Assembly, including the chairman of the Unification, Foreign Affairs, and Trade Committee (the equivalent of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs), the Honorable Kyung-Pil Nam.

All of these meetings were informative, productive, and educational. I learned so much about the history and the breadth and scope of the U.S.-Korea alliance partnership.

Meetings with business leaders were equally fruitful. It was my pleasure to attend a dinner hosted by AMCHAM, the American Chamber of Commerce in Korea, and I am grateful for the time I was able to spend with Amy Jackson, the AMCHAM president.

Similarly, a tour of the Hyundai Motors corporate headquarters and of the company's research and development facility in Hwaseong was particularly valuable. Hyundai has significant investment in the United States, including several engineering and design facilities in California, not far from Los Angeles, as well as in several other states. If one includes all their dealerships and repair shops, Hyundai employs over 30,000 American workers.

One of the topics that came up over and over during my visit to Korea was the much discussed trade agreement between our two countries. The Korean government officials and business leaders I met tried very hard to persuade me that the agreement should be ratified soon. It is an issue I continue to follow closely, seeking out insights and analysis from a wide spectrum of individuals within my congressional district and beyond. This visit to Korea further expanded my horizons and the knowledge gained was invaluable.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Korean Government for the opportunity to visit their country through the Congressional Member Exchange Program. Prior to my departure, I had the opportunity to have breakfast with Korea's Ambassador to the U.S., Duk-Soo Han, and our discussion was very insightful with respect to all the challenges and opportunities on the Korean peninsula. As I represent the congressional district with the largest Korean-American constituency in the United States, I also look forward to returning to Korea to continue building on the relationship with our great friend and ally.

IN RECOGNITION OF FATHER DENNIS WEEZORAK

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Father Dennis Weezorak as the members of St. Mary's Parish gather to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood. Throughout his professional career, Father Weezorak has spiritually guided and mentored many parishioners. His honorable actions are worthy of this body's recognition.

Father Weezorak was ordained to the priesthood on May 3, 1986 in the Cathedral of St. Mary in Ogdensburg, New York by Bishop Stanislaus Brazana. He began his career as an Associate Pastor and Administrator in St. Patrick Parish in Watertown, New York. During his tenure, Father Weezorak also served as Associate Pastor at three different New York State Parishes: St. Peter, St. Mary and St. Thomas. Father Weezorak later served in the military chaplaincy for the United State Air Force at various locations including Lackland Air Force Base and the hospital chaplaincy at Wilford Medical Center in San Antonio, Texas. He was finally installed as Pastor at St. Mary Parish in South Amboy, New Jersey on October 26, 1997.

In addition to his parish duties, Father Weezorak is active with the Municipal Alliance for Drug Abuse for the Township of South Brunswick/Monmouth Junction, New Jersey. He also remains an active member of the Sayreville/South Amboy Chapter of Rotary International. Father Weezorak earned a bachelor's degree in business from Pennsylvania State University and attended St. John Seminary in Boston, Massachusetts. He is the son of Pauline and the late Robert Weezorak. He has one brother and sister.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Father Dennis Weezorak upon the celebration of his twenty-fifth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood and also for his leadership and service to the community.

RECOGNITION OF ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Israeli Independence Day. Sixty-three years ago this week, the dream of so many Jewish people around the world became a reality. From desert and swampland emerged a nation that is now a leader in technology, medical advances and environmental research; and from the ashes of the Holocaust, a people was reborn.

Israel remains an important strategic ally and the only true democracy in a very unstable part of the world. In the wake of World War II and its tragic legacy for the Jewish people, the United States has considered the existence of Israel a profound moral and spiritual imperative and was the first nation to recognize the state of Israel in 1948.

Even sixty-three years later, however, there are ongoing threats to Israel's stability. It is critical that all parties in the region recognize Israel's right to exist as well as Israel's right to insist on the basic security of its citizenry. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to honor the men and women who have fought to defend Israel's independence year after year, to those who keep the hope for peace in the forefront

of our minds, and with a strong commitment to seeing that dream become a reality.

HONORING DR. WILLIAM TONTI

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding Vermonter, Dr. William Tonti of Essex Junction.

On February 1, 2011 Dr. Tonti celebrated an astonishing milestone: He earned his 250th patent making him one of the most accomplished inventors in Vermont and the country. This impressive accomplishment is worthy of recognition by this Congress.

Dr. Tonti is a graduate of Northwestern University where he earned his Bachelor's of Science in Electrical Engineering. He continued his education in Vermont, first earning an MBA from St. Michaels College and then a Master's of Science and a PhD in Electrical Engineering from the University of Vermont.

In 1978, he began what would prove to be a distinguished career at IBM in Essex Junction, Vermont. Dr. Tonti's work focused on areas fundamental to the functioning of our society, including advanced DRAM semiconductors, nanotechnology, microprocessors and chip reliability.

In addition to his professional accomplishments, Dr. Tonti has been an been an active community member and citizen. His commitment to IBM is only surpassed by his dedication and commitment to his wife, Debbie, and daughters, Janelle and Samantha.

Dr. Tonti was recently named an IBM Master Inventor for Life, a great honor that IBM bestows to only a handful of its most innovative employees worldwide. This is a fitting recognition for a lifetime of impressive accomplishments and for a Vermonter of high character.

As Vermont's Representative in this Congress, I ask that Dr. Tonti be recognized for his accomplishments and applauded for his contributions to the state of Vermont and this country.

THE PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT (H.R. 1229) AND THE REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT (H.R. 1231)

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the majority rammed through an ill-advised measure requiring the sale of four specific offshore drilling leases even if appropriate workplace and environmental safeguards aren't in place. This week's bills continue the same reckless "pre-spill" mentality. In the aftermath of the Deepwater Horizon tragedy, more drilling with less safety is simply not a responsible energy policy, and it will do nothing to enhance America's energy security.

Let's be clear: There is no drilling moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico. Since October, the Interior Department has issued 51 shallow water permits and 12 deepwater drilling permits—or roughly the same pace as before the Deepwater Horizon disaster. The major difference is that the Obama Administration is ensuring that future drilling be accompanied by safeguards reflecting the lessons learned from the Deepwater Horizon.

The so-called "Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back To Work Act" would deem drilling permits approved after sixty days with or without a completed safety and environmental review. While the intent of H.R. 1229 is to clearly to expedite permitting, the reality is that this kind of "drill first, ask questions later" approach could easily result in fewer drilling permits being issued as the Interior Department could in many cases simply be forced to reject permits that are still in process rather than having them "deem approved" without adequate safeguards in place.

H.R. 1231 proposes to expand the scope of this initiative's overarching recklessness by opening much of the outer continental shelf on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts to drilling before Congress has enacted a single legislative reform to improve safety. Lost in all of the rhetoric is the reality that oil and gas companies are already today sitting on more than 60 million acres of public lands with an estimated 11.6 billion barrels of oil and 59.2 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that have yet to be developed—or nearly as much oil and natural gas as could realistically be recovered by drilling up and down the east and west coasts.

Mr. Speaker, this country deserves better than carelessness masquerading as an energy policy. We need to end the billions in wasteful subsidies for the already highly profitable oil and gas industry and accelerate the development and deployment of clean energy alternatives that will power the 21st century.

DOMESTIC FUEL FOR ENHANCING NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 2011

HON. JAY INSLEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the bipartisan Domestic Fuel for Enhancing National Security (D–FENS) Act 2011, which will allow Civilian Agencies and Military Agencies to extend multiyear contracts from the current limit of 5 years to up to 15 years for the purchase of advanced biofuels. I thank my colleague Mr. JONES of North Carolina for working with me on this issue, which will increase our national security and help build an American industry.

Accounting for about 2 percent of U.S. energy consumption, the Department of Defense is the largest single consumer of energy in the country. According to Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "[the Department of Defense] is using 300,000 barrels of oil every day. The energy use per soldier creeps up every year. And our number-one import into Afghanistan is fossil fuel."

U.S. Navy Secretary Ray Maybus has outlined several goals to lead the Navy toward a more energy-secure fleet. By 2015, the Navy will reduce petroleum use in the commercial fleet by 50 percent. By 2020, the Navy will produce at least 50 percent of shore-based energy requirements from alternative sources and 50 percent of total energy consumption will come from alternative sources.

No one knows better than the Department of Defense that energy supplies are critical to combat troops and our national security. To ultimately realize these goals, we must dramatically scale-up advanced biofuel production in the United States. With added Congressional authority to purchase longer-term contracts, our defense sector could adopt domestically produced sustainable fuels for the security of our troops.

Companies already have developed technologies to produce "drop-in" ready fuels, meaning our military could use these fuels in existing infrastructure, aircraft and ships. The longer-term contracts provided by this bill will not only increase our energy security, but can ultimately help unlock private investment for construction and development of large advanced biofuel refineries in the United States. In states like Washington, North Carolina, California, Montana and others, interests from the private sector, universities, ports and major airports are already working to bring the first generation of biofuels to the market, and their efforts can be greatly enhanced by this legislation.

Washington state and the Pacific Northwest are well-positioned to commercialize aviation biofuels—all elements of the supply chain are feasible, and the region has come together to map out a strategic and sustainable path to bring advanced bio-based jet fuels to market. Already in the Northwest, 40 public and private stakeholders from academic research institutions, environmental advocacy, and government, and the aerospace and aviation, biofuels, and agriculture and forestry industries have formed the Sustainable Aviation Fuels Northwest (SAFN) initiative. This effort was convened by regional aviation leaders Boeing, Alaska Airlines, the region's largest airports—Port of Seattle, Port of Portland and Spokane International Airport—as well as Washington State University, a center of advanced biofuels research. Stakeholders include fuel producers, farm and forest managers, non-governmental organizations and key government leaders, including representatives from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Defense Logistics Agency. This diverse group representing all points along the supply chain is working to create a "flight path" that will overcome challenges to deploying advanced aviation biofuels. This legislation will support Washington's effort to make the Northwest region a market leader in the advanced biofuel industry.

With our nation's security and energy independence in mind, I urge my colleagues to support the Domestic Fuel for Enhancing National Security (D–FENS) Act 2011.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHRISTINA M. GOLEZ

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Police Officer Christina M. Golez, who is retiring after nearly 27 years of law enforcement service—24 years of service to the

City of Fairfield and a combined two years with the Yolo County Sheriff's Department and the Antioch Police Department. As her colleagues, friends and family gather together to celebrate the next chapter of her life, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in saluting this outstanding public servant and defender of peace and safety.

Christina started her law enforcement career as a Reserve Police Officer with the Antioch Police Department. She was then hired as a Deputy Sheriff by the Yolo County Sheriff's Department in November of 1985 and on August 18, 1986, she was hired as a Police Officer with the Fairfield Police Department. Christina worked in various capacities that included Patrol, Investigations, Youth Services, School Resource Officer, Cadet Advisor, Gang Suppression, Police Probation Team, Crime Scene Investigator, and Property. She received numerous commendations for her performance including Police Officer of the Year for 1997.

Christina's two most significant contributions to the Police Department were her expertise as a composite sketch artist and her talent in mentoring youths within the community. Her artistic talent and ability to create like images of suspects has helped solve numerous crimes in Fairfield. Her work as a Cadet Advisor and Diversion Officer was also exceptional. She intervened at many different levels by confronting and challenging youths that were showing destructive behavior through the appropriate amount of counseling and intervention opportunities for them and their families. Christina's work has made a difference to the citizens of Fairfield.

Christina was a valued employee and leader and her commitment to the community was evidenced on a daily basis. She was a loyal representative of the law enforcement community and admired for her hard work, dedication, and positive work ethic.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly honored to pay tribute to this dedicated public servant. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in wishing Christina M. Golez continued success and happiness in all of her future endeavors.

HONORING NORWALK, CONNECTICUT POLICE OFFICERS

HON. JAMES A. HIMES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the police officers who have dedicated their lives to serving the people of Norwalk, Connecticut.

Since its formation in 1913, the Norwalk Police Department has improved the quality of life for generations of citizens. Its officers' vigilant protection of the city's residents and their property has formed the foundation of public peace, order and tranquility that has allowed Norwalk to prosper.

Every day, Norwalk's police officers take on the responsibility of keeping the city safe. It can be a dangerous job. Five times in its history, the Norwalk Police Department has suffered the loss of one of its own in the line of duty. Sergeants Frank S. Stratton and Nicholas W. Fera, and Officers Sherrald Gorton, Marco Carias and Matthew Morelli each lost their lives in service to the community they sought to protect. We are forever indebted to them, and I join the people of Norwalk in honoring their memory today.

We also remember the retired officers of the Norwalk Police Department who passed away this year. All who serve today carry on a proud tradition inherited from those who wore the uniform in days gone by. We commemorate their service and we celebrate their lives.

Every officer deserves our praise. Their daily work makes it possible for each of us to enjoy the benefits of liberty, secure in the knowledge that our neighborhoods and places of business are safe. The dedication of Norwalk's officers to preventing crime and educating the public has spared so many families from experiencing unnecessary tragedy. And their collaboration with residents and business owners has promoted a sense of shared responsibility that makes the city an example to other communities nationwide.

To every officer who has served Norwalk with pride in years past, and every officer serving today, I offer my gratitude. And to the families of those men who gave their lives in the line of duty, I express the eternal thanks of a city, a state and a nation that can never say "thank you" enough.

CONGRATULATING THE ST. SEBASTIAN PARISH ON THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ST. SEBASTIAN FEAST

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to extend my sincere congratulations to the St. Sebastian Parish as they celebrate the 90th Anniversary of the St. Sebastian Feast. This wonderful annual celebration has become one of Middletown, Connecticut's most beloved community events. This is a remarkable milestone and I am proud to have this opportunity to commemorate this very special anniversary.

The Feast of St. Sebastian is a blend of faith, culture, and tradition. The three-day event reconnects city residents to their Sicilian heritage. The tradition dates back to 1414, when it is said that a statue of St. Sebastian washed up on the shores near Melilli, a small town in Sicily. No one could lift the statue except for the residents of Melilli, and they carried it to a place where they later built a church in the saint's name.

In the early 20th Century, immigrants from Melilli moved in large numbers to Middletown and soon there were enough families there to form a vibrant and close-knit Italian community that desired its own place of worship. Through a massive fundraising effort, the donation of materials, and the labor of masons, plasterers and stone carvers, the Italian community realized the dream of its own church, a significant local cultural symbol and the only Italian national parish in the Diocese of Norwich. The Feast of St. Sebastian was first celebrated in Middletown in 1921 and proceeds from the feast's early years helped finance the building of the church.

Today, the Feast is run by a committee of dedicated congregation members and proceeds continue to benefit the church. Carnival rides, traditional Italian fare, and musical entertainment are part of the festivities, but the heart of the event happens Sunday, when, after Mass, the church's statue of St. Sebastian is carried in a procession and I Nuri, a group dressed in white with red sashes, run barefoot or in socks in a show of devotion for the saint. The procession has grown to include hundreds of people and, as you might imagine, it is an extraordinarily beautiful demonstration of faith and culture.

It is events like the Feast of St. Sebastian, those forged in the bonds of family and community, which allow generation after generation to understand and celebrate their shared heritage. They enrich our communities as well as renew our commitment to faith and family. I am honored to stand today to extend my warmest congratulations to the St. Sebastian Parish and its many families as they celebrate the 90th Anniversary of their Feast of St. Sebastian. The Feast is a real community treasure and I wish them all the best for many more successful years to come.

A TRIBUTE TO BETTY JEAN VERETT PEPPER

HON. RANDY NEUGEBAUER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, Betty Jean Verett Pepper was born on April 28, 1931, in Crosby County, Texas, to Charley and Maggie (Fenoglio) Verett. She was the youngest of the family's nine children who were raised working on the family farm. Betty Jean graduated from Ralls High School and went on to graduate from Texas Technological College in Lubbock, Texas, in 1952.

At Texas Tech she met Herbert Leslie Pepper and they married in 1953. Leslie and Jean moved to the San Antonio area where their three sons were born and raised, also working on the family farm and in agriculture-related businesses.

Now back in Lubbock and known as Mama Jean to her own family and the expanded Verett families, she not only remembers the birthdays, anniversaries and other special occasions of this group, but personally calls each one on those special days.

That is why we want to take this opportunity to remember her 80th birthday on April 28, 2011, and to wish her many more joyous celebrations with her sons, six grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASIAN & PACIFIC ISLANDER AMERICAN HEALTH FORUM

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the board and staff of the Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum on the 25th anniversary of their founding. They are guided by a mission to influence policy, mobilize communities, and strengthen programs

and organizations to improve the health of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders. As the largest national Asian American, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander advocacy organization in the country, they maintain strategic relationships to move sound policy forward that benefit our communities.

Founded in 1986, the organization came together in response to the federal government's first groundbreaking report on minority health. ''The Secretary's Report on Black and Minority Health'' erroneously concluded that Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders were healthier than other minorities despite the ''paucity of data.'' Community leaders, advocates and medical providers who served Asian American populations came together to challenge this ''model minority'' myth and formed the Asian American Health Forum, solidifying the visionary idea of a national organization that would grow into the Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum. Working out of a basement of the old Chinese Hospital in San Francisco Chinatown with few staff, the organization has now grown to be a national organization with over 30 staff headquartered in San Francisco, an office in Washington, DC, and a national network comprised of more than 15 groups.

Over the years the Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum has reached several milestones. In the early '90s, the organization received funding from the Department of Health and Human Services to implement innovative outreach programs targeting chronic disease issues in the Asian American and Pacific Islander communities, like HIV/AIDS and Hepatitis B. As the number of API individuals in the U.S. increased, the organization continued to grow to do work to improve the health of the community by developing tobacco cessation programs, cancer education and outreach programs and reducing domestic violence. In 2006, the Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum received the largest ever philanthropic investment in Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander communities through a $16.5 million grant by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation which has helped build capacity across the country through the Health Through Action Program. Today the organization continues to advocate on behalf of our communities as the Affordable Care Act is implemented.

As the Chairwoman of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I have had the privilege of working with the Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum to eliminate health disparities in this country. Their analysis and research have informed the work of policymakers for many years at the local, state and national level. The work produced by its programs and divisions are valuable resources for community groups, legislators, agencies and researchers in understanding the unique health issues that affect Asian American, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander populations.

On behalf of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I would like to once again congratulate the Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum on their 25th anniversary and wish them the best in their work to achieve health justice over the next 25 years and beyond.

OPPOSING GIVEAWAYS TO BIG OIL AND DRILLING OFF THE CALIFORNIA COAST

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to allowing drilling off the California Coast and dismantling basic oil drilling safeguards.

Barely a year after the worst environmental disaster in our history, Republicans have brought legislation (H.R. 1231) to the floor that shows they are suffering from amnesia. This legislation, when coupled with the two earlier drilling bills—H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1230—would mandate that vast swaths of the East and West Coasts be open to drilling, while fast-tracking new leases without sufficient safety or environmental review.

Under H.R. 1231, the Interior Department would have to make at least half of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) available to leasing, including the California Coast, regardless of state objections or safety, economic, or environmental concerns. This is on top of the two earlier bills that would actually make drilling safeguards weaker than they were before the BP Spill while destroying judicial review of leasing decisions.

This legislation does nothing to bring down gas prices. It is nothing more than a gift-wrapped handout to the oil industry. Republicans are not working to end the $4 billion in yearly taxpayer subsidies that go to the largest oil companies. They are not working to crack down on the speculation that we know is driving up the price of oil and gas. Instead, they are pushing legislation that would give these companies free reign over our oil reserves and put our coastlines and the jobs that rely on them at risk. The Energy Information Agency has estimated that even if the entire OCS were exploited for oil, gas prices would drop by only three cents—and not until 2030. The U.S. accounts for just 7% of world oil production and we have only 3% of the world's reserves. Despite the bumper sticker slogan of ''drill baby drill,'' we cannot drill our way out of high gas prices.

I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this misguided bill and focus on sustainable and responsible solutions to rising gas prices.

HONORING LANCE CORPORAL BRANDON JOSEPH LONG

HON. MARLIN A. STUTZMAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true American hero, Lance Corporal Brandon Joseph Long of the 3rd battalion, 5th Marines, ''Darkhorse'' Lima Company from my district in Ft. Wayne, Indiana. On September 27, 2010, while out on point in Helmand Province, Afghanistan, Brandon stepped on a pressure plate which nearly cost him his life. He died four times on that day. He said the thought of Nicole and his child Clair kept him alive and that he left his body, but when he rose up to Heaven they told him that it was not his time. He has been part of one of the most courageous units, losing over 150 United States Marines. In a few short months he has come so far and a large part is due to his family. His lovely supportive wife and new born child have put a smile on his face and given him something to live for. Some people are put upon this earth to teach us and inspire us. Well, Brandon is one of those people. In honor of Brandon, I ask that this poem, penned by Albert Caswell, be placed in the RECORD.

U . . . B . . . LONG!

U . . .
U . . . B . . .
U . . . B . . . LONG!
As Brandon, as is your fine life's song. . . .
With but the greatest of all Americans, so very strong. . . .
All in our nation's history, who now so belong. . . .
Belong, to the defenders of the free!
As there is but such a list of most magnificent Americans, so indeed!
Who all for our Country Tis of Thee, would so die and bleed!
Ooo . . . rah Jar Head, As a United States Marine we see!
As Freedom Fighters, who but bring our liberty!
All to leave, a better world for you and me. . . .
Men and women, of such magnificent grace. . . .
Who one and all, the darkest of all evils so face. . . .
With tears in eyes, as they so watched their fine brothers die as still they kept pace. . . .
And still so valiantly marched onward, as their most heroic hearts so raced. . . .
The ones, such men of The Dark Horse who came home without arms and legs. . . .
All in their most amazing grace, teaching us all the meaning of courage and faith. . . .
And now comes another honored name. . . .
Lance Corporal Brandon Long, of Lima Co. as one in the same. . . .
For in our nation's history, have but come such Hoosiers so indeed. . . .
Such fine patriots of peace, sons and daughters who so believe. . . .
Who are a part of one of the greatest fighting machines, The United States Marines!
Who once upon battlefields of honor seen, so courageously fought all in green. . . .
As Brandon, as was your sheen!
And when, all out on point as an IED explosion almost took your life. . . .
Dying four times, but for his daughter and wife. . . . somehow your strength ignited!
At Heaven's gate, you said you were told it's not your time yet. . . .
As when you Marine, your new battle had just begun. . . .
As . . . The Walls . . . came tumbling down . . . tumbling down, you Indiana's son!
All in your most magnificent shades of green, all in what must be won!
As when you awoke, and you did not just step . . . but began to run. . . .
Running to recovery, as deep down inside . . . your fine heart shone like the sun!
Bringing you back from the dead, as you lifted up your head. . . .
And saw what you had left, take the hill Marine . . . as all of our lives you so bless!
As You So Teach Us . . . and So Beseech Us . . . and So Reach Us, oh so yes!
All with what that you so had left, as your courage began to crest!
All for his beautiful daughter Claire and his lovely wife Nicole so yes. . . .

As you so reached so deep down inside, your fine soul!
To find that kind of courage, that you can only find in hearts of gold!
And if ever I had a son, I wish he could be like you the one. . . .
Who such magnificent courage so holds. . . .
Who all in his most heroic shades of green, is but a fine champion so seen. . . .
For only so few in our Nation's history, have so lived so such lives so splendidly!
And took up that charge, and into that valley of death so marched. . . .
All so that we may be free!
All out on their most heroic course, to make a difference with it all and go forth!
And so answered out Nation's call. . . .
For only a few will know this song, for only a few to such heights will belong. . . .
Right at the top of that list! As America's greatest of all sons . . . their song!
Oh yes Brandon, that's U. . . .
U . . . B . . .
U . . . B . . . Long!

U.S.-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT (KORUS FTA)

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago, I had the privilege of visiting the Republic of Korea through their Congressional Member Exchange Program. In just 3 busy days, I was able to meet and converse with top officials in the Korean Government, my counterparts in the Korean National Assembly, business leaders, Korean War veterans and members of the Armed Forces.

My father was a veteran of the Korean War, so it was particularly touching and meaningful for me that I was able to visit the Korean War Memorial and Exhibition, lay a wreath and to meet with officials at the Ministry of Patriots and Veterans Affairs. My visit to the War Memorial served as a sobering reminder of the cost of freedom that was paid 60 years ago through the service and sacrifice of all Korean War veterans.

I had similar chills the next day, when our delegation visited the Demilitarized Zone and the Joint Security Area. It is difficult, if not impossible, to describe the flood of emotions I felt looking out across the DMZ and realizing what life is like in North Korea, a country with one of the world's most oppressive governments and, because of that, one of the world's poorest populations.

While these two occasions were strikingly memorable, they provided an important framework for when I had the opportunities to meet with Korean business leaders about trade, investment, and tourism.

Prior to my election as a Member of Congress, it was my great privilege to serve as mayor of Corning, New York, and of course Corning is part of the 29th congressional district that I am honored to represent. Corning is home of Corning Incorporated, a Fortune 500 company with interests and facilities across the globe—including in South Korea.

While in Korea, I was taken on a tour of Samsung Corning Precision Materials and was given a very informative briefing about the company's activities which are critical to my district. I also had an opportunity to do one of my favorite things—talk about the great wines produced in the Finger Lakes region of New York. Korean consumers are quite discriminating wine drinkers and, as you might expect, have developed a taste for fine wine from the United States, especially from New York wineries.

Currently, however, American wine exports to Korea are subject to a tariff that puts them out of the reach of many potential buyers. There is a glimmer of hope on the horizon, though, once the Congress ratifies and implements the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS FTA).

The KORUS FTA reduces Korea's tariff on U.S. wine imports to zero. That will be good for New York vineyards. There are more than 60 family-owned wineries in the area around my hometown, and many of them will benefit immediately from this new tariff-free situation.

In addition to the meetings with business leaders, I also had important discussions with Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade Sung-Hwan Kim, Deputy Minister for Trade Seok-Young Choi, and National Security Advisor Yung-Woo Chun, as well as with Kyung-Pil Nam, chairman of the Unification, Foreign Affairs, and Trade Committee of the Korean National Assembly. Additionally I met with U.S. Ambassador Kathleen Stephens and President of the American Chamber of Commerce in Korea Amy Jackson.

All of these government leaders were strong advocates of the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement. They did not have to do much to convince me, as I share their advocacy and appreciate their leadership and efforts to consolidate our alliance partnership overall.

Today, Korea has the world's eleventh-largest economy, known for its high-technology industries. It is the seventh-largest trading partner of the United States, the fifth largest market for agricultural goods, and the third largest destination for U.S. foreign direct investment in the Asia-Pacific region.

Bilateral trade between the Republic of Korea and the United States averages about $80 billion each year. The KORUS FTA represents the largest and most commercially significant free trade agreement ever signed by the United States in over a decade and since the ratification of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

This free trade agreement will ultimately eliminate tariff and non-tariff barriers, create better jobs, enrich consumer choice, boost industry and enhance overall welfare for both nations. It will immediately eliminate tariffs on almost two-thirds of U.S. agricultural exports worth over $1.9 billion.

Overall, the KORUS FTA is expected to boost the more than $80 billion in annual two-way trade between South Korea and the U.S. by $10 billion to $20 billion about 5 years after ratification. The reasons for swift approval by the Congress of the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement are numerous and compelling.

In closing, I wish to extend my sincere gratitude to the Government and people of Korea for their tremendous hospitality during my visit 2 weeks ago. In particular, I wish to thank and recognize Korean Ambassador Duk-Soo Han for all his help and support that paved the way for a successful and productive trip. He is a great advocate for his country and I appreciate our mutual friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I came away from my visit emboldened and excited by the opportunities that lay ahead with respect to benefits of the KORUS FTA. On this note, I respectfully urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important agreement. I hope to see it brought up for consideration very soon, so that it can be ratified and implemented at the earliest opportunity.

RECOGNIZING AMBASSADOR TONY HALL'S HUNGER FAST

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend my dear friend and our former colleague, Ambassador Tony Hall, for his devotion to those less fortunate. Ambassador Hall went on a 28-day fast after learning of proposed budget cuts for programs that help those less fortunate domestically and abroad.

Here are some comments that he made regarding his recent fast:

''Back in 1993, as a Member of Congress, I went on a 22-day fast to protest the lack of conscience of the U.S. Congress towards poor and hungry people. Now, almost twenty years later, the stakes are even higher. That's why on March 28, 2011—almost one month ago—I stopped eating and started fasting, calling on friends and colleagues from across the country and around the world to join me.

''This coming Easter Sunday I will stop fasting. The Hungerfast campaign is coming to an end, but the movement to ensure our leaders don't balance the budgets on the backs of poor and hungry people is only getting started.

''But before moving forward, I want to pause for a moment to look back on what we have accomplished together, and to express my gratitude for all the ways people have broken out of their normal routines—going above and beyond—in order to make the Hungerfast movement possible.

''Hungerfast has brought together a large and diverse coalition of partners; Meals on Wheels and the ONE Campaign. World Vision and MoveOn.org. Christian, Jewish and Muslim organizations breaking out of business as usual to call their constituencies to fasting, prayer and personal sacrifice.

''With over 36,000 Americans, including 28 Members of Congress, committed to fasting, prayer and other forms of serious personal sacrifice, the HungerFast movement will have repercussions long into the future; it has not only set the stage for our ongoing budget debate, it has moved all of us into deeper levels of solidarity with those who Jesus called, 'the least of these.''

As the Congress continues the budget process, we must carefully consider proposals that impact the most vulnerable. Scripture (Proverbs 19:17) tells us, ''He who is kind to the poor lends to the Lord.'' And in the New Testament Jesus talks a lot about the poor. In Matthew 25 he says that if we ignore the poor and hungry it is the same as ignoring him.

It is imperative that we all work together rein in our nation's unfunded liabilities to ensure that resources are available to help society's neediest and most vulnerable members.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 10, 2011, I was unavoidably detained and unable to be in the Chamber for three rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 299, the Polis amendment to H.R. 1229; "yea" on rollcall No. 300, the Garamendi amendment to H.R. 1229; and "yea" on the Markey amendment to H.R. 1229.

HONORING RUTH BURR POWELL

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Ruth Burr Powell, as she celebrates her 100th birthday on September 24th. The Colonial Dames of the 17th Century are hosting a party in Ruth's honor on May 19th in Florida.

Ruth Burr Powell hails from Linden Michigan. She graduated from Linden High School, attended Flint (Mott) Community College, and the University of Michigan. After receiving her Master's Degree in Music and Art from Wayne State University, Ruth taught in the Detroit Public Schools.

A lifelong interest in history and genealogy led her to publish a book on the genealogy of her mother's family. Along with her husband, Harold F. Powell PhD, she inventoried the grave-sites and headstones of Fairview Cemetery. The Cemetery covers 29 acres in Linden and dates back to 1836. Together they wrote a reference book about the Cemetery still in use today. Ruth has served as the Regent of the Ezra Parker Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution; President of the Huguenot Society of Michigan; Elder of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in Michigan; State President of the Michigan Chapter of the Society of Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company; Vice President of the Florida Genealogical Society; and she is a life member of the Linden Chapter of the Order of the Eastern Star. She has volunteered her time with several hereditary societies and with the Historical Collections at the Detroit Public Library and the Florida Genealogical Society Library.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in wishing Ruth Burr Powell much joy as she celebrates her 100th birthday and for many, many more years to come.

HONORING THE LIFE, SERVICE, AND SACRIFICE OF MINNESOTA LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and public service of all the brave men and women who gave their life in the line of duty.

As we celebrate National Police Week 2011, let us take time to recognize that our law enforcement officers risk their lives every day to protect our families and keep us safe. Every peace officer serving in Minnesota or any community across this country knows that wearing a uniform carries a special responsibility and exceptional risk.

Today marks nearly one year since Maplewood Police Officer Joseph Bergeron was killed in the line of duty after responding to reports of a suspected carjacking. This was a time of great pain and loss for the State of Minnesota. In the year since, the law enforcement community continues to heal from this loss and will ultimately do so because of their strength and resilience. The residents of the City of Maplewood will continue to have my full support during this time.

We must never forget the heroic sacrifice of our fallen peace officers. The valiant bravery of these brave men and women helps ensure the safety of our families and communities. This National Police Week, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the courage and sacrifice of all law enforcement officers who gave their life in the line of duty.

HONORING RABBI HERBERT N. BROCKMAN ON HIS 25TH ANNIVERSARY WITH CONGREGATION MISHKAN ISRAEL

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join Congregation Mishkan Israel and the Greater New Haven community in paying tribute to the outstanding efforts of Rabbi Herbert N. Brockman as he celebrates his 25th year of leadership at the synagogue. Rabbi Brockman is not only an exceptional religious leader, but has earned a distinguished reputation as an advocate for social justice and interfaith understanding. His commitment to these issues have enriched the lives of his congregation and fostered better communication and understanding among various community groups. In doing so, he has helped to mold the character of our community—going a long way in creating an environment of mutual awareness and respect.

Though he originally came to Yale Medical School planning to become a psychiatrist, like six generations before him, Rabbi Brockman heard a call to another purpose. Upon completion of his rabbinic studies in the Reform tradition, he served two other synagogues before finding a more permanent home at Mishkan Israel in Hamden, Connecticut.

His experiences led him to a broader world view and it has been through this holistic view of humanity that he has taught and inspired not only his congregation but the community as a whole. Rabbi Brockman holds firm to the belief that in order to really learn you must be willing to listen to opposing viewpoints and while you may not agree, you must respect that there are opinions other than your own.

He is both renowned and beloved for his encouragement of the congregation at Mishkan Israel, and the community at-large, to challenge themselves by approaching political and current issues in different ways. In fact one of the members of Mishkan Israel was recently quoted as saying, "he has brought the congregation to a place of social participation and awareness that does not happen all the time." It has been through his strongly held view that everybody has something to offer and that everyone should be heard that he has become a community leader in interfaith relationships. Indeed, at his Silver Salute, he will be honored by an imam, a bishop, and several ministers—a testament to his advocacy and the respect he has earned throughout our religious communities.

Rabbi Brockman has inspired hundreds to not only talk about those issues that impact our community, but to act on them as well. Among those is Abraham's Tent, a program that Rabbi Brockman helped found which was created to address the problem of the many homeless men who are turned away from shelters because of high demand and limited capacity. Each week a house of worship is opened to these men so that they may have a warm place to sleep at night and volunteers from the congregation also provide them with a hot meal. This effort has not only provided shelter to many who might have otherwise been subjected to the bitter conditions of a New England winter, but has also kept the issues of homelessness at the forefront of our community's public discourse.

Through his spiritual leadership and advocacy for social justice, Rabbi Herbert Brockman has left an indelible mark on our community. His infinite compassion and commitment to service inspires others to make a difference—a gift that has and continues to make the Greater New Haven community a better place to live, learn, and grow. I am so pleased to have the opportunity to extend my deepest thanks to him for all of his good work and to join the congregation of Mishkan Israel in congratulating him on his 25th Anniversary with them. I wish him, his wife, Elin, and their children Harry and Jonathan all the best for many more years of health and happiness.

HONORING SISTER MARY ANN SMITH

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Sister Mary Ann Smith, President/Principal of Ladywood High School, as she receives the Helen Kern Morris Award from the Father Kern Foundation and Most Holy Trinity Church, located in Southwest Detroit. Each year the Helen Kern Morris Award is presented to an individual who has demonstrated a deep commitment in the Catholic faith and dedication in serving her community and the needs of the less fortunate.

Born in Bronson, Michigan, Sister Mary Ann is the third of four children born to Leo and Martha Smith. She completed her elementary education in Bronson at St. Mary's Assumption and responded to God's calling to enter the Aspirancy of the Felician Sisters. After attending both the Felician Academy in Detroit and Livonia's Ladywood High School, Sister

Mary Ann entered the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Felix of Cantalice, Felician Sisters. She earned a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Music/Education from Madonna University in 1972 and went on to Wayne State University where she earned a Masters in Music/Education in 1980. Impressively in 1987, Sister Mary Ann received a Master's Degree in Educational Administration at the University of Dayton. From the State of Michigan she obtained Administrative Certification K–12 Building Level Leadership Improvement, a Secondary Certificate in Music-K–12 and in Music 9–12.

Sister Mary Ann Smith has served on numerous Boards and Committees in the academic community, is a member of the Livonia Chamber of Commerce and is a choir member and cantor at St. Monica Parish. She taught school in Detroit, Hamtramck, Wyandotte, Bay City and Livonia and served as Principal at St. Florian High School in Hamtramck before becoming Principal/President of Ladywood High School in my hometown of Livonia.

Mr. Speaker, Sister Mary Ann Smith has bettered the lives of countless students. Celebrating more than 40 years in Catholic Education, Sister Mary Ann Smith has been a member of the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Felix of Cantalice for 44 years. As she receives this much deserved award for her tireless efforts on the behalf of the youth of our metropolitan area, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding her legendary leadership, and in thanking her for her unfaltering service to our community and our country.

INTRODUCING THE INDUSTRIAL HEMP FARMING ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Industrial Hemp Farming Act. The Industrial Hemp Farming Act requires the Federal Government to respect State laws allowing the growing of industrial hemp.

Nine States—Hawaii, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Montana, North Dakota, Oregon, Vermont, and West Virginia—allow industrial hemp production or research in accord with State laws. However, Federal law is standing in the way of farmers in these States growing what may be a very profitable crop. Because of current Federal law, all hemp included in products sold in the United States must be imported instead of being grown by American farmers.

Since 1970, the federal Controlled Substances Act's inclusion of industrial hemp in the schedule one definition of marijuana has prohibited American farmers from growing industrial hemp despite the fact that industrial hemp has such a low content of THC (the psychoactive chemical in the related marijuana plant) that nobody can be psychologically affected by consuming hemp. Federal law concedes the safety of industrial hemp by allowing it to be legally imported for use as food.

The United States is the only industrialized nation that prohibits industrial hemp cultivation. The Congressional Research Service has noted that hemp is grown as an established agricultural commodity in approximately 30 nations in Europe, Asia, North America, and South America. The Industrial Hemp Farming Act will relieve this unique restriction on American farmers and allow them to grow industrial hemp in accord with State law.

Industrial hemp is a crop that was grown legally throughout the United States for most of our Nation's history. In fact, during World War II, the Federal Government actively encouraged American farmers to grow industrial hemp to help the war effort. The Department of Agriculture even produced a film ''Hemp for Victory'' encouraging the plant's cultivation.

In recent years, the hemp plant has been put to many popular uses in foods and in industry. Grocery stores sell hemp seeds and oil as well as food products containing oil and seeds from the hemp plant. Industrial hemp is also included in consumer products such as paper, cloths, cosmetics, carpet, and door frames of cars. Hemp has even been used in alternative automobile fuel.

It is unfortunate that the Federal Government has stood in the way of American farmers competing in the global industrial hemp market. Indeed, the founders of our Nation, some of whom grew hemp, would surely find that federal restrictions on farmers growing a safe and profitable crop on their own land are inconsistent with the constitutional guarantee of a limited, restrained Federal Government. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to stand up for American farmers and cosponsor the Industrial Hemp Farming Act.

HONORING BRAIN CENTER HEALTH AND REHABILITATION OF HENDERSONVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA

HON. HEATH SHULER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Brain Center Health and Rehabilitation of Hendersonville, North Carolina, during this year's National Nursing Home Week.

Brain Center Health and Rehabilitation provides extended care and skilled nursing services to seniors with short-term and long-term disabilities. The center houses a dedicated staff that provides 24-hour continuous care throughout the year to 120 patients. Through associate partners, they are able to offer reliable and high-quality medical assistance to residents in multiple states.

In celebration of this year's National Nursing Home Week, the theme of which is ''fulfilling the promise,'' Brain Center Health and Rehabilitation Center will host events to recognize residents and staff that focus on maintaining the high level of care that helped it be named one of the only 5 Star centers in the region.

I would like to applaud and thank the skilled and trained staff members of Brain Center Health and Rehabilitation. Their focus on individualized care respects the rights and dignity of their residents and their philosophy of caring and curing provides quality results.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of their excellence in care, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the staff and residents of Brain Center Health and Rehabilitation.

JOHN PANGELINAN GERBER POST OFFICE BUILDING

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to rename the U.S. Post Office Building in Barrigada, Guam, the John Pangelinan Gerber Post Office Building. John Gerber, a former Marine and lifetime resident of the village of Ordot, Guam, passed away on May 4, 2010, at the age of 58.

John Vincent Pangelinan Gerber was born in Guam on May 31, 1951. The eldest son of Martin and Dolores Gerber, John attended Barrigada Junior High School, Father Duenas Memorial School and George Washington High School. On June 4, 1969, immediately after graduating from high school, John enlisted in the United States Marine Corps. Upon completion of basic training at Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego, John was deployed to Vietnam where he served with the Fleet Logistics Command in support of the 1st and 3rd Marine Divisions. After completing his tour in Vietnam, John was assigned to Marine Barracks Guam where he would remain until he was honorably discharged as a Corporal from the Marine Corps on June 3, 1975.

Following his service in the Marine Corps, John returned to Guam and became a radio disc jockey with his signature ''Wireless Rock'' program. He had the most popular radio show on Guam at the time, and he was a local celebrity. As his program's popularity soared, John showed his business acumen by opening a record store called the Wireless Rock Music Box. John was an entrepreneur and he combined his love of our island and our ocean with a business venture, establishing a charter boat tour company that offered visitors a tour of Guam's best diving and fishing spots and Chamorro fiesta food on board. He promoted the Chamorro culture in his tours and was one of the pioneers of what is now recognized as culture-based eco-tourism.

In 1992, John joined the Guam Chapter of the 3rd Marine Division Association. As a member of this organization, John devoted his time and energy to helping fellow Marines and veterans. He was active in promoting and preserving the history of the 3rd Marine Division and its role in the War in the Pacific and the Liberation of Guam during World War II. He was a history buff and he immersed himself in collecting memorabilia and military equipment from the World War II era.

John also promoted the idea of welcoming active duty Marines and other servicemembers who visited Guam on temporary duty or deployments. He teamed up with the Guam Chamber of Commerce's Armed Forces Committee and veterans organizations to host fiestas for visiting Marines, World War II veterans, and military units deployed to Guam. He hosted numerous fiestas each year and it is estimated that his hospitality was appreciated by nearly 20,000 servicemembers who visited his home in Ordot called ''Gerber's Ranch.'' Gerber's Ranch was a mini-complex of outdoor pavilions, cooking facilities, and a mini-museum of his collection of World War II memorabilia. John collected and restored many World War II armored vehicles, weapons and uniforms and artifacts. His collection

was known worldwide among Marines and his mini-museum was visited by many of the Marine Corps' senior leadership, including the Commandant.

John worked tirelessly to educate the public about Guam's significance during World War II and the Marine Corps' role in liberating the island. On July 21, 2008, the 64th anniversary of Liberation of Guam, John opened the Pacific War Museum, transferring his collection to a site more accommodating to the public. This facility, located below a bluff named after U.S. Navy Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, served as an appropriate display venue for John's collection of World War II-era memorabilia and military equipment.

In 2004, John was instrumental in an effort to rename Route 1 on Guam from Marine Drive to Marine Corps Drive to clarify that this highway honors the 1,548 Marines who lost their lives and the 6,000 Marines that were wounded during the Liberation of Guam, and that it is not named Marine Drive because it parallels Guam's western shoreline as many tourists believe. When the bill stalled in the Guam Legislature, John called attention to this issue by walking the entire 27 miles from Andersen Air Force Base to Naval Base Guam pulling a handcart with a billboard that demanded action. His walk, which occurred during the morning rush hour, captured the public's admiration and support for this audacious stunt. John went to this extreme to ensure that our community will always remember the heroism of the Marines who liberated Guam, especially those who gave the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom. The following day, Route 1 was officially renamed Marine Corps Drive by an Executive Order of the Governor, overcoming the objections of the Legislature.

John was elated when the Department of Defense announced in 2005 that Marines from the 3rd Expeditionary Force would be transferred from Okinawa, Japan to Guam. He viewed the relocation of the 3rd Expeditionary Force as a homecoming for the Marine Corps and was always the first to defend the Marine Corps when members of the community made negative comments about "his" Marines.

After his passing, community leaders, family, friends, and John's fellow servicemembers spoke fondly of John's service and his dedication to honoring his fellow Marines and veterans. On April 16, 2011, the Marine Corps Heritage Foundation posthumously awarded John Gerber the prestigious Colonel John H. Magruder Award in Quantico, Virginia. This national award recognizes an individual or organization for their excellence in depicting and perpetuating Marine Corps history.

Mr. Speaker, John Gerber was a proud son of Guam who dedicated his life to honoring his beloved Marines, veterans, and the people of Guam. Renaming the Guam Main Post Office Facility will serve as a permanent honor to the legacy and memory of John Pangelinan Gerber, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

INTRODUCTION FOR A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER HIV/AIDS AWARENESS DAY

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution to honor the memory of 3,408 Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders we have lost to AIDS, and to recognize the 9,000 whom are still living with HIV/AIDS in the United States. It supports the goals and ideals of National Asian and Pacific Islander HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, its observance, and, draws attention to the stigma and disparities that hinder proper treatment and prevention within these communities.

Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders comprise more than 40 different ethnic subgroups, speaking more than 100 languages and dialects. This resolution recognizes the importance of providing access to culturally- and linguistically-competent services, especially HIV testing. According to an analysis of recent data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders were the only racial/ethnic groups with a statistically significant increase in new HIV diagnoses. The CDC estimates that 37% of the HIV diagnoses among these communities progress to AIDS in less than 12 months. Additionally, the CDC estimates that 1 in 3 Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders living with HIV/AIDS are unaware they are infected.

Yet, with increasing rates of infection, they continue to have the lowest rates of access to HIV testing services. Although there are a number of factors that contribute to increasing rates of infections, stigma and discrimination associated with HIV/AIDS has proved to be a leading factor in low testing rates and increased risk-taking behaviors.

The observance of National Asian & Pacific Islander HIV/AIDS Awareness Day was established by the Banyan Tree Project, and began as a national campaign to raise awareness of the impact of the HIV/AIDS-related stigma and how it contributes to lower testing rates and greater risk-taking behaviors.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in addressing this need and advancing the larger cause of reducing HIV/AIDS-related stigmas and disparities in access to HIV prevention, testing, and treatment. I would like to thank my colleagues, Representative HONDA, Representative FALEOMAVAEGO, Representative WU, Representative PIERLUISI, Representative MALONEY, Representative CONNOLLY, Representative CHRISTENSEN, Representative LEE, Representative GRIJALVA, Representative AL GREEN, Representative ROBERT SCOTT, Representative SABLAN, and Representative MCDERMOTT for their support as original cosponsors to this resolution.

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, May 12, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine strategic implications of Pakistan and the region.
SD–419

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine oversight and reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.
SD–538

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 516, to extend outer Continental Shelf leases to accommodate permitting delays and to provide operators time to meet new drilling and safety requirements, S. 843, to establish outer Continental Shelf lease and permit processing coordination offices, S. 916, to facilitate appropriate oil and gas development on Federal land and waters, to limit dependence of the United States on foreign sources of oil and gas, and S. 917, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to reform the management of energy and mineral resources on the Outer Continental Shelf.
SD–366

Finance
To hold hearings to examine financing 21st century infrastructure.
SD–215

Judiciary
Immigration, Refugees and Border Security Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine improving security and facilitating commerce at America's northern border and ports of entry.
SD–226

10:15 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Federal Railroad Administration and the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.
SD–138

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To receive a closed briefing the United States Northern Command (NORTHCOM) and the United States Southern Command (SOUTHCOM).
SVC–217

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine addressing the U.S. Postal Service's financial crisis.
SD–342

2:15 p.m.
Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider S. 618, to promote the strengthening of the private sector in Egypt and Tunisia, S. Con. Res. 15, supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day, and reaffirming United States leadership and support for efforts to combat malaria as a critical component of the President's Global Health Initiative, and the nominations of Daniel Benjamin Shapiro, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to Israel, Stuart E. Jones, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, George Albert Krol, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Uzbekistan, and Henry S. Ensher, of California, to be Ambassador to the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, all of the Department of State, and Mara E. Rudman, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and a promotion list in the Foreign Service.
S–116, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine strengthening medical and public health preparedness and response.
SD–430

3:30 p.m.
Intelligence
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.
SD–562

MAY 18

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities, Insurance and Investment Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the state of the securitization markets.
SD–538

10 a.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Business meeting to continue consideration of S. 772, to protect Federal employees and visitors, improve the security of Federal facilities and authorize and modernize the Federal Protective Service, S. 550, to improve the provision of assistance to fire departments, and S. 792, to authorize the waiver of certain debts relating to assistance provided to individuals and households since 2005.
SD–342

Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine improving efficiency and ensuring justice in the immigration court system.
SD–226

Armed Services
Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the current materiel readiness of U.S. Forces in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SR–232A

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine seamless transition, focusing on improving Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense collaboration.
SR–418

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Energy.
SD–192

Foreign Relations
European Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine Administration priorities for Europe in the 112th Congress.
SD–419

Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine S. 220, to provide for the reforestation of forest landscapes, protection of old growth forests, and management of national forests in the eastside forests of the State of Oregon, S. 270, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Deschutes County, Oregon, S. 271, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a property conveyance with the city of Wallowa, Oregon, S. 278, to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, S. 292, to resolve the claims of the Bering Straits Native Corporation and the State of Alaska to land adjacent to Salmon Lake in the State of Alaska and to provide for the conveyance to the Bering Straits Native Corporation of certain other public land in partial satisfaction of the land entitlement of the Corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, S. 322, to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers, S. 382, to amend the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986 to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture regarding additional recreational uses of National Forest System land that is subject to ski area permits, and for other permits, S. 427, to withdraw certain land located in Clark County, Nevada, from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials, S. 526, to provide for the conveyance of certain Bureau of Land Management land in Mohave County, Arizona, to the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, for use as a public shooting range, S. 566, to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System, S. 590, to convey certain submerged lands to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in order to give that territory the same benefits in its submerged lands as Guam, the Virgin Islands, and

American Samoa have in their submerged lands, S. 607, to designate certain land in the State of Oregon as wilderness, to provide for the exchange of certain Federal land and non-Federal land, S. 617, to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Elko County, Nevada, and to take land into trust for the Te-moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada, S. 683, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of land to the town of Mantua, Utah, S. 684, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of land to the town of Alta, Utah, S. 667, to establish the Rio Grande del Norte National Conservation Area in the State of New Mexico, S. 729, to validate final patent number 27–2005-0081, S. 766, to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild rivers, S. 896, to amend the Public Land Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service, and S. 897, to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to clarify that uncertified States and Indian tribes have the authority to use certain payments for certain noncoal reclamation projects and acid mine remediation programs.

SD–366

Armed Services
SeaPower Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine Marine Corps acquisition programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session.

SR–232A

MAY 19

10 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine evaluating goals and progress in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

SD–419

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine ten years after 9/11, focusing on if intelligence reform is working, part II.

SD–342

2:30 p.m.
Foreign Relations
African Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the next steps in Cote d'Ivoire.

SD–419

Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine S. 201, to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, S. 333, to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Little Wood River Ranch, S. 334, to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir, S. 419, to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System, S. 499, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project, S. 519, to further allocate and expand the availability of hydroelectric power generated at Hoover Dam, and S. 808, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Uintah Water Conservancy District.

SD–366

Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

MAY 24

9 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine al Qaeda, the Taliban, and other extremist groups in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

SD–419

2:30 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD–226

MAY 25

10 a.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine how to save taxpayer dollars, focusing on case studies of duplication in the Federal Government.

SD–342

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine seamless transition, focusing on meeting the needs of service members and veterans.

SR–418

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Missile Defense Agency.

SD–192

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine S. 233, to withdraw certain Federal land and interests in that land from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under the mineral and geothermal leasing laws, S. 375, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with State foresters authorizing State foresters to provide certain forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services, S. 714, to reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, and S. 730, to provide for the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

SD–366

MAY 26

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To receive a closed briefing on the United States Central Command (CENTCOM) and United States African Command (AFRICOM).

SVC–217

JUNE 15

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

SD–192

JUNE 16

10:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 343, to amend Title I of PL 99–658 regarding the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Palau, to approve the results of the 15-year review of the Compact, including the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Palau Following the Compact of Free Association Section 432 Review, and to appropriate funds for the purposes of the amended PL 99–658 for fiscal years ending on or before September 30, 2024, to carry out the agreements resulting from that review.

SD–366

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2851–S2894

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 943–957, and S. Res. 179–180. **Pages S2874–75**

Measures Passed:

Minority Party's Committee Membership: Senate agreed to S. Res. 179, to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, or until their successors are chosen. **Page S2892**

Appointments:

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy:

Senator Hoeven (Committee on Appropriations) and

Senator Graham (At Large) **Page S2892**

Urbanski Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent time agreement was reached providing that at 1 p.m., on Thursday, May 12, 2011, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Michael Francis Urbanski, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia; that there be one hour for debate, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote without intervening action or debate on confirmation of the nomination; that no further motions be in order to the nomination. **Page S2891**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By a unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. EX. 69), Arenda L. Wright Allen, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia. **Pages S2864–71, S2894**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Richard G. Andrews, of Delaware, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware.

Cathy Ann Bencivengo, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Jeffrey J. Helmick, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

William J. Burns, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

8 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.

26 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Navy and Public Health Service. **Pages S2892–94**

Messages from the House: **Page S2871**

Measures Referred: **Page S2872**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S2851, S2872**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S2872, S2892**

Executive Communications: **Pages S2872–74**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2875–76**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2876–91**

Additional Statements: **Page S2871**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S2891**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—69) **Page S2871**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 3:34 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, May 12, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2892.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal

year 2012 for the National Institutes of Health, after receiving testimony from Francis S. Collins, Director, Anthony S. Fauci, Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Griffin P. Rodgers, Director, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, Harold Varmus, Director, National Cancer Institute, and Susan B. Shurin, Acting Director, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, all of the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

APPROPRIATIONS: GUARD AND RESERVE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Guard and Reserve, after receiving testimony from General Craig R. McKinley, U.S. Air Force, Chief, National Guard Bureau, Major General Raymond W. Carpenter, U.S Army, Acting Director, Army National Guard, Lieutenant General Harry M. Wyatt III, U.S. Air Force, Director, Air National Guard, Lieutenant General Jack Stultz, Chief, U.S. Army Reserve, Vice Admiral Dirk Debbink, U.S. Navy, Chief, Navy Reserve, Major General Darrell L. Moore, U.S. Marine Corps, Director, Reserve Affairs, and Lieutenant General Charles E. Stenner, Jr., U.S. Air Force, Chief, Air Force Reserve, all of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine the Active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian personnel programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Thomas R. Lamont, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Lieutenant General Thomas P. Bostick, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, G1, Juan M. Garcia, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Vice Admiral Mark E. Ferguson III, USN, Chief of Naval Personnel, Lieutenant General Robert E. Milstead, Jr., USMC, Deputy Commandant for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Daniel B. Ginsberg, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, and Lieutenant General Darrell D. Jones, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff, Manpower, Personnel and Services, all of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine military space programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Gregory L. Schulte, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Space Policy, Rear Admiral David W. Titley, Director, Oceanography, Space and Maritime Domain, Awareness Division, OPNAV N2/N6 (Information Dominance), John A. Zangardi, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Information and Space, General William L. Shelton, Commander, Air Force Space Command, Lieutenant General Susan J. Helms, Commander, Joint Functional Component Command for Space, Lieutenant General Richard P. Formica, USA, Commanding General, United States Army Space and Missile Defense Command and Army Forces Strategic Command, and Major General John E. Hyten, Director, Space Programs, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, all of the Department of Defense; and Christina T. Chaplain, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office.

MANUFACTURING A STRONGER ECONOMY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine manufacturing our way to a stronger economy, after receiving testimony from Leo W. Gerard, United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union (USW), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on behalf of the United Steelworkers; Stephanie A. Burns, Dow Corning Corporation, Midland, Michigan; and Mike Rowe, Discovery Communications, Inc., Silver Spring, Maryland.

NATIONAL PARKS BILLS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine S. 114, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement for a park headquarters at San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, to expand the boundary of the Park, to conduct a study of potential land acquisitions, S. 127, to establish the Buffalo Bayou National Heritage Area in the State of Texas, S. 140, to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, S. 161, to establish Pinnacles National Park in the State of California as a unit of the National Park System, S. 177, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Gold Hill Ranch in Coloma, California, S. 247, to establish the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, S. 279, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of

establishing Camp Hale as a unit of the National Park System, S. 302, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue right-of-way permits for a natural gas transmission pipeline in nonwilderness areas within the boundary of Denali National Park, S. 313, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits for a microhydro project in nonwilderness areas within the boundaries of Denali National Park and Preserve, to acquire land for Denali National Park and Preserve from Doyon Tourism, Inc, S. 323, to establish the First State National Historical Park in the State of Delaware, S. 403, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Molalla River in the State of Oregon, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 404, to modify a land grant patent issued by the Secretary of the Interior, S. 508, to establish the Chimney Rock National Monument in the State of Colorado, S. 535, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands within Fort Pulaski National Monument, S. 564, to designate the Valles Caldera National Preserve as a unit of the National Park System, S. 599, to establish a commission to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the American Civil War, S. 713, to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, S. 765, to modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument, S. 779, to authorize the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 under the American Battlefield Protection Program, S. 849, to establish the Waco Mammoth National Monument in the State of Texas, and S. 858, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Colonel Charles Young Home in Xenia, Ohio as a unit of the National Park System, after receiving testimony from Senator Carper; Stephen E. Whitesell, Associate Director, Park Planning, Facilities, and Lands, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Joel Holtrop, Deputy Chief, National Forest Systems, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; and Raymond Loretto, Valles Caldera Trust, Jemez Springs, New Mexico.

UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, after receiving testimony from Miriam Sapiro, Deputy United States Trade Representative; Sandra Polaski, Deputy Under Secretary of Labor for International Affairs; General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.), former Combatant Commander, United States Southern Command, Department of Defense, Coral Gables, Florida; Jeffrey S. Vogt, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D.C.; and Gordon Stoner, Montana Grain Growers Association, Outlook, Montana.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRATIC REFORM IN IRAN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South and Central Asian Affairs concluded a hearing to examine human rights and democratic reform in Iran, after receiving testimony from Michael Posner, Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, and Philo Dibble, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Iran, and Near Eastern Affairs, both of the Department of State; Kambiz Hosseini, Voice of America Persian, and Andrew Apostolou, Freedom House, both of Washington, D.C.; and Rudi Bakhtiar, International Campaign for Human Rights in Iran, New York, New York.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. Res. 174, expressing the sense of the Senate that effective sharing of passenger information from inbound international flight manifests is a crucial component of our national security and that the Department of Homeland Security must maintain the information sharing standards required under the 2007 Passenger Name Record Agreement between the United States and the European Union;

H.R. 793, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12781 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in Inverness, California, as the ''Specialist Jake Robert Velloza Post Office'';

S. 349, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4865 Tallmadge Road in Rootstown, Ohio, as the ''Marine Sgt. Jeremy E. Murray Post Office''; and

S. 655, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 95 Dogwood Street in Cary, Mississippi, as the ''Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office''.

DIVERTING NON-URGENT EMERGENCY ROOM USE

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging concluded a hearing to examine diverting non-urgent emergency room use, focusing on if it can provide better care and lower costs, and health center strategies that may help reduce their use, after receiving testimony from Jim Macrae, Associate Administrator, Bureau of Primary Health Care, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of

Health and Human Services; Debra A. Draper, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; Peter Cunningham, Center for Studying Health System Change (HSC), Washington, D.C.; Alieta Eck, Zarephath Health Center, Zarephath, New Jersey; and Dana Kraus, St. Johnsbury Family Health Center, St. Johnsbury, Vermont.

AT&T/T-MOBILE MERGER

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights concluded a hearing to examine the AT&T/T-Mobile merger, after receiving testimony from Randall Stephenson, AT&T Inc., Dallas, Texas; Philipp Humm, T-Mobile USA, Inc., Bellevue, Washington; Daniel R. Hesse, Sprint Nextel Corporation, Overland Park, Kansas; Victor H. Meena, Cellular South, Inc., Ridgeland, Mississippi; and Gigi B. Sohn, Public Knowledge, and Larry Cohen, Communications Workers of America, both of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. Res. 116, to provide for expedited Senate consideration of certain nominations subject to advice and consent;

S. 739, to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to establish battery recharging stations for privately owned vehicles in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the Senate at no net cost to the Federal Government; and

The nomination of William J. Boarman, of Maryland, to be Public Printer, Government Printing Office.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 32 public bills, H.R. 1825–1856; 1 private bill, H.R. 1857; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 58–61; and H. Res. 263, 265–266 were introduced. **Pages H3217–20**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3220–21**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 264, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 754) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–75). **Page H3217**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Ellmers to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3163**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:45 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H3168**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Wallace Shepherd, Second Baptist Church, Santa Barbara, California. **Page H3168**

Report Filing: Agreed by unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services have until 5 p.m. on Tuesday, May 17, 2011 to file its report to accompany H.R. 1540. **Page H3171**

Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act: The House passed H.R. 1229, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico, by a recorded vote of 263 ayes to 163 noes, Roll No. 309. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, May 10th. **Pages H3180–86**

Rejected the Connolly motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 308. **Pages H3185–86**

Rejected:

Hanabusa amendment (No. 4 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that was debated on May 10th that sought to state that the Secretary shall not issue an offshore drilling permit without certifying that the applicant has calculated a worst-case discharge scenario for the proposed drilling operations; and has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the applicant possesses the capability and technology to respond immediately and effectively to such worst-case discharge scenario (by a recorded vote of 187 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 302); **Page H3180**

Holt amendment (No. 6 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that was debated on May 10th that sought to strike a provision in the underlying bill that would "deem" drilling permits approved after

60 days even if the necessary safety and environmental reviews have not be completed. The amendment leaves in place a timeline for approving drilling permits, but prevents permits from being ''deemed'' approved before the safety review has been completed (by a recorded vote of 179 ayes to 247 noes, Roll No. 303); **Pages H3180–81**

Polis amendment (No. 7 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that was debated on May 10th that sought to lift timeline requirements if the agency lacks an adequate budget or lacks staff expertise to properly review permits (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 254 noes, Roll No. 304); **Pages H3181–82**

Hastings (FL) amendment (No. 8 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that was debated on May 10th that sought to require a detailed description of the extent to which and by when any oil found on the leased property will decrease the price of crude oil and at the pump for hardworking Americans (by a recorded vote of 169 ayes to 258 noes, Roll No. 305); **Page H3182**

Deutch amendment (No. 9 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that was debated on May 10th that sought to strike section 202 of H.R. 1229, so that states outside of the 5th Circuit could have their courts hear civil actions relating to energy projects in the Gulf of Mexico (by a recorded vote of 205 ayes to 222 noes, Roll No. 306); and **Pages H3182–83**

Hastings (FL) amendment (No. 11 printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–73) that was debated on May 10th that sought to strike section 207 of the bill which pertains to limitations on attorneys' fees (by a recorded vote of 185 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 307). **Pages H3183–84**

H. Res. 245, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on May 5th.

Pursuant to section 3 of the rule, in the engrossment of H.R. 1229, the Clerk shall (1) add the text of H.R. 1230, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 1229; (2) conform the title of H.R. 1229 to reflect the addition of H.R. 1230, as passed by the House, to the engrossment; (3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and (4) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Fincher, wherein he resigned from the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. **Page H3188**

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 263, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H3188**

Report Filing: Agreed by unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until 5 p.m. on Wednesday, May 18, 2011 to file its report to accompany H.R. 1800. **Page H3188**

Report Filings: Agreed by unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans Affairs have until 5 p.m. on Friday, May 20, 2011 to file its reports to accompany H.R. 1407, H.R. 1484, H.R. 1627, H.R. 1383, H.R. 1657, and H.R. 802. **Page H3188**

Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby: The House agreed to discharge and agree to H. Con. Res. 16, to authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. **Pages H3188–89**

Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service: The House agreed to discharge and agree to H. Con. Res. 46, to authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service. **Page H3189**

Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act: The House began consideration of H.R. 1231, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources and to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, May 12th. **Pages H3171–80, H3186–88, H3189–H3207**

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole.

Agreed to:

Young (AK) amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 112–74) that makes technical numbering corrections to section 2 of the bill. **Page H3196**

Rejected:

Connolly amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 112–74) that sought to clarify that new offshore drilling would not conflict with military operations (by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 228 noes, Roll No. 312); **Pages H3196–98, H3205**

Markey amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 112–74) that sought to require that new 5-year leasing plans require that companies bidding on new leases first renegotiate any royalty-free leases they own; thus raising more than $2 billion over 10 years (by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 313); and **Pages H3189–99, H3205–06**

Keating amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 112–74) that sought to require the Secretary to make public information about the lessee's executive

bonuses from the most recent quarter (by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 314).

Pages H3199–H3200, H3206

Proceedings Postponed:

Tsongas amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 112–74) that seeks to require that all applicants for a drilling permit under a lease issued under H.R. 1231 would have to submit a worst-case scenario oil spill containment and clean-up plan; **Pages H3200–01**

Brown (FL) amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 112–74) that seeks to make permanent the current moratorium on drilling in the eastern gulf of Mexico that expires in 2022; **Pages H3201–02**

Thompson (CA) amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 112–74) that seeks to clarify that the legislation does not allow for oil and gas drilling on the northern coast of California; and **Pages H3202–03**

Inslee amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 112–74) that seeks to require the Washington state Governor and legislature approve any leasing of the Outer Continental Shelf off of Washington state.

Pages H3203–04

H. Res. 257, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a recorded vote of 243 ayes to 179 noes, Roll No. 311, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 310.

Pages H3171–80, H3186–88

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H3164.

Senate Referral: S. Con. Res. 16 was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

Pages H3164, H3216

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and twelve recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3180, H3181, H3181–82, H3182, H3183, H3183–84, H3185, H3186, H3187, H3187–88, H3205, H3205–06 and H3206. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Committee Meetings

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT—APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on National Endowment for the Arts FY12 Budget. Testimony was heard from Rocco Landesman, Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts.

DEFENSE—APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on Defense Health Program. Testimony was heard from Jonathan Woodson, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs; Lieutenant General Eric B. Schoomaker, Surgeon General of the U.S. Army; Vice Admiral Adam M. Robinson, Jr., Surgeon General of the U.S. Navy; and Lieutenant General Charles B. Green, Surgeon General of the U.S. Air Force.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing on the Government Printing Office, Congressional Budget Office, Members and Public Witnesses. Testimony was heard from William J. Boarman, Public Printer of the United States, GPO; Doug Elmendorf, Director, CBO; and public witnesses.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT—APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on National Endowment for the Humanities FY12 Budget Oversight. Testimony was heard from Jim Leach, Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a markup of the following: H. Res. 208, Directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication of the Department of Defense, or any portion of such communication, that refers or relates to any consultation with Congress regarding Operation Odyssey Dawn or military actions in or against Libya; and H.R. 1540, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

REMOVING INEFFICIENCIES IN THE NATION'S JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training held a hearing on Removing Inefficiencies in the Nation's Job Training Programs. Testimony was heard from Andrew Sherrill, Director for Education, Workforce, and Income Security, GAO; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee continued markup of the following: H.R. 5, the Help Efficient, Accessible, Low-cost, Timely Healthcare (HEALTH) Act of 2011. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

MONETARY POLICY AND THE DEBT CEILING

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Monetary Policy and the Debt Ceiling: Examining the Relationship Between the Federal Reserve and Government Debt.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO ADDRESS THE NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF THE DODD-FRANK WHISTLEBLOWER PROVISIONS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals to Address the Negative Consequences of the Dodd-Frank Whistleblower Provisions.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PEACE CORPS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing on the Peace Corps at 50. Testimony was heard from Aaron S. Williams, Director, Peace Corps; Kathy A. Buller, Inspector General, Peace Corps; Jessica Smochek, Former Peace Corps Volunteer; Carol Clark, Former Peace Corps Volunteer; Karestan Chase Koenen, Former Peace Corps Volunteer; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H. Res. 209, Directing the Secretary of State to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication of the Department of State, or any portion of such communication, that refers or relates to any consultation with Congress regarding Operation Odyssey Dawn or military actions in or against Libya. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

ON THE BORDER AND IN THE LINE OF FIRE: U.S. LAW ENFORCEMENT, HOMELAND SECURITY AND DRUG CARTEL VIOLENCE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management held a hearing entitled ''On the Border and in the Line of Fire: U.S. Law Enforcement, Homeland Security and Drug Cartel Violence.'' Testimony was heard from Grayling Williams, Director, Office of Counter-narcotics Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security; Amy Pope, Deputy Chief of Staff and Counselor Criminal Division, Office of Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice; Steven C. McCraw, Director, Texas Department of Public Safety; Thomas C. Horne, Attorney General, Arizona; Sigifredo Gonzalez, Sheriff, Zapata County, Texas; and Victor Rodriguez Chief, McAllen Police Department, Texas.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Committee on House Administration: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing on GPO—Issues and Challenges: How will GPO Transition to the Future? Testimony was heard from William J. Boarman, Public Printer, GPO; and public witnesses.

USA PATRIOT ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security held a hearing on the USA PATRIOT Act: Dispelling the Myths. Testimony was heard from former Congressman Robert Barr; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement held a hearing on H.R. 1741, the Secure Visas Act. Testimony was heard from Gary Cote, Acting Deputy Assistant Director, Office of International Affairs, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security; David Donahue, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Visa Services, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

USAID: FOLLOWING THE MONEY

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security, Homeland Defense and Foreign Operations held a hearing entitled ''USAID: Following the Money.'' Testimony was heard from Rajiv Shah, Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Donald Gambatesa, Inspector General, U.S. Agency for International Development.

TRANSPARENCY AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S REGULATION OF RISK RETENTION

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on TARP, Financial Services and Bailouts of Public and Private Programs held a hearing entitled ''Transparency as an Alternative to the Federal Government's Regulation of Risk Retention.'' Testimony was heard from Edward DeMarco, Acting Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency; and public witnesses.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by voice vote, a structured rule on H.R. 754, the Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 2011. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The rule provides that each such amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Mike Rogers of Michigan; Rep. Ruppersberger; and Rep. Gibson.

HYDRAULIC FRACTURING TECHNOLOGY AND PRACTICES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing on Review of Hydraulic Fracturing Technology and Practices. Testimony was heard from Elizabeth Ames Jones, Commissioner, Texas Railroad Commission; Robert M. Summers, Secretary, Maryland Department of the Environment; Harold Fitch, Michigan State Geologist; Director, Office of Geological Survey, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality; and Board Member, Ground Water Protection Council; Paul Anastas, Administrator, Office of Research and Development, EPA; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1425, Creating Jobs Through Small Business Innovation Act of 2011. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

EPA MINING POLICIES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing on EPA Mining Policies: Assault on Appalachian Jobs—Part II. Testimony was heard from Nancy Stoner, Acting Administrator, EPA Office of Water; and public witnesses.

EXAMINING VA'S IT STRATEGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on Reboot: Examining VA's IT Strategy for the 21st Century. Testimony was heard from Roger W. Baker, Assistant Secretary for Information and Technology and Chief Information Officer, Department of Veterans Affairs; and Belinda J. Finn, Assistant Inspector General for Audits and Evaluations, Office of Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1745, Jobs, Opportunity, Benefits, and Services Act of 2011. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

GROWING PRESSURE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine Central Asia and the Arab spring, focusing on growing pressure for human rights and whether the factors that drove the uprisings in North Africa and the Middle East exist in any of the Central Asian States, after receiving testimony from Robert O. Blake, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Asian Affairs; Stephen Blank, Professor, National Security Affairs, Strategic Studies Institute, United States Army War College, Department of Defense; Paul A. Goble, Institute of World Politics, Staunton, Virginia; Scott Radnitz, University of Washington Jackson School of International Studies, Seattle; and Gulam Umarov, Sunshine Coalition, Uzbekistan, Memphis, Tennessee.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 12, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Federal Aviation Administration, 9:30 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Secretary of the Senate, the Senate Sergeant at

Arms, and the United States Capitol Police, 1:30 p.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower, to receive a closed briefing on threats faced by our naval forces and the capabilities of our naval forces to respond to those threats in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: business meeting to consider the nominations of Peter A. Diamond, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, David S. Cohen, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, Daniel L. Glaser, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, and Timothy G. Massad, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary, all of the Department of the Treasury, and Wanda Felton, of New York, to be First Vice President, and Sean Robert Mulvaney, of Illinois, to be a Member, both of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine the Dodd-Frank implementation, focusing on monitoring systemic risk and promoting financial stability, 9:30 a.m., SD–538.

Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation and Community Development, to hold hearings to examine the need for national mortgage servicing standards, 2 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine carbon capture and sequestration legislation, including S. 699, to authorize the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program to demonstrate the commercial application of integrated systems for long-term geological storage of carbon dioxide, and S. 757, to provide incentives to encourage the development and implementation of technology to capture carbon dioxide from dilute sources on a significant scale using direct air capture technologies, 9 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety, to hold hearings to examine Federal efforts to protect public health by reducing diesel emissions, 2:30 p.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine oil and gas tax incentives and rising energy prices, 9 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine assessing the situation in Libya, 9:15 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine the middle class, focusing on if the American dream is slipping out of reach for American families, 9:15 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine ten years after 9/11, focusing on if intelligence reform is working, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 350, to require restitution for victims of criminal violations of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, S. 623, to amend chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, relating to protective orders, sealing of cases, disclosures of discovery information in civil actions, S. 890, ''Fighting Fraud to Protect Taxpayers Act of 2011'', and the nominations of Henry F. Floyd, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Kathleen M. Williams, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, Nelva Gonzales Ramos, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Richard Brooke Jackson, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, Sara Lynn Darrow, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois, and Donald B. Verrilli, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Solicitor General of the United States, Department of Justice, 9:30 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 Agriculture, Full Committee, hearing to review pending free trade agreements, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on Smithsonian Institution FY12 Budget Oversight, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, hearing on the House of Representatives FY 2012, 11 a.m., HC–5, Capitol.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing on Reviewing Workers' Compensation for Federal Employees, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, markup of legislation regarding the Enhancing CPSC Authority and Discretion Act of 2011 (ECADA). 9 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, markup of H.R. 1683, the State Flexibility Act of 2011, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, markup on the following legislation: H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011; H.R. 1573, to facilitate implementation of title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, promote regulatory coordination, and avoid market disruption; H.R. 1121, the Responsible Consumer Financial Protection Regulations Act of 2011; H.R. 1315, the Consumer Financial Protection Safety and Soundness Improvement Act of 2011; and H.R. 1667, to postpone the date for the transfer of functions to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection if the Bureau does not yet have a Director in place. 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing on Export Controls, Arms Sales, and Reform: Balancing U.S. Interests, Part 1, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, hearing entitled ''Taking Measure of Countermeasures (Part 2): A Review of Efforts to Protect the Homeland Through Distribution and Dispensing of CBRN Medical Countermeasures.'' 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Transportation Security, markup of the following: H.R. 1690, MODERN Security Credentials Act; H.R. 1801, Risk-Based Security Screening for Members of The Armed Forces Act; and H.R. 1165, Transportation Security Administration Ombudsman Act of 2011. 11 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing on the following: H.R. 470, to further allocate and expand the availability of hydroelectric power generated at Hoover Dam, and for other purposes; H.R. 489, to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; and H.R. 818, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Uintah Water Conservancy District. 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans, and Insular Affairs, hearing on the following: H.R. 295, to amend the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 to authorize funds to acquire hydrographic data and provide hydrographic services specific to the Arctic for safe navigation, delineating the United States extended continental shelf, and the monitoring and description of coastal changes; H.R. 670, to convey certain submerged lands to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in order to give that territory the same benefits in its submerged lands as Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa have in their submerged lands; H.R. 991, to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada before the date the polar bear was determined to be a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; H.R. 1160, McKinney Lake National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act; H.R. 1670, Sikes Act Amendments Act. 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Health Care, DC, Census and the National Archives, hearing entitled ''The District of Columbia's Fiscal Year 2012 Budget: Ensuring Fiscal Sustainability.'' 8:45 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and Labor Policy, hearing entitled ''Where Have All the Letters Gone?—The Mailing Industry and Its Future.'' 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Full Committee and the Committee on Small Business, joint hearing entitled ''Politicizing Procurement: Will President Obama's Proposal Curb Free Speech and Hurt Small Business?'' 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations and Regulations, hearing entitled ''Green Isn't Always Gold: Are EPA Regulations Harming Small Businesses?'' 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing on How to Stop Sitting on Our Assets: A Review of the Civilian Property Realignment Act, 10:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, markup of the following: H.R. 1407, Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2011; H.R. 1484, Veterans Appeals Improvement Act of 2011; H.R. 1627, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for certain requirements for the placement of monuments in Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes; H.R. 1383, Restoring GI Bill Fairness Act of 2011; H.R. 1657, to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the enforcement penalties for misrepresentation of a business concern as a small business concern owned and controlled by veterans or as a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans; and H.R. 802, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a VetStar Award Program; 3 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing on the burdens that the tax code imposes on American companies and how such burdens place them at a competitive disadvantage as they try to sell goods and services around the world, 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 1 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Michael Francis Urbanski, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia, and after a period of debate, vote on confirmation of the nomination at approximately 2 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, May 12

Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H.R. 1231—Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act. Begin consideration of H.R 754—Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bass, Karen, Calif., E863
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E862
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E853
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E869, E870
Burton, Dan, Ind., E861
Chu, Judy, Calif., E865
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E861, E865, E868
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E862
Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E859
Garamendi, John, Calif., E864
Gardner, Cory, Co., E853
Green, Gene, Tex., E853
Himes, James A., Conn., E865
Inslee, Jay, Wash., E856, E864
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E855
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E861, E868
King, Steve, Iowa, E858
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E857, E860
Langevin, James R., R.I., E868
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E854, E856
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E856
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E855
McCarthy, Kevin, Calif., E854
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E859, E868
McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E860, E868
Manzullo, Donald A., Ill., E863
Mica, John L., Fla., E859
Miller, George, Calif., E857
Neugebauer, Randy, Tex., E865
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E857
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E863
Paul, Ron, Tex., E858, E869
Petri, Thomas E., Wisc., E859
Pompeo, Mike, Kans., E855
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E867
Riggell, E. Scott, Va., E858
Sarbanes, John P., Md., E857, E863
Shuler, Heath, N.C., E855, E869
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E855
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E866
Stutzman, Marlin A., Ind., E866
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E864
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E855
Welch, Peter, Vt., E864
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E853, E862, E867
Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E860

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.