United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2011 No. 114

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 27, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KENNY MARCHANT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN 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.

DISPROVING REPUBLICAN ORTHODOXY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, this week we have just disproven two items of Republican orthodoxy, and that is corporations don't pay taxes, only individuals pay taxes; and tax cuts create jobs.

What am I talking about? Well, last Friday the authorization for the Federal Aviation Administration expired. So the government is not collecting $200 million a week in security fees and other fees that pay for the aviation system. It is partially funded by the users of that system with ticket taxes and such. That is $200 million a week.

Now, what's happened since? Well, three airlines, three honest airlines—Frontier Airlines, Alaska, and Virgin America—lowered ticket prices because the government isn't collecting the taxes. But the other airlines, not so much. They actually raised their ticket prices to match the taxes, and they're collecting the windfall.

At the same time, their association, the Air Transport Association, is complaining about ticket taxes: But a big chunk of your ticket is going to Washington. Well, you can now X out Washington, and you can put in United Airlines, Continental Airlines, U.S Airways, Southwest Airlines, and Jet Blue, because they're taking the money.

And guess what? In addition to the consumers getting ripped off here, $200 million a week, we have another problem, the second one, tax cuts create jobs. Well, we've cut taxes, $200 million a week. That's a lot. And guess what? So far, 4,000 government jobs.

Now, Republicans don't care about government jobs even if they're doing some pretty critical stuff. But also, tens of thousands of private sector jobs are down the tube because not collecting the taxes means all of the airport improvement projects across America funded by these fees are grinding to a halt. Critical projects, projects that will save lives from runway incursions, control towers, security improvements in our airports to defeat terrorist attacks.

And in the case of my little regional airport on the coast in Oregon, their project to install a runway lighting system for instrument landing before winter has stopped. We just got jet service in there. The airlines say, Look, if we're going to come in here in the wintertime, you've got some bad weather. We need that system. Well, if this impasse continues, we will not have that system by next winter.

Now, who is that helping? Who are you guys helping over there with these stupid stunts you're pulling here? $200 million a week that the government isn't collecting that would pay for these critical projects, put tens of thousands of people to work, and now it's a windfall to a bunch of airlines.

But don't worry, the Air Transport Association says, these short-term increases, that is by the airlines increasing their ticket prices to make up for the taxes going away, these short-term increases benefit all stakeholders because it enables the airlines to invest in their product and service. Huh? What?

Let's see. The money used to go for safety and security and other essentials; now it's going to the airlines, and they're going to use it to improve their product and service. Maybe they'll start serving peanuts and soda again on some of these flights. I don't know.

But this is outrageous. So much for the Republican mantra. You know, corporations do pay taxes. And, in this case, now they are getting a windfall because the taxes went away. And no, tax cuts don't create jobs. Wrong twice.

COMMUNITIES OF COLOR TEEN PREGNANCY PREVENTION ACT OF 2011

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the Communities of Color Teen Pregnancy Prevention Act of 2011. My bill addresses the sobering fact that the United States has the highest teenage pregnancy rate of any developed nation.

Printed on recycled paper.

With nearly 750,000 pregnancies a year, teen pregnancy is a critical public health issue that costs our country $10.9 billion annually. Contributing to the seriousness of this issue is that 82 percent of these pregnancies are unplanned.

While it is true our Nation has made progress in reducing the rate of teen pregnancy, the fact remains that many minority communities still have disproportionately high rates. For example, among all Latina and African American girls, over half will get pregnant at least once before age 20, compared to 19 percent of Caucasian non-Hispanic girls.

Giving birth during these teenage years increases the risk of infant mortality, premature birth, complications, and low birth weight. Also of great concern is the fact that teen pregnancies can lead to significant social, educational, and financial burdens to families and to our country.

Research tells us that girls who become pregnant during adolescence are less likely to finish school, have higher rates of unemployment, and a greater dependence on public assistance. In addition to these tragic consequences, many young girls in physically abusive relationships are three times more likely to become pregnant than non-abused girls.

While there is no simple solution to address teen sexual behavior, it is possible to reduce teen pregnancy with a strategy of sexual health education that takes into account cultural and linguistic differences.

My bill is designed to do just that.

The Communities of Color Teen Pregnancy Prevention Act will help reduce the disturbing rates of teen pregnancy in minority communities by supporting new and existing teen pregnancy prevention program interventions with a focus on strengthening community-based organizations, by reinforcing our multimedia campaigns to provide public health education, by increasing awareness about teen pregnancy prevention and healthy relationships, by enhancing research in communities of color that examine factors contributing to disproportionate high rates of teenage and unintended pregnancy, and by examining the role violence and abuse play in the decisions young people make about relationships, sex, pregnancy and childbearing.

Mr. Speaker, our daughters deserve equal opportunities to build a bright future. By preventing teen pregnancies and promoting healthy relationships, we can pave the way for our teenage girls to blossom into women and mothers who have realized their full potential.

I strongly urge my colleagues to cosponsor and help pass the Communities of Color Teenage Pregnancy Prevention Act of 2011.

□ 1010

THE AMERICAN DREAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. I think I share the embarrassment of all of the Members of this great legislative body when it appears as though in our hands we have the ability to tell people, our creditors all over the country and the world, that for the first time in our Republic's history we are prepared to say we are not going to pay our debts.

We're not doing this because of some pledges that we've signed or because of some commitment that some Members have made that they will never, never, never do anything in support of our President. They would never talk about raising revenue; that they will never vote for a bill, whether it's a health bill, Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare, education. If the President supports it, they just don't want it.

I don't know how many Americans are really waking up this morning wondering exactly what would happen if we hold our country and our President hostage in order to reach just short political gain by people who have been recently elected and believe that compromise is unpatriotic instead of the legislative objective. But more important than the jobs that we would lose, the money that we would lose, the fact that government would have to be expanded and larger than it's ever been, what I'm really afraid of is that we lose the American Dream and create a scenario where that dream becomes a nightmare.

I don't know what it is that made America so great. I can't imagine what kind of dream that someone could have in Europe or a foreign country and just believe that making it to America would be better than staying in their own country with their own language and with their own race of people. Yet these tens of thousands of people were prepared, in many cases to risk their lives, to come to participate in that American Dream. I can't imagine how people who have been snatched from Africa and brought in chains in the bottom of vessels and were actually sold as property, and yet, instead of saying that they want to go back to Africa, they adopted our Bible, they adopted American customs. But most importantly, with all of the obstacles that they had to overcome, they adopted the American Dream.

What makes America so different is that we're one of the few countries that no matter what you look like or what your last name is, you can become an American. It's absolutely amazing the attractiveness that this dream has. Does it mean that a part of that dream is getting rich inheriting or getting property, having yachts and cars? No. It's having hope and dreams that you would be able to do better for yourself, your family, your kids, your grandkids, your community, and yes, our great country. It means that you're willing to make sacrifices to help others because even though you never fulfill that dream, the dream never, never stops. There's always the ability to say that even though I didn't make it, my kid is going to go to school. Even though I didn't make it, there's going to be the possibility that I'll be living in a better world—a world of peace, a world of harmony, a world that makes no difference where you came from, that you have a dream that can be fulfilled in this country.

In other countries, you can't dream. How you're born is how you die. That's going to be your legacy. But in America, all of this is going to be placed in jeopardy because we don't have the guts to call out these people that obviously would rather have this dream shattered, not just for those people that are here but for people all over the world that watch us, and maybe they don't have the ability to come here and become a part of that American Dream still. Throughout the Middle East you see other people saying, I too can dream. I can be somebody.

Don't let that dream become a nightmare. Support our President, support our fiscal system, and support that dream.

IN MEMORY OF ED BELL

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor to remember a great friend of mine who passed away last Tuesday. Thomaston City Councilman Ed Bell was a huge presence in Georgia and a devoted cheerleader for both Upson County, the city of Thomaston, and me.

Ed's life of tireless service started when he entered the U.S. Navy as an aviation ordnance man for 4 years during the Korean conflict. He continued with a sense of duty as an agent with State Farm Insurance, where he worked for 33 years and became a mentor for every State Farm agent under his direction. He was an agent's agent. The people that he insured knew that Ed was their agent and that he was there to protect their interest.

Ed was serving his fourth term on the Thomaston City Council and was truly dedicated to improving the lives of those in his community. If I ever found myself within 25 miles of Thomaston and made the mistake of not calling Ed, you can bet that he would somehow find out, and I would get an earful over the phone for not coming by to see him. And when you came to visit, you had to be sure to set enough time for Ed to introduce you to everyone in town, even though he had already done it many times before.

Even in the years later, Ed could wear a much younger man out with his enthusiasm for showing visitors around his beloved city, taking them through

the courthouse and around the city square. Ed really was ''Mr. Thomaston.'' He was serving on my district's Small Business Committee as well as serving on the Thomaston-Upson Arts Council, the Upson County School Board, the Lions Club, and as a deacon at First Baptist Church of Thomaston. In recognition of all of Ed's work, he was rewarded the well-deserved Lifetime Achievement Award in 2009 from the Thomaston Chamber of Commerce. There is a laundry list of groups impacted by Ed's energy, and his involvement could never be replaced or forgotten by anyone.

The dedication Ed showed to his community pales in comparison to his dedication to family. My thoughts and prayers continue to be with Patricia, Ed's wife of 55 years; his three children, Dick, Debbie, and Nancy; and his six grandchildren, one of whom, William, is currently serving as an intern in my Newnan office. I cannot adequately express, Mr. Speaker, how grateful I am to Ed and his family for all that he has done for Georgia and for me.

So, Ed, until we meet again, we all miss you.

RATING THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Members often come to the floor to talk about inspector general reports about agencies. And they are almost always critical of reports—reports that document shortcomings.

I'm very proud today to come to the floor to present excerpts from a joint report from the inspectors general of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury, in which they give a perfect set of marks to the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Those two agencies looked into this agency. This is an agency that is being set up, under fire, unfortunately, in a somewhat unusual situation. And what the inspectors general reported is that they've done everything right; that ''they identified and documented mission-critical activities and legislative mandates''; that the CFPB has developed and is implementing appropriate plans.

□ 1020

They found that they are implementing appropriate plans that support ongoing operations as well as the transfer of employees and functions. They created several agency-wide documents that identified and tracked priorities. ''We found that the agency has completed elements of its implementation plans and is making progress on others.''

It is a joint report from two inspectors general that says they've done everything right; so I want to put that forward.

I want to put it forward, in part, because the individual most singularly responsible for its great success, as she was for the idea and the creation of this agency, is Elizabeth Warren. Elizabeth Warren is one of the most able and dedicated individuals that I've ever encountered, who has dedicated herself to public service.

I regret very much that uninformed political opposition denied her the appointment to be the head of the agency, because she was not only the creator of this idea and a great partner for those of us on the Financial Services Committee—I see my colleague from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) who was an important part of this on the floor as we set this up in the face of significant opposition from vested interests and from ideologues—but in having had the idea, she then presided as the appointee of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the President to set this agency up in an extraordinary way. It is now, on the date when it takes off, ready to function. So she was not simply the creator of the idea and a great advocate, but she has shown herself to be a great administrator; and I regret the fact that she is not getting the appointment.

Although I have great confidence in the appointment of Mr. Cordray, whom the President appointed—he was an outstanding Attorney General, and he will be an outstanding Director—I want to reflect for just a minute on why we had such unwarranted opposition to a woman of great sense and of moderation, a woman who understands the market and was ready to help it function.

Part of it, I have to say, was gender bias. Along with Sheila Bair, recently departed as head of the FDIC, Ms. Warren encountered from some people—maybe unconsciously on their part—the notion that a very strong-willed woman with strong opinions might have a place but not in the financial sector; and I regret the loss of both of them. Yet there was also on the part of my most conservative Republican colleagues a recognition that she was a threat. I disagree with the position not to appoint her, but I give credit to President Obama and Secretary Geithner because they helped us get this agency created, and they did put her in the position and gave her their full backing to get it this far.

We would have ideologues here who would have people believe that government is always a bad thing, that less government is always better. We've seen it in this notion that we should cap government at X percent or Y percent—but I don't regard more firefighting as a bad thing; I don't think research into Alzheimer's and cancer is something we need to limit; I am not opposed to fixing bridges and highways. So this notion that government is always bad is mindless. There is a particular problem—and the private sector is a place that will create wealth, and I want us to do what we can to create the right conditions for the private sector, but there will be times when we need the government to protect people from the private sector. That was the rationale of the Consumer Bureau.

The Consumer Bureau was set up—and it's a very popular entity—to protect individual citizens from abuses in the private sector. It's working well. It was well-designed, I must say. It was well set up, as the inspectors general have said. So I believe my most right-wing colleagues are terrified. It is their false notion that the government is always the source of the problem and the private sector is always the source of the good. Sometimes the government does create problems, and much of the time the private sector does create wealth, but there are times when the public sector has to protect people from the private sector. The Consumer Bureau was set up for that.

Now, the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, Mr. BACHUS, said the other day, We don't worry about the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation of the Federal Reserve. What we worry about is an agency that exists solely to protect consumers. He is also the one who said that he thought the bank regulators were there to protect the banks, but we want to have a regulator there to protect the consumers.

So I salute Elizabeth Warren. I regret that she will not be able to continue the excellent work she has done, but it will live on as a tribute to both the idea she had, the political work she did with us to get it created, and the extraordinarily good administrative work she did in setting it up. I believe Mr. Cordray and the others will do a very good job and that we will soon have proof that the public sector can, in some cases, protect citizens from private sector abuses.

RESULTS OF THE JOINT REVIEW

CFPB IDENTIFIED AND DOCUMENTED MISSION-CRITICAL ACTIVITIES AND LEGISLATIVE MANDATES

Based on CFPB planning documents and interviews of agency officials, we found that CFPB identified and documented implementation activities critical to standing up the agency's functions and necessary to address certain Dodd-Frank Act requirements. In addition to activities necessary to establish the primary mission areas identified by the Dodd-Frank Act, such as supervision and enforcement, CFPB designed its organizational structure to account for other mandated functional units as well, including offices for financial education, fair lending, and service member affairs, among others. Moreover, CFPB identified the activities necessary to complete the transfer of employees and data from the transferring agencies in a timely manner. CFPB identified in its plans the need to establish a pay and classification system, information security processes, and financial management capabilities—areas required by the Dodd-Frank Act.

In addition, CFPB prepared documentation addressing critical activities vital to establishing a new agency. For example, CFPB's plans identified core business activities—such as securing office space, establishing procurement capabilities, building payroll and benefits functions, and designing an information technology infrastructure, among others.

CFPB DEVELOPED AND IS IMPLEMENTING APPROPRIATE PLANS

We found that CFPB developed and is implementing appropriate plans that support ongoing operations as well as the transfer of employees and functions that will occur on July 21, 2011. CFPB planned for mission-critical standup activities and certain Dodd-Frank Act requirements. In July 2010, Treasury officials created a document that, according to a CFPB official, served as a roadmap for implementation. Overall, CFPB's approach was to create detailed planning documents at the division level to provide input for the agency-wide strategic plan. Most CFPB divisions maintained a draft strategic plan, organizational chart, and ''dashboards'' that tracked implementation progress and potential risks. The division-level strategic plans generally included division-level missions, goals, deliverables, and coordination activities. We also noted that these plans included multiple phases that span beyond the designated transfer date.

CFPB also created several agency-wide documents that identified and tracked priorities and milestones for implementation. For example, one priority for CFPB was the transfer of employees from other agencies. To implement this priority, CFPB maintained a detailed recruitment schedule, developed coordination agreements with other agencies, and allocated resources from the various divisions to timely complete the employee transfer process.

In reviewing the agency's planning documents and discussing the standup status with CFPB officials, we found that the agency has completed elements of its implementation plans and is making progress on others, including its overall strategic plan. Nevertheless, CFPB's operational success will depend, in part, on its ability to effectively execute its plans.

LIBERIA CELEBRATES ITS 164TH INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Liberian people on 164 years of independence.

Liberia, which translates to ''land of the free,'' shares a unique history with the United States. Founded by African Americans and emancipated slaves in the early 1820s, this small nation of close to 3.8 million people is striving to build a lasting democracy—an incredible feat in such a war-torn region.

Mr. Speaker, more than 25,000 Liberian Americans call Minnesota home, and I am proud to call them my neighbors, friends and colleagues. Liberian Americans in our communities are entrepreneurs, small business people, teachers, lawyers, and nurses. They contribute to the very fabric of our Nation and to who we are as a people.

So let us today recognize the Liberian people and the long road they have traveled as a nation, and let us always remember the bond between the United States and the Republic of Liberia.

FAMINE IN THE HORN OF AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, today we are witnessing a tragic humanitarian crisis in Somalia and the Horn of Africa, which is currently experiencing its worst drought in over 60 years. According to USAID, crops have failed; livestock has died, and prices in the local markets are too high for most people to buy what they need to feed their families.

On July 20, 2011, the United Nations announced that famine exists in two regions of Somalia. This crisis is affecting over 11 million people throughout the region, and USAID estimates that over 3.2 million people are in life-threatening situations and are in dire need of food, water and medical attention. Additionally, over 80 percent of those fleeing Somalia are believed to be women and children.

At Kenyan and Ethiopian refugee camps, Somali children under the age of 5 are dying at an alarming rate. I visited a camp in Kenya 2 years ago, the Dadaab camp, where many of the refugees from Somalia are going. There are five times as many people in that camp as the camp can handle. It was overcrowded 2 years ago, and with the drought, it is just becoming almost impossible to sustain life.

An alarming 60 percent of the people at risk are still in al-Shabaab-held territory. Al-Shabaab is supported by al Qaeda. They initially said there was no drought—a denial. Yet, in the part of the country of which they are in charge, the drought is very serious, especially in southern Sudan. Then they did agree that the drought was occurring and said they would allow humanitarian organizations to go to that area to distribute food and medicine. However, just last week, they changed their position again.

As we saw in the nineties with Aidid and Ali Mahdi in the original drought during which the United States became involved in Somalia, we cannot have the political warlords and that situation happen again. The World Food Programme and the United Nations are desperately trying to get the food, water and medical assistance into that area, and we are going to continue to ask the al-Shabaab people to allow the food to come in.

During a similar drought in Ethiopia during the early eighties, the international community was slow to respond, resulting in more than 1 million deaths. Then world leaders said, Never again. Now we are facing a worsening humanitarian disaster that threatens to take even more lives. We must act and support those in need.

I have to commend USAID and the work that they're doing. Yesterday, at a hearing we had on this situation, Ms. Cromer, from the USAID, talked about the fact that they had an early warning system and that they had pre-positioned food, which shows that planning has resulted in less loss of life than there would have been had it not been pre-positioned, but we still have a serious problem.

□ 1030

Last week I introduced H. Res. 361, calling attention to this crisis, and we have already over 50 cosponsors.

Indeed, Congress is taking notice. My colleagues, JIM MCGOVERN, JO ANN EMERSON, members of the Hunger Caucus, along with myself and BARBARA LEE and MAXINE WATERS and GWEN MOORE and others have been very vocal on this issue. Ms. MCCOLLUM also has added her voice, from Minnesota.

The crisis is worsening, though. The Famine Early Warning Systems Network believes that within the next 1 or 2 months, the famine will spread throughout all of southern Somalia. As the situation has grown more dire, over 600,000 Somalis have fled to neighboring countries, some walking hundreds of miles to refugee camps. The roads to these camps in northern Kenya and eastern Ethiopia have been described by The Washington Post just yesterday and others as ''roads of death.'' Thousands of women, children, and elderly are left on the side of the road weak from malnutrition, unable to continue. They are resting on those who have already died.

So I ask all of you to respond to this very serious situation.

BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, March 2, 1995, was a pivotal day in the history of our country. On that day, the United States Senate failed by one vote to send a balanced budget amendment to the States for ratification. The amendment had passed the House by the required two-thirds majority previously, and the Senate vote was the last legislative hurdle before ratification by the States.

If that amendment had passed, then we would not be dealing with the fiscal crisis we now face. If that amendment had passed, then balancing the budget would have been the norm rather than the exception over the past decade and we would have nothing like the annual deficits and skyrocketing debt that we must address today.

The good news is that, like 1995, this Congress is again standing at a crossroads at this very moment. The decisions we make this week could steer the direction of the country for many years to come. We have an opportunity now to take action to ensure that our children will face a much brighter fiscal picture. We must not allow ourselves to miss this opportunity.

And while, yes, we definitely need to deal with the debt limit squarely in front of us and take the opportunity to make significant cuts in government spending, we also must have a long-term solution to this problem. And that long-term solution is a balanced

budget amendment to the United States Constitution. We will, I hope, have the opportunity to vote on such an amendment this week.

Experience has proven time and again that Congress cannot, for any significant length of time, rein in excessive spending. The annual deficits and the resulting debt continue to grow due to political pressures and dependency on government programs. In order for Congress to be able to consistently make the very tough decisions necessary to sustain fiscal responsibility over the long term, Congress must have an external pressure to force it to do so. The most realistic chance we have today to enact this type of institutional reform is through a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution.

Many Members of Congress have introduced balanced budget amendments in this Congress. I introduced two versions on the first day of the 112th Congress. H.J. Res. 2 is the exact text that passed the House in 1995 and failed in the Senate by one vote. This amendment requires that total annual outlays not exceed total annual receipts. It also requires a three-fifths majority to raise the debt limit, and, in addition, this legislation has limited exceptions for times of war.

H.J. Res. 1, which I also introduced, goes much further. In addition to the provisions of H.J. Res. 2, it requires a two-thirds majority to raise taxes and imposes an annual spending cap that prohibits spending from exceeding 18 percent of GDP.

In the United States Senate, 47 Republican Senators have cosponsored a balanced budget amendment, which is a strong sign that the Senate is ready to engage in debate on this subject.

Our extraordinary fiscal crisis demands an extraordinary solution. So we simply cannot afford to succumb to political posturing on this issue at a point in time so critical to our Nation's future. We must rise above that and move forward with a strategy that includes legislation that will get at least 290 bipartisan votes on the House floor.

So as we consider a balanced budget amendment, I encourage the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle to devote our effort to passing this strongest balanced budget amendment that can garner two-thirds of the House of Representatives.

We are at a crossroads in America. We can make the tough choices and control spending paving the way for a return to surpluses and ultimately paying down the national debt, or we can allow big spenders to lead us further down the road of chronic deficits and leave our children and grandchildren saddled with debt that is not our own.

The choice is ours. The stakes are high. Failure is not an option.

FAMINE IN AFRICA

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I had breakfast this morning. I had granola and yogurt, a little fruit, an egg and bacon sandwich, and I'm feeling irritable because I didn't have my coffee. I'm looking forward to a delicious lunch that I've planned at about noontime.

But in the meantime, on the Horn of Africa, 11 million people are facing starvation. And not because they're lazy people or unworthy people, but because they're suffering from the biggest drought that they have seen in 60 years, because they're experiencing flooding, because there are people who have stepped away from the loving care that we usually extend to others of our brothers and sisters, others who are human beings on this planet. Tens of thousands of people will die.

There is an official famine that has been called by the United Nations. And for those of you who know what a famine is, it's not when you don't have a particular thing like me—I didn't have my coffee this morning. Famine exists when at least 20 percent of the population has extremely limited access to basic food requirements, global acute malnutrition exceeds 30 percent, and the death rate exceeds 2 out of 10,000 per day for the entire population.

An example that was in the news recently is of a 7-month-old Somali boy who weighed the same amount as any one of our newborns—weighed 7 pounds. A 7-month-old boy weighed 7 pounds. That is an example of what happens in a drought.

And what are we doing here in the United States of America, the world's largest humanitarian donor, when the United Nations has called for, on July 20, has asked for more than $1.6 billion to support the humanitarian response in the next 12 months urgently, desperately needed to address and abet this bourgeoning humanitarian crisis that is unfolding? We are in the midst of cutting funding of our foreign aid and peace food budget.

The fiscal year 2012 Agricultural appropriations budget bill that passed a few weeks ago, over my opposition, cut this program by $200 million. It was heartbreaking to see amendment after amendment after amendment come forward to cut it further, and even amendments to eliminate it completely.

□ 1040

The United States, as the world's largest humanitarian donor, we need to do more. We talk about balanced budgets here; and there are people in this world, our brothers and sisters, who don't even have a balanced meal on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we not become numb to the conditions of peoples around the world. Less than 1 percent of our budget goes toward foreign aid, and that includes operations of the State Department and everything, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking that in these discussions of debt and deficits that we do not turn a blind eye and a deaf ear to those people who are starving.

In closing, I just want to mention, Mr. Speaker, that of course we know who suffers disproportionately among the poor, the usual suspects. Women and children are disproportionately represented among those who are food insecure, those who are starving, and those who die.

I thank my colleague for yielding and for his continued leadership to make sure that we do not forget or overlook this tragedy that is currently occurring in the Horn of Africa. I know that as chairman, and now, ranking member of the Africa Subcommittee, he has been a true leader in working to empower the people and nations of Africa.

The United Nations has declared a famine in parts of Somalia and an emergency humanitarian crisis throughout the Horn of Africa—including Eritrea, Djibouti, Ethiopia and Somalia.

In Somalia alone, tens of thousands of people have died in the past three months because they cannot get enough food to keep themselves alive.

Tens of thousands will surely die in the coming months if the international community, led by the U.S., does not respond quickly and comprehensively. Famine exists when at least 20 percent of the population has extremely limited access to basic food requirements, global acute malnutrition exceeds 30 percent, and the death rate exceeds 2 out of 10,000 per day for the entire population.

The lives of over 11 million people in East Africa are at risk. That is twice the population of my state of Wisconsin. And as usual, those most vulnerable women and children are suffering disproportionately. One in every three children in southern Somalia is malnourished (some 550,000 total). UNICEF estimates that 2.3 million children are suffering from acute malnutrition in the region.

These numbers don't include those who are dying on literal "roads of death" as they attempt to flee famine in Somalia to neighboring countries (Kenya, Ethiopia, Eritrea) that are struggling with drought themselves.

There was a news report recently about a 7-month old Somali boy who weighed the same as a newborn, some 7 pounds. At this stage in his life, he should weight three times as much. A nurse at the refugee camp his family made it to recently puts the little boy's odds of survival at 50–50, a flip of a coin.

The U.N. has asked for some $1.6 billion to support the humanitarian response in the next 12 months.

Yet, as the humanitarian crisis unfolds, this Congress is in the midst of cutting funding our foreign food aid budget. The FY 2012 Agricultural Appropriations bill that passed a few weeks ago over my opposition, would cut Food for Peace programs by some $200 million. During that debate, some of my colleagues offered amendments to even make deeper cuts and even eliminate funding for that program all together. It's as if we are telling the men, women, and children desperately searching for food, to "keep warm and well fed."

I hope that my colleagues on the House Foreign Operations Committee will not make that same mistake and will in fact boost funding for our global humanitarian aid programs which will be needed as this crisis unfolds.

The U.S., as the world's largest humanitarian donor, must do more if a humanitarian catastrophe is to be averted.

Tens of thousands of lives can be saved, but the window of opportunity to do so is extremely limited and is closing even as we speak.

DEBT NEGOTIATION

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

Mr. HERGER. Six days, Mr. Speaker. Six days until we exceed the debt limit, and we still haven't seen a plan from the White House. However, we have the first 2½ years of his administration as an example of the future he wants for America. The President's policies display his commitment to unchecked government spending. The President supports massive tax hikes on a Nation already enduring the worst jobless recovery since the Great Depression.

The President is content to ignore our entitlement crisis. His actions over the last 2½ years have put this country in significantly worse shape than when he took office. We have seen a total failure of leadership from the White House. He threatened to veto the commonsense solutions of Cut, Cap, and Balance. The reason? By his own words, he wants a debt limit increase to carry him through the next election.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have had enough. We need action, and we need it now. No more speeches, no more rhetoric. The American people deserve to know what the President's plan is. It's time for President Obama to come to the negotiating table and work with us. We're running a $1.6 trillion deficit, borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spend. Without action, we will guarantee our children and grandchildren a future far less bright than the one our parents left us.

Republicans are here, ready to make the tough decisions, cut spending, and reform the way business is done in Washington. We're ready with solutions that will turn around our debt crisis and begin getting America back to work. But these solutions will remain a fantasy as long as the President's focus remains on politics and reelection rather than the good of the American people. We have 6 days left. It's time to act.

REMEMBERING JAMES T. MOLLOY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the memory of James T. Molloy. Many in Washington knew Jim as the former, and last, doorkeeper of the House of Representatives. Western New Yorkers know Jim as a proud third-generation Irish American and career public servant.

Jim was born on June 3, 1936. He was raised in South Buffalo and paid his way through Canisius College. He developed his strong work ethic in the grain elevators on the waterfront and as a member of the city's fire department. He also worked as a schoolteacher for the city of Buffalo and the city of Lackawanna.

Jim came to Washington, D.C., in 1968 at the invitation of Congressman John Rooney. He managed the House Finance Office until 1974 when he was elected doorkeeper of the House. He held this position until it was eliminated in 1995. As the last doorkeeper of the House, Jim was a member of an elite group. Only 34 people have served in this position in our 215-year history. He oversaw more than 400 employees and administered a budget of $6.8 million. He introduced Presidents and heads of State and coordinated 71 Joint Sessions of Congress.

Regrettably, I did not have the honor of serving in the House of Representatives during Jim's tenure, but he was a friend and an endless source of help and advice. I have long been inspired in my own service by his strong commitment to this institution. In fact, numerous western New Yorkers were inspired to consider political careers thanks to Jim Molloy. It was well known that Jim had a particular affection for helping western New Yorkers visiting the Capitol and young Buffalonians looking for work in our Nation's Capitol as well.

Jim was recognized on numerous occasions for his service. He received the Outstanding Citizen Award from the New York State AFL–CIO, the President's Award from the New York State Federation of Police, and the United States Senate Youth Alumni Association Outstanding Service Award. He received an honorary Doctor of Law degree from Canisius College and was named Congressional Staffer of the Year by Roll Call. In 2005, I was a proud sponsor of legislation that was signed into law naming a post office on South Park Avenue in our shared neighborhood of South Buffalo after James T. Molloy.

The loss of Jim Molloy will be felt for many years to come by all who knew him. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence in honor of a servant of this institution, James T. Molloy.

THE DEFAULT CRISIS AND ITS EFFECT ON AMERICAN JOBS

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Progressive Caucus to draw attention to the devastating effects that could be caused if the United States were to default on its debt. First, let's be clear that raising the debt ceiling will have no effect whatsoever on any new spending that the Congress might do. It's simply giving the government authority to pay its bills, to pay its bills for obligations that the Congress has already authorized.

Second, while Republicans have attempted time and time again to pin the current deficit on President Obama, the facts cannot be denied: It was the policies of the Bush years that got us here. It was just a decade ago that President Clinton left office not with just a balanced budget but a surplus, and the Congressional Budget Office declared in 2001, ''The outlook for the Federal budget over the next decade continues to be bright.'' That quote, of course, came before the 2001 Bush tax cuts were signed into law; two wars that weren't paid for, put on the credit card; two tax cuts that weren't paid for and that mainly benefited the wealthy; and a devastating recession that may have been prevented, had government regulators not turned a blind eye to Wall Street greed. The Bush policies ran up the bills. Those are the bills that our country is committed to pay, and those are the bills that need to be paid if the full faith and credit of the United States is to be protected.

So now this Republican-manufactured crisis could be solved in 5 minutes if we simply passed a clean debt ceiling increase, like we did seven, eight times during the Bush administration, 18 times under Ronald Reagan, and then turned our attention immediately to ways to put our fiscal house in order, focusing on the real crisis, which is the jobs crisis. Instead, Republicans are choosing to hold our Nation's financial standing hostage, with potentially devastating consequences.

Allowing a default on the debt would essentially be a tax on every American family. Interest rates on everything, from mortgages and auto loans to credit cards and small business loans, would immediately soar. A conservative estimate suggests that the effect of an increase in interest rates could cost a homeowner with a 30-year mortgage of $172,000 an additional $19,100 more over the life of the loan. A drop in the stock market would hit the savings and retirement accounts of middle class Americans, less available credit for small businesses and consumers, and lower economic growth that could cost hundreds of thousands of jobs.

□ 1050

In addition, if the country can't pay its bills, an unthinkable scenario becomes a reality, having to choose between what aspects of the government to fund and what bills to pay.

Seventy million checks are due to go out next Wednesday. Those include Social Security and veterans and our military families, and these checks are threatened. That is the threat the Republicans are willing to make, holding the full faith and credit of the United States hostage in order to push for extreme policies that would gut Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid and devastate the economy and the middle class in order to protect hedge fund managers and corporations that

ship our jobs overseas. That is what the Republicans are advocating, but they are not willing to ask for one penny more for millionaires and billionaires.

We need to deal with our fiscal challenges, and I have offered proposals for how to do that in a way that protects the social safety net and what is now the disappearing middle class.

First, we need to create jobs. Putting people back to work will raise revenues and bring down the deficit as a proportion of the economy.

Second, we need to eliminate spending we don't need, such as billions of dollars in waste spent by the Pentagon. But we need to protect spending on vital programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

And finally, we need to raise revenues in a fair way.

I've introduced the Fairness in Taxation Act, H.R. 1124, which would create new tax brackets beginning at 45 percent for income over $1 million a year and rising to 49 percent for income at $1 billion a year; and yes, there are Americans who make that. And according to an estimate by Citizens for Tax Justice, my legislation could raise as much as $800 billion over the next 10 years. Those are the types of proposals that should be considered so that we can achieve fiscal responsibility in a way that protects seniors and children and the middle class and all those who aspire to it.

Right now the American Dream itself is at stake. It is slipping through the hands of people that used to be middle class. We cannot tolerate that. We need to raise the debt ceiling.

FAIRNESS AND JUSTICE FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, it's a difficult time to talk because Ms. SCHAKOWSKY has said just about everything that I was planning to say. She said it extremely well and synopsized the issue.

It basically comes down to fairness and justice for the American people. And the President, who has been burdened with problems caused by the Republican Congress and the Bush years, wars in Iraq, wars in Afghanistan not paid for, prescription drug bill not paid for, and Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans which have caused most of the deficit and the problem with the debt ceiling, and now we're not calling on them to make some sacrifice and to pay for it.

Most everybody in America knows about dieting. Most of us are a little overweight. Michelle Obama will tell you that any day. We need to watch our weight. But when you go to diet, you've got to reduce your calories and you've got to exercise some more. Spend some calories, reduce some calories. That's the way you diet. It's the same thing with the budget.

If you had a problem at home with your budget, kind of having a problem, well, maybe you think, I won't take that vacation and go to Miami Beach and stay in that three-star hotel. I'll go to Fort Walton and stay in a two-star hotel. And maybe I'll get another job or work some more overtime. You increase your income, you decrease your spending, and you get it together.

This Congress, though, has got the problem because of dealing with this, and the debt ceiling's independent of all of it. Many Members of Congress on the Republican side have pledged not to raise revenue. Well, you've got to do both. You've got to cut some things, and you cut some things that don't decrease your ability to increase jobs later on or increase jobs now, and you increase revenue at the same time. You have to do both.

Some of the Republicans have pledged never to do revenue. Well, that means they've got one arm tied behind their backs—never increase revenue.

You come to the table and you try to get a bargain. You negotiate in politics. You've got to have both hands at the table, one give and one take. Both sides have to come, open palms, friendship, no guns. Here we are.

But they've got one hand tied behind their backs. That's the problem we've got. So we're not being able to negotiate because one side comes ill-equipped, unprepared, incapable.

Last week we had a new Member here from California (Ms. HAHN), and the Speaker read to her and she repeated the oath of office: I pledge to support, I swear I will support, the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

We've got a domestic enemy right now, and it's the idea that we're not going to pay our debts: The full faith and credit of the United States goes by, interest rates go up, jobs go down, credit card rates go up, home mortgage rates go up, 401(k)s go down, stock market drops 10 percent. Yet we're not doing it. We're considering a pledge to some third-party person that said, No new revenue, arm behind my back, instead of, I will support the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

So that's the problem we've got.

I had a town hall last night on the telephone. My constituents can't understand why we have the problem. I tried to explain it to them. They're concerned about their Social Security checks coming or their veterans check coming. They could be cut off if we don't get this done and we don't have money to pay our debts.

People living simply on Social Security are endangered, and yet millionaires and billionaires go on. Hedge fund guys, they earn billions of dollars—millions at least, billions for some—pay 15 percent, something called carried interest on their income, 15 percent. But the average person out there is paying 25, 26, 34 at the most; 15 percent for the richest guys in New York spending money outrageously and the ones that almost brought this economy down.

Somebody asked me, Is this thing going to pass?

I don't know. But I'll tell you this: In my life, and I hope nobody out here listening has had that situation, Mr. Speaker, I've had kidney stones. They're easier to pass than this.

Mr. Speaker, I've got a pain in my side.

CHANGING OUR FISCAL DIRECTION

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult time in the life of the people of this country. Families are hurting. Our economy is struggling. The economic policies of this administration have failed to turn around this Great Recession, as it has come to be known. And I believe that runaway Federal spending, deficits, and debt are a barrier to our economic recovery, a barrier to putting Americans back to work.

We have to change the fiscal direction of this government for this generation, for jobs for Americans today, and for future generations who are facing a mountain range of debt—a $14 trillion national debt; $1.65 trillion deficit this year alone.

As most of my colleagues know, I've fought against runaway spending on a bipartisan basis. I opposed Big Government plans when they were offered by Republican Presidents and in Republican Congresses, and I fought with equal vigor against the borrowing, the spending, the bailouts, and the takeovers of the recent Democratic Congress and this administration.

But now we come to another debt ceiling vote, and as the late Russell Kirk wrote, ''Politics is the art of the possible.'' The American people are looking in and they know, if you owe debts, pay debts. We have to find a way to pay the Nation's bills. But the American people also know we have to find a way to set our Nation on a course of living within our means once again.

Now, I am still studying Speaker BOEHNER's proposal, but there is much that recommends it. I have long said that there should be no increase in the debt ceiling without real and meaningful spending cuts and reforms in the short term and in the long term.

□ 1100

In many respects, the deal negotiated with Senate leaders by Speaker BOEHNER meets that standard. There are no tax increases in the bill. After adjustments to the bill today, there will for certain, according to CBO, be dollar-for-dollar cuts for any increase in the debt ceiling. Also, there are spending caps, a commission, and the possibility of long-term entitlement reform. All of this commends the Boehner plan as an important first step toward fiscal discipline and reform.

There is also a call at some point to vote for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and it's my belief in the importance of that last element that brings me to the floor today. I rise to urge all of my colleagues to keep an open mind on the Boehner plan, but also to keep an open mind about bringing a balanced budget amendment to the floor that could enjoy broad bipartisan support.

Look, Washington, D.C., is not only broke; it's broken. The American people have seen both political parties run up deficits and debt, both political parties live outside the means of the American people, and they know in their heart of hearts that something is missing. I believe that's a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Now, I've authored the spending limit amendment to the Constitution. I support the stout version of a balanced budget amendment that Republicans marked up and referenced in the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill, a spending limit cap, a supermajority on tax increases. But I don't think it takes any great insight to know that that bill will likely not get the 290 votes that we need to send it to the Senate and send it to the States.

So in addition to voting on that bill, with spending constraints and others, I believe the time has come to bring the historic balanced budget amendment back to the floor of the Congress. I believe there should be no increase in the debt ceiling unless this Congress does everything in its power to send a balanced budget amendment to the Senate and to the States for ratification. And I believe we have that moment.

I've talked to some of the most prominent Members of the Democrat minority in this Congress today, and they've expressed support for this amendment. The American people overwhelmingly support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

So I urge my colleagues to keep an open mind, keep an open mind to the Boehner plan. I'm continuing to study it and seeing if we can embrace it as an important first step on fiscal discipline and reform, finding a way to pay the Nation's bills, but change our fiscal direction. But I also encourage my colleagues to consider at some point in the near future, let us bring to this floor a balanced budget amendment that could enjoy broad bipartisan support, to know that we cannot only make progress for fiscal discipline and reform, but we can make history by restoring to the national charter or placing in the national charter those restraints on spending that this Nation's Capitol, under both parties, desperately needs.

THE DEFAULT CRISIS AND HOW IT IMPACTS JOBS

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in American history we are at the brink of compromising the full faith and credit of the United States Government—the pledge that America has made to be the strongest, most trustworthy economy in the world, the promise that we will always keep our word and pay back the money we have already spent.

And why are we on the brink of a default crisis? Is it because of a natural disaster that has devastated our Nation? Is it because of a catastrophic national security threat? Is it because of another meltdown of our financial system like the one we saw in 2008? No.

The default crisis is for none of these reasons. Instead, it is a crisis wholly manufactured by my Republican colleagues, who are holding our economy hostage to pursue a radical agenda. This is an agenda that seeks to continue the Bush policies of wars and tax cuts paid for by undoing the New Deal, shrinking the social safety net, and pulling the rug out from under millions of Americans who are still struggling to recover from a financial crisis that was created by Wall Street.

Mr. Speaker, the debt ceiling is being used as political leverage to pursue this agenda. Remember, the debt ceiling was raised 18 times under President Reagan and seven times under President George Bush. Instead of this phony crisis, we should be debating the real crisis facing this Nation, the crisis that is consistently named as the number one concern of American taxpayers, that is, the jobs crisis.

Today, about 14 million people are unemployed, wages are declining, and home values are still plummeting. The unsurprising result is consumers aren't buying, businesses don't need to hire as many workers. And the cycle continues. In minority communities, these problems are even worse, with over 16 percent of African Americans and 11 percent of Hispanics out of work. In fact, just yesterday, the Pew Research Center reported that while all households lost wealth during the recession, minority families experienced disproportionate losses, and the wealth gap between minority and white households is actually growing. The median wealth of U.S. households in 2009 was $13,000, compared to just over $6,000 for Hispanics and $5,600 for African Americans.

But to hear my Republican colleagues, it's as if these unemployed Americans are living in the shadows instead of the communities we represent. Because instead of pursuing a jobs agenda, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have proposed a continuation of failed Bush policies, this time on steroids. First under the Ryan budget, and now under these debt ceiling hostage negotiations, my Republican colleagues are pushing to cut Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, and job-creating domestic programs no matter the cost. Mr. Speaker, now is the time to invest in our communities, not retreat.

We need jobs to get people employed and get them back paying taxes to pay down our deficit. In fact, the Congressional Progressive Caucus is happy to provide for you, Mr. Speaker, a long list of ways to create jobs. We can create a new civilian conservation corps; we can close tax loopholes and bring jobs back from overseas; we can encourage investments in the new green economy; and we can provide incentives for businesses to train and hire the long-term unemployed. And guess what? We can do this while balancing the budget. In fact, the people's budget, offered by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, can balance our books at least 10 years before the Ryan budget.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to stand opposed to Republican efforts to perpetuate this default crisis and balance our budget on the backs of seniors and the middle class. It will amount to an unmitigated and unprecedented disaster to not only America's reputation, but to our capital markets, our job-creating businesses, and our economic recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I held two town hall meetings this past weekend on Saturday, one in the city of Inglewood and one in the area of Westchester. They made it very, very clear that they want us to increase this debt limit, they want us to get about the business of creating jobs, and they want to close tax loopholes for the richest corporations in America that receive tax breaks under the Bush administration. They are sick of us playing with this issue. They want us to do the people's business and look out for the interests of the least of these.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Rick Postell, Christian Renewal Church, Brunswick, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we come to You in Jesus' name on behalf of this great Nation. We ask for Your forgiveness of our transgressions and to thank You for Your blessings and favor upon America. Keep us mindful of Your word that ''righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.''

Grant these Representatives wisdom to make decisions to strengthen our Nation, motivated more by Your hand

than by bipartisan concern. Grant them grace to listen to one another with open hearts and minds. May the clarity and charity of their words reflect respect for their colleagues. May their decisions of today not become future apologies, but may they be a statement of this Congress' character, their firm resolve, and a hope for a better America.

All this we ask in the name of Jesus Christ, Your Son, and our Savior.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SIRES 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 846. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse.

S. 1406. An act to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 510 19th Street, Bakersfield, California, as the Myron Donovan Crocker United States Courthouse.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the request of the House that the Senate return to the House the bill (H.R. 1309) ''An Act to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes.''.

WELCOMING PASTOR RICK POSTELL

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, our guest chaplain today is Mr. Rick Postell from Brunswick, Georgia. Rick is a native of Gastonia, North Carolina, and received his BS in business management from Troy State University and later a master's degree in theology from Beacon University in Columbus, Georgia. He currently lives in Brunswick, Georgia, with his wife, Amy, and their three children.

After graduating from school, Rick served in the United States Air Force base at Moody Air Force from 1981 to 1986. He traveled extensively well in the Air Force and worked on the aircraft maintenance unit while at Moody facilitating F–4 Phantom aircraft.

After his service in the Air Force, Rick served in the United States Post Office from 1986 to 2000. And then he joined the staff of Christian Renewal Church in Brunswick. He currently teaches religious studies at Heritage Christian Academy in Brunswick and has served as guest chaplain not only with us here today but in the Georgia State legislature on the Senate and on the House side.

He travels extensively and has been to Mexico many times on mission trips. His wife, Amy, is with him today along with 18-year-old Sam and 16-year-old Charlie and 14-year-old Hayley.

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome with me Pastor Rick Postell.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

ANOTHER GLITCH

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the Hill newspaper recently reported that there's another prominent glitch in last year's health care law. Millions of families could struggle to purchase insurance because of the sloppy manner in which the bill was written.

The law mandates that every individual pay insurance. If the insurance offered by an employer is deemed affordable by the government, then an employee must purchase it. However, the Federal Government will only look at the individual plans offered by companies—not the family plans. While the plan for an individual may be affordable, the family plan could be significantly more expensive.

Correcting this mistake in the law would mean at least $50 billion more per year in government subsidies. The President told the American people that the new health care law would not increase the deficit. Now we find yet another example of how this bill will cost both American families and the Federal Government far more than what was claimed.

Clearly, we need full repeal before this law full of glitches and mandates is fully implemented, bankrupting families and the government.

GOP ADULT MOMENT IS LONG OVERDUE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, members of the House leadership have walked away from the negotiating table three times and continue to push their plan to cut Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid benefits, protect the top 2 percent of Americans at the expense of 98 percent of our families, pass a short-term deal that would lead to credit downgrade, higher interest rates, and a tax hike on every American and repeat this crisis next year.

Let me read you some emails that I've received:

''I'm a disabled 57-year-old gentleman who is restricted in a wheelchair. I thank God I live in a country where I am able to receive disability income like millions of other disabled Americans and Social Security recipients. I'm afraid if the Republican leadership gets their way, I'll soon be living on the street.

''I'm very concerned that the default would cause even more dire straits for the average homeowner/worker than even currently exists. That does not even count the repercussions that would result from higher interest rates, falling dollar in the global economy, and lower earnings on annuities and other investments, such as decreasing principles.''

What we need is not a Republican plan or a Democratic plan; we need an American plan to deal with our debt that will take care of it so we don't have all of these dire consequences next Tuesday.

SPENDING CUTS SAVED CANADA—NOT HIGHER TAXES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in The Wall Street Journal, Fred Barnes documented on July 21 that in 1993 Canada faced a fiscal disaster similar to the one we're facing today. Government spending was on the rise, huge deficits were setting peacetime records, the economy was stagnant, an unemployment rate that was around 9 percent with interest payments on debt using 35 cents of every tax dollar.

The newly elected Prime Minister in 1993 listened to the voters by stating, ''Canadians have told us they want the deficit brought down by reducing government spending, not by raising taxes, and we agree.''

By cutting spending, the Canadian economy roared back from 1995 to 1998 and turned a $36.6 billion deficit into a $3 billion surplus. The Prime Minister was able to put aside partisan politics

and listen to the wishes of the Canadian people.

By leading in a manner that cut spending instead of raising taxes, the Prime Minister put Canada first. Our President should change from his failed policies and stop tax increases and destroying jobs.

REID VERSUS BOEHNER

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, we have less than 1 week to prevent our Nation from defaulting on its loans. Rather than focusing on a compromise, the majority has come up with yet another irresponsible plan to raise the debt ceiling and slash funding from programs that matter most to seniors and the middle class.

First, their budget tried to end Medicare and gut Medicaid, all the while protecting tax breaks for Big Oil and corporations that send jobs overseas. Then it was the so-called Cut, Cap, and Balance to achieve the same objectives.

Now the Speaker has put forward another plan that seeks the same goals so they can impose cuts on Medicare and Medicaid as well as set their sights on Social Security. This plan will keep the crisis going with a temporary increase in the debt ceiling, leaving the cloud of uncertainty over our economy.

We need to instead focus on the compromise plan that Majority Leader REID has presented to extend the debt ceiling through 2012 to provide certainty to the markets without hurting the economic recovery, as well as protect Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security from cuts.

Mr. Speaker, we must accept the compromise plan to raise the debt ceiling in order to prevent another recession and save jobs in America.

□ 1210

EPA GREEN MONEY GOES TO CHINA. HUH?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the past 10 years, the EPA has sent almost $100 million in taxpayer money to fund green projects in foreign countries. In 2010 alone, the EPA gave 18 grants to our good friends, the Chinese. Why does the EPA do that? We owe the Chinese over $1 trillion. Why are we adding to our debt in misguided hopes that they can clean up the smoggy skies in China with American grant money? There is more. Why is the Breathe Easy, Jakarta program in Indonesia the responsibility of the taxpayers in Houston, Texas? Well, it's not. I don't breathe easier knowing green money from the U.S. is financing green development in Indonesia.

At a time when we are facing ''somewhat'' of a financial problem, we can't afford to be trying to green the rest of the world too. I'm for protecting our environment, but we do not have the money to spend in hopes of controlling pollution in other countries. Let's green America first, not China.

And that's just the way it is.

JOBS

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, in the over 200 days since the majority has controlled this House, they have yet to bring a bill to the floor that would create jobs or help working families, not one. Not one bill to create jobs and build a stronger economy for the future. Not one bill to invest in education, innovation, or infrastructure. Instead, we have a partisan agenda to unfairly burden the middle class with deep cuts while preserving tax cuts for the wealthy and loopholes for Big Oil and corporations that ship jobs overseas. And to make things worse, the majority is threatening to force an unprecedented default on our Nation's debt.

A default would destroy close to 700,000 jobs, spike interest rates on credit cards and mortgages, and cause untold damage to our struggling economy. This is not what the markets are looking for, and it's certainly not what the American people want. They want us to help create jobs and reduce the deficit. They want us to compromise on a fair and balanced approach that doesn't just kick the can down the road. The American people are asking us today to put aside our differences for the good of this country. I support this responsible approach and urge my colleagues to do the same.

THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, America stands on the brink of our Nation's first default in history. Our economy is struggling. The Federal Government borrows $188 million every hour of every day.

For too long, both parties have turned a blind eye to our government's budgetary mess. Washington needs to show the American people that we can deal with these challenges today and in the future. So far, it has failed to do so.

Congress and the President need to quit the partisan games and do what's in the best interest of America. The time to act is now. The American people demand nothing less.

BOEHNER DEBT LIMIT PROPOSAL

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I recently heard from a long-term care facility in my district that is set to build an additional location, creating over 100 construction jobs and increasing the number of seniors able to receive quality care. The financing was in place. But when my constituent met with his bank this week about moving forward, the bank put the deal on hold. With the threat of a U.S. default unresolved, the bank was concerned that the facility's payments from Medicare and Medicaid would stop, leaving them unable to repay their loan.

A 6-month extension, like the one being proposed, won't help my constituent reassure his bank or create the kind of long-term certainty needed in this still-fragile economy. I urge my colleagues to reject short-term proposals that push us to the brink of default again and again and call on the House to pass a plan that reduces the deficit while providing real long-term economic certainty to our financial markets, to our small businesses, and to the American people who need the jobs these businesses create.

DON'T FALL FOR THESE ACCOUNTING TRICKS

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all the talk about raising the debt ceiling, I don't hear anyone talking about the most important factor in this equation, our unsustainable National debt. Everyone is focused on raising the debt ceiling, but if we truly want to get our economy back on its feet, we need to begin paying off the debt that President Obama and his predecessors have created.

It's obvious that our Democrat leaders in the White House and the Senate care more about making campaign speeches than about the livelihoods of the American people. Liberals want to raise taxes, but of course not until after the elections. And they want to sham us with talks about future cuts that we will never see materialize. It's like one big Ponzi scheme, and they're trying to get the American people to buy into it.

We need spending cuts now, and we need to pay down our outrageous debt. I urge both my colleagues and the American people not to fall for these accounting tricks.

WE CAN REVIVE THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it's been 29 weeks since Republicans took control of the House, and yet they have failed to bring a single jobs bill to the floor. In fact, I just learned that their proposals are estimated to cost another

2 million lost jobs. Instead, they're wasting time pushing bills that will never become law but do make their position clear. Republicans are willing to hold the full faith and credit of the United States hostage in order to push for extreme policies that will gut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid and devastate the economy and the middle class while doing everything they can to protect millionaires and billionaires and companies that ship American jobs overseas.

We need to raise the debt ceiling and then turn our attention to the real crisis, the jobs crisis. We can revive the American Dream. We must.

ROADBLOCKS TO THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the 14.1 million Americans who are unable to find jobs.

This administration's reckless spending policies, massive bailouts, and excessive regulations have driven the unemployment rate to an astounding 9.2 percent. Democrats have shown again and again that they care more about the bureaucrats that prevent jobs than the businesses that create them. Every year, unelected bureaucrats issue more than 3,000 final rules. That's close to 10 rules a day. Make no mistake, federally imposed rules consume precious time and resources. Businesses are less likely to invest and hire new employees. This is a recipe for failure.

Americans have always been a forward-thinking and innovative people. We're constantly looking ahead to the next breakthrough. Unfortunately, businesses now look over their shoulders instead of aiming for the horizon. The American Dream is still alive, Mr. Speaker; just ask the men and women who are pounding the pavement, polishing their resumes, and looking for paychecks. Americans are ready. We need to make Washington tear down the roadblocks.

THE DEBT CEILING

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

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican debt ceiling plan that will be considered later this week.

My Republican colleagues have brought a bill to the floor that would introduce statutory spending caps for the next 10 years with mandatory automatic cuts across the board to all programs if the cap is breached. Disguised as a solution, this cap would quickly become one of the most serious budgetary problems this country has ever faced. While a spending cap might sound responsible, in reality, caps don't balance budgets; caps trigger massive unsustainable cuts. We tried this in California. The Republican spending cap jeopardizes our ability to improve our schools, rebuild the Nation's crumbling infrastructure, and invest in R&D.

A global spending cap is not a silver bullet for our budgetary woes. Far from being a budgetary cure-all, a drastic ceiling on spending would undermine our recovery when the economy gets better. So I urge my colleagues to abandon this hostage-taking on raising the debt ceiling and work with the President to lead us forward with a responsible debt reduction plan.

Besides forcing significant cuts to important programs, a cap would make it nearly impossible to restore services cut over the recession as our economy recovers or step in to respond to current or future economic challenges. This is not the time to be talking about capping spending at unsustainable levels that can never be raised again.

□ 1220

LET'S GET THE JOB DONE

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, the American people are depending on the Congress and the President to find a solution to the Nation's skyrocketing debt. Now is not the time for partisan rhetoric. Rather, now is the time for both sides to come together and work on finding a bold bipartisan plan to address the Nation's debt and debt ceiling.

One thing we can all agree on is default is not an option. We will and must pay our obligations. Small business owners who have worked their entire lives for sterling credit ratings would receive a devastating blow if Washington can't set aside their differences and come together on this important debate.

At a time when unemployment is at 9.2 percent, default is not an answer. We need to encourage the job creators of our country to invest and to hire, not paralyze them with even more economic uncertainty.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work on a bold plan. There's no reason that we cannot come together and work to cut spending and put our Nation back on the path to fiscal sanity. Americans across our country are depending on us to get the job done.

''COMPROMISE'' IS A DIRTY WORD

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, when did the idea of ''compromise'' get to be a dirty word? When did the idea that ''my way or the highway'' is the only way to go forward become the order of the day? We are at a stalemate because we cannot come to some basic ideas about how to move forward.

Here's the fact, absolute fact, irrefutable: We do not need to link and tie deficit reduction to raising the debt ceiling. They are independent necessities. They are two different things, and one does not have to be tied to the other. And when you link the two together, you are holding the full faith and credit of the United States hostage to a set of budgetary cuts.

This is a mistake. It is not statespersonship. It is not what we are elected to do.

Yes, we have to do deficit reduction, but it doesn't need to be linked to raising the debt ceiling. We should raise the debt ceiling now and then work on debt reduction.

How do we do that? We need more people paying taxes to reduce the deficit. That means jobs; that means infrastructure.

Let's get it done now. Raise the debt ceiling and pass a good infrastructure bill at the same time.

FIGHTING FOR LANDOWNERS IN THE SAN JOAQUIN DELTA

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to stand shoulder to shoulder with the landowners from the San Joaquin Delta who are fighting against the peripheral canal. Without permission, the State is sending its employees into private farmland to conduct surveys that the State needs to conduct studies to build a canal. Delta farmers are not standing for it. Delta farmers have taken the case to the courts, and I urge them to keep fighting for their property rights and the health of the delta.

A peripheral canal or tunnel that takes large amounts of fresh water from the delta would devastate our families, our farmers, and our businesses in our community. A canal will cause saltwater intrusion, destroy thousands of acres of farmland, and devastate our water quality.

It's time for our State and Federal agencies to respect the delta and its people. We won't tolerate anything less.

RECOGNIZING YOUTH INTERNATIONAL DAY AND THE CULMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL YOUTH YEAR

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize International Youth Day and to honor youth leaders in Rhode Island as we celebrate the culmination of the International Youth Year.

Since 1999, when the U.N. designated August 12 as a day to recognize the integral role youth have played in sustainable progress, we have commemorated the importance of young people getting involved in our global, regional, and national development.

In celebrating the many milestones of the youth of today, we also honor the lives and work of those who led them, and Rhode Island has so many fantastic youth leaders. One such example is my friend, Franklin Rodriguez, the Minister of Youth Affairs in the Dominican Republic and the president of the Ibero-American Organization of Youth, who has joined us here today in the gallery.

Under Franklin's leadership, the Ministry of Youth has worked to engage and empower Dominican American youth in Rhode Island by collaborating with the Community College of Rhode Island to provide training opportunities and honoring outstanding young civic and educational leaders in the community with their Youth Excellence Award.

Many of Rhode Island's Dominican residents are young people who have contributed to the cultural, economic, and social development of our State in so many ways. For this reason, I'm honored to recognize International Youth Day, the leaders of the youth movement, and the culmination of International Youth Year.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members not to refer to occupants of the gallery.

ONGOING VIOLENCE IN SYRIA

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly condemn the Syrian regime's recent hostility towards both the United States and the Syrian people. The courageous visit by U.S. Ambassador Robert Ford to Hama, the site of massive antiregime protests, demonstrates that the United States stands by those who advocate for democracy and freedom.

Days after Ford's visit, the American Embassy in Damascus endured several violent pro-regime demonstrations, resulting in considerable damage. Had the Syrian security forces acknowledged their international obligations, these rioters in support of President Assad would not have been able to approach the embassy. By responding poorly, Assad has conveyed disrespect towards the United States.

I applaud Secretary of State Clinton's recent tough stance toward Assad, declaring that his regime ''has lost legitimacy.''

Time and time again, Assad, like his father before him, has turned to arresting, torturing, and killing anyone who would stand in the way of his tyranny. Therefore, with the best interests of the Syrian people in mind, I call on President Assad to resign as President.

COMMEMORATING NATIONAL YOUTH SPORTS WEEK

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate National Youth Sports Week and to welcome several exceptional student athletes joining us in the gallery. The Baltimore SquashWise program and their leader, a local lacrosse star, are here to help us celebrate.

Moments ago I was joined by Hockey Hall of Famer Pat LaFontaine, former Redskin Ken Harvey, youth sports leaders and coaches to unveil the ''F.A.N.S. for Youth Sports'' legislative agenda to address fitness, access, nutrition, and safety.

Student athletes make better grades, get in less trouble, and are less likely to be obese. Sports shape the character of each child who walks onto the field.

I'm especially pleased that some of our Nation's top sports programs, including the NFL, the NHL, the PGA, and the U.S. Tennis Association, among others, are supporting this agenda. This agenda represents a renewed commitment to our Nation's youth.

Children are the best investment we can make in our future. We should never be too busy to help a child. Let's celebrate together National Youth Sports Week.

EXTEND FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FUNDING

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Saturday morning at midnight, following 20 previous clean extensions, funding for the Federal Aviation Administration was allowed to expire.

Why did this happen? Simple. Just like the Republican Party's lack of leadership over the debt ceiling debate, they absolutely refuse to compromise to extend funding for the FAA. For them, this debate is theoretical. Yet for the 4,000 Americans throughout the Nation who are paid out of the FAA trust fund that will not be paid, and tens of thousands who are affected by the cancellation of the airport construction projects, this situation is real. For the State of Florida, that includes over 3,000 airport construction jobs lost and 27 FAA employee jobs, 19 of them in the Orlando International Airport.

Let me just be clear. The reason that the FAA extension was not renewed is because the House Transportation Committee chair, Mr. MICA, inserted language into the FAA extension bill that would end the program that provides subsidies to rural airports.

Shame, shame, shame on the Republican leadership in this House.

REBUILDING THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I am from Colorado, and in Colorado, just like all across the country, Americans believe that if they work hard, if they play by the rules, if they're responsible in how they conduct their lives, they're going to get ahead.

Well, it's been very tough here recently. We've had a downturn. We have all this uncertainty because of, I believe, Republican brinksmanship to either shut down the government or maybe shut down the economy.

People want to get ahead. They want to know that this country will continue to innovate, educate, and rebuild itself so that we have good, long-lasting jobs that provide for our families. That's what Democrats stand for. We don't stand for all this brinksmanship every day.

Are we going to have a government or are we not? Are we going to have an economy or are we not? That's got to change. We have got to get back to rebuilding the American Dream.

□ 1230

SANTIAGO CANYON COLLEGE

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to extend well-deserved congratulations to Santiago Canyon College's Imagine Cup team.

Earlier this month, Team Syntax Errors accomplished what many thought they would never do. First of all, we're talking about a community college. And especially with the cuts happening in California to these wonderful colleges we have, they went and they competed against 430 of the best universities in the world. In addition to that competition, this community college is a gem for our community.

Santiago Canyon's Team Syntax Errors proved that hard work and determination can make impossible dreams come true. They placed within the top 15 universities in the world. I am very proud of these students, and I admire their ambition. They are true role models for all of our young students striving to succeed in an ever-changing, ever-global world.

It is my honor to recognize Hayden Donze, Bill Vetter, Gary Kelley, and Dale Laizure for their remarkable accomplishments. Congratulations.

HAPPY 350TH BIRTHDAY TO SCHENECTADY, NY

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and celebrate the city of Schenectady on the occasion of its 350th birthday.

Originally inhabited by the Mohawk tribe and then the Dutch, Schenectady's rich history has often served as an inspiration and genesis for many of America's accomplishments.

In the late 1800s, Thomas Edison moved Edison Machine Works to Schenectady, where advances led to new products, including the manufactured light bulb. Later becoming the headquarters of General Electric, Schenectady also played host to the former home of ALCO, the American Locomotive Company. These two developments prompted the community to be dubbed ''the city that lights and hauls the world'' and the ''electric city.''

Today, Schenectady is an important part of New York's Tech Valley, a nationwide leading region committed to green technology. From steam turbines to advanced batteries, Schenectady continues to lead the country with a focus on ingenuity and innovation, proving we can ''Make it in America.''

I am pleased to applaud the city of Schenectady on the rich history and numerous achievements it has accrued as we celebrate the wonderful 350th birthday of this community. I look forward to many bright and booming days to come.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

ESTABLISHING SPECIAL ENVOY FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THE NEAR EAST AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 440) to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 440

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Seven Baha'i leaders in Iran have been wrongfully imprisoned since 2008.

(2) In May 2010, suspected terrorists attacked two mosques in Pakistan belonging to the Ahmaddiya minority Muslim sect, killing at least 80 people. Ahmadis consider themselves Muslim, but Pakistani law does not recognize them as such.

(3) Said Musa, an Afghan Christian convert, was arrested in May 2010 on charges of apostasy, a crime which can carry the death sentence, and was released in February 2011 only after sustained international pressure.

(4) On October 31, 2010, gunmen laid siege on Our Lady of Salvation Church in Baghdad, Iraq killing at least 52 police and worshipers, including two priests, making it the worst massacre of Iraqi Christians since 2003.

(5) Iraq's ancient and once vibrant Christian population that numbered an estimated 1,500,000 out of a total population in Iraq of 30,000,000 in 2003 has been reduced by at least one half, due in significant part to Christians fleeing the violence.

(6) In November 2010, a Pakistani court sentenced Aasia Bibi, a Christian mother of five, to death under the country's blashphemy law for insulting the Prophet Muhammad.

(7) On New Year's Eve 2010, 23 people were killed when a suicide bomber attacked a Coptic Christian church in Alexandria, Egypt.

(8) On March 2, 2011, Pakistani Federal Minorities Minister Shahbaz Bhatti, the only Christian member of the Cabinet, who was outspoken in his opposition to Pakistan's blasphemy laws was assassinated by extremists.

(9) The Department of State's 2010 International Religious Freedom Report stated that many religious minority groups in Uzbekistan ''faced heavy fines and/or short jail terms for violations of restrictive religion laws''.

(10) The Special Envoy for Anti-Semitism, Hannah Rosenthal, has noted that Holocaust glorification ''is especially virulent in the Middle East media''.

(11) A number of countries in the Middle East have recently undergone popular revolutions which in some countries have left security vacuums making religious minorities especially vulnerable to violent attacks, such as—

(A) in March 2011, the Shahedin Church in Helwan province, Egypt, was torched, leading to protests which spurred sectarian clashes in the streets of Cairo;

(B) on March 20, 2011, a group of Salafists in Upper Egypt cut off a Christian man's ear and burned his home and car; and

(C) news reports from April 2011 indicate that Salafi organizations in Egypt have been implicated in the destruction of Sufi shrines across the country fueling violent conflict.

(12) Many of these ancient faith communities are being forced to flee the lands which they have inhabited for centuries.

(13) The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom has recommended that Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan be designated by the Department of State as Countries of Particular Concern in accordance with the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998.

(14) The situation on the ground in the region continues to develop rapidly and the United States Government needs an individual who can respond in kind and focus on the critical situation of religious minorities in these countries.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL ENVOY TO PROMOTE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM OF RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN THE NEAR EAST AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA.

(a) APPOINTMENT.—The President shall appoint a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia (in this Act referred to as the ''Special Envoy'') within the Department of State.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Special Envoy should be a person of recognized distinction in the field of human rights and religious freedom and with expertise in the Near East and South Central Asia regions. The Special Envoy shall have the rank of ambassador and shall hold the office at the pleasure of the President.

(c) PROHIBITION.—The person appointed as Special Envoy may not hold any other position of Federal employment for the period of time during which the person holds the position of Special Envoy.

SEC. 3. DUTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Special Envoy shall carry out the following duties:

(1) Promote the right of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia, denounce the violation of such right, and recommend appropriate responses by the United States Government when such right is violated.

(2) Monitor and combat acts of religious intolerance and incitement targeted against religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(3) Work to ensure that the unique needs of religious minority communities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia are addressed, including the economic and security needs of such communities to the extent that such needs are directly tied to religious-based discrimination and persecution.

(4) Work with foreign governments of the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia to address laws that are inherently discriminatory toward religious minority communities in such countries.

(5) Coordinate and assist in the preparation of that portion of the report required by sections 116(d) and 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d) and 2304(b)) relating to the nature and extent of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(6) Coordinate and assist in the preparation of that portion of the report required by section 102(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6412(b)) relating to the nature and extent of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the duties under subsection (a), the Special Envoy shall, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate with the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration of the Department of State, the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and other relevant Federal agencies and officials.

SEC. 4. DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION.

Subject to the direction of the President and the Secretary of State, the Special Envoy is authorized to represent the United States in matters and cases relevant to religious freedom in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia in—

(1) contacts with foreign governments, intergovernmental organizations, and specialized agencies of the United Nations, the

Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe, and other international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(2) multilateral conferences and meetings relevant to religious freedom in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

SEC. 5. PRIORITY COUNTRIES AND CONSULTATION.

(a) PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—In carrying out this Act, the Special Envoy shall give priority to programs, projects, and activities for Egypt, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Special Envoy shall consult with domestic and international nongovernmental organizations and multilateral organizations and institutions, as the Special Envoy considers appropriate to fulfill the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts made available for ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'' for fiscal years 2011 through 2015, $1,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for each such fiscal year for the hiring of staff, for the conduct of investigations, and for necessary travel to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) FUNDING OFFSET.—To offset the costs to be incurred by the Department of State for the hiring of staff, for the conduct of investigations, and for necessary travel to carry out the provisions of this Act for fiscal years 2011 through 2015, the Secretary of State shall eliminate such positions within the Department of State, unless otherwise authorized or required by law, as the Secretary determines to be necessary to fully offset such costs.

(c) LIMITATION.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'' to carry out this Act.

SEC. 7. SUNSET.

This Act shall cease to be effective beginning on October 1, 2015.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 440, a bill to establish a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

The bill is authored by my very good friend and colleague, Congressman FRANK WOLF, who was also the author of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1988 and other religious freedom legislation. He has taken the lead in Congress time and time again to advance the cause of those who are persecuted because of their faith. I wish to thank him for his years of service on this issue—his legislation and his tireless advocacy on behalf of religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this bill establishes the special envoy position for religious minorities in 31 Middle Eastern and South Central Asian countries, almost all of which have had bad or very bad records of persecuting or disadvantaging religious minorities. The special envoy will represent the United States in contacts with foreign governments, intergovernmental organizations, U.N. agencies, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and in contacts with international organizations and multilateral conferences. He or she will also meet with victims and try to take their story to offending governments to try to end the abuse.

We know from experience, Mr. Speaker, that special envoys, including and especially for Sudan and Northern Ireland, have achieved unparalleled successes over the years in mitigating explosive situations and literally saving lives all while pursuing positive and durable solutions to what appear to be intractable and unresolvable problems.

But not all special envoys have been equally effective. Almost everything depends on whom the President appoints to the position. So I would appeal to the President: When this bill becomes law, appoint someone with the passion, energy, and experience to get this job done and to stand up as never before for these persecuted minorities.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues will speak about different religious minorities in the Middle East, but I am particularly concerned about the Coptic minority in Egypt. They have been called the bellwether of the rights for religious minorities in the Middle East. As the largest and one of the oldest minorities, they are suffering, and their escalating agony portends suffering throughout the region.

And make no mistake, they are suffering. On Friday of last week, I chaired a hearing specifically to hear of the needs and experiences of the Copts during this time during transition. What I heard and what my colleagues heard on the Helsinki Commission worried us deeply. Coptic women and girls, some as young as 14, are being systematically lured from their families or kidnapped off the street corners and forced to change their religion and forced to marry outside of their community. These young girls frequently suffer physical and psychological abuse, including rape, beatings, forced isolation, and lack of personal freedom both before and after their so-called ''marriage/conversion.'' The drugging of victims appears to be commonplace.

One story that emerged at the hearing detailed the situation of a married woman who was forced to leave her Coptic community and marry a Muslim. Her family was present at the official inquiry—which are no longer conducted, I might point out—and said that she showed signs of being drugged. She was out of it. Over and over she repeated, ''I had to do it for the children. I had to do it for the children.''

Dr. Michele Clark, an internationally recognized anti-trafficking expert—she was one of those who led the Protection Project at Johns Hopkins and was director of the OSCE trafficking efforts for years—she authored a report called ''The Disappearance, Forced Conversions, and Forced Marriages of Coptic Christian Women in Egypt.'' She testified that this happens to thousands of Coptic women and girls each and every year. She said this on Friday. Others also concurred in that analysis.

Dr. Clark further testified that the mounting evidence shows that the term ''alleged''—which has been used in the U.S. State Department Reports on Human Rights Practices, as well as in the TIP report—needs to be replaced. It's no longer even close to being accurate. It's not an allegation; it's a fact that she herself, as a human rights investigator, has helped to establish by doing extensive investigation and inquiries on the ground in Egypt.

She pointed out that the criminality of alleged forced marriages and conversions is generally dismissed by authorities here and everywhere else, especially in Egypt. The coverup must end. Young women are presumed to be willing participants, they are not. The abduction and the disappearance of Coptic women and girls follow, as she puts it, consistent patterns and constitutes human trafficking—modern day slavery.

Dr. Clark testified that men and women and peers are used to build trust and dispel resistance in young women targeted for conversion in marriage. Most cases documented in the report begin with a trusting relationship that ultimately leads to the disappearance or abduction, marriage to a Muslim man, and conversion to Islam. These supposed new friends exploit the vulnerability and naivete of a young Coptic woman.

Once trust has been established, girls are lured to an isolated place, drugged and kidnapped. Often they are raped. Following the rape, the Coptic women experience shame and fear of how their families will respond. They become more willing to stay with the Muslim friends. They feel that they have been so abused. And then they often marry their rapist because they feel they have nowhere else to go. This outrageous abuse must be exposed and stopped—and these young women rescued.

□ 1240

Let me just point out to my colleagues, what is going on in Egypt and the abuses being experienced by Christians and people of the Baha'i faith in Iran and elsewhere, we need to do much more than we have done to combat this, to speak out, to do effective chronicling, but also, once you get the information, to ensure that it is actionable and that you take it to those governments. Sadly, we have not done that. A special envoy would be uniquely equipped and empowered to take the cause of the beleaguered, suffering religious minorities in the Middle East and to fight, and to fight every day of the week for those people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, and I yield

myself as much time as I may consume.

This bipartisan legislation creates a special envoy to promote religious freedom of religious minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia. Housed at the State Department, the special envoy would be responsible for monitoring and combating acts of religious intolerance, engaging with foreign governments to address laws that discriminate against religious minorities, and working to ensure that the unique needs of religious minority communities are being addressed.

This bill is important because religious minority communities all around the world, but particularly in the Near East and South Central Asia, are facing increased attacks and increased persecution. For example, Iraq used to have a significant number of religious minorities, including Christians, Yazidis, Sabean Mandaeans, Baha'is, Shabaks, Kaka'is, and a small number of Jews. These groups have been subject to escalating violence, persecution, and discrimination for their religious beliefs, and today they comprise only about 3 percent of Iraq's population. By some estimates, half of Iraq's Christian population has fled since 2003.

In November of 2010, a Pakistani court sentenced Aasia Bibi, a Christian and mother of five, to death under the country's blasphemy law. And what was her offense? In June 2009, she was asked to get water for herself and a group of women working in the fields with her. The other laborers objected to a non-Muslim touching the water bowl and an argument ensued. That group of women later falsely accused Aasia of speaking ill of the prophet Mohammed in order to settle a personal score against her. Aasia remains in prison awaiting review of her death sentence.

When Punjab's Governor Salman Taseer had the courage to demand that Aasia be pardoned, one of his own bodyguards killed him. Two months later, when Pakistan's Minister for Minorities, Shahbaz Bhatti, condemned the blasphemy law, militants executed him in broad daylight.

In Egypt, as the gentleman from New Jersey has stated, 23 men, women, and children were killed in a bombing at an Alexandria church in Egypt on New Year's Eve. Just last May, extremists attacked Christians at St. Mina Church in Cairo, leaving 12 dead and hundreds wounded.

I wish these were isolated cases, but I could provide countless other examples, from Afghanistan, to India, to Saudi Arabia. We're fortunate to live in a country that was founded by religious refugees on principles of tolerance, but it is important that we do everything we can to ensure that religious minorities elsewhere in the world enjoy the freedoms and protections they deserve, the freedoms and protections enjoyed by all Americans. Appointing this special envoy will be an important step in that direction, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce-Justice-Science for the Appropriations Committee, the author of H.R. 440, the gentleman from Virginia, FRANK WOLF.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to thank Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN for her support, Mr. BERMAN for his support, and Mr. SMITH for his help. I also want to thank some key staff members whose hard work and efforts on the bill have not gone unnoticed: Elyse Anderson, Kalinda Stephenson, Yleem Poblete, Steve Stombres, and also Kyle Nevins with the majority leader's office. They have been very, very helpful, and I am grateful for their help.

This past January, in the wake of increasing violence, targeted attacks, and heightened discrimination against Christians and other religious minorities in Iraq and Egypt, and persistent concerns in Afghanistan and Pakistan, among other nations, I introduced bipartisan legislation, H.R. 440, which would require the administration to appoint a special envoy to advocate for religious minorities in the Middle East and South Central Asia in order to make this issue a foreign policy priority.

Since introduction, this legislation has garnered widespread bipartisan support with nearly 80 cosponsors. I want to thank ANNA ESHOO, the lead Democrat in the House, for her work on this. Also, companion legislation has been introduced now by Senators ROY BLUNT and CARL LEVIN. The legislation has also been championed by a host of faith-based organizations and diaspora communities, who recognize the importance of ensuring that the vulnerable communities have an advocate within the U.S. Government and around the world.

Shortly before introducing this legislation, I chaired a hearing at the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission on the recent spate of attacks and the ongoing persecution of Christians in Iraq and Egypt. Commission members heard testimony about the increasing sectarian tensions in the two countries and the need for greater U.S. attention to the plight of religious minorities. The hearing was held prior to recent events in the Middle East which have, in some cases, created a political vacuum that have left religious minorities particularly vulnerable. I heard this fear expressed time and again during a recent trip to Egypt.

Religious minorities throughout the region, including those who are Jewish, Ahmadis, Baha'is, are under increasing pressure. In fact, many of these ancient faith communities have been forced to flee the lands that they have inhabited for centuries.

Consider some of the following:

Last October, at least 70 people were killed during a siege on Our Lady of Salvation Church in Baghdad, making it the worst massacre of Iraqi Christians since 2003.

Iraq's once vibrant Christian community population has been reduced by at least half since 2003. This would be tragic under any circumstances, but it is especially so given the rich ancestral heritage of this indigenous community.

Apart from Israel, the lands and peoples of modern-day Iraq are mentioned with greater frequency in the Bible than any other country. Abraham, Jonah, Nineveh, Esther, and Daniel all hail from Iraq. The Christians of Iraq today still speak Aramaic, the language that Jesus spoke.

In Afghanistan and Pakistan, countries where the United States has invested its treasure and the lives of countless brave American soldiers, persecution of Christians runs rampant.

On November 7 last year, a Pakistani court sentenced Aasia Bibi, a Christian mother of five, to death for the crime of blasphemy. Only after intervention by the international community was her execution delayed. Her fate still remains, at this moment, unclear.

Pakistan's blasphemy laws are often used to victimize both religious minorities and Muslims. Earlier this year, Punjab's influential Governor, Salman Taseer, was shot and killed by his own bodyguard, who reportedly told police that he, quote, killed Mr. Taseer because of the Governor's opposition to Pakistan's blasphemy law.

In April, Pakistan's Federal Minister for Minority Affairs, Shahbaz Bhatti, a heroic man of faith whose courageous and outspoken leadership against his nation's draconian blasphemy law made him a prime target of extremist Islamist elements in his country, was assassinated. Bhatti was the only Christian member of the Pakistani Cabinet.

□ 1250

In an interview with The Washington Post's Fred Hiatt, Shahbaz Bhatti ''urged Americans not to forsake or forget'' Pakistan's suffering religious minority community.

Members of the Jewish faith continue to experience discrimination and persecution throughout the region. The Special Envoy for Anti-Semitism, Hannah Rosenthal, has noted that Holocaust glorification ''is especially virulent in the Middle East media.''

If the international community fails to speak out, the prospects for religious pluralism and tolerance in the region are bleak. I urge my colleagues' support for this bill, and again thank the leadership on both sides for making this legislation a priority. I am hopeful that this bill will overwhelmingly pass the House and send a clear and unequivocal message to both the persecutors and the persecuted that the United States of America stands with those whose most basic freedom—the right to

worship according to the dictates of conscience—is under assault.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), who brought this bill to my attention and has worked with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) to put it together and bring it to this point. She is deeply committed on this issue and a very great Member of Congress.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank Mr. BERMAN, our distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for not only yielding me this time but for his conscience, because that indeed is what this is about, and his unflagging leadership on so many issues. Your endorsement and strong support of this bill I think bolsters it enormously, and says to the entire House that a person that is steeped in the background of the issues of the entire world is for this.

I want to pay tribute to Mr. WOLF for his incredible advocacy on this issue relative to religious minorities for so long. It is an honor to have worked with you to bring this to a realization of not only legislation but to bring it to the floor. I salute you. You are a gentleman; and you, too, are a man of great conscience.

Mr. Speaker, I think today we are here on something that really distinguishes the United States of America. From the founding of our Nation, religious freedom has been a pillar of our democracy, and it remains one of the most critical exports of our great Nation. I think having said that really establishes the foundation of why we are here in strong support of H.R. 440. This bill, as my colleagues have said, will create a special envoy to promote religious freedom of religious minorities in the Near East and South Asia. The legislation responds to the very urgent needs of Christians and other religious minorities who are under siege. When I say that, I underscore it. They are under siege in the Middle East. Again, I commend everyone, especially Mr. WOLF, who has been part of this effort. And as a cochair of the Religious Minorities Caucus and all of the members of it, I thank them as well.

In January of this year, Representative WOLF chaired a hearing to review the violence and the hardships faced by Middle Eastern religious minorities. I was privileged to testify that day about the plight of many people, but most especially the Assyrians. I am of both Assyrian and Armenian descent, and the language Mr. WOLF spoke of, Aramaic, I speak fluently and understand very well. It is the language, as he said, that Jesus spoke. These are the world's oldest Christians, and they are quickly disappearing from Iraq. During this hearing, we also learned of Egypt's Coptic Christian population and the renewed threats they face and unacceptable violence in that uncertain political situation.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentlelady 2 additional minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. At the conclusion of the hearing, we agreed to press forward with this legislation to create a special envoy at the State Department, someone at the ambassador level to elevate this issue for the attention it deserves. We need a high-level official dedicated to religious freedom in the region, committed to addressing the concerns of the minority communities.

I am very, very pleased that this legislation has attracted very solid bipartisan support. We have 78 cosponsors, an even split between Republicans and Democrats, all calling for the State Department to elevate religious freedom in the Middle East as a diplomatic priority. There is a history for this. Senator John Danforth served our Nation as special envoy to Sudan, and Senator George Mitchell as special envoy to Northern Ireland, so there is precedent for this.

I want to speak of a meeting I had in my office last week. Three Dominican nuns, sisters who traveled from Iraq, and they once again relayed their story of what is happening to them. They have been dispersed across Iraq. They teach everyone regardless of their background, Muslims, Christians, no matter what the background is. And in their hospitals, they care for whomever is sick and wounded. And yet their convents have been burned, the statute of the Blessed Mother's hands chopped off and placed at their door. So these threats are very real. They are very real. That is just one example of it.

So this history of violence must and should be dealt with. As I said, our great Nation, our great Nation treasures its religious freedoms, and it is part of the core of our democracy. So that's why I urge all of my colleagues to join us, not just me but all of us, in supporting this important legislation. The message that will go forward from this Chamber, with all of the other issues that are swirling around us, is that we stand with great dignity for one of the great principles of our great Nation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who both here and abroad fights against persecution and discrimination against religious minorities.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 440, a bill to provide for the establishment of a special envoy to promote religious freedom of religious minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia. I want to thank my colleagues, Congressman FRANK WOLF and Congresswoman ESHOO, for introducing this legislation and for their tireless leadership on this critical issue.

Ethno-religious minorities continue to face a crisis in Iraq, where attacks and violence against Christians continue. My district is home to a large and vibrant Assyrian population, and they regularly share with me the devastating stories of their friends and family members still living in Iraq who are facing threats because of their faith. In November 2010, over 1,500 protesters demonstrated in Chicago, sending a powerful message about the need to protect Iraqi minorities.

By creating a special envoy specifically focused on the rights of religious minorities in the region, this legislation is an important step toward ending the cycle of violence.

To date, the U.S. Government and the international community unfortunately have failed to provide security for Iraqi ethno-religious minorities. Iraqi Christians continue to fear for their physical safety, as well as for the survival of their communities and culture. Of a population that numbered 1.4 million people before the American-led invasion, there are now less than 500,000 Iraqi Christians in the country.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 440 is a critical step toward addressing the threat against Iraqi ethno-religious minorities. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

□ 1300

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Since 1947, 49 million Hindus in Bangladesh have gone missing, according to Professor Sachi Dastidar. A recent Hindu American Foundation report concluded that the ''Hindus of Bangladesh continue to be victims of daily acts of murder, rape, kidnapping, temple destruction, and physical intimidation.''

Dr. Richard Benkin, an authority on human rights abuses in Bangladesh, has described to me on several occasions the atrocities and human rights abuses suffered by Bangladeshi Hindus that he personally has verified. Other groups, like the Christian Assyrians in Iraq's Nineveh province, the suffering of the Baha'i prisoners in Iran, and millions of others who seek to practice their religion in peace, look to the United States as a beacon of hope. I believe this bill helps us answer that important call. H.R. 440 will create a powerful diplomatic tool for the promotion of religious freedom and human rights in the volatile regions of the Near East and South Central Asia.

I thank the gentleman for his bill, and I urge support for this meaningful legislation.

Mr. BERMAN. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to rise in support of H.R. 440, a bill to establish a special envoy to promote religious freedom of religious minorities in the Near East and

South Central Asia. As a cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation and as a member of the Religious Minorities of the Middle East Caucus, I strongly support its passage.

While many parts of the Near East and Southeast Asia are predominantly Muslim, historically these areas have been home to a diverse group of ethnic and religious minorities. Whether it is Chaldeans, Syriacs, and Assyrians in Iraq, Baha'i in Iran, Copts in Egypt, or the Hindus in Pakistan, religious minorities have for centuries lived and worshipped alongside their Muslim countrymen and women.

Unfortunately, instability in the Middle East has had a disproportionately negative impact on religious minorities. The most striking example of this has been in Iraq, where more than half of the Iraqi Christian population has been forced to flee the country since the invasion of Iraq in 2003. Those who have stayed have been specifically targeted in gruesome and random acts of violence, such as murder, rape, and abduction.

This includes religious and community leaders like Archbishop Rahho, who was kidnapped and murdered. Religious minorities have also suffered attacks in their places of worship, such as the October 2010 massacre at Our Lady of Salvation Church in Baghdad, in which 58 worshipers were killed by militants and extremists.

While the end of the Mubarak regime in Egypt has brought about the promise for democratic reform, it has also given rise to instability and acts of violence against religious minorities. Coptic Christians have lived peacefully in this part of the world for centuries. Sadly, in recent months, Coptic churches and protesters have also been targeted for violence.

Freedom of religion is something we take for granted here in the United States. Our citizens are free to worship however they please, without fear that they will be targeted for violence because of their religious beliefs. I'm honored to represent Michigan's Ninth Congressional District, which is home to an amazingly diverse population. We have Jewish synagogues, Islamic mosques, Hindu temples, and Christian churches of almost every kind imaginable. This diversity is a source of strength in our community, and something my constituents are very proud of. Many of my constituents have relatives in Near East or South Central Asia and they wish that they, too, had the same freedom to worship that so many of us take for granted. They are desperate to see the United States take more leadership in promoting religious tolerance overseas.

That is why the legislation we're debating today is so important. It creates a permanent special envoy that will work on behalf of the President and the Secretary of State to advance the cause of religious minorities abroad. This individual will be able to ensure that the United States is fully engaged to fight to protect religious minorities in other countries and to help hold our own government accountable when that should be done.

I would like to thank Representative WOLF, who is not only the author of this legislation but also the cochair of the Religious Minorities of the Middle East, a tireless champion on behalf of vulnerable populations. I would also like to thank my friend, Representative ESHOO, who is also a cochair of the caucus and a true champion for religious minorities in the Middle East.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that the United States will be vigilant in promoting religious tolerance and freedom around the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I simply ask the House to pass what is I think an important bill because we only have to read what is going on recently to understand this is a rapidly increasing and severe problem that affects those countries deeply in terms of the conflict's intentions. I think much good can come from having someone focused on these issues in that region.

I urge an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. I rise to urge this Chamber to support H.R. 440, a bill that requires the President to appoint a special envoy at the State Department to advocate for religious minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia. I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this matter.

I have personally met with oppressed people from all over the globe, but predominantly ones from the Near East and South Asia. The region has long been a hot-bed of religious discrimination, and little has been done by our government to aid these innocent practitioners of faith. Revolutions striving for democracy and greater expression in the region have been matched by a wake of religious intolerance and extremism. As we cherish our right to the free expression of religion here at home, our State Department needs to reflect our dedication to protecting this right in our diplomatic engagements abroad.

Religious minorities in Egypt, Iraq, Iran, and countless other countries are left without an advocate in the political process of their respective governments. H.R. 440 would provide an envoy that can advocate for these religious minorities and focus solely on their plight while being able to avoid bureaucratic red tape. As basic human rights are increasingly under assault in this region, our government needs to rapidly respond to the new challenges rapidly emerging. It is in our strategic interest to pass this legislation. I ask the Members to join me in supporting it.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 440.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN).

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is a bipartisan bill, which I support. I would just note—and I know the gentleman's long history with mine of advocating for human rights and religious freedom in Vietnam. I hope that we can follow up this great effort with a similar effort really specifically oriented toward the religious oppression that's going on in Vietnam against the Buddhists, against the Cao Dai, against the Catholics and many others. I commend the gentleman for this bill. I just wanted to raise that issue in the hopes that it can be addressed at a later date.

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

Mr. Speaker, the issue of religious freedom for minorities in the Middle East and South Central Asia must be of the highest priority. For far too long, religious minorities and the persecution and marginalization they endure has been overlooked, even trivialized. Their rights and even their very lives must now be assiduously protected in this time of political upheaval, especially in the Middle East.

Mr. WOLF had the foresight to draft this bill before the so-called Arab Spring. It was needed in January. It's even more needed now, especially in light of the spate of church bombings and escalated persecution against believers, especially with kidnappings of thousands each and every year of Coptic Christian teenage girls, who are then forced to convert to Islam and forced to ''marry'' a Muslim man.

□ 1310

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. The Middle East is at a critical juncture. We are witnessing the systematic extinction of centuries-old religious communities. South and Central Asia are also systematically failing their religious minorities.

The late Shahbaz Bhatti, Federal Minister for Minorities in Pakistan, gave his life to fight the injustices and atrocities suffered by the religious minorities in Pakistan. The Government of Pakistan has since abolished the Ministry for Minorities, perhaps under the false impression that it does not matter in relations with the United States.

A Special Envoy for religious minorities sends the right message at the right time, and empowers a diplomat with access to the President and to, hopefully, all the leaders throughout

the region and to all those who are disenfranchised. The rights of religious minorities matter, and we will not look askance during this perilous time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of H.R. 440, a bill to establish a Special Envoy to promote religious freedom for minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, because no one should be made to feel that the practice of their religion is a crime or a source of shame.

Around the world, people are persecuted in the name of one religion against another. Such persecution not only violates their inalienable right to worship as they choose; it also creates instability in many places around the world. Many conflicts are rooted in sectarian differences and rivalries. To the extent the United States can promote religious tolerance, we advance the cause of human rights, justice and peace around the globe.

This bill creates a special envoy in order to monitor and combat acts of religious intolerance and incitement targeted against religious minorities and to work with foreign governments to address laws that are inherently discriminatory toward religious minority communities.

As we speak, there are minorities all over the world who live in fear for their lives merely because they practice a different religion than those around them. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 440.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 440, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1315

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey). Pursuant to House Resolution 363 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. 2584.

□ 1316

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. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (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, July 26, 2011, the bill had been read through page 56, line 22.

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

An amendment by Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

An amendment by Mr. DICKS of Washington.

An amendment by Mr. TONKO of New York.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

An amendment by Mr. DOLD of Illinois.

Amendment No. 44 by Mr. REED of New York.

An amendment, as modified, by Mr. SCALISE of Louisiana.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE) 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 173, noes 251, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 651]

AYES—173

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rogers (MI)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—251

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
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
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant

Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Bachmann
Buerkle
Costa
Giffords
Hinchey
Landry
McCotter
Stark

□ 1340

Messrs. CONNOLLY of Virginia, MORAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Messrs. ROHRABACHER, and McINTYRE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BECERRA, DUFFY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. LEE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) 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 224, noes 202, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 652]

AYES—224

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
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
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
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
Stearns
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—202

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
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
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Bachmann
Costa
Giffords
Hinchey
McCotter
Stark

□ 1345

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) 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 184, noes 238, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 653]

AYES—184

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn

Hanna
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Richardson
Richmond
Roskam
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keating
Kind
King (IA)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Crenshaw
Giffords
Hinchey
McCotter
Schrader
Smith (WA)
Stark
Terry
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1349

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 294, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 654]

AYES—131

Altmire
Amash
Bartlett
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Canseco
Carney
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Costello
Denham
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yoder

NOES—294

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush

Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Johnson (IL)

NOT VOTING—6

Bachmann
Becerra
Giffords
Hinchey
McCotter
Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1353

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) 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 137, noes 291, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 655]

AYES—137

Ackerman
Altmire
Baldwin
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Chabot
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Coble
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Denham
Dent
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Engel
Farr
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Hahn
Hanna
Heinrich
Higgins
Hochul
Honda
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Landry
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Manzullo
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Moore
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Nunes
Owens
Paulsen
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Roskam
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shimkus
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Sutton
Tiberi
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOES—291

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
Kingston
Kissell
Labrador
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Walden
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Bachmann
Giffords
Hinchey
McCotter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1356

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. REED

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) 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 237, noes 189, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 656]

AYES—237

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Altmire
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Cohen
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Engel
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling

Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hochul
Holden
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Landry
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shuler
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—189

Alexander
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleischmann
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
King (IA)
Kingston
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Lynch
Markey
McCaul
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Olson
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Rehberg
Renacci
Reyes
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schiff
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Speier
Stark
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Towns
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Bachmann
Emerson
Giffords
Hinchey
McCotter
Meeks

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1402

Messrs. PERLMUTTER and CLEAVER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. RIGELL and WITTMAN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) 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 215, noes 213, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 657]

AYES—215

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
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
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—213

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
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
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
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
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall

Rangel	Scott (VA)	Tonko
Reyes	Scott, David	Towns
Ribble	Serrano	Tsongas
Richardson	Sewell	Van Hollen
Rogers (KY)	Sherman	Velázquez
Ross (AR)	Shuler	Visclosky
Rothman (NJ)	Simpson	Walz (MN)
Roybal-Allard	Sires	Wasserman Schultz
Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Waters
Rush	Smith (NJ)	Watt
Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Sánchez, Linda T.	Speier	Welch
Sanchez, Loretta	Stark	Wilson (FL)
Sarbanes	Sutton	Wolf
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Woolsey
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Wu
Schrader	Thompson (PA)	Yarmuth
Schwartz	Tierney	Young (FL)
	Tipton	

NOT VOTING—4

Bachmann	Hinchey
Giffords	McCotter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1406

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

So the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

YUKON-CHARLEY NATIONAL PRESERVE

SEC. 116. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to implement or enforce regulations concerning boating and other activities on or relating to waters located within Yukon-Charley National Preserve, including waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, pursuant to section 3(h) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–2(h)) or any other authority. This section does not affect the authority of the Coast Guard to regulate the use of waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States within the Yukon-Charley National Preserve.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 56, beginning on line 23, strike section 116.

□ 1410

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Section 116 would prohibit the National Park Service from carrying out boat inspection or safety checks on the Yukon River within the Yukon-Charley National Preserve in Alaska. This provision was put in at the request of Mr. YOUNG from Alaska who is upset with the National Park Service law enforcement at the preserve.

Last summer, two park rangers arrested a 70-year-old following an altercation during a boat safety inspection. This case is still before the courts, but it has stirred considerable local anger, especially when it was learned that the rangers had handcuffed but later released another local resident who refused to speak to rangers when approached.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska is a long-time friend of mine, and I am very hesitant to offer this amendment to strike his provision, but I think he has already won the case. The people there, the two rangers, have been reassigned to another duty, and the Park Service does have jurisdiction. I have discussed this with Chairman YOUNG, and the Park Service always has jurisdiction within the national park.

Now, the gentleman from Alaska suggested that the Coast Guard had jurisdiction or the State had jurisdiction, but we have checked this carefully. The Park Service has jurisdiction within the national preserve to look at safety on the river. I think it is wrong to prohibit a safety inspection for people whose lives are at risk up there.

I have been to Alaska many times. These rivers can be very dangerous, and to make sure that the people who are being conveyed—this is a commercial endeavor—the people who are being moved around in these boats are safe, the people who own the boats are safe, whether it is commercial or not.

So I would like to yield to the ranking member and discuss this amendment and the importance of it.

Mr. MORAN. Well, first of all, I would like to ask my good friend: Why is this not an earmark? Why is this not an earmark for one particular national preserve?

While we are considering that, perhaps Mr. YOUNG can come up with an explanation. And I share the ranking member's great affection for Mr. YOUNG. He is a good friend. But this also creates a precedent. Any time something happens on a national preserve or park land, they could come to the Congress and say, all right, no more inspections, and we could get a proliferation of these kinds of things specific to individual national reserves or parks.

The fact is that if the Park Service has jurisdiction, then they have responsibility. And I'll bet you anything that if we were to say there were to be no boat inspections, something's going to happen and some serious accident is going to occur, and then people are going to ask why in gosh name wasn't the Park Service there to do inspections? And it's going to go back to this, where we set a precedent of not allowing any boat inspection or safety check.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, the thing is this has happened before. I can remember one of our colleagues putting in a provision in one of these bills, I think it was the Merchant Marine and Fisheries bill years ago, about one of the boats that was going up to Alaska to fish in these very dangerous waters. This wasn't in the river; it was in the ocean. And that boat went down, and there were many questions raised about why that Member had prohibited boat and safety inspections of that boat.

Now, I think the gentleman is completely right. This is a bad precedent. The gentleman from Alaska has already won. He has already gotten his view across with the Park Service. They have taken these rangers away. It's time to leave this. We're doing this amendment in the best interests of Mr. YOUNG. And if Mr. YOUNG would like to get up and explain this, I would like to hear his explanation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, Members of the body, with all due respect, this is about the State's rights. This bill does not preclude the State of Alaska, the Coast Guard, or any other entity from enforcement on the Yukon River. The Park Service can still move on the river. But it does not allow them to enforce inspections of boats on the river that are private. Not in business, but private.

And I have to tell you a little story about this. This is the reason I'm very adamant about it. The Park Service is for the people; it's not for the Park Service. The Park Service in Alaska has become, very frankly, I'd say, like an occupying army of a free territory. To give you an example, this man that was arrested was 70 years old with his wife, who happened to be from Germany—I'm going to bring that up a little later—and a couple. So 70 years old, 69 years old, 68 years old, on a cruise on the Yukon River in a very seaworthy boat, Coast Guard inspected. And there was another boat on the river and there was a distress signal given by the Park Service. Being a good Samaritan, they went over to help them out. As they approached the boat, they flashed their badges and said: We're the Park Service. We're going to board your vessel and inspect you for safety and registration.

Think about this. A distress signal, and then: We're going to board your boat.

And maritime law says you will not board a boat on a moving river. You have to put it to shore.

And the guy said: Up yours; I'm going to go to shore. And that's what he did.

And he gets to shore, he gets out of the boat. The rangers have already got a shotgun on a 70-year-old man, and carrying a pistol out of the holster. And as the guy walked toward them, they started to say something. He turned around and walked back. They tackled him and rolled him in the mud, a 70-year-old man. These are two young bucks—cowboys—and handcuffed this man, this 70-year-old man, and made him sit on the shore. And they took him a great distance down the river to a village and flew him to Fairbanks—drove him to Fairbanks—handcuffed.

This is your Park Service? This is not my Park Service.

Well, it did go to trial and the judge hasn't rendered his decision yet. In the first place, the State never gave them the authority to do any inspection. In the second place, they never gave them the authority—by the way, the Coast Guard did not give them authority. And they do not have jurisdiction over that water; that's State water. In every State in this Union, it's the State's water. To have the Park Service act like that is dead wrong.

So I'm asking you not to support this amendment. This is an amendment that shouldn't be adopted because we have agencies today who are acting, very frankly, like occupiers. The lady I brought up was from Germany. And during the trial they asked her, the prosecution: Did you ever have a gun pointed at you? And she said: Yes, by the SS troops.

Now, that gives you an idea. A 70-year-old lady and have them point a shotgun. Now, that's wrong.

You say it sets a precedent; yes, it sets a precedent because it's State's waters. This amendment should not be accepted. We should leave it in the bill as it is. It's the right thing to do.

I say vote down the amendment. Think about the little people. Quit thinking about these agencies. These agencies aren't God. Think about the little people. People are abused by agencies, and you're paying for them.

And by the way, the one ranger, the one ranger, had a record longer than my arms, and they hired him to enforce the so-called park regulations.

So I'm asking you to think about this a moment. It's the wrong amendment. This is the right thing to do. It's time we start telling these agencies: Think of the people, not the parks themselves.

□ 1420

This is about parks and partners. And they're certainly not partners in Alaska. They say: We're going to educate Alaskans about Alaska. Now, this is a 70-year-old man that had been living there all his life. And to have that happen is dead wrong.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, in response to my very good friend, it appears that the conduct—it appears—the conduct of these park rangers was wrong. So they have been reassigned. And I'm sure that whoever has responsibility now in that jurisdiction has been told you don't do this.

Now, these kinds of things happen all over the country, if not all over the world, clearly. Some people in authority abuse their power. It happens with local police departments. It happens with State police. It happens with other people with a badge. And so they get disciplined. Sometimes they get taken to court. But normally we don't change national policy to deal with misconduct, if that's what it was, on the part of certain individuals. We don't change national policy. And that's what you're trying to do.

Let me put into this discussion and deliberation the fact that they had to go through national park land to get to that State water. They do. And the National Park Service runs the concessions. So the National Park Service does have responsibility for some of the vehicles on this water. They don't know if there's contraband stuff coming. They don't know what's on the vessel.

My guess is—I don't know for sure—my guess is it's very seldom that they're going to stop and board any boat. They would probably have to have some reason. I'm sure now, after this incident, they have to have very substantial reason. But it's entirely conceivable that at some point in the future they're going to have very substantial reason to stop and board a boat. And we have precluded their ability to carry out their responsibility.

So that's why we're concerned about the precedent. We're not concerned about the fact that if there was misconduct, that these folks have been reassigned. We're sure that the instructions that have been given by superiors have changed now to ensure that this incident is never repeated. But we really don't think that the solution is to change national policy, which would have repercussions for other national preserves around the country, and it might have very serious ramifications on this particular one in the future. We can't tell right now.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Again, I plead with my friend from Alaska. You have made your case. You have gotten the relief for your constituents. The rangers have been reassigned. Accept victory and don't give us an amendment that would undermine boat safety inspections. That's what this amendment does.

Let me read this amendment: No other funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to implement or enforce regulations concerning boating and other activities on or relating to waters located within Yukon Charlie National Preserve, including waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. Pursuant to section 3(h) of public law, or any other authority.

Mr. MORAN. Reclaiming my time, it's clear that's not just the waterway. That includes all of the land. The entire park on this national preserve, they can't carry out their responsibilities. We're not just talking about the water.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. It is not their responsibility. This is the State waters.

Mr. DICKS. It's within a national park.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has the floor. Members will yield time appropriately to each other.

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MORAN. I yield to my very good friend from Alaska to try to clarify what seems to be inextricable.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Again, this is Yukon Charlie, the Yukon River that was used by the Gold Rush people, has been used by Alaskans all these years without the Park Service. The State has authority over the waters. The Coast Guard has the authority for inspection. The State has the authority for registration, not the Park Service. This is navigable water that is our water. Now, the land is there on one side. But this is our water.

I have not won because I may have won a temporary battle, but there can be another park ranger—rangers. There can be another park superintendent that does not listen to anyone. Then where are we?

Mr. MORAN. Reclaiming my time, the language is clear it applies to all waters, not just navigable waters.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The only navigable water is the Yukon.

Mr. MORAN. It's possible if the language was more specific, we wouldn't have quite the trouble with it.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Again, relating to waters located within Yukon Charlie National Preserve, including waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

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

(On request of Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MORAN. I would be happy to yield to the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate my friend from Washington reading the section, but he left out the last sentence of that section.

I think this is a pertinent part and this is the point that the gentleman from Alaska is making, and it regards safety inspection.

I will quote the last sentence: ''This section does not affect the authority of the Coast Guard to regulate the use of waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States within the Yukon Charlie Preserve.''

I would interpret that as saying the safety part of that is taken care of. But the gentleman from Alaska certainly is right on the part that these are State waters.

I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MORAN. I was happy to yield.

Reclaiming my time, I would respond to the gentleman, the Coast Guard really doesn't spend much time on rivers. It's normally coastal waters. It may have responsibility, but the fact is the Coast Guard normally doesn't apply much in the way of resources.

I would like to know how large is this national preserve, because I suspect it's a very expansive national preserve that we're talking about. Do we know?

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. If the Park Service doesn't have jurisdiction, how does the Coast Guard have jurisdiction? That's another Federal agency. The gentleman changed his story and told me it was the State that had authority. I wonder who in the hell has authority.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman from Washington yield?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Again, the Chair requests that Members use proper yielding to each other for time. The gentleman from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the Chair.

I think a number of very good questions have been raised by the ranking member of the full committee—Appropriations Committee—and we are concerned about this precedent. We're also concerned about the safety of people who use this national preserve. We can understand Mr. YOUNG's angst, but nevertheless we have a responsibility not to establish precedent that may come back to haunt us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to point out that the staff clearly researched the language here and applicable laws that relate to these waters. That's what we do when we put this language in here.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. To answer the gentleman, the Coast Guard has all the authority for enforcement on all waters, including all rivers. In fact, sometimes the Coast Guard is too active on the river, as far as I'm concerned. I have been on that river. Like I say, I'm a tugboat captain, a licensed mariner, and my biggest challenge to this is excessive use of the Park Service.

Now, you say I won that battle. Like I said before, that doesn't keep them from trying to enforce this again over the State's objection. The State didn't give them the right to register the boats or check registrations. The Coast Guard didn't give them the right to inspect the boat.

And remember this now: Here are two guys giving a distress signal and a good citizen tried to help them and they flash a badge. This sounds like you know what to me. That's not a good thing. I get very frustrated. Leave this in the bill. Let the Park Service know they no longer can trod over the people of Alaska because they are part of the Federal Government. They are the Park Service—You better listen to us—when this man was breaking no laws. This is wrong.

Now, you say I have won the battle. Maybe I have. But it took a lot of effort to do it. But I haven't won the war. And they will come back. So I'm suggesting this stay in the bill as it is. It's very, very important.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1430

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. I rise in support of the amendment.

We understand that this is a huge 2.5 million-acre park and that what we're talking about here is a 158-mile-long river in the middle of this park, so we're talking about a huge area.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The river is 2,800 miles long. This is one little tiny section. This is a river that's 5 miles wide and 2,800 miles long. It's the third largest river in the United States of America that carries transportation.

Mr. MARKEY. I reclaim my time to say that the 158-mile area is a portion of the inside of the park, of the 2.5 million-acre park. So it seems to me what the gentleman is suggesting is that he believes—and I understand—that the National Park Service or that an individual officer made a mistake here, that they abused their authority, and I understand that.

When I was a boy, my favorite television show when I was 9, 10, 11 was ''Sergeant Preston of the Yukon.'' He had his faithful horse, Rex, and his dog, Yukon King. Each week at 5 o'clock on Friday, he would come out to patrol the Yukon. He worked for the Canadian Royal Mounties. I would like to think that, if he ever made a mistake—if he ever overstepped his boundaries, if he ever improperly treated anyone he was in the process of arresting—that the punishment wouldn't be that the Mounties could never again, any of them, go into the Yukon, because that would seem to me to kind of result in a less fully implemented set of law enforcement principles in that area.

What we're learning here is that the punishment to the National Park Service for potentially something that one or two officers engaged in is that none of them can continue their policing, which the Coast Guard says they need. In fact, this is, in many ways, such a remote part of the Yukon that the Coast Guard right now relies upon the Park Service police to police these areas.

The answer which we're getting from the gentleman of Alaska—and I understand the example that he's trying to make of this one particular incident—is that you're using this as something that, I think, is illustrative—okay?—and perhaps just the highlight, but I don't think you really want the result to be a reduction in the overall enforcement of the laws inside of the park, because that's what would result here. The partnership between the Coast Guard and the Park Service on this river and all that abuts the river is something that is seamless and has worked for generations, and it is something that everyone seems to support.

Perhaps you could target this a little bit more narrowly but not punish the entire Park Service and every officer in the Park Service. It's like every person who works there is now going to suffer as a result of this amendment, and I don't think that's what you intend.

So I will support the amendment of the gentleman from Washington State. It will, I think, make it possible for us to come back to maybe take another look at but not in a way that undermines this partnership that has existed up there for a generation, which has worked. By the way, if there is an exception in any police department, the action of that person who did something wrong should not lead to that entire police department never again being able to enforce the laws. That would be an indictment of everyone; okay?

I think, to the extent to which the Dicks amendment seeks to delete the provision which is in the bill, it doesn't mean that you can't come back and talk about something that might be more specific.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Again, what I worry about here is we're talking about safety. We're talking about inspecting boats that may be unsafe. I think that is an important issue that we should not deal with in an across-the-board way here in this bill.

I think the gentleman from Alaska has made his point. I think he should support our amendment to strike this in order to make sure that the people of Alaska are protected. I know he cares about them.

Mr. MARKEY. Reclaiming my time, the effect of this amendment could be, because the Coast Guard relies upon the Park Service, that we wind up with an entire area without any law enforcement. Because the Coast Guard does not reach that area, the Park Service is there. If you take out the Park Service, it becomes much more of a dangerous place for everyone, and I don't think that's really what the gentleman intends.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. It has been a fascinating debate to listen to the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Virginia tell the gentleman from Alaska how it works in Alaska. I will tell you that he knows more about Alaska than any of you ever thought of knowing. The problem is, you say you're trying to save Mr. YOUNG from himself by offering this amendment. We're trying to save the Park Service from itself and the actions that it has taken.

Now, logically, your argument says if people have problems in their own areas, then you might see other amendments come up like this and we'll be setting a precedent. Exactly. If we can't have oversight about what goes on and about what the Park Service does, why are we even here?

You heard the story, which I won't repeat, of what happened to this gentleman, Mr. Wilde, on the river. We all agree that it's a problem. In fact, when the Park Service stops the gentleman in the middle of the river and tells him to shut down his boat, to shut down his motors—and as they testified in court, they refused to shut down theirs because it was unsafe—who is being protected? That's the point. The safety inspections of these boats will not stop. The statutory authority is given to the Coast Guard. That's who has the statutory authority, not the Park Service. That's the debate that's going on here.

This language is intended to only limit the Park Service's authority to engage in boater safety checks on the Yukon River within the Yukon Charley National Preserve, the only non-ocean navigable waterway within Alaska's national parks. It is important to note that this language will not have any effect on the ability of the Coast Guard to conduct the statutorily granted power of conducting boater safety checks. It is intended to avoid similar incidents between the Park Service and the public.

Yes, when Mr. YOUNG brought this up originally, the manager of the Park Service could have said, ''You're right. There is a problem there, and I'll get rid of these people.'' They didn't do that. It took this to bring about the actions that have finally occurred: that they've been dismissed from that region. We're trying to prevent the Park Service from harming itself.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Just keep in mind that the Coast Guard has its authority. As soon as this happened, I called the Coast Guard because the Park Service said the Coast Guard had granted them that authority. The Coast Guard said, No way. That's our authority.

Secondly, they said, with registration, only the State has the right to register a boat—that's the same thing in your State—not any Federal agency.

Remember, this is the highway of Alaska. The highway of Alaska has been used for hundreds of years, and we've gotten along very well without any Park Service all these years. By the way, I don't think there was a drowning because of a boat accident on that section of the river—in history. So why all of a sudden you're wanting me to protect the Alaskan people who do not like this, I do not understand.

Very frankly, I think you're meddling. You're meddling in something that a State has a great interest in, that has said before, This is our waterway. We have a right to traverse it from Canada through Alaska, all the way down to the Bering Sea. By the way, it had an illegal boat. According to the Coast Guard, the boat they were driving was overpowered. So just leave this in the bill as it should be.

I ask all of my colleagues to think about this very carefully. Do you want an agency that does not respect the rights of individuals because they work with the government or an agency that does not respect the rights of history? I don't think you do.

So I'm asking for the amendment to be defeated, and I'm asking for my colleagues to understand this is a big issue in my State. It is very, very important, not only to me, but to my people—the people of the State of Alaska, who have been using that river for centuries. So let's just leave it in the bill.

□ 1440

So let's just leave it in the bill.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. We have people in the law enforcement area who make mistakes, but we don't get rid of law enforcement. We don't say we're no longer going to protect people, the other people. We go through a process to see what that officer did. I think the gentleman gets the gist.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, we're not getting rid of law enforcement here. The Coast Guard will still do the safety inspections which they are statutorily authorized to do. The Park Service is not statutorily authorized to do that. They say they have been given that authority from the Coast Guard. I don't think that's the case.

So we're not getting rid of anything. What we're doing is clearing up a jurisdictional problem here.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I would hope we could clarify this. There seems to be a misunderstanding here. I hope that we can, if my amendment doesn't prevail, that we could try to work together to clarify this before conference.

Mr. SIMPSON. I'll guarantee there is a misunderstanding here.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would again remind all Members that they should direct their comments to the Chair, not to others.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. There is no doubt, Mr. YOUNG, that you are the renowned expert on Alaska. So I don't rise to counter that. And in fact, I come from the other open, wild State that likes their own self-determination, and they just associated you with the State of Texas.

I remind my colleagues that there is water in Virginia, there's water in Massachusetts, and there's water all along. But I rise to support the gentleman's amendment because frankly, the last time I talked to the very important Coast Guard, they're short on money. Frankly, I want the Coast Guard to be in the port of Houston doing their job as it relates to protecting the coastline of America from terrorists. They are involved in that. They are not, in essence, an agency that can just expand its resources.

I would just raise the question. I think the gentleman from Washington was very engaging and cooperative by saying how can we work this out.

My interpretation is, in opposing the language that's in the bill and supporting Mr. DICKS, is that we have, in essence, a legislative earmark, and that means that all of us can rise up and try to solve our problems in that way.

I would like to get back to regular order.

And I cite for all of you just another example. We've got a legislative earmark when one of our Republican colleagues has decided to shut down the FAA. That's an example.

And lost in the doing of that is $2.5 billion in construction projects, 87,000 American construction jobs, 3,000 FAA aviation engineers furloughed, safety analysts, career professionals in 35 States and in my own city of Houston. I want to get on the floor and put an amendment on the floor to get that Member out of the business of stopping the FAA from doing its work—$200 million per week is being lost.

Nobody is saying anything because we're also not doing regular order by fooling around with the debt ceiling. Nobody can come together and act like adults and say, Let's just raise the debt ceiling so the American people can go on with their business.

Now we've got a Member that says ''my way or the highway'' and shutting down the FAA. You can't run the government like this.

And I think the message of the amendment that is on the floor is not that we don't respect Members' personal knowledge of their States, it's

just that we can't go willy nilly and change laws just for isolated incidences.

And I apologize to Mr. Wild, but you can see I'm pretty agitated about a situation where we're quietly allowing the FAA not to work. And as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, who knows what danger is around because the FAA is not functioning? Who knows what jeopardy we're putting for seniors and students and families and people trying to buy a home because we're fooling around with the debt ceiling?

So I just think we're in a pattern here. Do what you want to do and forget the heck of the American people and forget that we live in a big country and that we should be for all of the people. And if we need safety on our waterways, we need to find a way to work through our issues. I don't like the way individuals were handled. I agree on that issue.

But I certainly don't like the way we're handling our business with the debt ceiling when we are literally putting ourselves under jeopardy. And I encourage the President to do anything he needs to do to save the American people and to be able to move forward so that we don't lose all of our resources and opportunities for the Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security recipients of America. And I hope he stands up and recognizes this is a ridiculous position to be in when the FAA is not even functioning.

And my Bush Intercontinental Airport can't even continue doing its construction work, and the people who need the work are thrown out on the streets because they can't work because one lone Member wants to get up and talk about the FAA and foolishness about not protecting small airports and not allowing our airport employees or our employees such as air traffic controllers and others to be able to confer about the quality of work issues.

So I would just suggest that you might be able to find a solution, Mr. YOUNG. I know you know all of the issues about that. We have a lot of water from where I come from. I think Mr. DICKS has put forth a perfect question and then an answer to the idea of whether or not your amendment or language would have a far-reaching impact beyond Mr. Wild and the unfortunate behavior of two individuals that I understand may not be here.

Let's look at this holistically, as we need to look at this Nation. Let's come together as adults representing the American people.

I thank the gentleman for the time. I ask support for Mr. DICKS' amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members are again reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to others.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the underlying bill H.R. 2584, a bill which irresponsibly slashes funding for many of our Nation's most important environmental and infrastructure programs. If it's passed, the overall legislation would cause grave harm to the health and safety of our communities and in addition removes protections for our wildlife and environment.

I'll take a few issues at hand.

Clean water infrastructure. Ensuring our families have clean water is under attack in this bill. It cuts 55 percent, almost $1 billion, from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. This program enables the States to invest in much-needed repairs and improvements to aging water infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, an estimated 25 percent of all treated water in the United States of America is lost due to leakage from water systems that are in disrepair—25 percent of the water that's already been treated. What a waste of money in supposedly an austere Congress.

We're facing a $500 billion funding gap to bring aging water and wastewater infrastructure back to par. Our pipes are literally crumbling beneath our feet, out of sight, out of mind until the next major water main break disrupts our lives and our towns.

This investment in water infrastructure has the potential to generate thousands and thousands of American jobs since every $1 billion in infrastructure investment supports 28,500 jobs.

Second issue: air quality. The bill that's before us takes us further backwards to an era where polluters poisoned our atmosphere at will by preventing the EPA from implementing two important air quality rules—the power plant air toxics rule and the transport rule, irresponsibly putting the health of our communities at risk. We're going backward instead of forward.

□ 1450

Air pollution disproportionately impacts the urban areas in my district, such as Paterson, New Jersey, where we see much higher incidences of asthma and other respiratory ailments due to the concentrations of harmful pollutants. It is terrible. Go to our hospitals. It is out of control not just in Paterson, New Jersey, but across the United States. These pollutants can become lodged in the tissues of the lungs and interfere with the respiratory system. This needs to be controlled.

And the National Park Service itself, referred to in the last debate, this proposed legislation would cripple the operation of the National Park Service. This service takes care of our parks. We fought for this, all of us, Democrats, Republicans in whatever State it was in this Union. They want to slash this by $409 million from the President's request. Our national parks are visited by 275 million people each year. They come from all over the world to appreciate our country's natural and historic wonders. In my district, the Park Service is hard at work on the Great Falls National Historic Park right in my home city of Paterson, the only historic park in the entire Nation that has aesthetic value as well as historical importance, as it was the first industrial city of the United States.

The investment we make in our parks pays for itself many times over in economic development in the surrounding areas and the enjoyment and education they provide to Americans of all ages. We must ensure that the Park Service has the resources they require to ensure that parks all over the country are properly operating.

How about the arts and humanities in this legislation? Besides the huge cited cuts to our health, infrastructure, and environment, the bill before us drastically cuts funding to the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. As a former teacher, as a member of the Congressional Arts Caucus, as many of us are, I have seen firsthand the positive impact that arts and humanities education has on the success of our students. In my district, as a result of the economic crisis, many schools have been forced to cut back on arts programs and to lay off arts teachers. They're the first to go.

In conclusion, I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation leaves a lot to be desired. We are seeing our colleagues on the other side of the aisle attempting to legislate through the appropriations process, selectively imposing deep cuts to programs which their special interest constituencies don't approve of. The draconian cuts in this bill are truly unacceptable, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY

SEC. 117. (a) DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY.—During fiscal year 2012 and thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior may appoint, without regard to the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, other than sections 3303 and 3328 of such title, a qualified candidate described in subsection (b) directly to a position with a land managing agency of the Department of the Interior for which the candidate meets Office of Personnel Management qualification standards.

(b) QUALIFIED CANDIDATES DESCRIBED.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a former resource assistant (as defined in section 203 of the Public Land Corps Act (16 U.S.C. 1722)) who—

(1) completed a rigorous undergraduate or graduate summer internship with a land managing agency, such as the National Park Service Business Plan Internship;

(2) successfully fulfilled the requirements of the internship program; and

(3) subsequently earned an undergraduate or graduate degree from an accredited institution of higher education.

(c) DURATION.—The direct hire authority under this section may not be exercised with respect to a specific qualified candidate after the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the candidate completed the undergraduate or graduate degree, as the case may be.

REVIEW PROCESS FOR CERTAIN BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

SEC. 118. (a) EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW REQUIRED.—Hereafter, a person may bring a civil action challenging a proposed action of the Bureau of Land Management concerning grazing on public lands (as defined in section 103(e) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702(e))) or an amendment to a land use plan proposed under section 202 of such Act (43 U.S.C. 1712) in a Federal district court only if the person has challenged the action or amendment at the agency level and exhausted the administrative hearings and appeals procedures established by the Department of the Interior.

(b) ISSUE LIMITATION.—An issue may be considered in the judicial review of an action or amendment referred to in subsection (a) only if the issue was raised in the administrative review process described in such subsection.

(c) EXCEPTION.—An exception to the requirement of exhausting the administrative review process before seeking judicial review shall be available if a Federal court finds that the agency failed or was unable to make information timely available during the administrative review process for issues of material fact. For the purposes of this subsection, ''timely'' means within 120 calender days from the date that the challenge to the agency action or amendment at issue is received for administrative review.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 58, beginning on line 13, strike section 118.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in support of my amendment. This would strike section 118, which amends administrative appeals procedures for grazing decisions on public lands to require parties to exhaust all administrative appeals before they may file suit in Federal court.

This is a back-door attempt to curtail the use of court injunctions to stop grazing decisions made by the BLM. Without the ability to seek injunctive relief, opponents of a grazing decision are handicapped because irreparable damage to a resource may occur while the administrative appeals process is being exhausted.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member, to further discuss this amendment.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

We hear from a number of people and organizations around the country who are concerned about this because without the ability to seek injunctive relief from the courts, opponents of a grazing decision are very much handicapped. Meanwhile irreparable damage to a resource may occur while the administrative appeals process is being exhausted. So that's our concern. I know that's the concern of the ranking member of the full committee.

But let me share another concern that I think underlies this whole issue of grazing. Currently—I know the ranking member's aware of this—the Federal Government charges $1.35 per month, per cow to graze on federally owned lands. In the meantime, States like Idaho charge four times that, $5.12; Montana, $6.12. Nebraska can charge up to $41 per acre to graze on State-owned land. Texas—I know the gentleman is aware of this—Texas will charge $65 to $150 per acre per cow. But the Federal Government charges $1.35.

Now that's the kind of Federal subsidy that we really think we ought to go after. When we're cutting deeply into the bone programs for people who are destitute, programs that are absolutely necessary to protect our environment or needed infrastructure in this country, we're giving this kind of a subsidy, $1.35 to graze on Federal land versus as much as $65 to $150 that the great State of Texas charges to graze on State land. And then private land is oftentimes even more expensive. So that's the kind of subsidy that I don't think passes the test of fairness, if the taxpayer was really aware of the kind of subsidy they're providing some grazers on their federally owned land. It ought to be rectified. But this particular issue simply rubs salt into that wound.

Mr. DICKS. Again, I ask for support for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia's concern about the cost or the subsidies or whatever he wants to call it, but it has absolutely nothing to do with this amendment. It's a whole different issue. Should the Resources Committee be looking at the prices charged for cattle grazing, or mining, other things? Sure, they should be. It's not the purpose of this bill. It's not the purpose of this amendment.

All this amendment says is that in the past, BLM regulations have required that litigants exhaust the administrative review before litigating in Federal court. That means they have to go through the review process that's been set up administratively before they can go to court.

Recently, numerous lawsuits over grazing have been filed in Federal courts before the administrative review process had been completed. That means they haven't gone through to find out whether they would win or lose on the administrative side. This ties up the BLM field offices because they must respond to both an administrative process on one side and a litigation process on the other side. This provision simply requires litigants to first exhaust the administrative review before litigating grazing issues in Federal court. Litigants could still file for temporary restraining orders, contrary to what you said. They have to show irreparable harm, and they can still file for temporary restraining orders. Nothing in this provision prevents that.

I would hope—and I know the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. DICKS, because we've talked about this before—if we could spend more money actually managing the lands rather than in court, we would all be better off. All this says is, follow the administrative procedures, and exhaust them before you go to court. You still have that option after those administrative procedures have been exhausted. As I said, you can still get a restraining order if there's irreparable harm. This, I think, will cut down on the lawsuits, and I think this is a good provision in the bill.

And I would hope that the gentlemen from Washington and Virginia would recognize how well the underlying bill is written and would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I am told that the ability to offer a temporary restraining order is very narrowly drafted. So irreparable harm, that wouldn't do it.

□ 1500

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. It's only if a Federal court finds that the agency failed, or was unable to make information timely available during the administrative review, according to this language. So it's probably an unreal situation.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, that's the standard that exists now, as I understand it. We're not changing that.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. I would like to make two points. One is that this is clearly authorizing language on an appropriations bill. If we're going to change the law, then it ought to be done by the authorizing committee.

But, secondly, I know the gentleman is aware, you can only get an injunction from a Federal judge if you can prove that you are likely to win your case, or if there is imminent harm. So I don't know why the gentleman is so concerned about the existing legal situation.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, to answer your question, the reason I'm concerned is the extraordinary amount of money that we are spending in court instead of on managing public lands. That's the real issue here. And we have a process set up where, if you have problems, you can go through an administrative process. Go through it. At the end if you don't like the outcome, go to court. That's all we're saying.

And is this legislating on an appropriation bill? Well, I guess funding unauthorized programs is legislating on an appropriations bill also, which we've done in several provisions in this bill which you support. I hope my colleagues will vote against 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. DICKS).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRAY WOLVES

SEC. 119. Hereafter, any final rule published by the Department of the Interior that provides that the gray wolf (Canis lupus) in the State of Wyoming or in any of the States within the range of the Western Great Lakes Distinct Population Segment of the gray wolf (as defined in the rule published on May 5, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 26086 et seq.)) is not an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), including any rule to remove such species in such a State from the list of endangered species or threatened species published under that Act, shall not be subject to judicial review if such State has entered into an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior that authorizes the State to manage gray wolves in that State.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, beginning on line 16, strike section 119.

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

Mr. DICKS. Section 119 exempts from judicial review any final rule of the Secretary of the Interior that delists wolves in Wyoming or the Western Great Lakes States, provided the Fish and Wildlife Service has entered into an agreement with the State for it to manage the wolves.

The irony here is that the majority does not trust any action of Secretary Salazar except if it involves the delisting of wolves. The rider undercuts the public's right to petition a Federal court to review an agency's decision and blocks the court's ability to carry out its customer authority to review executive branch decisions.

Now, I have been a strong proponent of the re-introduction of the gray wolf into Yellowstone and in other areas. This has been one of the most successful operations in restoring a species that had been nearly wiped out in our country. And today we're seeing all of the benefits of this. So I don't think we should undercut the people's right to go to court if they don't think the agency has done this according to the law. And I have great respect for Secretary Salazar, and I'm sure he would agree with me that there should not be a prohibition on judicial review.

And I'd like to yield to the distinguished ranking member for any comments he would have on this.

Mr. MORAN. My only observation is it's ironic that the majority doesn't seem to trust anything that Secretary Salazar does, except if it involves the delisting of wolves. This rider does undercut the public's right to petition a Federal court to review an agency's decision. So, we're establishing a precedent here with regard to wolves. It blocks the court's ability to carry out its customary authority to review executive branch decisions.

That's the way the system's supposed to work. The executive branch makes a determination and, in our system, if there are individuals or organizations that don't agree, they have recourse to the judicial system. This says, no, we're going to suspend that part of the Constitution. No, you don't, you can't go to the courts. The executive branch is inviolate here. They make a decision, that's it. Permanent.

We like Secretary Salazar, and we support Secretary Salazar far more consistently than the majority does, if the majority supports him on anything. But we don't really see why we need to suspend the constitutional process in this particular specific unique circumstance.

So I would support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Again, I ask for support for my amendment. I think it corrects a flaw in this bill. And believe me, there are a lot of flaws.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose my friend's amendment. I hope this isn't a pattern long term, but on this particular bill it seems to be a pattern at any rate.

His amendment would strike the important language in H.R. 2584 that addresses the administration's confusing policies involving Endangered Species Act-listed populations of gray wolves nationwide.

As I mentioned on the House floor during a colloquy with Chairman SIMPSON on Monday, the Obama administration has created a confusing and impractical result with its recent announcement to delist the gray wolves in some States, but leave other States, such as Washington, Oregon and Utah with mixed management. H.R. 2584, as written, and as clarified in my colloquy with the chairman, would help remedy this flawed policy.

Problems with the Federal management of gray wolves are nearly as old as the Endangered Species Act itself. Five years after ESA's passage in 1978, the gray wolf was listed as endangered or threatened in all of the lower 48 States. In the mid-1990s, the Clinton administration ordered an experimental introduction of wolves into the Yellowstone area, central Idaho, and the Mexican wolf into Arizona, New Mexico and Texas. It also established a new definition to identify the population of listed species. As a result, wolves multiplied. But, unfortunately, because they can't read maps, they moved into areas where they weren't supposed to go.

In 2003, the Fish and Wildlife Service divided gray wolves into geographical boundaries that made more sense. It included the entire States of Washington, Oregon, Utah and other areas so that States would eventually be able to develop their own State management plans to remove wolves from the endangered species list.

Then, in 2009, the Obama administration reversed course and adopted the theory that wolves should be delisted in Idaho, Montana, and only parts of certain other States, but would leave other areas where wolves likely populate still. This is under ESA.

As a result, in my own Fourth Congressional District in central Washington, and I'll put up a map here, the wolves are delisted on the eastern side of Highways 97, 17, and 395. Highway 97, Highway 17, and 395.

Delisted over here, listed over here. This makes absolutely no sense, and it shows how the ESA is badly in need of updating and how ineffective the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is in managing wolves. And I might add, this is true in Oregon, in parts of Oregon and parts of Utah.

So I oppose this amendment because the colloquy that I had with the chairman is one that sets the stage for properly managing these wolves in the States that I associate with.

I just might add on a personal level, I live very, very close to here. But I live in the listed area.

Now, we do fish marking. I know my friend is very well aware of fish marking, and I'm not opposing the authorizing on this bill, as the gentleman knows—this year, anyway. But there is no listing here for the gray wolf. Now, I have no idea if a wolf crosses down here into my area, if it is, in fact, a listed or a delisted wolf.

□ 1510

But apparently Fish and Wildlife think that they know where Highway

97 ends, where 17 comes down here and connects with Highway 395, because that's what their arbitrary rule says. It doesn't make any sense at all.

And so as a result of this, the colloquy I had with Chairman SIMPSON clarified this, that it includes the whole areas that are within that geographic boundary. And for that reason, I oppose my friend's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. I also rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from the State of Washington.

The best way to manage wolves is to let State experts do the job. Now, that's true whether you want to increase the number of wolves in your State, like the gentleman from the State of Washington wants to do, or you want to maintain a recovered population, which is what we want to do in my State of Wyoming.

Now, the truth about current wolf management is that if Washington wants to try to increase the wolf population in western Washington, they cannot do it under the current rules. And in my State of Wyoming, when asked at our committee meeting whether the wolf was fully recovered in the State of Wyoming, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service testified that, yes, the gray wolf is fully recovered in the State of Wyoming, has been for a long time.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. LUMMIS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate that very much.

I think the problem is that the State of Wyoming, unlike Idaho and Montana, has not come up with a plan where the State would protect the wolf if it were delisted.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Reclaiming my time, I'm coming to that.

The State of Wyoming has a wolf management plan that was approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as adequate. And then subsequently, through litigation upon litigation upon litigation, the courts changed their mind, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service changed its mind, the court changed its mind again, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service changed its mind again. So this is a process that is driven by litigation, not by science, because the science and the numbers both say that the gray wolf is recovered in Wyoming.

Wyoming has a wolf management plan on the books. However, what we are saying here with this amendment is that the State of Wyoming, through its Governor, will negotiate changes to that management plan which, when agreed to with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and submitted to the Wyoming Legislature, will not then be subject to additional whipsaw litigation—that will be the end of it—returning management of wolves to the State experts that should be doing this job.

Wolf management is frozen, and it need not be. By trying to strip this language, the gentleman from the State of Washington emboldens the people who don't want Washington State—or Oregon or Wisconsin or Michigan or Wyoming or any other State—to make its own decisions using its own wildlife biologists. I believe that State wildlife experts, not D.C. cube dwellers, have the expertise and the knowledge and the passion to manage the wolf anywhere they roam.

It is the intent of this legislation as currently written to make sure that the people who have the science, the background, the knowledge to make sure that the wolf, which has admittedly been recovered—admittedly by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recovered—to be managed in a way that ensures that ongoing recovered status and ensures it at the very level where you're able to do it, where the boots are on the ground of the wildlife biologists and the paws are on the ground of the wolf that is already recovered but that needs to be maintained pursuant to a wolf management plan.

Let's trust our States, their wildlife biologists. Let's trust my Wyoming Game and Fish Department that has been recognized as one of the best wildlife management agencies in the country.

I'm stunned that people in Washington really believe that they can do it better and make decisions for wolves they've never seen, in places they've never been, and don't trust wildlife biologists they've never met. It is much better if the people on the ground are where the wildlife are on the ground, where the interaction is on the ground, where the conditions are understood, where the geography is known, where the life expectancy, where the birthrates, where the survivability of the species can be witnessed and determined.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I'll be brief, Mr. Chairman, or as brief as I can.

I appreciate this discussion on wolves because it is something that is near and dear to the people of Idaho.

I was the speaker of the house in Idaho when the gentleman from Washington supported wolf reintroduction in Yellowstone and Idaho and Montana and Wyoming—something that Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana frankly didn't want but, nevertheless, the Fish and Wildlife Service said that's what we're going to do and that's what they did. Since that time, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming have been doing the right thing in restoring these wolf populations.

In Idaho and Montana, they came up with a wolf management plan that was approved by the Fish and Wildlife Service—it was approved—but then it was taken to court because it didn't include Wyoming. And a judge said—not based on science. We're trying to get back to science. But a judge said, You can't just delist in Idaho and Montana; you have to include Wyoming, and Wyoming didn't have a State management plan approved then. Since that time, I understand that the Fish and Wildlife Service and Wyoming have come up with a plan in principle—and they're still working out the details, but I believe that they will have a plan by the end of this year—to delist in Wyoming.

All we're saying is that when they're delisted by Fish and Wildlife Service, they have an approved plan, then it is not subject to judicial review. Because, frankly, there are people who don't think we ought to have any wolf management plan that would include, guess what? Hunting wolves. I know the gentleman from Washington is astounded by that. Our Governor has indicated that he likes to hunt wolves. The problem is wolves have no natural predator out there except hunger. When they've done away with the food supply, some wolves die; otherwise, they just continue to grow in population.

Anybody that thought we were going to reintroduce wolves into the Rocky Mountains and there wasn't going to be some type of control—a hunt or whatever—were living on a different planet. But those same people now that wanted the wolves reintroduced, that oppose any type of wolf management, go to court to try to stop the delisting.

The gentleman from Washington has explained the problem that exists when you have mixed management of wolves that get confused. They don't know which side of the line they live on, whether they're protected or whether they're not protected, whether they can go out and eat your puppy dog or not. So they're confused wolves. We're trying to clear that up for them.

And in the Great Lakes, the Great Lakes have had a population that is greater than in the Rocky Mountains and have been deserving of delisting for a number of years but have just not gotten it done.

And contrary to what the gentleman from Virginia said, I actually think the Secretary of the Interior is doing a good job. There are many things I agree with him on. Many of my westerners would disagree with that. I happen to think he's doing a good job as Secretary of the Interior. I don't agree with everything he does, but you know what? When I call him up and say we've got some real problems with this, he listens—he might not agree after he listens, but he listens to us. That's all I ask from a gentleman in that position.

So don't believe that we are critical of the Secretary. We do have some differences of opinion, and I realize that he works in an administration that

makes it difficult for him sometimes. He's from Colorado. He knows western issues. But I have enjoyed working with him.

And I trust the Fish and Wildlife Service and the science that they provide to delist wolves better than I do adjudge. That's why this language is here. Wolves will still be protected in Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Washington, Oregon, Utah, where they have expanded to, and in the Great Lakes.

□ 1520

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. As I recall, the fact was that Montana and Idaho had plans that would protect the wolves if they were delisted, and then at some point they would take further action if necessary to protect the wolves if too many of them were killed.

The problem with Wyoming was Wyoming's plan didn't have credibility. Now I understand that it does. But what the judge was saying is that you have to protect the wolf throughout the area, which included Wyoming. That's why they couldn't delist it without dealing with Wyoming, and Wyoming wasn't ready. So, I hope that Wyoming will come up with a credible plan at the State level to keep the wolf going.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is right. If wolf populations get below acceptable levels, then they go back on the endangered list. Guess what. Wyoming and Montana and Idaho are not going to let that happen.

I think this is a good way to go for proceeding with the Endangered Species Act and making sure it does what it's intended to do.

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

(On request of Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SIMPSON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I asked the gentleman to yield because this is precisely the point that this debate and discussion on the Endangered Species Act is having.

If you recall in the CR, the Endangered Species Act was amended to allow Idaho and Montana to delist, because the way ESA was written, unless the whole identified population could have been managed, nobody could manage, and that was the flaw. And that's what we have been saying—as we had last night and we will probably have later discussions on this—why ESA needs to be looked at in a comprehensive way, because it was clearly a flaw. It was clearly a flaw. I'm glad that the CR amended the Endangered Species Act to take care of this provision.

The colloquy that we had regarding Washington, Oregon, and Utah was simply to recognize these larger populations but recognize States are moving in a direction of managing their populations.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would just say to the gentleman from Washington that was supportive of the reintroduction of wolves in Idaho and Montana and Wyoming that put us in this situation, several wolves——

Mr. DICKS. I want to say to the chairman, if you would yield, I also tried to reintroduce the wolf in western Washington, but the chairman of the Interior Committee in the other body disagreed with me.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, western Washington.

I just want you to know that there have been several wolves that have come to my house, and they presented me with a petition that they would like to visit the Cascades.

Mr. DICKS. We'd like to have them.

Mr. SIMPSON. You're welcome.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield real quickly?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. As a matter of fact, the gray wolves are showing up in the Cascades now, the eastern side of the Cascades. So you'll get them.

Mr. DICKS. The Olympics too.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRAILING LIVESTOCK OVER PUBLIC LAND

SEC. 120. During fiscal years 2012 through 2014, the trailing of livestock across public land (as defined by section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702)) and the implementation of trailing practices by the Bureau of Land Management shall not be subject to review under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, beginning on line 6, strike section 120.

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

Mr. DICKS. Section 120 provides that for 2012 through 2014, the movement of livestock across public land shall not be subject to NEPA review.

Proponents of this provision will argue that moving cattle from one location to another shouldn't require a NEPA review. However, this movement of cattle can be across wide swaths of public lands and take weeks, not just days. The impact on water, plants and other wildlife species, including bighorn sheep, can be significant.

I would like to yield to the ranking member to further discuss this amendment.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Some on the other side may be thinking, well, what's a guy from a heavily residential suburban area in the Washington area and with no cattle in his district know? So I would have thought this would have been a perfectly fine amendment: What do you need to have restrictions for livestock moving from one place to another?

But upon further investigation, what is not immediately apparent becomes very important. As the gentleman has said, we're talking about very wide swaths of land that are covered by these livestock movements, and they don't just take a few hours or a few days to cross. Sometimes they can take weeks. When you've got very large herds of cattle, you can cause quite a bit destruction to the soil, to the brush, to waterways, to any number of environmental resources in the process of major transfers from one area to another of very large herds of cattle. There can be very substantial environmental destruction. That's why those who are involved in this feel there ought to be a NEPA review. The National Environmental Policy Act will review it, it will tell us what the ramifications will be, what are the consequences, and then based upon that information it empowers those who have land or interests that would be adversely affected by large movements of cattle from one place to another. That's why the NEPA review has an appropriate place and role to play in this, and that's why I think the gentleman's amendment makes a lot of sense and I would support it.

Mr. DICKS. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Referring my remarks to the Chairman, I've got to get the gentleman from Virginia on a horse out with some cattle.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. ''Trailing'' is the process of moving a livestock herd from one grazing area to another. It generally doesn't take weeks. It certainly doesn't take weeks in the same location. You're moving from one location to another. Trailing has no significant impact on the environment, so

while in the past it has been generally considered part of the process of grazing on public lands, the BLM has rarely conducted environmental assessments on or issued permits for trailing itself, focusing instead on the impacts of grazing.

Recently—and this is the problem and this is why this amendment is before us—environmental activists that want to get cattle off of public lands, and they have a right to try to do this—I disagree with them—have focused their attention on trailing as a way to shut down grazing on public lands.

Congress, not the courts, has the authority to determine public land policies, and today responsible grazing is an important and legitimate use of public lands. Unfortunately, because activists have tied local BLM offices up in knots with litigation, judges are now determining how public lands can be used in the West.

This provision—and this is the important part—attempts to get ahead of this issue by exempting trailing from NEPA requirements for 2011 through 2014. The Forest Service on their grazing permits require permits on trailing. The Forest Service does. The BLM has not in the past. But, instead, these litigations are tying this up in knots. The BLM is going through a process to include trailing when they issue their grazing permits, so that the NEPA process on trailing will be included. The problem is between now and when they get that completed, we're going to be in court spending all our money in court rather than getting this process moving forward.

We're not opposed to requiring NEPA process on trailing permits just like the Forest Service does, but what this does is exempt this through 2014 while BLM, for lack of a better term, gets their act together. That's all this does.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. I rise to oppose the amendment as well, Mr. Chairman.

There is a gentleman who is a wildlife biologist by the name of Allan Savory, and Allan Savory studied the way that the buffalo grazed on the sweeping landscapes of the American West. Buffalo grazed in a manner that cut wide swaths. Concentrated numbers of buffalo would move through and graze literally everything down to the nubs, both the weeds, the buffalo grass, and all of the very nutritious hard grasses and the grasses of the Sandhills of Nebraska, very different, very nutritious grasses that we call hard grasses. Some short hard grass, and others the tall grass. But they'd take everything out. They would at the same time, through their split hooves knead the soil in a way that allowed those lands to regrow more healthy, stronger, more filled in than they were prior to this intensive short-term grazing. That's how buffalo grazed the plains of the United States before people were here.

So Allan Savory took those same practices to Rhodesia and studied the manner in which grazing occurred there, and created something called the Savory system. The Savory grazing system is now used in a number of places throughout the West, and it actually emulates the way that buffalo grazed. And that is what happens when you trail cattle and sheep across public lands in a manner which keeps them concentrated for very short periods of time where they do very intensive grazing for very short periods of time, and then get off that land quickly so grass can regenerate so you don't have the type of runoff that happens when you have some charismatic megafauna overgrazing repeatedly day after day after day in the same place.

That's why these grazing practices are appropriate, these trailing practices are appropriate, and actually create a healthier grazing situation that carries a long-term, studier, stronger, healthier grass resource to be used by wildlife and domestic animals.

That is why on a scientific basis there is great rationale for relieving people who trail livestock across public lands from the onerous, expensive obligations of the NEPA process. I appeal to the desire to use sound science in the manner in which we approach these issues and not the type of emotional arguments that are raised by people who are just philosophically opposed to grazing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 121. The Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) log and track the specific reasons for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement returning to an applicant, without approval, any exploration plan, development and production plan, development operations coordination document, or application for permit to drill submitted with respect to any oil and gas lease for the Outer Continental Shelf; and

(2) provide quarterly reports to the Committee on Appropriations and Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate that include—

(A) the date of original submission of each document referred to in paragraph (1) received by the Bureau in the period covered by a report;

(B) for each such document—

(i) the date the document was returned to the applicant;

(ii) the date the document is treated by the Bureau as submitted; and

(iii) the date of final agency action the document.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, beginning on line 15, strike section 121.

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

Mr. DICKS. Section 121 requires the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement to keep detailed records and provide quarterly reports on any oil and gas permit or plan that was not approved by the agency. They don't ask for the ones that were approved, just the ones that were not approved.

This is the majority's attempt to try to speed up the approval of oil and gas permits and plans, and I have no objection to that. Here we are 16 months after Deepwater Horizon, and the Congress hasn't enacted a single significant safety reform. Despite the serious safety and environmental shortcomings found as a result of the Deepwater Horizon tragedy, the majority wants BOEMRE to return to the good old days of lax reviews and quick approval of oil and gas permits and plans.

I think this provision should be stricken.

I yield to the ranking member for his comments on this provision.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman. Not surprisingly, I fully agree with the gentleman that this language again is inappropriate in here. It's punitive. It requires excessive record-keeping, and ironically, because normally we are getting complaints there is too much record-keeping. Well, now what we do is we're requiring in this bill even more detailed records that are not now required. It is going to expand the bureaucracy. They have to provide quarterly reports on any oil and gas permit or plan that wasn't approved by the agency.

So in other words, the intention is to discourage the agency from not approving anything even if they feel that the oil and gas drilling operation might not be a safe one, that they don't have the requisite rules in place to prevent a Deepwater Horizon tragedy.

It says for each such document that the bureau receives, they have to provide the date the document was returned to the applicant, the date the document is treated by the bureau, and the date of final agency action, and on and on. More and more records that are not necessary.

We know what the intent of this is. It's to tell BOEMRE, the new Bureau of Ocean Energy Management Regulation and Enforcement, it's in your interest to just speed these along. Don't hold up any of these permits because if you do, you're going to have this very burdensome requirement on you. Here it's 16 months after Deepwater Horizon, and the Congress hasn't enacted a single significant safety reform. And the majority wants us to return to the good old days of very lax reviews, quick approvals of every oil and gas permit and

plan. And if you don't, we're going to impose this very burdensome requirement on BOEMRE. That's just not in the interest of safety. It works against our resolve not to let a Deepwater Horizon tragedy occur again.

I'm using this acronym BOEMRE. For those who don't know what it means, it's the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement. It's the new agency that was set up to prevent any future Deepwater Horizon tragedies. So here we're seeing language that is intended to mitigate against BOEMRE being able to do its job. I strongly support the intention of the ranking member of the full committee in striking this burdensome language.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I move to strike the last word in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, you know, if a little green man from outer space came and landed and watched this debate, he'd be puzzled. If the gentlemen on the other side were so concerned about the Culberson amendment, I'm puzzled why they didn't request a recorded vote in the committee. This was adopted in the committee, full committee markup, by a voice vote.

But beyond that, nobody wants another Deepwater Horizon. But this language that the gentlemen are objecting to says that this new agency will report quarterly to Congress on the status of permitting and why permits were rejected. Now why would the gentleman not want to have transparency and oversight over an agency to which we appropriate dollars?

Now this wouldn't puzzle me if we just hadn't come off of 4 years of a majority that was preaching to us about transparency and oversight and openness. Why wouldn't you want some report issued by the agency that tells us what they are doing with the money that we appropriate to them and what's the status and why a permit was rejected. That's a reasonable question.

□ 1540

Just to move to a different agency—you may not know this, Mr. MORAN. I've lived in Mr. MORAN's district for a period of time when I'm here in Washington, D.C., and I never saw anybody grazing and I never saw anybody moving livestock. But in my area, I will tell you that we're the nursery capital of the world. We are very much concerned with the guest worker program.

Under this administration, applications for guest worker applications have been denied at an alarming rate. When we ask the Department of Labor how many have been denied and how many have been appealed and how many appeals have been successful, they keep those records. You know why? Because that's a reasonable inquiry by a Member of the Congress, a member of the public, a guy who's growing arbor vitae in Perry, Ohio. So to describe this as somehow burdensome and crippling and somehow going to lead to a another Deepwater Horizon disaster is just ridiculous.

The guys on the other side, Mr. Chairman, are great Members and great advocates for a lot of things, but this argument doesn't even pass the straight face test. And I would respectfully urge that it be defeated.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATOURETTE. I yield to my former Congressman, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Thank you.

You have this deep-seated concern about why we did not ask for a vote; so I can clarify that. The reason is we were overwhelmed with more than 40 amendments and we were trying to look to the welfare of the rest of the committee. There's only so many of these issues that you can call a recorded vote on, so we tried to be reasonable.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Reclaiming my time, I can appreciate the pressure that the gentleman found himself under. There are over 200 amendments. We're approaching 200 amendments on this particular piece of legislation.

I recall sitting in another full committee markup where the gentleman asked for a recorded vote on whether or not we could use Styrofoam containers in the House cafeteria. So clearly, the gentleman has to be as concerned about knowing what it is this new agency is doing relative to permits as he is about Styrofoam containers in the cafeteria.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATOURETTE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. This year, I'm sure the gentleman has noticed, we've been trying to reestablish regular order—having a subcommittee markup and a full committee markup and amendments on the floor, which is welcomed by our side. So we have to kind of make a decision: Are we going to ask for a vote on every single issue? We never do that. We try to cooperate. This is comity, something that the gentleman from Ohio understands quite well.

So I would just remind him that we're trying to get through these bills, and that's why we try to not ask for a vote on everything. We wanted to save this one for the floor so the American people would hear about what's going on.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate it. I know the gentleman said "comity," not "comedy." I think it's comedy with a "d" that reigns here. I trust that the gentleman has had his tongue firmly implanted in his cheek as he made that observation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FLEMING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I hail from Louisiana, which of course is a very big part of what this section 121 is about and certainly what the amendment is about. Just bringing everyone back, we had the Deepwater Horizon spill, which was a tragic situation which has hurt Louisiana in several ways, one being, of course, oil in the water. That's obvious. But then, of course, the many jobs that have been lost.

Going back over history, what we found is that in response to this the President brought together 10 experts to determine whether or not drilling should be stopped in deep water off the shores of Louisiana—in the Gulf of Mexico, in fact. This board of experts came together and said, no, that should not happen. We should continue forward. We can solve this problem. We can prevent it from happening. Nonetheless, the President came out and said, no, let's shut down drilling.

Well, when that didn't work, the President and Secretary Salazar slapped a moratorium on drilling. Then there were lawsuits. Then we had a de facto moratorium. Then we had a permitorium after there was a stay placed by a judge. Today, we have what I would call a "slowitorium" on permits and leasing in the Gulf of Mexico.

So it's very clear what's going on is the fact that even though the administration can't get the courts to stop drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, even though the other side can't advance legislation, they're trying to do it administratively by slowing the process down. So all we ask, the people of Louisiana, is some transparency on this issue.

Section 121 does some very simple things. It just says the Secretary of the Interior shall log and track the specific reasons for BOEMRE returning to an applicant without approval any exploration plan, development and production plan, development operations, coordination document, or application, et cetera, et cetera.

We're getting reports continuously from drillers, from contractors who are out there trying to drill, that they put in applications. Weeks, months go by; they hear nothing. Finally, they get it back and an "i" was not dotted, so now they've got to start the process all over again.

So all we're asking is that integrity be brought back into this process, that there be accountability back into this process.

And the gentleman is absolutely right. We do want to get drilling back up in the Gulf of Mexico. We were at a peak of 1.7 million barrels a day before this incident. It has dropped now to 1.59 million barrels a day. And it's going to continue to drop because we have a process in which permits and leasing are still way off track. They're not back to the levels they were. And production is going to net down. As a result of that, we're going to continue to see oil and gas prices going up.

So despite what is coming out of the Secretary of the Interior, drilling and production is not up; it's down. And it's continuing down and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future until we get the permits and the leases back up.

I certainly suggest, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues and I should oppose this amendment. We do need to have transparency and accountability in BOEMRE when it comes to offshore drilling

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLEMING. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. The gentleman is quite right that there are now 1.6 billion barrels per day being drilled. Today, 67 new shallow water well permits have been issued since the implementation of these new standards. They're averaging six per month. The average before the disaster had been eight. So they're catching up. Just three of these permits are currently pending. Eight have asked for more information, have not been denied.

In terms of deep water, 75 permits have been issued. There are 25 pending. Twenty-two have been asked for additional information. Mostly, that information is with regard to containment, which is exactly what we instructed the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to do: are they sure, can they assure us that they can contain any spill.

So things are not quite as dire as you might believe.

Mr. FLEMING. Reclaiming my time, I would just suggest that we're still well off pace. And accountability is not going to be a factor in that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, in the 7 months before the blowout, there were 49 deepwater permits issued. And in the 7 months since the moratorium was allegedly lifted, there's only been seven deepwater permits issued. We in the committee adopted this amendment, which I was proud to offer, simply to shine sunlight on the process. All the language in this bill requires is that the agency report to the American people and report to Congress the reasons why a permit for exploration or for drilling has been slowed down or delayed.

We're all committed to transparency. We all want to know where and how our tax dollars are being spent. And the slowdown in drilling in the Gulf of Mexico has had a catastrophic effect on employment. We've lost 60,000 jobs since 2008 in the Gulf of Mexico area. If we would get back to the levels of drilling, of permitting, both shallow and deepwater, that we were before the blowout, it's estimated that as many as 190,000 jobs could be created in the Gulf of Mexico in about 18 months, with about 400,000 industry-supported jobs across the United States supplying equipment to the offshore oil industry.

No one has a stronger stake in protecting the environment than we have that live there. These folks that work for these great companies are my friends and my neighbors. I'm proud to represent so many of these companies. Houston, Texas, is to the oil industry what Silicon Valley is to the computer industry.

□ 1550

These are engineers. These are the scientists. These are people who live and work in and around the Gulf of Mexico, who fish there, whose kids play on the beaches. Being a Houstonian and growing up along the gulf, I remember tarballs were common on the beach in Galveston. You just don't see it anymore.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I just wanted to say that the gentleman and I have worked together, and I have great regard for him. I just wanted to mention a couple of facts and that, if we take up time, I'll try to get you extra time.

''To date, 67 new shallow water well permits have been issued since the implementation of new safety and environmental standards on June 8, 2010. Permits have averaged more than six per month over the past 8 months compared to an average of eight permits per month in 2009. Just three of these permits are currently pending, with eight having been returned to the operator for more information.'' Now, the question I have is:

Why don't we ask them to give, when they're doing the report, not just the ones that they've turned down but the ones that they've approved? I mean, wouldn't the gentleman want to have all that information instead of just the negative side of this?

Mr. CULBERSON. In reclaiming my time, as for the permits that have been approved, of course that's a matter of public record; but as for the permits that have been rejected and that are not yet a matter of public record, we want to see those and know why they've been rejected, why they've been delayed. That's all this language requires is that they shine sunlight on every corner of the process. Many of these permits have been rejected for reasons that are not directly tied to the substance of the application. I've seen permits that are rejected because the typeface wasn't, in the opinion of the permitter, correct. It is clear that there has been a slow-down and that this administration overreacted to the spill. It has deliberately slowed down the permitting process and has made it more difficult for Americans to find American oil and gas.

We are committed to drill here and drill now in a way that is safe and clean, that protects the environment but yet takes advantage of the natural resources that God has so abundantly blessed this continent with. The Gulf of Mexico demonstrated that it can be done cleanly and safely; and there is no quicker way to generate high-paying jobs than to open up drilling in the continental United States, particularly in the Gulf of Mexico. Those rigs are gone, by the way, Mr. DICKS. Once those rigs leave the Gulf of Mexico, they don't come back.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

The reason that this is the greatest deliberative body in the world is that sometimes during the course of a very intelligent discussion the truth and facts come out. Now, both the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Virginia have been able to cite chapter and verse of how many applications have been applied for, where they are, and what has happened to them. So, to suggest that somehow this is going to create some additional burden, you've got to add a line: ''We denied it because . . . ''

So I trust that, based upon the sunshine that has now been brought forth to the good facts by the distinguished ranking member, perhaps we can get past this amendment, in the interest of comity, without a recorded vote as we did in the committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, and I urge the House to defeat this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield again just briefly?

Mr. CULBERSON. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Now we get to deepwater: Since an applicant first successfully demonstrated containment capabilities in mid-February of this year, BOEMRE has approved 75 permits for 21 unique wells, with 25 permits pending and 22 permits returned to the operator with the request for additional information, particularly information regarding containment.

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

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CULBERSON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. DICKS. Now, we want them to do this safely. We don't want to go through what we went through, which was one of the greatest disasters in the history of the country.

Mr. CULBERSON. Cleanly and safely.

Mr. DICKS. I just hope that we can have reports not only about the ones that are turned down. As you say, it may be that the other ones are part of the public record, but I think the report should come back with both of these if it's going to come to the Congress. You know how this place works. Not everybody sees these public

records. If these reports are going to be used by the committee, we ought to have both sides of the equation.

Mr. CULBERSON. Reclaiming my time, I couldn't agree more. We find ourselves in agreement that sunshine is a healthy thing, and that's the purpose of the language in the bill.

With all due respect, Mr. DICKS, it is important that the House reject this amendment so that we can have sunlight in every corner of the permitting process and so that the public and the Congress can know why these permits have been delayed or denied so that we can open up the Gulf of Mexico to drill here and drill now—cleanly and safely.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I feel, I guess, like a lot of Americans in that I just can't act like it's business as usual. I am very upset that the FAA has shut down. Let me just tell everyone that H.R. 2644, by Representative COSTELLO, was filed yesterday. It is a clean reauthorization of the FAA bill.

Saturday morning at midnight, following 20 previous clean extensions, funding for the Federal Aviation Administration was allowed to expire. Why did this happen? Simply because the Republican Party's lack of leadership over the debt ceiling debate is the same as their position with the FAA. Over 4,000 people have been laid off and over 3,000 in Florida—good construction jobs.

Just last night, I spoke with a single mother of two children, a woman from Kansas, who received an eviction notice at her apartment because she is not going to be able to pay her bills because of this impasse. These are real people. I repeat:

The reason the FAA extension has not been renewed is because the House Transportation Committee chairman inserted language in the FAA extension bill that would end a program that provides subsidies to rural airports.

So, yes, this is another example of the Republican Party's, ''if you don't do it my way, then we'll just shut it down, shut it down.''

Let me be clear. There are people here in the Capitol who flew up. They paid, let's say, $500 for their tickets. The aviation still charged the $500, but the money that goes to fix up the airport, that money is going now to the airline industry. In fact, they have raised the ticket price. This is an example that, if we don't do our job, the people get hurt, and that goes back to what everybody is so nervous about as far as what we should do about raising the debt ceiling.

I spoke to the longshoremen on Monday. I asked them: Have you ever heard of it before? Not one person. Do you know I voted for it seven times under President Bush? They didn't know that. Four times under President Clinton and 19 times under Ronald Reagan? Yet, we've got people who will bring down the United States Government if they don't have their way:

It's our way or not at all.

I was here under President Bush when we had 8 years of what I call ''reverse Robin Hood''—robbing from the poor and working people to give tax breaks to the rich. We did the same thing in December. We gave $70 billion to the millionaires and billionaires, and now people are calling my office, wanting to know whether or not they're going to get their Social Security checks. There is something wrong with that. There is something wrong in the people's House that we are having senior citizens worrying about whether they're going to get their Social Security checks or whether they're going to get their veterans' checks. We can include the billionaires and millionaires, and we've got people over here from Louisiana to whom we've given billions of dollars; yet we want to close the opportunities to help other areas when we have disasters. That's what a budget is about. The budget determines your priorities.

It's a sad day in the people's House when we have people in this House who do not care about the American people; they only care about the next election. I can truly say that you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time. So the people who have lost their jobs at the FAA because of politics, wake up. The people who think that it's okay to rob Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare—education—wake up.

□ 1600

You know, elections have consequences, and we are going to have another election. And the people in this country are going to wake up, and they're going to realize that we're going to move forward or move behind. And clearly we've got people in charge that are only interested in pushing us behind.

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

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

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

Mr. LANDRY. I find it very amusing that the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Washington would use an argument that we are overburdening a Federal agency when it is that side of the aisle that has a tendency to overburden and overregulate and demand reporting from our private sector. They have no problem asking the private sector to report things to the government so that they can discern whether or not the private sector is conducting its business accordingly.

And when this amendment comes up—and we're simply asking for transparency in order to see whether or not my constituents are being disingenuous or whether it is the government that is being disingenuous in the permitting process. That is simply all we're asking here.

This allows us to help separate fact from fiction as to whether or not BOEMRE is rejecting permits for ridiculous reasons or legitimate reasons.

And so, again, it just amazes me that when we have an opportunity to shed a little light on a Federal agency that the party who has claimed that it's all about transparency and open government is now trying to shield that agency.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment should fail.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEASE AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 122. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') may lease to the Savannah Bar Pilots Association, or a successor organization, no more than 30,000 square feet of land and improvements within Fort Pulaski National Monument (referred to in this section as the ''Monument'') at the location on Cockspur Island that has been used continuously by the Savannah Bar Pilots Association since 1940.

(b) RENTAL FEE AND PROCEEDS.—

(1) RENTAL FEE.—For the lease authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall require a rental fee based on fair market value adjusted, as the Secretary deems appropriate, for amounts to be expended by the lessee for property preservation, maintenance, or repair and related expenses.

(2) PROCEEDS.—Disposition of the proceeds from the rental fee required pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be made in accordance with section 3(k)(5) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–2(k)(5)).

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A lease entered into under this section—

(1) shall be for a term of no more than 10 years and, at the Secretary's discretion, for successive terms of no more than 10 years at a time; and

(2) shall include any terms and conditions the Secretary determines to be necessary to protect the resources of the Monument and the public interest.

(d) EXEMPTION FROM APPLICABLE LAW.—Except as provided in section 2(b)(2) of this Act, the lease authorized by this Act shall not be subject to section 3(k) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–2(k)) or section 321 of Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 1302).

SELF-DETERMINATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

SEC. 123. The Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall reinstate the Demonstration Project that was in place from 2004 until 2008 for the Indian tribes within the California Tribal Trust Reform Consortium, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, and the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boys Reservation; shall thereby ensure that the participating tribes shall be able to continue operations independent of the Department of the Interior's trust reform and reorganization; and shall not impose its trust management infrastructure upon or alter the existing trust resource management systems of the above referenced tribes having a self-governance compact and operating in accordance with the Tribal Self-Governance Program set forth in title IV of Public Law 93–

638 (25 U.S.C. 458aa–458hh): *Provided*, That the California Trust Reform Consortium and any other participating Indian tribe agree to carry out their responsibilities under the same written and implemented fiduciary standards as those being carried by the Secretary of the Interior, including complying with section 102 of Public Law 103–412 (25 U.S.C. 4011): *Provided further*, That participating Indian tribes shall timely transfer funds and supply sufficient data to enable the Secretary of the Interior to comply with section 102 of Public Law 103–412 (25 U.S.C. 4011) for accounts that are maintained by the Department of the Interior when funds are being collected by the Indian tribes: *Provided further*, That such Indian tribes demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that they have the capability to do so: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall provide funds to the Indian tribes in an amount equal to that required by section 403(g) of Public Law 93–638 (25 U.S.C. 458cc(g)(3)), including funds specifically or functionally related to the provision of trust services to the Indian tribes or their members.

WILD LANDS FUNDING PROHIBITION

SEC. 124. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Secretarial Order No. 3310 issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 22, 2010.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, beginning on line 15, strike section 124.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, as the amendment states, I seek to strike section 124 of this bill because section 124 prohibits expenditures for the Bureau of Land Management to carry out its lawful duties under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

Secretary Salazar issued an order appropriately. It was called 3310. It stated the policy that BLM, the Bureau of Land Management, should act consistently with the law. Section 201 of the law, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, requires that the Interior Department maintain a current inventory of land under its jurisdiction and that it identify within that inventory of land the resource values including wildernesses of those lands.

Now, section 101 of the Federal Land Policy Act also says that certain public lands should be maintained in their natural state. Now, that's the law, the law since 1976. Secretary Salazar is simply attempting to implement that law.

Despite what some have claimed, Secretary Salazar's order does not create any de facto wilderness. One of the reasons that I would strike section 124 is that it will then return BLM wilderness policy to the way that it has operated for 27 years until it was unilaterally changed by then-Interior Secretary Gale Norton in 2003 in the Bush administration.

Now, the order that Secretary Salazar has issued directs BLM to develop recommendations to the Congress regarding wilderness land designations. And it directs public involvement in the development of those recommendations. Now what could be wrong with that—make recommendations to the Congress and have public involvement?

But section 124 of this bill removes the requirement for public involvement. Why are we afraid of public involvement? And it also removes the requirement for the Bureau of Land Management to provide recommendations to the Congress.

Why does this bill want to prevent the Secretary of the Interior from making recommendations to the Congress and for having public involvement?

It's not going to prevent the Congress from designating wilderness. What it does do is to prevent the Congress from being properly informed before we can consider those designations.

The Secretary's order is the kind of good government process that encourages public involvement and forward thinking. As a demonstration of that forward thinking, Secretary Salazar reached out to the Congress in June, just a short while ago, and asked for Members' input into the wilderness characteristics of lands within their districts. Isn't that what we want them to do, reach out to the Congress, ask for our input?

I don't know what more we can ask from the Secretary or from the Bureau of Land Management but an open, public process with congressional input.

But this section that I think should be struck, this section 124, wants to foreclose that process, foreclose that open, public process with recommendations to the Congress.

It was a process that the majority and the committee report applauded.

Let me say further that wildlands do have real benefits. They have economic, they have environmental, and they have aesthetic benefits. It's important that we protect not only public land in its natural state but that we protect our ability to make informed decisions about which areas should or should not be designated as wilderness areas.

I do think we need the secretarial order so that we can be informed so that we can make the right decisions with regard to those designations. Wilderness areas are important, but it's also important that we maintain our responsibility. The Secretary makes recommendations to us for us to make these designations within the context of a public process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate very kindly the gentleman from Virginia and his explanation of this particular provision that's in the bill. Unfortunately, it's not quite that way. Your recommendation of this is that in June the Secretary asked for our input as to wilderness, which is indeed exactly what he should do if he wants to obey the law. That is the proper course. Only Congress has the ability to designate wilderness areas.

□ 1610

You said that the provision that's in the bill would foreclose that process. In fact, you're arguing the exact opposite. This provision in the bill does not allow the Secretary to go around that process but insists that he does come and work with Congress to do any kind of land designation as it is written in the law.

Secretary Salazar and Deputy Secretary Hayes and BLM Director Abbey have all assured us that they have no plans to implement this ill-advised policy they established just before Christmas, a Secretarial order that usurped congressional authority and congressional responsibility. I'm going to take them at their word. Unfortunately, though, the order has never been withdrawn officially. It has been superseded.

The Solicitor General's opinion to clarify the legal status of that superseding of the opinion has been promised us. It was promised to the chairman, promised to the chairman of the authorizing committee. Yesterday at a hearing we asked where that was, and we were told once again, well, it's on its way. What was said at that hearing, obviously, is what they will do is nothing contrary to the provision that was placed in the CR. Therefore, if we are going to take their word for it—in the old Reaganesque form, ''Trust, but verify''—continue this language in here and make sure that what they claim they will do will be done and there is no legal way of getting around it.

Now, I say that legal process for a purpose. Even if I trust the word of the Secretary—and I do—if this provision is in some way legally in doubt—now, once again, until the Solicitor General's opinion is clear with us, it is in doubt—in a litigation-prone society like we have, any kind of radical activist may ask a renegade judge for political purposes to contravene what the policy states it's supposed to be. That's why I support Congresswoman LUMMIS' inclusion of this language in here. It would oppose any kind of roundabout process of going around Congress and allowing the administration to go around NEPA and around FLPMA, which is actually what the original order did.

It is not that we don't have confidence in this process; it's simply that we want to make sure it is very clean. And if, indeed, we all agree and believe what the Secretary is saying, then this language in here has no impact whatsoever. It should be accepted by all of us. If, though, you want to try to have some kind of dangling aspect out there so that somebody can sue someone

somewhere and maybe change the entire process, then create doubt and actually withdraw language that was in the CR that was approved by the House and the Senate and signed by the President.

What we're asking for is consistency so that what the gentleman from Virginia said will indeed happen, that if wilderness is designated, it will be done by Congress—it is our legal responsibility to do it—and that no one can do these evaluations, which are legal under FLPMA, with only one criterion. That, once again, was admitted by Director Abbey in our committee that that is not the way the law is written, and indeed if you do that, that is abrogation of the law.

Now, once again, you have a process here. If you leave the language in there, it's no harm, no foul. It is consistent with the law, and it is consistent with what the Department of the Interior said their policy will be. You take this language out, and all of a sudden you have created a doubt. Find somebody who has a good attorney, and all of a sudden that doubt creates a major problem for the Department of the Interior, and especially for us in Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. The amendment that's being offered is perfectly appropriate. It's the duty of the Department of the Interior to carry out the law. The law requires the Secretary to review, from time to time, the status of public land.

All too often, I hear my colleagues on the Republican side say that this is government land. No, no, no, this is not government land. This is our land. This is the land of the American people, owned in common for the common good. And the Secretary, carrying out that responsibility, reviews the attributes of the land. Is it good for oil? How about gas development or coal development? Or maybe it's useful as grazing land, or perhaps it should be wild and scenic land and preserved for the purpose of remaining in its most natural state. So my Republican colleagues come up and say, No, you can't look at the land. You can't study the land. We just won't want to know anything about the land, except to allow for the destruction of the land.

This particular amendment doesn't come in a vacuum. This amendment leads to the House floor another bill that is likely to move out of the Resources Committee and soon be on the floor, which would take the previous work done over the last 30 years that would quantify the values of the land, scenic, natural, wilderness, and push all of that aside and say, Open all the land, all the land to what was euphemistically—I hope euphemistically—called mechanized conservation. Hmm, ''mechanized conservation.'' Sounds to me like bulldozer, drilling rigs, a stampede of cattle and the like over any and all land.

Understand that this particular line in this appropriation bill goes hand in hand with a piece of legislation that went through, that was heard in the Resources Committee just yesterday, that would take all of the land that has been designated as wild and scenic some 30 years ago—some of which is said, no, it's not perfect for a wild and scenic designation—and take all of that land and open it for development. We ought not do that.

Therefore, this amendment that's been brought forward by the ranking member is appropriate in that it allows the Department of the Interior to upgrade some 30-year-old studies, taking into account new scientific information, new information about the land, and making that information available to us in Congress so that we can make an informed decision about whether land should or should not be wild and scenic or whatever designation might be appropriate, including opening some land for development. But I suppose it's best to know nothing.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I would love to yield briefly to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I understand the gentleman's comments. And I know the hearing yesterday addresses the issue, which is separate from this. Listen, we should have that debate; we should have that discussion.

This issue is an administrative Secretarial order that, to the credit of Secretary Salazar, they withdrew. It was confirmed, by the way, to be withdrawn because of the CR we passed that takes us through September 30. The Secretary, to his credit, said, I'm going to abide by that. As a result, the order has not been withdrawn.

This debate here is about next year's funding. So until we get clarification on that order or the order is withdrawn, this language is appropriate. And that's simply all we're saying.

Now, we can get into a discussion of whether wild lands is, in fact, a designation or not. And as a matter of fact, wild lands has no definition whatsoever administratively. So there's a question on our side, obviously, if they can even do that because wild lands may be synonymous with wilderness, but wilderness can only be designated by the Congress.

And that is the concern that we have. And that's why I think the language that was put into the appropriation bill takes care of next year. And I say, to the credit of the Secretary——

Mr. GARAMENDI. Reclaiming my time, sir, my apologies for interrupting you.

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

(On request of Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and by unanimous consent, Mr. GARAMENDI was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you for that accommodation.

I think the underlying problem was well described by you, and that is that the language prohibits the Secretary from going forward with the study of the wild lands. I think that's wrong. I think it's appropriate for us to always update our studies, always to understand what has changed and what is appropriate as we go forward.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

□ 1620

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman remembers, because he was in a committee hearing, under direct questioning, I think it was Director Abbey said that there is no authority to make any designation under law of wild lands because that was a made-up term. There's no designation.

Can they inventory? Yes. Nobody argues with that. But you can't make up administratively a new designation, and that's what the issue was. And he testified that he had no authority to do that.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think you're down to parsing words here. The study that was attempted to be undertaken by the Secretary was to study the lands for their wild land values. He obviously could not designate a wild land that doesn't exist. But that study could give us information that we would need to open land to more drilling or other purposes, or to hold it aside for scenic and other values.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, this debate is always fascinating. I've got to tell you, if rhetoric were fast food, there'd be golden arches over all these doors because I've never heard so much rhetoric in my life. And I hope that the gentleman from California actually read the report. Maybe he did and maybe these pages got stuck together. I don't know.

But if you look at the report—he said that we don't care about the lands and the designations, that we just want to use them up and all that kind of stuff.

Let me read, for the RECORD, what the report says: As mentioned in the introduction of this report, the committee lauds the Department of the Interior for its significant changes in wild lands policy and notes that the Bureau of Land Management has, to this date, been in compliance with the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution prohibiting funds for the use of Secretarial order 3310, which was to designate, and as the gentleman said, he couldn't designate wild lands because

that policy didn't exist, and he can't. And he's in compliance with that.

It continues: While the Department is now rightly requesting the input of Members of Congress, Senators, and the public, the committee is concerned about the internal direction given by the Bureau of Land Management regarding the inventory of lands managed by the Bureau. As the Department has stated, inventories of bureau lands are required under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, FLPMA, and the committee agrees. The committee agrees with this reading of the act.

The committee points out that inventories should, however, cover all land uses, multiple use, not just lands with wilderness character. The values to be assessed include wildlife, fish habitat, nonmotorized and motorized recreation, hunting, fishing, grazing, conventional and renewable energy development, mining, wilderness character, forest management, and aesthetics. All of these values are important, and one value does not supersede the other.

The committee also directs the Bureau to use the definition of wilderness as defined in the 1964 Wilderness Act, as directed by section 603 of FLPMA. The committee will continue its oversight of this issue.

The Secretary has done the right thing by withdrawing his policy of wild lands designation, a designation that he made up. Only Congress can designate a new land designation. That's what Congress does. The Secretary agreed with that, withdrew it.

We have no problem, and encourage them to go on with the inventories for all of the characteristics of public lands. So the gentleman's comments relative to oh, all we care about is mining and flattening the land, or whatever he said, is just rhetoric.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. The reality is, if the Secretary carries out what he says he's going to do, this amendment probably isn't necessary. If they decide to reverse course, then it was necessary. If they do what they said they are going to do, it absolutely won't have any effect, as the gentleman from Utah said.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. When I was the Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior, I thought that the Department of the Interior should do what it needed to do. Now that I'm here I would agree with you that they should do what we tell them to do. Just a change in jobs.

However, the point here is that the language that you have put into this bill would preclude the Secretary from moving forward, even to carry out the words that are in the document itself. And I did read the document.

We need to know what is on the land, and we need to know its potential uses. As I understand the amendment that you have put forward that is in this bill, it would deny the funding for those purposes to do the study. Now if I am wrong about that intent and effect of the amendment, then we've had a wonderful debate in which we all agree that the Secretary and the Department of the Interior should continue to always study the land and to take into account new information, new science, new knowledge, new GPS or satellite photos of the land. So I think, as I understand the amendment, and the intent of the amendment, it is to stop the Department from continuing to study these multiple attributes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, the Secretarial order which is in question needs to be withdrawn, and then he needs to issue a new one which doesn't include this new designation of wild lands because that still stands out there even though he says he's not going to designate any new wild lands.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Is it not true that the ability to designate and study and do these inventories comes under FLPMA regulation which is not changed by this amendment?

Mr. SIMPSON. That's exactly correct.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. This amendment only deals with the category that was called wild lands, which is a made up category that has nothing to do with any kind of law.

Is it not true that the Secretary and the Interior Department can still do inventories on any consequence, but they are not allowed only to do inventory for one characteristic. They can inventory for all characteristics they're supposed to, and that comes in FLPMA.

Mr. SIMPSON. The amendment deals with the Secretarial order, not just wild lands.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Section 124 prohibits expenditures for the Bureau of Land Management to carry out its duties under section 201 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. Secretarial order 3310 states a policy that the Bureau of Land Management should act consistently with section 201 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and maintain a current inventory of land under its jurisdiction, and identify within that inventory the resource values, including wilderness, of those lands.

Despite what some have claimed, it does not create de facto wilderness. It returns BLM wilderness policy to the way it operated for 27 years before being unilaterally changed by then Interior Secretary Gale Norton in 2003. It directs the BLM to develop recommendations to Congress regarding wilderness land designation, and it directs public involvement in the development of those recommendations.

Section 124 removes the requirement for public involvement and removes the requirement for the BLM to provide recommendations to Congress. Section 124 doesn't prevent Congress from designating wilderness; it just prevents us from being properly informed before we consider these designations.

Secretarial order 3310 is the kind of good government process that encourages public involvement and forward thinking. As a demonstration of that forward thinking, the Secretary reached out to Congress in June asking for Members' input into the wilderness characteristics of land within their districts. I'm not sure what more we can ask for from the BLM and the Secretary but an open public process, as Mr. MORAN has stated.

Section 124 seeks to foreclose that process, a process that the majority in the committee report on H.R. 2584 applauded. These wild lands have real benefit—economic, environmental, and aesthetic. It's important that we protect not only public land in its natural state but our ability to make informed decisions about what areas should or should not be designated wilderness. We need the Secretarial order, and we need to be informed.

I yield to the gentleman from California if he would like to make a final comment here.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It's useful to read, and the characteristic of order No. 3310, which is the subject matter, was well described by the gentleman from Washington—if one were to read the order, the order basically directs the Bureau of Land Management to continue to do its studies for the purpose of identifying those lands that have wilderness characteristics. This is exactly what I was talking about when I raised my first point, that this particular section that is in this appropriation bill, section 124, fits directly with the piece of legislation that was authored by Mr. MCCARTHY and was heard in the subcommittee yesterday, and that is to terminate efforts to create wilderness areas in the United States. That's what this is all about. This is about opening lands to development, and to prohibit the Department from exercising its authority under the law to continue to investigate and to analyze our land for the value of its wilderness characteristics.

□ 1630

Therefore, this particular clause, 124 in the appropriation bill, runs directly counter to the requirement under the existing law that's been there for more than three decades for the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Land Management, to carry out its responsibilities.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the distinguished chairman, who I just heard a few minutes ago praising Secretary Salazar for the way he conducts himself, that he's a good man. And now 3310 is like the Communist Manifesto.

Mr. SIMPSON. Part of the reason I was praising him is because he came over and sat down and listened to us and realized that there was a problem with Secretarial order 3310.

Mr. DICKS. Well, then why don't we trust him?

Mr. SIMPSON. I trust him.

Mr. DICKS. Well, then why do we have this amendment?

Mr. SIMPSON. What does it hurt? It doesn't hurt a thing.

What the gentleman is suggesting is because we are essentially saying you can't follow Secretarial order 3310, that means you can't follow FLPMA, which requires the inventory of these lands. They still have to do the inventory of the lands under FLPMA whether or not there is a Secretarial order 3310.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DICKS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentleman from Washington and our colleague on the other side.

It's useful to read the Secretarial order rather than all of the hullabaloo of what this is all about. The Secretarial order follows the law. It says that the BLM shall do an analysis as to the wilderness characteristics. That is in FLPMA; that's the law. And so it says that's what it's doing.

Mr. DICKS. Are you suggesting that this provision says that he shouldn't follow the law?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I believe that's precisely what they're trying to do is tell the Secretary not to follow the law.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. It is absurd to think that repealing a Secretarial order which does not supercede Federal law somehow changes the underlying Federal law. It does not. FLPMA still exists whether the Secretarial order is there or not.

Mr. DICKS. Secretary Norton did it.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. In fact, the Secretarial order does follow the law. It precisely follows the law.

Mr. DICKS. Let's vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I didn't want it, but thank you.

Let me just simply try and come up with this one last time. The idea of inventory is covered in FLPMA; that doesn't change. The Secretarial order that established wild lands is a new policy. That has been superseded by another Secretarial order. It doesn't have an impact on this, which is one of the reasons why the administrative policy says it is unnecessary, given the Department's policy that includes collaboration with stakeholders, to identify public lands that may be appropriated.

The administration is not fighting this thing; they're on board with us. All we're saying is the reason you want to keep this language in here—until the supersession has taken place and the entire thing is repealed and you go back to FLPMA—is in case someone wants to litigate outside of it and try and force the Department of the Interior to do something it has said it will not do. That's what we're about here.

All these other arguments are extraneous. Its relationship to other legislation. It does not have any impact whatsoever. This is simply saying what the policy is, and the policy they're going to continue will be substantiated in the statute in case someone else wants to play around with it.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, so the point is this: The administration does not object, as I understand it, to the language of my amendment. The executive order, if it were repealed, would allow FLPMA to function as it is designed in the law. The problem that has been called to my attention is that the executive order has not been repealed. Secretary Salazar communicated privately with Chairman SIMPSON and Chairman BISHOP that he did not intend to enforce the wild lands order, but the order is still in place. So until the order is withdrawn, this amendment is necessary.

Democrats strongly opposed including this language in the committee level. They've offered this amendment today. And then the President has threatened veto because this language might be in the bill. Now given that development, my initial skepticism on including this language is long gone. I'm not even skeptical anymore. Clearly, there are those who still want the Secretary to operate outside his legal authority and declare wilderness or wild lands areas without Congress. Only Congress can do that.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I'm glad the gentleman brought up Secretarial order 3310 because that's what we're talking about here.

Now the first sentence under section one, Purpose, it says: The Secretarial order affirms the protection of wilderness characteristics. Nobody is arguing about that at all. Then you go to page 2 of the Secretarial order, section 4, Policy, and it goes on through the process of inventorying and so forth.

And the last sentence is the problem where we have our heartburn. It says: ''Where the BLM concludes that protection of wilderness characteristics''—which nobody argues about—''is appropriate, the BLM shall designate these lands as 'Wild Lands.' ''

Now that is a made-up definition. Nobody argues about the inventory part, but now all of a sudden they're superseding and suggesting that there should be a new designation called wild lands. That is what the problem is. They have no authority to do that. And they affirmed that, by the way, in testimony in front of our committee. This part of the Interior bill simply says we're not going to fund that. And until the Secretarial order is withdrawn—this one here that says wild lands—once this is withdrawn, you're right, there's no issue. But it hasn't been withdrawn. That's why that language needs to stay in there. It's nothing more complicated than that.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Reclaiming my time, this issue is not just an academic discussion on this floor. People in the West are terrified that the Department of the Interior is going to create a new category of lands called ''wild lands'' that will be managed differently than the law provides.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I want to speak in favor of Mr. MORAN's amendment to strike an irresponsible provision in the underlying spending bill.

Sec. 124 puts our wild lands in harm's way by prohibiting funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce Secretarial Order 3310, or the "wild lands" policy.

This policy is a reasonable, well-grounded approach that will facilitate public participation and will restore balance to our public lands management policies.

Most importantly, it will protect cherished natural icons from development.

I commend the Secretary on his Order to resume the Interior Department's compliance with Wilderness Act and other existing laws that guarantee wilderness preservation.

The Secretarial Order overturns a flawed decision made by former Interior Secretary Norton during the Bush Administration to halt all assessment or new protection of public land with wilderness characteristics.

In effect, the Bush Administration stopped complying with the statutory requirements of the Wilderness Act and other laws.

The Salazar Order reverses that decision.

As a Member of Congress who understands the value of preserving wild places I fully support Salazar's decision to restore balance to public land management and any other measures taken to ensure the protection of ecologically important spaces.

Clearly, some of my colleagues do not agree with me.

Once again, the majority is trying to block BLM's and Congress' ability to manage public lands for the people.

They are breaking with years of bipartisan tradition of protecting these important spaces.

But we've witnessed these same tactics before with H.R. 1 earlier this year.

Blocking funds for the "wild lands policy" will have the immediate effect of despoiling thousands of acres of wild lands.

Destroying what could have been a legacy for future generations.

It allows the American people, through their elected representatives, to decide which lands should be permanently preserved as wilderness.

It is supported by the millions of Americans who are committed to the preservation of our wilderness heritage.

Without the policy, many of our nation's pristine wild and public lands remain at risk.

Don't take nature away from the American people.

Vote "yes" on Mr. MORAN's amendment to strike this irresponsible provision from the Interior spending bill.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; and other operating expenses in support of research and development, $754,611,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk occurring on page 65, line 5. I actually have three amendments all on the same subject, but one amendment touches line 21 and one amendment touches line 73. In the interest of comity, I would ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to offer all of those amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to considering all three amendments en bloc at this point in the reading?

Hearing none, the Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $20,000,000)".

Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $13,000,000)".

Page 65, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $50,000,000)".

Page 73, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $50,000,000)".

□ 1640

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the Chair.

There's a lot going on in Washington, Mr. Chairman, and I would tell you that people back home think we can't get along, but this is a great example of how we're going to get along, and I'm going to become the second member of this subcommittee to say something nice about a member of the Democratic Party, and that's the President of the United States, Barack Obama.

President Obama became the first President of the United States in history to recognize that we needed to put real money into Great Lakes restoration. Those of us who live in the region selfishly know it, and those around the world know it as about 20 percent of the world's freshwater.

We've nickeled-and-dimed and sort of moved along with some nice legislation in this House, some of it written by one of our former colleagues, Mr. Ehlers of Michigan, the Great Lakes Legacy Act, but it wasn't until President Obama, and I suspect that his then-Chief of Staff, the new mayor of Chicago, Mr. Emanuel, was whispering in his ear because he was certainly conversant with these issues, that we need to address the Great Lakes as an ecosystem and make sure that we deal with it appropriately.

So President Obama proposed $475 million a couple of years ago for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. However, as so many things occur around here, that went from 475 to 300, and now in this bill we find it to be $250 million. The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative is designed to mitigate toxic substances in the Great Lakes, to reduce the impact of invasive species, to improve nearshore health and reduce nonpoint source pollution, improve habitat and reduce species loss, and improve information engagement and accountability in the program overall.

I just want to focus on one of those, and that is the invasive species, and not the invasive species that come in ballast water. This is an invasive species that is swimming up the Mississippi River, the Asian carp. The Asian carp and I have something in common: The Asian carp can eat 20 percent of its body weight a day, and this Asian carp, if it is successful in breaking through the electronic barrier and getting into the Great Lakes, will devastate that entire ecosystem. This is important.

I know that there are some Members who are going to say, well, I love the Great Lakes; I love the fact that the President made this designation; you're right, we need more money, but what doesn't need more money in this bill, and the account from which I'm taking it, climate change, but if we don't take care of the Great Lakes, 20 percent of the world's freshwater, we're not going to have to worry about climate change because we're all going to be dead. We need to make sure that we protect this valuable resource. And on this instance, Ms. Jackson, the administrator at the EPA, has been really a great partner in implementing these programs. She has over 300 projects under way at this current time.

I know this is a heavy lift, I know that it's selfish, but I would tell you that it's not selfish because the Great Lakes continue to be the treasure of the world, and there's going to come a time when water is the new oil when it comes to an important resource. I urge Members of the House to please support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. This is really hard, Mr. Chairman, but given our allocation, we had to cut many EPA programs, including programs we support like the clean water and drinking water State revolving funds. In the base bill, we reduced nearly every EPA geographic program below the 2011 enacted level, in addition to providing none of the requested increases.

Despite the cuts, restoration of the Great Lakes remains a committee priority as demonstrated by the fact that the Great Lakes program is the largest recipient of funds in the geographic programs. It's the largest geographical area, also, so you would probably expect that.

While I appreciate the intent of the gentleman's offset, where he offset this from, we cut EPA's climate budget by $23 million—and it's easy to vote against funding for climate change or the increased funding that we have put into climate change—in the chairman's mark, and, believe it or not, there are some EPA programs we support under the climate change heading, including research and development of new automotive technologies, including the hydraulic hybrid technology for trucks, carbon capture and sequestration, and initiatives to increase methane transmission.

The reality is that over a period of time, because "climate change" is now kind of the key phrase, that if you want to get money for your basic science, you call it "climate change." Just like after 9/11, if you wanted money for some program, you called it "homeland security." That was the key phrase. Now "climate change" is the key phrase. A lot of the requests from the administration have been basic science programs that have been going on for a long time but have been shifted over and called climate change.

While we looked at the funding for climate change and the increases that had occurred in this budget over the years and that have been substantial, the fact is, when we looked at them, many of them were just basic science that needed to be continued. So we couldn't just go out and eliminate all the climate change or reduce it, I believe, any more than we did, and climate change took an $83 million hit in this bill.

We see the same thing happening in the Department of the Interior, where base programs have been reclassified as climate change. So we really need to be

careful about what we are using as an offset under the administration's classification of a ''climate change program.''

In addition, funding for the Great Lakes restoration efforts grew from $60 million in 2009 to $475 million in 2010. Therefore, at the chairman's mark of $250 million, funding for the Great Lakes is still four times above its historical levels. And, again, it continues to be a committee priority as evidenced by the fact that the Great Lakes program is the largest recipient of funds in the EPA's geographic programs.

If I felt we could fund the Great Lakes at a higher level within our allocation, then believe me, I would have done so. I would have done anything to avoid this debate with the gentleman from Ohio, but, unfortunately, even though the gentleman makes a good point and I agree with him and if we had more money in the allocation I would be more than happy to do it, it's the offset and where it comes from that causes me some concern.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the distinguished chairman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be more than happy to yield.

Mr. LATOURETTE. If I seek to amend my amendment to say ''Great Lakes Restoration Fund/Climate Change,'' will the gentleman give me my 50 bucks?

Mr. SIMPSON. Well, that would be one of the overall problems with the title, Climate Change, but I would have to oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to speak against the amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his work on the Great Lakes.

I represent a Great Lakes region in Minnesota. As the chairman pointed out, the climate change has been cut, Great Lakes have been cut, and I'm here to tell the gentleman from Ohio, I think we can have a win-win even without supporting your amendment. The reason being is, by leaving the dollars where they are in the climate change, I think we can count on and, through our work, make sure that what is happening to the Great Lakes is documented and proven so that the facts are out there about what we need to do about climate change, and I'm going to refer to two examples. One is from a local paper of mine, the Star Tribune, from July 13:

It talks about how, with climate change, that they're seeing that Isle Royale in Lake Superior used to be too cold for deer ticks, but not anymore. Scientists are watching the effects of climate change and what is happening to the Great Lakes region. The ticks that carry Lyme disease have been found for the first time on the island off the coast of northern Minnesota. At the end of the century, nesting loons may disappear altogether from most of the Great Lakes. These are findings from a report on the effects of climate change on the Great Lakes. It talks about, also, its effect on five of the largest national parks and public waters that we share in our region.

The series of studies has concluded that the current and future effects of warming, global climate change on national parks from California to Virginia and the consequences of it. But if people think that that is not hard enough to really kind of get, to make sure that we do climate change, that we look at what is going on in the Great Lakes, let me speak from another report that dealt with shipping on the Great Lakes.

□ 1650

I will enter for the RECORD which reports I use, but let me quote from this. It says: ''The expected higher temperatures of climate change are predicted to increase evaporation, lower runoff, reduce ice formation, and raise surface water temperatures in the Great Lakes, resulting in a fall in lake levels. The increased precipitation will not be sufficient to completely offset the reduction in lake levels.

''For international commercial navigation in the Great Lakes, the impact of lower lake levels will be restrictions in vessel draughts and tonnage carriage, thus increasing the number of trips and the total costs to move a given tonnage of cargo.''

In other words, climate change on the Great Lakes has an effect on the economy.

I know that the chairman did not have, in my opinion, sufficient allocations to address many issues I care passionately about, like climate change, including the economic consequences of climate change, as well as do some of the funding that the gentleman from Ohio and I both sought for the Great Lakes.

But I think the gentleman from Ohio could actually see benefit to the Great Lakes in research by not having his amendment move forward and keeping the dollars that we do have for science and climate change.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. MCCOLLUM. As the chairman says, with great risk, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATOURETTE. No, no, no, you're going to like this. Actually, the deer tick is misnamed because it really doesn't come on deer. It comes more on the little gray mouse because the gray mouse is closer to the ground. And if you treat a cotton ball with an appropriate substance, you can relieve the deer ticks not only in Minnesota but here in Virginia and also in Ohio.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for sharing that. I know how to remove leeches, deer ticks, fish hooks. Yes, I've been out there. But I really do think the Members should reject this amendment and leave the dollars where they are. We need to work harder to put more dollars into our environment, not only for its natural beauty and to leave a valued treasure to our children, but also because it has a direct impact on the economy of many of our States.

[From the StarTribune, July 13, 2011]

MORE DEER TICKS, FEWER LOONS: CLIMATE CHANGE ON THE GREAT LAKES

Isle Royale in Lake Superior used to be too cold for deer ticks. But not anymore.

The ticks, which carry Lyme disease, have been found for the first time on the island off the coast of northern Minnesota. And by the end of the century, nesting loons may disappear altogether from most of the Great Lakes.

Those are some of the findings of a report on the effects of climate change on the Great Lakes' five largest national parks.

It was the latest in a series of studies they have conducted on the current and future effects of a warming global climate on national parks from California to Virginia.

The report, the authors said, provides an early look at what's to come if the Republican-led Congress continues to thwart federal efforts to curb greenhouse gas emissions. Republicans this week tried and failed to repeal new standards for more energy efficient lightbulbs, and are resisting the new federal rules regulating greenhouse gas emissions expected later this summer. They say the rules are unnecessary intrusions on freedom, and job-killers.

''We have an increasing partisan divide on this,'' said Stephen Saunders, president of the Rocky Mountain Climate Organization and a former national parks official with the Department of the Interior. ''If people pay attention to how the places they know and love respond to climate change, I hope that makes people aware of what we should be doing differently.''

The authors analyzed a century's worth of temperature trends for the Great Lakes area drawn from two weather stations on Lake Michigan, and found that both show more rapid change than the global averages. The one near the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, near Chicago, showed that in the last decade average temperatures have increased by 1.6 degrees, and the one near Picture Rocks National Lakeshore in Michigan showed an average increase of 2.7 degrees.

Lee Frelich, a University of Minnesota researcher who studies the effects of climate change in the Upper Midwest, said the analysis used widely accepted climate models and data, and the findings are right on the mark.

''Climate changes are more extreme in the mid continents,'' said Frelich, who was not involved in the report. ''If you are fairly far north you will see bigger magnitudes of climate change than other places.''

Water temperatures in Lake Superior have increased 4.5 degrees between 1979 and 2006, twice the rate of land temperatures, the report found. Between the 1970s and 2009, winter ice cover over the lakes shrunk 15 percent.

The report also documented a 31 percent increase in rain falling during big storms, and a 12 percent increase in wind speeds. Combined with less ice during the winter, those changes lead to faster erosion along the shores, putting fragile landscapes like the Sleeping Bear Sand Dunes in Michigan at risk. Frelich said that he's already seen the effect on his family's cabin in Door County, Wis., where winter storms have taken out trees on the edge of his property.

The report found that temperature changes are having a sometimes dramatic effect on wildlife. A growing number of botulism outbreaks, linked to higher water temperatures, have killed hundreds to thousands of birds in recent years in the Sleeping Bear Sand Dunes. Meanwhile, Isle Royale used to be free of deer ticks, which can only survive in average winter temperatures of 19 degrees or higher. But a park service employee this year reported finding a deer tick on his body after he'd been there for a month, meaning he had picked it up while on the island.

The report projects that average temperatures at Isle Royale and the Apostle Islands would increase by an average of 3.6 and 4.6 degrees by 2040 to 2069, depending on the rate of future air emissions—warm enough to squeeze nesting loons into the northwest corner of Lake Superior.

Mark Seeley, Minnesota state climatologist, said it's difficult to make projections about Lake Superior using data from two weather stations in Lake Michigan. But he said the report accurately documented the extreme upward shift in minimum temperatures in the winter. ''The winter season is showing more dramatic increase in temperatures than summer,'' he said.

The authors said that the five parks in the study draw 3.7 million visitors per year, generate $200 million in spending and support close to 3,000 jobs. ''We face the financial reality that climate change may bring tremendous economic challenge,'' said Larry McDonald, the mayor of Bayfield, Wis., a tourist town on the edge of the Apostle Islands. He joined the authors of the report in a telephone news conference. ''We need to respect and protect Lake Superior,'' he said.

[From the Transportation Research Board Special Report 291, May 2007]

GREAT LAKES SHIPPING, TRADE, AND AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES

(By Frank Millerd, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario)

SUMMARY

The possible impacts of climate change on Great Lakes international shipping and on nonindigenous species are examined. The expected higher temperatures of climate change are predicted to increase evaporation, lower runoff, reduce ice formation, and raise surface water temperatures in the Great Lakes, resulting in a fall in lake levels. The increased precipitation will not be sufficient to completely offset the reduction in lake levels.

For international commercial navigation in the Great Lakes the impact of lower lake levels will be restrictions in vessel draughts and tonnages carried, thus increasing the number of trips and the total costs to move a given tonnage of cargo. Estimates of these impacts are derived from a simulation of international cargo movements from and to the Great Lakes in a recent year. In other words, climate effects the economy of the Great Lakes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. I must agree with the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee and object to this amendment. I want to make a number of points. One is that the amendment adds funds for what are called geographic programs. That is a pretty broad category. It includes the Chesapeake Bay, the Puget Sound, the Great Lakes, and other water bodies that need restoration projects. So if the amendment passes, I trust the gentleman understands that the funding will be and should be divided up amongst all of those programs.

Now, I do support the efforts of the Congress to clean up the Great Lakes and to deal with these invasive species. Clearly, it is a very serious problem. Asian carp is horribly destructive. But I think it is worth pointing out that it was during Democratic leadership in the Congress that the Great Lakes Restoration Project received its largest increases. In fiscal year 2010, the program received $475 million, and this current year they're getting $300 million. With all due respect, it would seem that the funding level of $250 million, which is in this bill, that cuts far more dramatically many other programs, would be seen as something of a success. I think if anything, Mr. SIMPSON should be thanked for protecting this program.

I will let Mr. DICKS speak about Puget Sound—but the Chesapeake Bay was funded at $17 million below the request, and it's only getting $50 million. Now, I understand the gentleman's frustration that more could not have been done in this bill for all of the geographic programs.

But the reason why we are in this position of underfunding these admittedly critical water programs is because of two actions. I know the gentleman will remember those two actions because he supported them. One was the so-called Ryan Republican budget resolution that the gentleman voted for; and the second was the 302(b) allocation to the Interior Department. I think that set the stage. It really set parameters that were far too tight to be able to provide the kinds of funds for many programs, including Great Lakes restoration, that are needed.

Now, another point that needs to be made is that the GAO reported to the committee, and I quote: ''Progress remains slow as the program has delisted only one of the 31 areas of concern.'' EPA officials said that the program set less ambitious goals for fiscal year 2012 because it has had such trouble in meeting past goals. The agency did set lower goals in 2012, and so it does seem to make some sense that reduced funding might be appropriate in view of those lesser goals.

But I also want to point out that the offset is really untenable. It reduces EPA's science account and environmental programs with what I think is the express intent of cutting additional climate change and clean energy programs.

Now, I also want to point out, and I know that the gentleman offering the amendment may not be excited about this, but it does seem a bit hypocritical, the gentleman offering this amendment, to add funds for the Great Lakes restoration also offered language which was put in the bill to defund the Great Lakes restoration over the ballast water standards. That amendment would save——

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I will yield when I'm finished.

If we want to help the Great Lakes get the kind of money they need, it doesn't seem to me that we should be offering amendments that would completely defund all EPA programs for the States bordering the Great Lakes if they don't meet adequate ballast water standards, which is the amendment that the gentleman put in the bill.

So I think that is a sufficient number of points to urge defeat of the amendment.

Now I will be happy to yield to my very good friend from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman very much. I wanted you to yield because you mischaracterized the other part.

What the other piece of language in the bill does, it says to the State of New York——

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

(On request of Mr. LATOURETTE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank you. You know there are eight States that border the Great Lakes. One State in particular, New York, has imposed ballast water exchange in innocent passage that can't be met by any technology that exists today. That set of standards will cripple, will literally cripple and bring to a halt all waterborne commerce in the Great Lakes. My amendment says, listen, if you want to impose that kind of standard, you're not going to get any money until this thing gets sorted out when the EPA and the Coast Guard come up with a uniform ballast water exchange.

But let me just tell you, since you're talking about the regional programs, the Great Lakes are unique. The Great Lakes were unique in the world. And I can remember a couple of years ago, Senator Dodd, he wanted to have Lake Champlain become a Great Lake. And I said to the distinguished Senator at the time: Lake Champlain is a good lake; but it's not a Great Lake. The Great Lakes are the five Great Lakes that every grade schooler learns on how to identify them. It is 20 percent of the world's fresh water. And if we don't take care of them, as the President of the United States recognized we needed to do in a big way, we're going to be in trouble in this country. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of transferring $50 million in funding from EPA climate change programs to support the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. While I have serious concerns about the offsets used in Mr. LATOURETTE's amendment, I strongly believe that we need to continue to restore the Great Lakes to preserve its many rare environmental attributes and to strengthen the American economy.

The Great Lakes are vitally important to the American manufacturing industry. According to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, nearly 200 million tons of cargo travel through the Great Lakes each year. The Corps reports that the Great Lakes saves manufacturers and other industries approximately $3.6 billion per year in transportation costs.

Studies undertaken by the University of Michigan show that more than 1.5 million jobs are directly connected to the Great Lakes generating $62 billion in wages. The Great Lakes help provide nearly 1 million manufacturing jobs, over 200,000 jobs in tourism and recreation, nearly 120,000 jobs in shipping and more than 118,000 jobs in agriculture, fishing and food production.

The University of Michigan study also states that the 83 million people living in the Great Lakes area helped produce 27 percent of the Nation's gross domestic product and 24 percent of the country's exports in 2009. The basin is home to 38 percent of Fortune 500 companies. Moreover, the region's colleges and universities award 32 percent of the nation's advanced science and engineering degrees resulting in a stronger American workforce to compete against nations such as China and India.

Furthermore, the Great Lakes are an environmental treasure containing nearly 20 percent of the world's fresh surface water. The lakes also support over 200 globally rare plants and animals, and more than 40 species that are found nowhere else in the world according to the U.S. Department of the Interior.

In addition, the Great Lakes provide one of the best areas for fishery and other recreational activities in the world. It is estimated that 180 species of native fish, including small and large mouth bass, the northern pike and lake herring all reside in the Great Lakes. A study conducted by the Great Lakes Commissions reports that there are 4.3 million boats registered in the Great Lakes states, which is nearly one-third of all registered boats in the United States.

The many environmental and economic benefits generated by the Great Lakes are in danger because of its damaged ecosystem and numerous environmental conditions. Despite recent improvements, there is much work still to be done such as eliminating toxic substance pollution, controlling invasive species, reducing nonpoint source pollution and protecting against habitat and species losses.

Recognizing the importance of the Great Lakes, the Federal Government developed the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan to implement solutions to the many environmental challenges facing the Great Lakes. The Initiative has been focusing on ecosystem protection, enhancement, rehabilitation, and remediation within the Great Lakes Region.

According to a study by the Brookings Institution, fully implementing the Great Lakes restoration strategy would not only protect various rare fish and wildlife it would also generate $50 billion in long-term economic benefits and $50 million to $125 million in reduced costs to municipalities.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support protecting our environment and our economy by voting to transfer funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative—so vital to restoring fresh water resources for the next generation and beyond.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 5, insert ''and fellowships'' after ''development''.

□ 1700

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, my amendment would simply highlight the longstanding role of EPA in supporting the education of our Nation's top environmental scientists by inserting the word ''fellowships'' after research and development in the Science and Technology Account. EPA currently awards the fellowships, and thus my amendment has no scoring impact and does not authorize a new activity.

I realize that my Republican colleagues will surely not agree to this amendment, but they have to agree that science is the underpinning of great and good environmental policy. As the scientific arm of EPA, the Office of Research and Development supports world-class research and development activities to protect man's health and the environment. Supporting the next generation of scientists and engineers through fellowships is just one way the government supports the kind of critically important research that private industry and academia alone cannot and will not do.

With no real justification or detail, the committee's report language for this bill specifies that funds are not provided for the fellowship programs, amounting to a substantial $17 million loss to this field. Lab equipment cannot operate itself. They cannot publish important papers or make groundbreaking discoveries, which creates jobs. That requires people. And EPA has a history of fostering some of the Nation's top young researchers that have gone on to apply their talents across government, academia, and industry. For instance, since 1995, EPA has awarded approximately 1,500 STAR fellowships.

Turning our backs on the next generation of academic researchers, governments scientists, science educators, and environmental engineers all but ensures that we are doomed to make bad, uninformed environmental decisions for the future.

I realize the gentleman's point of order. I do not agree with it. But I'm sure he will be upheld by the Parliamentarian. So I simply would ask that if we could work together to try to preserve some of this talent that we have already put in place and some of the equipment that's already in place to continue groundbreaking research, that is going to be one of the few ways that we're going to develop good sound jobs for the future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate what the gentlelady is trying to do, and actually agree with what she's trying to do, I must insist on my point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. Clause 2 of rule XXI states in pertinent part:

''An appropriation may not be in order as an amendment for an expenditure not previously authorized by law.''

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to appropriate funds for an earmark that is not authorized. The amendment therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I accept that point of order, but I would like to appeal to the chairman of this committee to work with us and see if we can't preserve some of the investments we've already made and some of the talent that is in place.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment expands the eligible uses of appropriations in the pending paragraph to include ''fellowships.'' As such, it proposes to appropriate for that purpose.

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

Having reviewed the amendment and entertained argument on the point of order, the Chair is unable to conclude that the item of appropriation in question is authorized in law.

The Chair is therefore constrained to sustain the point of order under clause 2(a) of rule XXI.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, as somebody who has spent many, many years working in my community and around the country on the promotion of livable communities, I am

frankly mystified to see included in this bill an end to the program that provides technical assistance and guidance to communities who are looking for ways to increase economic development, plan for economic growth, and make their communities safer, healthier, and more economically secure. It is mystifying.

The EPA Office of Sustainable Communities was established to provide a resource for communities that need technical assistance to plan for economic growth, to deal with development, to account for a changing population and the demographics, to expand their economic development options, and make communities more attractive to business and local citizens.

Mr. Chairman, there are hundreds of examples from across the country about the work that the Office of Sustainable Communities has accomplished. Some of the most important projects were situations where the Office of Smart Growth has helped in brownfield redevelopment. These are very complicated problems for local communities where they help turn unusable, polluted land into land that's ready for development. This helps create housing and business opportunities and provide cities with an important foundation for planning future growth. This is precisely the sort of thing that we should be doing to help communities leverage resources and prepare for the future.

In Iowa City, Iowa, the Office of Smart Growth recently approved a grant to redo their downtown riverfront area after the 2008 flood devastated that community. With the help of EPA, they created a plan with input and support from local elected officials, business leaders, and local residents that's helped regenerate the downtown business area while preserving green space and recreational areas for families who are moving into the newly redeveloped residential buildings. Closer to my side of the continent, just picking at random, the communities of Driggs and Victor in Idaho received a Smart Growth Implementation Assistance Grant to help analyze the barriers and opportunities of infill development in support of downtown revitalization efforts. This small Federal investment helped communities take advantage of public-private partnerships and redevelopment opportunities that helped revitalize these small rural towns.

Hundreds of other communities across the country have received similar assistance under the Smart Growth Program. But these cooperative efforts would come to an end under this House legislation. The services offered by EPA's Sustainable Communities Office are in high demand. They've been able to assist only 9 percent of the communities that are interested, due to existing budget constraints.

In addition to their technical assistance work, the Office of Sustainable Communities is engaged in a partnership that we all should be supporting and encouraging between HUD, the Department of Transportation, and EPA. The Partnership for Sustainable Communities enables these three Departments to work together to ensure that Federal funds work in conjunction with each other, break down the silos that frustrate us all to ensure that the Federal funds are spent as efficiently as possible and eliminate duplicative processes.

Despite the obvious connections between housing, transportation, and land use, we all know and have been frustrated that in the past the three agencies have not always worked well together as we would like. But Secretaries Donovan, our former colleague LaHood, Administrator Jackson, and the agency have spent these last 2 years cutting down the redtape and coordinating to meet multiple economic, environmental, and community objectives while also cutting redtape and working to partner better with local communities. The EPA's Office of Sustainable Communities helps fill a critical need by providing assistance and support to local communities.

□ 1710

I find it ridiculous that at a time when this type of help is needed more than ever, when there is nary a Member of Congress who hasn't been frustrated about the lack of coordination and implementation, that the House is now considering ending critical support to communities looking for ways to jump-start their own economic recovery, looking to improve the quality of life for their communities by making the Federal Government a better partner. This is something for which there should be no geographic, regional, partisan or ideological divide. This is an outstanding program. It deserves to be supported, and I hope, as this bill works its way through the process, that we find a way to retain this valuable service.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chairman, beside me is a picture of the Cuyahoga River in 1952. The river is on fire.

The reason for this fire is that the river was heavily contaminated with flammable industrial waste. This water was dangerous to drink, needless to say, and to swim in. Fish and wildlife could not survive here. Flooding in this river would have spread pollution onto the shore and into neighborhoods. In short, this pollution was dangerous for the health of the people and the communities that depended on this river.

It was incidents like these that helped raise public awareness of the dangers of water pollution. Ultimately, that awareness became government action, including the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, in 1970 and of the passage of the Clean Water Act in 1972.

The EPA's purpose is simple: to protect human health and the environment. It does this by ensuring minimum standards for water quality nationwide while acting as a referee between the States.

Despite this important mission, this bill slashes the EPA's budget by 18 percent from current levels, so of course I rise to speak against this underlying bill. It also includes a number of riders that will prevent the EPA from carrying out the duties it is already legally required to perform. I don't know why the majority is so keen on undermining the vital mission of the EPA. I hear them talk a lot about the costs of certain EPA regulations; but what about the cost of getting rid of these regulations?

One serious cost that would go up is the cost of public health. The impact of polluting our air and water isn't a speculative matter. We know that it will make people and communities sick. More mercury in the air we breathe means more deaths and debilitating illnesses. More water pollution means families and communities will be subjected to a variety of health risks. In short, more pollution means rapidly escalating health care costs.

Another cost is the cost to our environment. Our rivers, coastlines and wetlands are the places that we take our children to experience the wonders of our country. This is where their interests in the natural sciences and the outdoors are kindled. Polluted waters and coastlines mean less wildlife, poorer fishing and a lot less beauty in this world. We have to remember that we are merely stewards of our natural resources and that the cost of polluting those resources isn't only borne now; it will be borne by future generations.

Finally, the EPA helps to ensure a fair playing field for businesses. This helps keep their long-term costs manageable. It's a simple fact that a few dollars in prevention is far, far cheaper than expensive cleanup costs later. For those who disagree or question that, I encourage you to contact BP Oil. That company will—and should—be paying for their damage for years to come.

So those are the costs the EPA helps to mitigate. That's why we need the EPA. We need a referee that is empowered to make sure that everyone plays by the rules and protects our natural resources. If we pass this bill, we are essentially ejecting the referee from the game of calling out misconduct on certain players, which will only encourage more misbehavior in the future.

Take a look at this picture. Is that what we want?

This bill is so flawed, there is little hope for it. I hope that my colleagues will reevaluate their approach to this legislation, will pull it from the floor and go back to the drawing board.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. We should be here today passing a clean debt ceiling and creating jobs; but in these challenging times of high deficits and a fragile economy, when it is critical that our limited spending priorities be focused on programs that can achieve results and encourage the creation of jobs and economic growth, the majority is, instead, bringing an unprecedented attempt to gut pollution controls and public health protections in order to give bigger profits to Big Oil and other special interest polluters.

By attaching more than three dozen policy riders to H.R. 2584, the House GOP is attempting to use a spending bill to make backdoor changes to 40 years of important Federal laws.

H.R. 2584 makes drastic spending cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency, as you've just heard, and to the Department of the Interior. It fuels a multi-front assault on America's air, water, lands, wildlife, and public health; and it severely undermines the environmental integrity of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. In doing so, this legislation cripples the budgets of key Federal agencies charged with protecting American citizens and natural resources.

The bill is laden with contradictions and regressive reforms:

It slashes funding to the Environmental Protection Agency by $1.8 billion, yet restores $55 million in oil and gas subsidies;

It dramatically cuts the U.S. Fish and Wildlife budget by 30 percent;

It zeros out funding to list new endangered species;

It reduces the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration budget by 18 percent from the President's 2012 budget and wholly eliminates funding for NOAA's climate service;

It cuts the Land and Water Conservation Fund by 80 percent—a program that has been critical to my district of the U.S. Virgin Islands and to everyone's districts. H.R. 2584 renders this program's funding to its lowest level in history;

It cuts $19.7 million from the National Endowment for the Humanities, threatening support for teachers, community colleges, museums, libraries, and archives of important historic documents and many others, as well as the preservation projects that enhance local economies and create jobs.

Another program that is affected is one that's near and dear to my community. That's the National Heritage Area program. I have recently introduced a bill to create a National Heritage Area on the island of St. Croix, which we have been looking forward to, not only to preserve and protect some of our local historical treasures, but as a badly needed economic development tool that would create jobs. National Heritage Areas are some of the most effective public-private partnerships for resource conservation and heritage tourism supported by the Federal Government. National Heritage Areas have matched every dollar of Federal support with $5.50 of other public and private funding, demonstrating a high yield of return on Federal resources.

I am appalled that this bill puts so much energy into tearing down America's foundational environmental protections, especially as the Representative of a place with some of the highest greenhouse gas emissions per square mile in the country. Instead of working on the bigger looming issue of our deficit crisis, this bill flies in the face of decades of bipartisan support for the protection of public health and environmental issues.

It does not put the American people first as it should. It further endangers them by allowing for more dangerous air pollution. It does not clean up urban and other critical waterways. It threatens clean water that millions of our constituents depend on. It shuts the door on endangered species, and ties the hands of our Federal agencies.

As leaders, we should not advance a budget that eliminates critical protections that our constituents so desperately need. We should not turn a blind eye to corporate polluters while holding the right of our future generations to clean health and a clean environment hostage just as the leadership is holding the well-being of the poor and middle class Americans and the economic security of our country hostage to an absolutely necessary lifting of this debt ceiling.

□ 1720

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against the fiscal year 2012 Interior and Environmental appropriations bill and any antienvironment and antipublic health and anti-American amendments that may be offered.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill which guts longstanding environmental policy. Unfortunately, this is not the only thing that's wrong with America today.

Once again, Speaker BOEHNER and the GOP are putting the needs of a few right-wing Members of Congress ahead of ordinary, hardworking, everyday Americans, many of whom lit up the phone lines yesterday in record numbers to express their disgust with Republican intransigence that's holding our Nation and international markets hostage. Not only did they call in record numbers, but 50 to 60 people came to my district office yesterday to show their support for a balanced approach to solving this debt ceiling issue. I also received a petition with over 1,500 names begging that we protect Social Security.

But still, against the urgent pleas of international financial institutions, Wall Street executives, and millions of Americans who can ill-afford any reduction in their ability to borrow or an increase in interest rates for a car, home, or student loan, Republicans continue to show contempt for the American people by saying ''no'' to increasing the debt ceiling.

Do you realize out there how many of us have adjustable rate mortgages on our primary residence? Can you imagine what will happen if this Nation defaults on its obligations to pay its debt and, as a result, interest rates go up? That means your adjustable rate mortgage, my adjustable rate mortgage rate goes up. Could I stand to pay $1,000 extra or $2,000 extra per month on my mortgage because interest rates went up because we didn't do what we should have done here, which is to increase the debt ceiling, something we've done 21 times, I believe, over the last several—we did 18 times with Ronald Reagan as President?

But we can't afford not to deal with this debt ceiling issue.

Mr. Chairman, The Washington Post reports that House Republicans watched a movie together about bank robbers to motivate members of their caucus to stand firm in their solidarity against raising the debt ceiling. What kind of example does this set for the American people? What would they say if they knew that there is a concerted effort by Republicans not only to prevent an increase in the debt ceiling, but to impede economic progress, slow or stop job creation, cause the loss of 700,000 jobs, with the passage of cut, cap, and kill?

What about our seniors, our veterans, our students? What about our credit rating in this country?

Mr. Chairman, just like bank robbers, it appears that Republicans seek to threaten society as a whole, leaving a trail of destruction in their wake. Republicans have now taken hostage of the U.S. economy, threatening the livelihoods and well-being of Americans, young and old, rich and poor. They can see the hands of the clock ticking, precious seconds, minutes, and hours wasted.

Speaker BOEHNER and his cohorts say ''no'' to the President's request for reasonable compromise, ''no'' to the desperate pleas of businesses begging for a sense of certainty about the debt ceiling, and ''no'' to the American people who have shouted at the top of their lungs for shared sacrifice in these budget negotiations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if Republicans are looking for some additional inspiration in the debt ceiling negotiations, I'd recommend that they watch ''Saving Private Ryan.'' It's about a man who makes the ultimate sacrifice to save the lives of his fellow Americans. He was not a survival-of-the-fittest-type guy, you're on your own.

We're all in this together.

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

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this country is in the middle of a great crisis, entirely an artificial crisis created by an attempt by one political party to blackmail the entire country into adopting its program of destroying Medicare and Social Security and food stamps and unemployment and all of the things that many of our people depend on.

But why do I say it's an artificial crisis? Because the debt ceiling increase is something we normally do—seven times during President Bush's administration.

Some people think to raise the debt ceiling is to say we're going to borrow and spend more. No, it's not. You raise the debt ceiling in order to pay for bills you already incurred because of decisions made 2 and 3 and 5 years ago, mostly during the Bush administration.

Not to raise the debt ceiling is like going into an expensive restaurant, having an expensive meal, and then getting the bill and saying, Oh, my God. I've got too much money on my credit card. I don't think I'll pay the bill. Well, if that's the case, you shouldn't have had the meal.

If you don't want to pay the bill, you shouldn't have made those budget decisions. You shouldn't have cut those taxes 10 years ago and gotten into those wars 7 and 8 years ago and made the other decisions that piled up the deficit.

If you want to have a debate, which we should, on how to change our policies in the future, that's for the budget debate. We're going to pass the budget at some point. We're going to debate tax levels, expenditure levels.

But instead, what are they doing? They're saying, That's a nice economy you've got there; pity if something should happen to it. And if you don't do exactly what we want, we're going to destroy it by not raising the debt ceiling and causing a collapse in credit so that everybody's interest rates go up and that people have to pay a thousand dollars more a month on their mortgage or whatever, because it's a ripple right throughout the economy.

A default would be a real crisis for the economy, and it will cost the economy probably a trillion dollars in extra deficit spending over the next 10 years just in higher interest costs. But if we don't do exactly what they want, to destroy Medicare and Social Security and the other things they never liked in the first place, they will wreck the economy by not raising the debt ceiling in order not to pay the bills that they incurred.

Then we hear that we have a deficit crisis, that, after all, the country is broke. We've got to cut the budget. Even the President says the country is broke. We've got to cut the budget—a little less savagely, but we've still got to cut.

Wrong.

The country is not broke. It is just that we are not taxing the millionaires and the billionaires and the corporations the way we used to.

In 1950, the corporations paid 6 percent of the entire economy of the GDP in corporate taxes. Today, it's under 1 percent. Twenty years ago, 30 percent of all income taxes came from corporations; today, it's under 6 percent. And that's why the middle class feels overtaxed, because they are, because we don't tax the millionaires and the billionaires the way we used to. We don't tax the corporations the way we used to—the big multinationals, I'm talking about, not the small businesses. Instead, we've shifted the tax burden to the middle class, and we don't get enough tax revenue.

And the fact of the matter is, if you look at the budget of 2001 and if you look at the budget of 2011, in 2001, the budget was $258 billion in surplus. It was the last Clinton budget. How has it changed? Why is this budget $1.2 trillion in deficit and that was a quarter trillion in balance? What's changed?

□ 1730

Well, adjusted for inflation and for population growth, nondefense discretionary spending, everything they want to cut now, hasn't changed at all. It was $369 billion then; it's $369 billion now.

What's changed? Well, defense spending and homeland security spending have gone up 74 percent because of two wars and a lot of bloat, a 74 percent increase in defense spending. Mandatory programs, that is to say, Medicare, Social Security, veterans, up 32 percent. And it is not only those. There is also unemployment insurance, mostly because we're in a recession, and you have to pay more unemployment insurance and food stamps and so forth. Total revenues are down 24 percent. From a bigger country, we're getting 24 percent less revenue today. Why? Because in 2001, the taxes collected 20 percent of GDP, and today it's 14.5 percent of GDP.

So what should we be doing? Well, first of all, we should raise the debt ceiling to recognize the debts that were already incurred, and we should do it cleanly, so as not to throw the economy into a tailspin. Then we should debate all of these issues in the budget. We should raise taxes on the millionaires, the billionaires, the corporations; cut defense; and try not to tamper with people's Social Security, Medicare, and the things that they depend on.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related costs and travel expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; administrative costs of the brownfields program under the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002; and not to exceed $19,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $2,498,433,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That of the funds included under this heading, not less than $346,280,000 shall be for the Geographic Programs specified in the explanatory statement accompanying this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $48,206,000)''.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $48,206,000)''.

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

Mr. FLEMING. A little over a year ago, the GAO reported alarming findings at the ENERGY STAR program, a joint EPA and DOE program designed to save American consumers money on their utility bills. Although well intentioned, I have concerns that the ENERGY STAR program is leveraging hard-earned tax dollars and the trust of the American people for a program that lacks oversight, could still be subject to fraud and abuse, and one that would be better administered by the private sector.

I have the report here in my hand. In March 2010, the report indicates that the GAO released its report, documenting that the program was mainly a self-certification program without much oversight or accountability. In fact, according to the report, GAO created several fictitious companies without any relevant products on the market that easily became ENERGY STAR manufacturing partners. This new status granted these groups unlimited access to ENERGY STAR logos and promotional resources, and GAO was also able to obtain certification for 15 bogus products, including a gas-powered alarm clock and a ''room cleaner'' which was incredulously a feather duster taped to a space heater. Prior to approving these items, EPA failed to review any additional materials, including Web sites and self-incriminating pictures.

My amendment will simply reduce the Environmental Programs and Management account within EPA by $48,206,000, with the intent of removing the EPA's portion of funding for the ENERGY STAR program. The savings from my amendment will be added to the spending reduction account.

Mr. Chairman, the ENERGY STAR program, created in 1992, enables companies and manufacturers to voluntarily label qualifying and EPA-approved household products and goods such as air conditioners, refrigerators,

computers, and light bulbs, et cetera. ENERGY STAR also grants energy-efficient labeling for home improvements and businesses. ENERGY STAR labeling encourages consumers to purchase such products and make home improvements in order to be more energy efficient, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and save money on utility bills, all very good value-oriented ideas and concepts.

It is my belief that the Federal program should not be paying anything for the ENERGY STAR program, however. Rather, this program would be better served as a private entity, saving the taxpayers millions of dollars each year. There are several good examples of well-respected, well-run independent private sector initiatives, including the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, an internationally recognized green building certification system; Consumers Union, an expert independent nonprofit organization which publishes the widely acclaimed Consumer Reports; and Underwriters Laboratories, Inc., UL, a global independent safety science company offering expertise in five areas, including product safety and environment.

These are just a few examples of nongovernment, nontaxpayer-funded entities that understand that if you don't do a good job, they will lose credibility. Not as much can be said for the ENERGY STAR program.

Americans rely heavily on this program and look to purchase household products with the ENERGY STAR label. Companies use the EPA-approved logo to market products. The Federal Government and several States offer tax credits to those who purchase ENERGY STAR products, and Federal agencies are required to use certain ENERGY STAR-approved products.

The ENERGY STAR program continues to receive millions of dollars, including approximately $300 million through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the stimulus bill, and $48 million in the underlying legislation. It's time for the Federal Government to allow the private sector to take over and to stop funding programs riddled with loopholes that investigators need to point out before the EPA institutes systematic changes.

So in summary, Mr. Chairman, we could well afford to save $48 million, and we have plenty of good models where private entities have been doing a much better job for a much longer time. I ask others to support this amendment. This is good for not only energy savings but is a money-saving idea. Let's turn it over to the private sector. They do a much better job.

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

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would eliminate the ENERGY STAR program, even though a great many American consumers rely on it to choose appliances that meet Federal energy efficiency standards, such as windows, refrigerators, dishwashers, and clothes washers.

The program has improved since an Inspector General report highlighted flaws with the program. In response to the IG's report, ENERGY STAR moved away from allowing manufacturers to self-certify that they comply with efficiency standards, and now it requires third-party certifiers. Well, I'm sure there's room left for further improvement in the program.

As the gentleman from Louisiana has stated, many, many consumers have come to rely on this program in their everyday purchases and would, frankly, be stunned to think that this program is now being targeted. Americans, with the help of ENERGY STAR, saved nearly $18 billion on their utility bills last year alone and enough energy to avoid greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to those from 33 million cars. Isn't that a good thing?

This is a voluntary program that works. We've heard so much railing coming particularly from the other side about EPA's regulations, and now the majority wants to attack a voluntary pro-consumer program. The underlying bill already contains a very substantial cut to the ENERGY STAR program, notwithstanding the fact that it has saved hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars and has enabled consumers to be much better informed as to what their appliances might cost them in terms of energy requirements.

But the ENERGY STAR program has been funded in this bill at the 2008 level, 4 years ago. Since then, the population has expanded, the number of appliances and things that use a great deal of electricity, particularly computers, has expanded almost geometrically. People's bills are going up. They want to know what are the most energy-efficient products, so they rely upon the ENERGY STAR program, again, a voluntary program and one that has been improved since the IG report. They have third-party certification now as to what they are saying so that we should have some confidence now in the ENERGY STAR imprimatur, if you will, on appliances.

□ 1740

It doesn't seem that this is the kind of thing that we should be cutting. This is a pro-consumer, voluntary effort that works. So I strongly oppose this amendment.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLEMING. I don't disagree with the gentleman's comments. It's a good program, although it has been a flawed program. Hopefully, it's been improved.

My point is that this could be better done in the private sector, a fee or whatever paid directly to whatever private entity out there that would be nonprofit for this. Why should the taxpayers have to subsidize it? That's really the issue here.

Mr. MORAN. Reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman, we have things like the Better Business Bureau which, frankly, doesn't have that kind of certification. Almost anybody can get designations. Sometimes it's helpful. Other times it's less so.

I think the American consumer wants some level of credibility in the organization that is certifying that an appliance is energy efficient. The Energy Star designation means something. And if this was self-policing, done completely in the private sector, you wouldn't have had an Inspector General report. You wouldn't have had this corrective mechanism that now says, you've got to fix this. You can't rely completely upon self-certification, which is exactly what you'd have under the private sector.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLEMING. There are plenty of private sector oversight organizations. And again, UL: No appliance ever goes to market now without a UL stamp, and again, that's done through a private entity. So, again, it's a great program. Don't get me wrong. I just don't see where taxpayers should be funding that. We can do much better through the private sector.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. I appreciate the gentleman's shared desire to reduce spending, however, I must oppose this amendment. As the minority pointed out, to meet the 2012 302(b) allocation, we cut the Energy Star program by $27.5 million, funding for the Energy Star program down to $48.2 million, which is below the 2006 level. And we believe that significant cuts took place in this program, as they should have been taken. And with that we reluctantly oppose the amendment, and would ask for a ''no'' vote.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVERT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I want to commend the gentleman. We agree with his position on this, and we oppose the amendment as well.

Mr. CALVERT. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

Mr. POMPEO. 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 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $6,246,000)''.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $6,246,000)''.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying thank you to the committee chairman for running a great piece of legislation. I think this bill will go a long way towards creating a pro-growth economy. We've done a great deal of work to reduce spending on this bill, and I stand here this afternoon hoping to help out even just a little bit more.

The amendment I offer I offered during H.R. 1. It passed. It passed with votes from both sides of the aisle. The Senate failed to act on it, so I'm here today again to offer this amendment one more time, and I hope it will pass again with bipartisan support, and that we will, once again, move towards a smaller, more humble Federal Government that does only those things that it's intended to do.

The amendment I offer today seeks to reduce by $6.2 million the amount of money available for the EPA's greenhouse gas registry program. If I had my druthers, I'd probably prefer to see the program go away. But I offer a more modest amount today.

This amendment only reduces spending for this program back to the levels from 2009. Now, this is very consistent with the legislation that we're acting on, the bigger bill which takes us back to 2009. This is a program that currently stands, without this amendment, 95 percent higher than the funding for the greenhouse gas registry in 2009. I think we can all agree that we weren't spending too little money in 2009 regulating greenhouse gases in America.

We know the EPA says that this registry is just about data collection. We'd just like a little bit more information. But those of us in Kansas who are trying to operate businesses and make a go of it know that there's an agenda far beyond that. This is an agenda that is job-killing. This is an agenda that will destroy jobs, not only in Kansas, but will drive up the cost of energy for every American. And so I urge my colleagues today to support this amendment.

If we simply restore funding back to the 2009 level we will roll back, I hope, again with bipartisan support, and we'll create jobs and keep EPA doing those things it ought to be doing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. I do rise in opposition to this amendment because it attempts to strip half of the remaining funding for EPA's greenhouse gas registry program. This amendment is part of an effort to ignore what the scientists tell us is the most serious environmental problem of our time, climate change.

Republicans have already passed a bill to repeal a scientific finding that greenhouse gases pose a danger to human health. The underlying bill we're considering says that no stationary source, no matter how large, or how lethal to human health, should ever have to reduce its carbon pollution.

But this amendment goes even further. It says that we should not even bother to find out how much pollution is being put into the air. I guess you could call it the ''ignorance is bliss'' amendment.

What we should be doing is the opposite of what the gentleman is trying to do. The bill already makes a 30 percent cut to the registry program in order to cripple the efforts of EPA with regard to greenhouse gases.

The Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program simply requires the largest sources of carbon pollution, power plants, refineries, and the very largest factories, to tell EPA and the public how much they pollute. If we're ever going to deal responsibly with this pollution that is costing us billions in health care and shortening thousands of lives, we need to know where it is coming from and have some idea of how much is being emitted.

This amendment is yet one more example of putting the profits of industry, and particularly those industries that pollute the air and eventually clog the water, that poison much of our environment, to put their profits ahead of the public interest and the public's health.

We all know that pollution is dangerous to our health. The scientists tell us that, certainly the reputable scientists. Let's allow EPA to fulfill its core responsibility, which is to collect this information and inform the public.

I know our friends on the other side hate regulations because they believe that the Environmental Protection Agency doesn't understand the impact of those regulations on businesses and on the economy and on jobs and so on. EPA's job is to protect the public health, and in doing so, and in encouraging cleaner sources of energy, we will not only protect the public's health, but we will grow this economy, grow it in a more competitive and a healthier way and a far more sustainable manner.

□ 1750

I oppose this amendment vigorously.

At this point, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, who offered the amendment.

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will be very brief.

I certainly care deeply about clean air, so do all the businesses in Kansas, so do all the agriculture people. We want clean water, but we know how to do it and we're doing it.

You said this was the ''ignorance is bliss'' amendment. I would prefer to call it the ''jobs are a good thing'' amendment.

When things get mischaracterized—I'm not suggesting we abolish this. There is still $6.2 million available for the Greenhouse Gas Registry. That's as much as was available in 2009.

This is a simple, modest amendment that many on your side voted for when I offered it before, and I hope many of them will continue to do that.

I thank you for yielding.

Mr. MORAN. I was happy to yield.

Reclaiming my time, it just seems to me that more information, accurate information, should not be a threat. Isn't it appropriate to let the public know—in fact, to let lawmakers know who might need to respond—how lethal is the pollution? How substantial is the pollution? What's the composition of the pollution coming from the very largest polluters? What are we doing to our people? What are we doing to our environment? What are the sources of much of the billions of dollars that we're spending in health care, twice as much as any other country spends on a per capita basis?

So all we're trying to do here is to have a registry—information. That ought not be threatening.

This amendment should be defeated.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. A few years ago, the Supreme Court said that the EPA, under the Clean Air Act, had to come up with and look at the consequences of greenhouse gases and to create this registry, which is a scientific document that allows us to know just exactly what the various sources of these greenhouse gases are.

Now we hear a lot about climate change. I just want to point out there is another more immediate problem. The gentleman from Kansas may not be aware of this because it affects our oceans, and Kansas is in the middle of our country. The oceans are now a sink for carbon dioxide. And as we get more and more CO_2 in the ocean, it creates acidity, the so-called pH factor, which at normal range is around 8.1, and when it goes down—we have places in Hood Canal, in my home area, that are down at 7.3. At that level of acidity, it starts to take apart coral. It takes apart oyster shells. It takes apart the vital plankton, which are the food for salmon, 60 percent of the food for salmon.

This is an incredibly important situation. So the more we can learn about greenhouse gases and what their effect is not only on our climate, but also on the ocean. We are poisoning the ocean. And again, there is this ''let's not take time to work on this issue because somehow it's going to cut away jobs.''

It may end civilization. Think about that.

Your grandchildren, my grandchildren—your children, maybe. Maybe you're younger. I worry about them. I worry about what's going to happen if we don't deal with this climate change issue. And we should take this seriously. The best scientists in the world say this is something that needs to be dealt with.

So, again, I think this idea of taking out the money for the Greenhouse Gas Registry so that we will have a scientific underpinning to know what these problems are and how much various sources produce is the ''ignorance is bliss'' amendment.

Let's defeat this amendment and let the EPA do its job.

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

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

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

Mr. POMPEO. 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 Kansas will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $41,099,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, $36,428,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

Ms. RICHARDSON. 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 66, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 68, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to speak on the Richardson amendment.

This amendment adds an additional $5 million to the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act—also known as DERA grants—by cutting $10 million from the EPA Buildings and Facilities account. The Richardson amendment is about creating jobs, saving lives, and improving our Nation's air quality.

Mr. Chairman, in the last Congress I introduced legislation that extended DERA for 5 years. The DERA legislation received large bipartisan support and was later signed into law by President Obama. DERA is supported by a coalition of over 500 leading transportation, environmental, and health organizations.

I represent a region that's home to the largest port complex in the Nation and consists of some of the busiest freeways and railways in our country. However, the area also suffers from poor air quality, which has led to much higher rates of asthma and cancer than any other area in the Nation. DERA improves our air quality by reducing the CO_2 emissions by up to 35,600 tons per year. It has been estimated that nearly 2,000 lives will be saved over the next 5 years through DERA by increased air quality.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today reduces the funding for DERA grants by $19.9 million, which is well below the fiscal year 2011 levels. The EPA estimates that the DERA program averages more than $13 in health and economic benefits for every $1 we authorize in funding. The EPA also estimates that DERA saves more than 3.2 million gallons of fuel annually, which means that truckers and other diesel operators will spend $8 million less on fuel. Mr. Chairman, that's less dependency on foreign oil.

In these tight economic times, it makes sense that we invest in programs that work and are cost effective. The CBO score on the Richardson amendment showed that it will decrease the budget authority by $5 million without creating any new budget outlays. Simply put, the Richardson amendment saves money.

Since DERA funding began in 2007, more than 3,000 projects nationwide have benefited from this program. In fact, there have been nine projects in the Los Angeles County area, where I reside, alone.

Mr. Chairman, DERA projects have created jobs and improved air quality in my district and across the country. The Richardson amendment saves lives, saves money, and creates jobs, which is certainly what we need and we should be talking about more in these dark hours.

I urge my colleagues to support the Richardson amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. I do this extremely reluctantly because I am very supportive of the DERA program, but I can't support the offset.

The DERA program, as the gentlelady is aware, was not in the administration's mark, and in this underlying bill, we provide for $10 million for the DERA program. As she well knows, throughout the country this is a way to remove old diesel engines that pollute, and this is something that actually works.

It's not a program; it's not a study; it's not some academic exercise. It's actually something that cleans up the air, so it's something I am very much supportive of. But right now EPA's Buildings and Facilities accounts are cut by nearly one-third. We have cut back these accounts substantially, and so we just can't support the offset in the bill.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVERT. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1800

Ms. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman from California, which we both serve, and it's my understanding that the account that the funds we're requesting that it would be taken from do, with what we're taking, still meet its outlay that's required, so I don't believe that this would be a hurt to that account.

Mr. CALVERT. Reclaiming my time, the program has already taken a substantial hit, a $20 million hit, as a matter of fact. Almost every other program in our bill has taken substantial hits.

We're serious about reducing spending. If we had the additional money, I'm sure the chairman would have added more money in the DERA account in the first place if we had the extra money to do so, because it's an extremely successful program, something that I certainly support. I understand the gentlelady's conviction, but we just don't have the money to take care of this offset, so we have to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished Member from California. I know my colleague—and she's more than a colleague, a friend—is very passionate about this program, and it has a sweet acronym, DERA. As I said during the H.R. 1 debate, the diesel emissions program is a good program. That's not the issue. Right now, with regard to this amendment, the issue is whether or not we should be raiding other EPA accounts to give this diesel program even more funding than it actually has already gotten in this bill.

Chairman SIMPSON funded the diesel program at $30 million, even though President Obama requested nothing for it. Now this amendment would add a mere $5 million, but it would take $10 million from EPA's buildings to pay for it. It may be politically attractive to take from a buildings account, until you know what it funds.

The following facilities would have to give up funding to add this $5 million to the diesel program: the Ann

Arbor, Michigan, national vehicle and fuel emissions lab; the Andrew Breidenbach environmental research center in Cincinnati, Ohio; the Region 9 office in San Francisco; the Research Triangle Park main laboratory in North Carolina. In that regard, the project in 2012 needs to be funded so we can save future lease costs that would be in jeopardy if we were to take this money away from the Research Triangle Park lab. The Narragansett, Rhode Island, research lab would be cut, and the air and radiation lab in Montgomery, Alabama.

All of these facilities have requests in this fiscal year 2012 budget for needed facilities improvements. To cut those in order to increase a program that was already plussed up $30 million above the request doesn't seem to me to be the right thing to do.

In addition, we have an amendment filed from another Member—and I see her here so I suspect it's going to come up right now—to take away the $30 million that's already in the bill. I would hope my good friend would stick around to strike the last word and address this amendment that would zero out the diesel program. I don't want to zero it out, but neither do I want to zero out money for six important EPA facilities. So I hope the supporters of the diesel program will stick around, will defend it against its elimination, which is an amendment that's coming up very soon, but right now it seems to me that the wisest thing to do is to try to protect the $30 million that's already in the program, which is $30 million more than the President requested.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. 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 California 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 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

The first amendment by Mr. DICKS of Washington.

The second amendment by Mr. DICKS of Washington.

The amendments en bloc by Mr. LATOURETTE of Ohio.

Amendment No. 39 by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

Amendment No. 23 by Ms. RICHARDSON of California.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) 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 174, noes 237, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 658]

AYES—174

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
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
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
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
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)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—237

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
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
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
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
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
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
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
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—21

Austria
Bachmann
Bishop (GA)
Broun (GA)
Cassidy
Chandler
Giffords
Harris
Hinchey
Honda
Lowey
McCotter
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Schock
Schrader
Tiberi
Velázquez
Wu

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1829

Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. ROONEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CARNEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 658 I was unavoidably detained, and could not be present for the rollcall. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) 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 174, noes 250, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 659]

AYES—174

Ackerman
Andrews
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)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
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
Meehan
Meeks
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
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
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
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—250

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
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
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
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
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
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
Rahall
Reed
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 (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
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)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Bishop (UT)
Chandler
Giffords
Hinchey
Mack
McCotter
Rehberg
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1836

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 206, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 660]

AYES—220

Adams
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Clarke (MI)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Costello
Cravaack
Critz
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hochul
Holden
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Lamborn
Landry
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Waters
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—206

Ackerman
Aderholt
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gosar
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kind
Kissell
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Bishop (UT)
Chandler
Giffords
Hinchey
McCotter
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1843

Mr. ROHRABACHER and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendments en bloc were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) 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 235, noes 191, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 661]

AYES—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
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
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
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
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
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
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
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)

NOES—191

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
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
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
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
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
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
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Chandler
Giffords
Herger
Hinchey
McCotter
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1849

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) 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 193, noes 232, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 662]

AYES—193

Ackerman
Aderholt
Altmire
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lynch
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McDermott
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Posey
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richardson
Richmond
Rooney
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Upton
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—232

Adams
Alexander
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (NY)
Kingston
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Marino
Matheson
McCaul
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rehberg
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Serrano
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Akin
Barton (TX)
Chandler
Giffords
Hinchey
McCotter
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1856

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611) $1,224,295,000, to remain available until expended, consisting of such sums as are available in the Trust Fund on September 30, 2011, as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) and up to $1,224,295,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $9,955,000 shall be paid to the ''Office of Inspector General'' appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2013, and $23,016,000 shall be paid to the ''Science and Technology'' appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2013.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, $105,669,000, to remain available until expended, of which $78,051,000 shall be for carrying out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended; $34,430,000 shall be for carrying out the other provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act specified in section 9508(c) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended: *Provided*, That the Administrator is authorized to use appropriations made available under this heading to implement section 9013 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide financial assistance to federally recognized Indian tribes for the development and implementation of programs to manage underground storage tanks.

INLAND OIL SPILL PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $18,274,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, $2,610,393,000, to remain available until expended, of which $689,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (the ''Act''); of which $829,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended; $60,000,000 shall be to carry out section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including grants, interagency agreements, and associated program support costs; $30,000,000 shall be for grants under title VII, subtitle G of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; and $1,002,393,000 shall be for grants, including associated program support costs, to States, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multi-media or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public Law 104–134, and for making grants under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities subject to terms and conditions specified by the Administrator, of which $49,396,000 shall be for carrying out section 128 of CERCLA, as amended, $9,980,000 shall be for Environmental Information Exchange Network grants, including associated program support costs, $11,300,000 of the funds available for grants under section 106 of the Act shall be for state participation in national- and

state-level statistical surveys of water resources and enhancements to state monitoring programs and, in addition to funds appropriated under the heading ''Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund Program'' to carry out the provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act specified in section 9508(c) of the Internal Revenue Code other than section 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, $1,550,000 shall be for grants to States under section 2007(f)(2) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 603(d)(7) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the limitation on the amounts in a State water pollution control revolving fund that may be used by a State to administer the fund shall not apply to amounts included as principal in loans made by such fund in fiscal year 2012 and prior years where such amounts represent costs of administering the fund to the extent that such amounts are or were deemed reasonable by the Administrator, accounted for separately from other assets in the fund, and used for eligible purposes of the fund, including administration: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2012, and notwithstanding section 518(f) of the Act, the Administrator is authorized to use the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year under section 319 of that Act to make grants to Federally recognized Indian tribes pursuant to sections 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2012, notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 518(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(i) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, up to a total of 2 percent of the funds appropriated for State Revolving Funds under such Acts may be reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) and section 1452(i) of such Acts: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2012, notwithstanding the amounts specified in section 205(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, up to 1.5 percent of the aggregate funds appropriated for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund program under the Act less any sums reserved under section 518(c) of the Act, may be reserved by the Administrator for grants made under title II of the Clean Water Act for American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, and United States Virgin Islands: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2012, notwithstanding the limitations on amounts specified in section 1452(j) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, up to 1.5 percent of the funds appropriated for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund programs under the Safe Drinking Water Act may be reserved by the Administrator for grants made under section 1452(j) of the Safe Drinking Water Act: *Provided further*, That not less than 30 percent of the funds made available under this title to each State for Clean Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants and not less than 30 percent of the funds made available under this title to each State for Drinking Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants shall be used by the State to provide additional subsidy to eligible recipients in the form of forgiveness of principal, negative interest loans, or grants (or any combination of these), and shall be so used by the State only where such funds are provided as initial financing for an eligible recipient or to buy, refinance, or restructure the debt obligations of eligible recipients only where such debt was incurred on or after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That no funds provided by this appropriations Act to address the water, wastewater and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border shall be made available to a county or municipal government unless that government has established an enforceable local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any additional colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia the construction of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2012 and hereafter, of the funds provided for the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act State Revolving Fund Tribal Set-Asides, the Administrator may transfer funds between those accounts in the same manner as provided to States under section 302(a) of Public Law 104–182, as amended by Public Law 109–54.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

Page 68, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $30,000,000)''.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to begin by commending our Appropriations Committee for the extraordinary job that they have done to claw back this money and to reduce spending below the levels that we had last year or the levels in the CR.

They have, indeed, done an exemplary job. But I think during these extraordinary and unprecedented times, we have to do more. And this Diesel Emissions Reduction program is one of those areas of funding that we can look at and say, indeed, this is duplicative, and because of that, we can eliminate this $30 million and move that funding into the spending reduction account.

Now, DERA, the program under discussion, is a grant program administered by EPA. It seeks to reduce diesel emissions—that's a worthy goal—by providing funds for technologies to retrofit existing vehicles and infrastructure not subject to updated diesel air standards. This is something that at one point in time, yes, it was important and had a tremendous impact on some of our communities, and they have done grants all across this country.

□ 1900

Now I want to point out that President Obama's fiscal year 2012 budget recommends completely eliminating funding for the DERA grants, and there is a reason that it has done that.

One of the reasons that they have done that is because since 2007, new diesel engines have to comply with a much higher emissions standard, therefore, it is decreasing the need for retrofits. There's also other funding available for such retrofits through the Department of Transportation Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program. They have about $45 million for diesel retrofits annually, and through the EPA's Supplemental Environmental Project enforcement agreements, where there's $7.1 million for that.

There are other programs with similar grants, the EPA's Smart Growth Program, the EPA's Performance Partnership Grants, the Clean Fuels Formula Grants. Indeed, the administration has not increased Federal funding for this program above the $60 million level in place since fiscal year 2009, when it received an additional $300 million in the Stimulus Act.

This is a program that we can say, indeed, has been a helpful program, but it is duplicative, it has outlived its usefulness because there are emissions standards on diesel vehicles that have been in place since 2007. There is less need for these grants.

Indeed, one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as we were debating the CR, had recommended that we use this program, an offset with this program, and eliminate the funding for this program. Mr. MORAN had offered, at that point in time, that we do that, and one the reasons he gave was because the President had eliminated it in order to encourage the truck industry to increase its own diesel R&D. I agree with that.

This is a program that we would save $30 million. I know that it is duplicative. We need to save every penny we can possibly save of the taxpayers' money. This is a step that we should take. I appreciate the support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. I rise in strong opposition to the amendment that's brought forward to us today. If you look at the history, actually, of the DERA program, it's one of the rare programs in this House that has enjoyed bipartisan support from day one. When you consider the inception of the program and the continued amendments that have been passed on this floor, it has garnered support. And let's talk about why.

There is evidence to show that for every $1 of investment that's made into this particular program, $13 is received back, $13 in economic benefits, in terms of jobs and in terms of health savings. Why?

DERA is the diesel emission program. I would say, is there anyone here who honestly believes that the American public that is driving on the highways every single day and sees the spewing of smog and soot coming out of trucks thinks that we no longer need this program?

There are thousands and thousands of trucks on our highways, and if this program weren't needed, I would suggest, then why are we receiving thousands and thousands of applications every single day? When the trucks have been

replaced and we have reduced the emissions, then there will be the time to reevaluate this program. But that time is not now. We are finally making progress.

And let's talk about the benefits of the diesel emission program. Yes, one, it helps us to reduce the old trucks that are on the highways. But what does it also do?

By having diesel emission, it allows us to also save in terms of fuel that's being used. And we all know our dependency currently on foreign oil, so when we consider the ability to be able to reduce the amount of oil that we have to purchase, that individuals are purchasing, that truckers are purchasing, it reduces that cost of our dependence on oil. It reduces the cost of what the end users receive when they're getting the various products.

Now, let's talk about safety. When we look at the old trucks, if we can incentivize truckers to be able to upgrade their equipment, which would include filters, protection with diesel emissions, oftentimes there are other benefits that they're gaining with those vehicles, and so we're also saving lives.

I would say any suggestion of this amendment is shortsighted and ill-advised. This is a good working program, and the maker of the amendment agrees to that, and it garners bipartisan support.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and strongly urge that my colleagues would all join us in opposition to this amendment. Let's keep this program that is working in this country, and let's address the desperate diesel emission that's impacting asthma and many health issues in our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. I rise to oppose the gentlelady's amendment. I think it's instructive to point out, I offered an amendment to strike funding for this program during H.R. 1, back in February, so that we could add funds to the North American Wetlands Conservation Program.

Now my colleague from Tennessee, let me just check the record here, voted ''no,'' so I'm a little confused that now, a few months later, 5 months later, she has changed her mind. It seems to me, my amendment from February would have been preferable to the Members who have anglers and hunters in their district, which I suspect the gentlelady from Tennessee does. They rely upon healthy wetlands, which have been very much endangered by what was an elimination of the North American Wetlands Conservation Program in this bill.

This amendment simply throws away the needed funding. And I know the chairman of the subcommittee understands how needed those dollars are. So it does seem to me that our amendment to have restored money for wetlands made more sense.

But, not only did I lose that vote, Mrs. BLACKBURN voted against eliminating this diesel program. So we did not eliminate that money largely because of the compelling argument that was made by Ms. RICHARDSON at the time. In the meantime, she has continued to lobby for this program. I found some of her arguments convincing. So we're not trying to take the money out that the chairman added. We can understand why it was added to the bill. So we would agree with the chairman. Let's leave it in the bill, even though it had been zeroed out by the President.

So I think Ms. RICHARDSON not only won that vote back in February, but I think she should win this vote as well. The money should be kept in the program—$30 million does seem to be doing some good things. And so I would oppose the gentlelady from Tennessee's amendment to eliminate the program, and not even to use the $30 million for any other constructive purpose.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

When I first looked at the President's proposal to eliminate funding for the diesel emissions reductions grant, I knew that there was a budget gimmick that we would have to backfill when we did this budget. This was an issue I addressed with the EPA administrator when she came before the subcommittee to justify her budget.

The diesel emissions reduction program, or DERA, is a proven program with known, quantifiable health benefits. The DERA program provides grants to States to retrofit old diesel engines in order to reduce pollution.

□ 1910

These grants produce $13 of economic benefit per Federal dollar. And the technology supported by DERA reduced black carbon emissions by 90 percent.

When I asked the administrator why she would propose to eliminate funding for a program with proven technology that works in order to fund new, nice-to-have voluntary initiatives that we have no idea what they do, she responded that it was a tough budget choice. Well, it was the wrong choice.

I think the committee supports this program, it has in the past. As I said, it's a proven program that has proven results, and that's why we backfilled the request—even though the President didn't request any funding for this—to put $30 million in. It is $20 million below what was funded at the current level. So it did have a reduction just like every other program, but we did keep it alive at $30 million.

I yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And, indeed, we are all for clean air; we are all for clean water; we are all for a clean environment. I think that during these times we have to look at how we're going to spend that money. And Mr. MORAN is right. I did vote against his amendment because the money was going to wetlands and not into a spending reduction account.

This is a program that is duplicative. There are other programs on the books. As we look at how to remove these redundancies and the duplications that are in the budget, this is an area where we can do it. We all want to make certain that we clean up the diesel emissions, but I would remind you all, since 2008 there have been a total of 500 grants that the EPA has given through this program, and we have four other programs that do this same work.

This is an area where we can go and achieve a savings. It is $30 million, but these are the types of steps in the right direction that, Mr. Chairman, we have to be willing to take if we're going to get the Federal spending under control.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentlelady.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 68, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 76, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to speak on Richardson amendment No. 2.

This amendment would direct $5 million for clean air grants, which were cut by nearly 15 percent in the current legislation.

Air pollution is a national problem. According to the EPA, approximately 127 million people live in counties that exceed at least one of the health-based national ambient air quality standards in 2008. New health-based standards for ozone will likely increase this number.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a region that's home to the largest port complex in the Nation and consists of some

of the busiest freeways and railways in the country. However, the area also suffers from poor air quality, which has led to much higher rates of asthma and cancer than the current national average.

Exposure to dirty air causes tens of thousands of premature deaths each year and results in serious health problems, such as the aggravation of respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, difficulty breathing, increased susceptibility to respiratory infections, adverse effects on learning, memory, IQ, and behavior, as well as cancer.

Improvements in air quality lead to greater productivity, fewer sick days, and less money spent on health care to address air pollution-related problems. State and local air pollution control agencies have the primary responsibility to implement our Nation's clean air programs that are required by the Clean Air Act. However, due to this current recession, State and local governments are increasingly strapped for resources and are finding it ever more difficult to carry the Federal Government's share of funding this responsibility.

Because of the continuing adverse impacts of this recession on State and localities, air agencies will continue to make more painful decisions, such as reducing or cutting air programs that protect our public health. So in other words, we took 10 steps forward and now we're taking 20 back.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen firsthand that clean air grants are effective, when you consider, in an area of mine that's home to 16.8 million people and is one of the smoggiest areas in the Nation, the South Coast Air Quality Management District is one of the air pollution control agencies for Orange County and Los Angeles urban areas, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties as well. Clean air agencies also assist companies in being able to help them to comply with Clean Air Act regulations. This assistance has allowed many businesses to expand and to create jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support clean air, support public health, and support American jobs. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, a good friend of mine from Virginia once said that he would hear this on the floor, and I guess this is probably the first time that he's going to hear it; that is, the gentlelady makes a good point. But given the allocation that we have and the low funding level, frankly, we just don't have the money to do what she's requesting.

Her offset is to take money out of the Capital Improvement and Maintenance program. That's a program that has already been cut by $94 million in this bill. We've had to make some tough decisions. And while we haven't eliminated the funding for this, obviously, we just don't have that kind of money to put back into it.

Every program is going to have to suffer some cuts. I don't think we should be taking money out of the Capital Improvement and Maintenance program allocation that has already been cut by nearly $100 million. So I would oppose the gentlelady's amendment and hope my colleagues will oppose it also.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

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

Mr. SIMPSON. 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 California will be postponed.

Ms. EDWARDS. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I didn't think I would be down here this evening debating the Interior-EPA appropriations bill, in part because of the number of hours that we have spent in this Chamber on this bill when we actually should be facing the Nation's debt ceiling, giving the President a clean debt ceiling and moving forward with rebuilding our economy and creating jobs. Instead, we're debating yet another flawed bill. It is the biggest assault on clean air, clean water, the endangered species, and public lands that we've seen in our Nation's history.

The bill's unprecedented funding cuts and polluter riders to benefit rich and often reckless mining and oil companies will cripple the EPA's employees, health professionals, and scientists' ability to do their job protecting our Nation and its public health.

Rather than celebrating the advancements that we've made over the last 40 years in air and water quality, instead, these Republican ''riders to ruin'' are driving us back to the sixties, a time when Rachel Carson wrote ''Silent Spring'' to awaken the American public to the man-made impacts on the environment. And I just want to take a few moments to discuss a couple of them. There are so many that it's a tough challenge, these Republican ''riders to ruin.''

The bill would prohibit funding for the Endangered Species Act listings. Hundreds of animals have been protected under the Endangered Species Act. The bill would eliminate the protection that leads to the repopulation and revitalization of bald eagle populations in our Nation. And for all the flag pins that we wear, we're about ready to decimate the very act that protects our Nation's symbol, the bald eagle.

Among other things, the bill also strikes out at ending regulations to expand the storm water discharge program under the Clean Water Act. The program prevents harmful pollutants from being washed or dumped into our water systems. And as our cities and urbanized areas grow, storm water runoff can become a threat if we're not able to better manage the discharge waters and possible impact of toxins and pollutants.

And here we are, something I can hardly believe. I recall taking my son to the Grand Canyon and camping along the side of the south rim many years ago. What are we going to do now? We can pitch our tents next to the uranium mines at the Grand Canyon. This is insane.

□ 1920

For the 5 million visitors a year who visit the Grand Canyon, we're going to jeopardize the water quality of our Nation's most important rivers. I can't imagine families visiting the Grand Canyon. I can't imagine future generations pitching their tent next to the Grand Canyon, next to a uranium mine, because of this senseless legislation.

It almost makes you breathless to wonder why it is that we've decided that the Federal Government doesn't have a role anymore in protecting our water and our land and our air and our air quality. The majority is pushing a bill on the floor that blocks Clean Air Act regulations of fine particles and soot and delays the EPA from limiting toxic mercury pollution from power plants. Why don't we just break up all our thermometers and dump them in the water?

I'm not sure who these riders are meant to help, but I know that they don't help children in communities in my district and across the country who are vulnerable to air pollution. Thirty percent of childhood asthma is due to environmental exposures, costing the Nation $2 billion per year. These riders add to the arsenal. They just add to the arsenal. Low-income and minority children experience more doctor visits and hospitalization due to asthma than the general population and three times the rate of white Americans.

This is a really sad day, but it's most especially sad because we should be doing the Nation's business. Today, we watched the stock market plummet because of the uncertainty that we've created in this body because of the recalcitrance of the Republican majority. I know that we have to do this horrible EPA appropriations bill, but what we need to do is fix this Nation's economy, get people back to work building our roads and our bridges and our infrastructure, and protecting our national parks. Instead, we're engaged in the silliness of trying to play dice and chicken with the American economy.

It's a really sad day for the American public. Just a really sad day.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike last word.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Thank you.

The majority has been saying how concerned they are about future generations, that we shouldn't be overburdening them with our debt. I wholeheartedly agree. That's why I'm disappointed that, instead of addressing the urgent debt crisis, we are on the floor debating a bill that will gut pollution controls and public health protections in order to boost profits, the profits of America's biggest polluters, the last people who probably need a hand right now.

This bill does a number of things, Mr. Chairman. It blocks even modest pollution control standards that could mitigate climate change; the bill also erases 40 years of Federal laws that protect clean air, water, lands and wildlife; and it cripples the budgets of the Federal agencies we've charged with protecting our constituents.

As a mother and grandmother, I'm appalled that this bill signals a willingness to leave our families a more unhealthy environment than we have today. Isn't the idea always to leave things better than we found them?

Instead of protecting our citizens and shorelines, this bill exempts oil companies from complying with the Clean Air Act for offshore drilling.

Instead of protecting our drinking water and waterways, it cuts nearly $1 billion in funding for the clean water State revolving funds and will, if enacted, compromise the ability to address urban stormwater runoff, one of San Diego's greatest environmental threats.

And instead of supporting a cleaner, more efficient auto industry, it blocks an improved fuel efficiency standard, jeopardizing a process projected to create up to 700,000 new green jobs, cut fuel costs and save 2.4 million barrels of oil every day by 2030.

It's alarming, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues who speak so passionately about giving the next generations a clean financial slate would so carelessly leave them a dirty planet. I suspect that the grandchildren of some oil company executives can always jet off to pristine resorts, but quite frankly that's not the situation for most of my constituents. The grandchildren of the 85 percent of Americans who just told The Washington Post/ABC News poll that they are, quote, just getting by or falling behind will be stuck paying high gas prices and worrying about their jobs and worrying about their health.

We should be leaving our children and our grandchildren a chance at the American Dream of middle class prosperity and a legacy of environmental responsibility and stewardship, not one of reckless disregard.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill and getting back to bridging the debt divide so our constituents can focus on their own jobs rather than being concerned about whether we're doing ours.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. SPEIER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In some respects, I feel like I'm in the Twilight Zone. Can anyone explain, when we are 144 hours from crossing the brink, from going over the ledge, to have this country come to a screeching halt financially, tell me why we are debating the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior? Why aren't we dealing with what the American people want us to be dealing with right now, and that is the debt limit, raising the ceiling on the debt limit? But, no, we're going to spend hundreds of hours here over the next couple of days talking about the Interior appropriations bill.

Let me tell you what I'm hearing from my constituents, and maybe my colleagues on the other side of the aisle aren't getting phone calls from their constituents, but I am, and let me tell you what I'm hearing.

One woman wrote me and said:

''My mom is 79 years old, worked all her life in a factory and retired. Her pension was handed to her on her very last day of work, $25,000. The plant closed, moved the work to Mexico, and her husband died 8 years later. That $25,000 didn't last long. Now her only source of income is Social Security. She lives in a senior retirement center that she loves. Last Thursday, she and my aunt, who is 83 and also widowed, called me to pick them up and take them to the bank. They were going to withdraw from their savings money to pay their rent, as they, along with all of the other seniors they live with in that retirement center, are convinced they will not get their Social Security checks come August 1. My mom has a doctor's appointment on August 5, and she wonders if the doctor will continue to see her if the government doesn't pay for Medicare.

''I care deeply about them. I know for a fact that my mom is losing sleep over this. Last week, I thought she was foolish. This week, I'm beginning to think that I'm the fool. How do you look your mom and your aunt in the eye and say with great certainty that the U.S. Government will send them their Social Security?''

That was just one letter I received, and I've gotten lots of phone calls. A 52-year-old woman who's self-employed as a court reporter paid $13,000 into the Social Security system last year and she's calling me saying, ''What are you all doing? The interest rate on my mortgage is going to go up. Interest rates on my credit cards are going to go up. Why aren't you fixing this problem?''

No, we're standing here talking about the Interior appropriation budget.

A woman from Daly City, 68 years old, previously suffered a stroke, has had seizures and relies on Medicare to treat her rheumatoid arthritis. Her husband, a cab driver, will turn 70 in December, at which point he will go on Social Security and hopefully go from working 5 to 6 hours a day to maybe 4 hours. If he loses his Social Security, he will probably have to work longer hours again.

□ 1930

They're all anguished. They all want us to do our job. They want us to lift this debt ceiling, protect Social Security and Medicare, and fix our attitude that we have here that somehow it's okay to just stall. It's okay to just try and make points, make political points while they're all wringing their hands and while they're taking money out of their savings accounts because they can't pay their rent if they don't get their Social Security check come August 1.

Well, for my colleagues who maybe haven't heard from their constituents, I want the American people to call this telephone number. Call this telephone number and call your Member of Congress and tell them what you think we should be doing. Should we be debating the Interior appropriation bill right now, or should we be fixing this debt limit? A debt limit, I might add, which virtually every economist of every political stripe has said: You have to lift it. President Ronald Reagan said: It has to be lifted.

Why should Congress always take us to the brink before they act? It's time for us to be responsible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the television audience.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I want to thank my colleague from California for reminding all of us that there are consequences for what we do here. This current wholly manufactured debt crisis has people very, very nervous.

The women that Ms. SPEIER talked about, concerned and nervous about their Social Security checks, whether they will be able to get their medical care, and today's Wall Street Journal, the first five items on what's news, various businesses around the world and financial institutions being prepared for the first time ever in America's history that our debt may not be worth a hoot. It may be worthless, that

we're going to default. This is a totally manufactured, unnecessary crisis. We didn't have to be here.

I want us all to step back a little ways, step back to December 2010, when we had another manufactured crisis. It came time to fund the Federal Government and to deal with some issues having to do with unemployment. And the Republicans in the Senate held us hostage and demanded that we extend the high-end Bush tax cuts, which created a $700 billion deficit. We went ahead and did that, and rolled the issue forward 3 months so that in February we would have yet another crisis, the funding or the shutdown of the Federal Government.

Yet again another opportunity for our Republican colleagues to create a crisis so that they could use it to force onto the American public their policies, which became very evident what they wanted to do. They wanted to reconfigure the entire American scene. They wanted to roll back Social Security. They wanted to end Medicare for all Americans who are not yet 55 years of age. They wanted to end the programs to support higher education, to reduce research, to reduce funding for food safety programs. They used these manufactured crises to shut down a government.

And yet here we are again with the debt limit, first discussed back in May, and then because of the Treasury Department's ability to continue paying bills, we are now up against the final deadline of August 2. Yet again a totally manufactured unnecessary crisis.

Previously, Ronald Reagan said: Don't do this. Do not put the good faith and credit of the American government on the line. He told the Republicans, his Republicans back in the 1980s, honor the debt. This is not about new spending, this is about spending going back a century. This is about the American bills that were paid or not paid years ago, and that's our debt today.

We don't need to do this. There are options. We're putting forth, as we did earlier, a clean debt limit increase. Get us past this. We are also looking at the opportunity for the President to invoke the 14th Amendment, the fourth clause of the 14th Amendment, that says America will honor its debts. I believe he has the power, issuing an Executive order to the Treasury Department: pay our debts. This is something that is fundamental for America, and we must do it.

Put aside this manufactured crisis. It didn't need to be real, but it has become all too real in these last few days as our Republican colleagues are unable to get their act together, even to put forth a proposal that would eviscerate necessary programs. Can't even do that.

The President has called for a balanced approach, one of taxes, raising the taxes that should have been raised back in December and eliminate some $700 billion of this problem, but let's do it now. Let's go after the oil companies that are receiving our tax money at the very same time that over the last decade they have created nearly a trillion dollars of profit. They don't need our tax money. The poor in America, the senior citizens in America, they are the ones that need help.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TONKO. I agree with the two previous speakers, my colleagues from California. Here we are dealing with a flawed bill that would deny our stewardship of our environment all while we're faced with an economic consequence, with a default that stares us in the face.

For the past 200 days, the Republican leadership of this body has set aside America's priority of job creation in order to talk about the debt and to talk about the deficit. My concern is that as we face that looming threat of default, my Republican colleagues aren't doing much but talk.

After 200 days with no jobs agenda, after 200 days of voting to destroy millions of jobs, after 200 days of saying that those hardest hit by the recession should bear the burden of unbalanced cuts, after 200 days of rhetoric and walking away, my Republican colleagues have forced this Congress and the American people to wait yet more hours to see and vote on their plan.

As we all know, last night the Congressional Budget Office pointed out that some of the cuts in the Speaker's plan weren't real. Meanwhile, the Tea Party base said that Cut, Cap, and Balance is the only plan they will support. We considered that plan last week, and it has failed in the Senate. It is a plan that Bruce Bartlett—who was a Reagan adviser and a Bush Treasury official—said was ''mind-boggling in its insanity.'' Others have called it the ''most ideologically extreme'' budget legislation to come before Congress in decades.

Governing is not always easy. There are extremists on both sides of the political spectrum, and standing up to them takes strength. But our advantage lies in the fact that however vocal, extremists are a minority, a faction.

I have traveled my district extensively in recent weeks. I have held town halls and meetings with local businesses, and here's what I've heard: We have a spending problem in Washington. We have a revenue problem in Washington. But more important than anything else, we have a jobs problem in America.

So what are we going to do about it? Well, my constituents had an easy answer there, too. First, cut what doesn't create jobs and stability for the middle class. That includes wasteful government spending. It also includes tax breaks for corporate jet owners, millionaires and billionaires, and a system of kickbacks to the big oil companies that even their CEOs say they don't need.

Second, save whatever actually works. That means investment in education so middle class kids have a chance to get good jobs when they finish school. That means boosting innovation so we can get American industry booming again. And it means infrastructure so that we can drive to work on safe roads and bridges and build them with American materials and workers.

Finally, my constituents have told me that whatever talking heads on TV say, they know fair when they see it, regardless of partisan divides. We have an aging population. Nobody disputes that. But cutting Social Security and ending Medicare in order to protect corporate tax breaks and long-standing kickbacks for special interests puts us in a position where ideas are replaced in government by ideology. We have been asked in recent weeks to manipulate the United States Constitution in order to enshrine this ideology. Where I'm from, we believe that the only ideology that belongs in the United States Constitution is that of democracy.

□ 1940

In our democracy, if you want your ideas to become law, you don't rewrite our history or change our foundational documents. You come down to this floor. You tell your colleagues and your constituents what you think, and you let us debate it, amend it, and vote on it right here in front of the cameras and in front of the people we are sworn to serve.

But that's not what's happening today. After 200 days of talking about little else, my Republican colleagues have forced this body and the American people to wait yet hours to see their top secret default plan. Exactly which principled stand was important enough for the Republican House leadership to walk away from the negotiations for the fifth time? More importantly, the clock is ticking. We need to get back to work—and the American people are getting sick and tired of the games.

Just based on rhetoric, we know that their call to end Medicare and end Social Security plans would protect 2 percent of our population at the expense of the rest of us, the 98 percent of us. I'm sure that takes a lot of vote wrangling. But we've had a year to get this done. No matter how much Congress cuts their classroom budgets, even our elementary school children know that a due date is a due date.

Democrats support a balanced, bipartisan solution to reduce our deficit, to create jobs, to grow our economy, and to expand the middle class. My Republican colleagues say they share those same goals. So I would invite them to come down here, join us, share their plan. Let's get on with business. America is waiting and deserves better. We

need to solve this default crisis. It's staring us in the eyes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, lines 11 and 12, after each dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,411,000,000)''.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase the Clear Water State Revolving Fund by $1.41 billion, from $689 million to $2.1 billion, the amount that was appropriated in fiscal year 2010.

All of us recognize the gravity of the financial situation facing this Nation today, and we are struggling to emerge from the worst economic recession since the Great Depression. Clearly, with the national unemployment rate hovering still around 9 percent and the unemployment rate for the construction sector at over 20 percent, we are far from completing our work.

Christine Todd Whitman, the Republican EPA administrator under President George W. Bush, estimated that the needs of our Nation's aging water infrastructure topped $660 billion. Yet within the FY 2012 Interior appropriations bill, the Republican majority cuts the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, the primary source of investment in our wastewater infrastructure, by $1.4 billion compared to FY 2010. Coupled with the severe cuts to the Clean Water SRF in H.R. 1, the FY 2011 continuing resolution, and the attacks on clean water in the Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act passed earlier this month, the Republican majority has made it clear that they place no priority—none—on preserving clean water or creating jobs.

In terms of job losses, the cuts in the FY 2012 Interior appropriations bill when compared to FY 2010 funding levels would eliminate over 39,000 direct construction jobs throughout the country and countless additional jobs in the industries and small businesses that support the wastewater construction industry at a time when many small businesses and the construction sector are struggling to recover. Furthermore, this cut undermines longstanding Federal efforts to address our Nation's aging infrastructure systems.

Mr. Chairman, addressing the Nation's debt and deficit should absolutely be a priority; however, we should focus our efforts on finding a balanced approach that focuses on job creation rather than slashing budgets that are proven job creators. We hear repeatedly from our Republican colleagues that we should not tax our job creators. I agree. However, in my district and in districts across the Nation, the environment is the job creator.

The economy of my district depends on clean water, clean air, and safe, swimmable beaches. The cuts in this bill place all of these in jeopardy. If the Republican priorities in this bill prevail, we could put an effective tax rate of zero on small businesses in my district, and it wouldn't help because they would have no income. And no income means no jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the extension of the Bush tax cuts give the average millionaire a $139,100 tax break in 2011. That's a tax break of $2,700 per week or $380 per day. Let me be clear: I'm talking only about tax breaks for millionaires—not tax breaks for the middle class—and only for millionaires, using not the $250,000, but the million.

If our Republican colleagues were to set aside ideology and agree to eliminate the tax breaks for just those millionaires, we could reestablish our commitment to clean water and economic development within 12 days. The Bush tax cuts give millionaires across the Nation such a deal that we could completely shore up the $1.4 billion deficit in the Clean Water SRF and begin to address the needs outlined by Administrator Whitman in less than 2 weeks.

Even if Congress gave the Bill Gates and the Warren Buffetts of this world the Bush tax breaks for the remaining 353 days of the year, we could put tens of thousands of men and women back to work, protect clean water, and protect the economies that depend on clean water and pristine beaches.

Finally, the Republican majority has included in this bill several special interest policy earmarks to pull back on EPA's compliance and enforcement capabilities, making it far more difficult for the agency to identify and pursue serious violations impacting public health and the environment in communities across the Nation. In my view, this proposal stands in stark contrast to the EPA's efforts to increase compliance in critical areas within a limited budget and suggests that a weakened compliance and enforcement presence is somehow better for our Nation. I strongly disagree with that suggestion.

Combine the lackluster funding for the Clean Water SRF and the dozens of special interest policy earmarks, it's quite clear that Republicans have abandoned the decades-long national, bipartisan commitment to creating jobs, protecting public health, and preserving the ability of local communities to grow their economies through clean water projects.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

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

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

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I fully expected that my friend from Idaho would insist on his point of order. I fully expect the Chair to sustain the point of order. But let's be clear: The underlying bill violates House rules. There are 39, at least by my count, special interest policy riders in the underlying bill, every one of which is protected by a rule that waives all points of order. Each of these policy riders are in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI. We all know that.

I understand that the point of order will be sustained, but I do wish we would adhere to what we were promised. We were promised an open, transparent House in which regular order would prevail and in which the House would work its will. This rule does not allow that to take place.

I will accept the ruling of the Chair.

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

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

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Idaho, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 71, lines 15 and 17, strike ''not less than 30 percent'' and insert ''30 percent or less''.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. As you may know, the Environmental Protection Agency currently administers Clean Water State Revolving Funds and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds to provide low-interest financing through the States. These low-interest loans are a way for States and communities to be able to use their own discretion in making much-needed improvements to their water supplies and infrastructure. This program was a grant program

years ago, but was transitioned into a loan program to save money some 25 years ago.

□ 1950

When the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act passed in 2009, an increase in funding for these accounts was coupled with a provision in those two funds, requiring no less than 30 percent of the financed funds issued to be used as principal forgiveness. It was a type of grant program to them. This principal forgiveness changes the low-interest loan program to a direct funding program. It's a hybrid between a loan program now and a grant program.

Since the stimulus expired and funding for these provisions returned to normal levels, unfortunately, the principal forgiveness provision has remained. This bill rolls back to pre-stimulus funding levels, but it doesn't roll back to pre-stimulus Federal strings.

So my amendment removes the Federal mandate of principal forgiveness and allows the States to use their discretion on the amounts they'd like to offer. States will be allowed to provide principal forgiveness up to 30 percent. Communities rely on these funds to ensure their infrastructure security and safe drinking water. By supporting my amendment, you can empower your State to leverage their already limited funds and ensure that communities all across our Nation receive the much needed infrastructure assistance.

Not to put words in both parties' mouths on this one as well, but there is a very bipartisan focus on this. This is one of the priorities from President Obama. In his budget proposal, he requested the same thing. Also, for conservatives and others, it gives back to the States their rights to be able to make those decisions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

What the amendment does is create the 30 percent language that we've had in the past, which is a floor, and makes it a ceiling rather than a floor.

The EPA's Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Funds provide grants to States to capitalize on their revolving loan fund programs. These programs offer low-interest loans to communities for projects included on a State's Intended Use Plan. These low-interest loans are usually below market rates and are used to finance water and wastewater infrastructure projects.

Many small and disadvantaged communities with a low income base can hardly afford to apply for these loans even with the low-interest rates. Therefore, this provision in the base text, which we have had for a few years, would offer zero-interest loans, which are loans that forgive a portion of the principal, or grants, to these disadvantaged communities that would otherwise be unable to afford a standard SRF loan. The provision provides some relief to small communities across the Nation that are tirelessly working to provide clean and safe drinking water to their residents and bring construction jobs to their communities, all at the same time as they balance their books.

Given the huge infrastructure needs facing this Nation and the crumbling water and wastewater infrastructure, we should be providing more of this assistance, not less. So, while I appreciate my colleague's amendment and share his interest in preserving the viability of the SRFs, I do not support this amendment, and I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I would just say, we've talked about this in the subcommittee for a number of years. One of the real problems we have is we have these State revolving loan funds. We put the money out there, and there are a lot of communities that can't even afford the loans, so it doesn't help them rebuild their water systems or the wastewater treatment facilities. With the standards that we have with arsenic and other things, I have a lot of small communities in Idaho, and it doesn't help them that they have a State revolving loan fund, because they can't afford it. What this does is help them through that to meet some of the clean water standards that they have to meet.

As I said, what we've carried in the bill before us is that a minimum of 30 percent, or a floor of 30 percent, of those funds have to be used for those types of things. What the gentleman's amendment would do would make that a ceiling in which you could only use 30 percent of that. I oppose the amendment, and hope my colleagues would also.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LANKFORD. 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 Oklahoma will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RECISSION OF FUNDS)

For fiscal year 2012, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's function to implement directly Federal environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agreements to federally recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia, if authorized by their member Tribes, to assist the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental programs for Indian Tribes required or authorized by law, except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded from funds designated for State financial assistance agreements.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate pesticide registration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended by Public Law 110–94, the Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act.

The Administrator is authorized to transfer up to $250,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the Great Lakes Initiative under the heading ''Environmental Programs and Management'' to the head of any Federal department or agency, with the concurrence of such head, to carry out activities that would support the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement programs, projects, or activities; to enter into an interagency agreement with the head of such Federal department or agency to carry out these activities; and to make grants to governmental entities, nonprofit organizations, institutions, and individuals for planning, research, monitoring, outreach, and implementation in furtherance of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

From unobligated balances to carry out projects and activities funded through the ''State and Tribal Assistance Grants'' and ''Hazardous Substance Superfund'' accounts, $140,000,000 are permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

For fiscal year 2012 the requirements of section 513 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1372) shall apply to the construction of treatment works carried out in whole or in part with assistance made available by a State water pollution control revolving fund as authorized by title VI of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.), or with assistance made available under section 205(m) of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1285(m)), or both.

For fiscal year 2012 the requirements of section 1450(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–9(e)) shall apply to any construction project carried out in whole or in part with assistance made available by a drinking water treatment revolving loan fund as authorized by section 1452 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–12).

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest and rangeland research as authorized by law, $277,282,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, $66,805,000 is for the forest inventory and analysis program: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, no less than $29,161,000 is for the forest products laboratory.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For necessary expenses of cooperating with and providing technical and financial assistance to States, territories, possessions, and others, and for forest health management, including treatments of pests, pathogens,

and invasive or noxious plants and for restoring and rehabilitating forests damaged by pests or invasive plants, cooperative forestry, and education and land conservation activities as authorized, and conducting an international program as authorized, $208,608,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by law; of which $3,000,000 is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and shall remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 76, line 2, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $20,860,800)''.

Page 158, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $20,860,800)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce State and Private Forestry funding by a modest 10 percent, and it would transfer more than $20 million to the Spending Reduction Account.

The State and Private Forestry funding sets aside money for international forestry, urban and community forestry, and supports more than 500 million acres of non-Federal forested lands. We are more than $14.3 trillion in debt, and we need to be cutting areas of our budget wherever possible. It is more than reasonable to request a reduction in this program because the Federal Government has no business giving a handout to private forestry landowners in the first place. This funding would be better managed by the State and local levels of government.

We are broke, Mr. Chairman, as a Nation. We need to be doing what businesses do when they get overextended. They lower their borrowing level; they try to find out ways to pay off their debt, and then they start cutting expenses. This is a mere 10 percent cut. So I urge my colleagues to think about our massive debt, and I urge them to consider sending part of this program back to the State and local governments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to ask if we could see the amendment. It's pretty difficult to address it until we actually see the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is No. 18 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment would take $21 million from the Forest Service's State and Private program and put it in the Spending Reduction Account.

While it's easy to stand here and say, ''It just reduces it by 10 percent. Who can't stand a 10 percent reduction?'' I'd like to note that the State and Private Forestry program has already had a significant cut in this budget—$133 million below that of FY11, and despite its name, it is critical to managing the national forest system.

The accounts we kept intact are extremely important: for example, cooperative fire protection in rural areas. This helps rural communities fight catastrophic wildfires. With such a large percentage of public land and such a small tax base, many rural communities are hard-pressed to pay for the suppression of large wildfires that start on public lands.

Cooperative forest health: in other words, the prevention and treatment of insects and disease. Improving forest health helps prevent catastrophic wildfires. In the South, I know you're familiar with the southern pine beetle. This program has helped to contain the spread of southern pine beetle. I wish the same were true in the Western United States where 20 million acres are dead due to the mountain pine beetle.

I understand the gentleman is standing on principle. So am I. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. I simply rise to associate myself with the very thoughtful, insightful comments of the gentleman from Idaho, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. We agree. The amendment should be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendCment was rejected.

□ 2000

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, line 2, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 80, line 1, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to have funds available to restore the Forest Legacy Program through the fiscal year 2011 level, as well as the fiscal year 2008 levels, of approximately $53 million. This amount is $83 million less than what was requested by the administration and $22 million less than what was authorized in fiscal year 2010.

The reason for this amendment is we cannot let this very important program in essence be eliminated by the present funding of only $3 million in the present bill before us.

The Forest Legacy Program partners with the States to protect environmentally sensitive forest lands. It is a partnership program in which States are permitted to accomplish this very important goal. It is a voluntary program that encourages the protection of privately owned lands and encourages the purchase of conservation easements without removing the land from private ownership. The easements then act to protect water, air quality, and habitats for threatened and endangered species.

This particular program is important for the State of Hawaii. We have more endangered species per square mile than any other place on the planet. We claim 75 percent of the endangered plants in the United States. We are the most unique archipelago.

One such project is called the Kainalu Forest Watershed, which is an easement that was bought to preserve 614 acres of strategic watershed. This was done in the year 2010. This area produces a large part of the freshwater that contributes to the recharging of the aquifer through the forests and the streams that are preserved and sustains the residents of Molokai.

Molokai may not be known to many of you, but in 2009, this island was made famous with the canonization of Father Damien, when he became St. Damien. This is the island that he so loved.

But this is not a program that only affects Hawaii. It affects many of my colleagues' States. For example, in Idaho, 720 acres called the Bane Creek Neighbors project, which connects to important ecosystems and critical wildlife habitats and important timberlands, were preserved, and it preserved grizzlies' and gray wolves' habitats for these in the future.

Also in Idaho, the McArthur Lake Wildlife Corridor, which basically protects 3,727 acres of critical private timberlands.

Utah benefited from it through the Dry Lakes Ranch, which protects not only the timberlands themselves but a beautiful scenic view and keeps the area pristine and whole.

As of 2010, almost 2 million acres have been so protected.

Now, it is important to realize that it is not taken from private owners, but it is in partnership with all the parties, including the States, to preserve these important habitats for the future.

This is the kind of program that we are always talking about and looking for, the preservation through partnerships—not just simply government going in and buying things. This is making it possible so some of the actual individuals and communities, the neighbors, for example, in Idaho are able to get together with government to preserve important easements.

It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that I ask for a vote in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the gentlelady's amendment.

While the program that she seeks to increase funding for is a good program, and I think most people support it and its intent and what it does, the problem is is that it takes the money out of the Wildfire Suppression Program.

Anybody that has been watching the news for the last 5 months understands the wildfire problems we have in Texas, in New Mexico, in Arizona. And as NOAA has told us, those wildfires are going to climb into the Pacific Northwest later in the year this year. So I suspect August, September, October in the Pacific Northwest is going to be a huge fire suppression cost.

So I think we can ill afford to take the money out of wildfire suppression and put it into the program. It would be nice to increase the funding for those conservation programs to help protect those things, but if they burn up, we're not really protecting them. So we've tried in this bill to fund the wildfire suppression at the 10-year average, which we have done, and I would be hard-pressed to support taking money out of that given the fire situation we find ourselves in this year. And I would oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, for management, protection, improvement, and utilization of the National Forest System, $1,546,463,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, $336,722,000 shall be for forest products: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, $30,000,000 shall be deposited in the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund for ecological restoration treatments as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 7303(f): *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, up to $122,600,000 is for the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program for Region 1, Region 3 and Region 4.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, lines 10 and 13, insert after each dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 80, line 1, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $16,600,000)''.

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

Mr. GOSAR. I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2584, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2012.

This summer, over a million acres of Forest Service lands, as well as another 600,000 acres of Federal, State, and private lands, burned throughout the American Southwest. Those fires are costing millions of taxpayer dollars and immediate fire response, and will cost many millions more in restoration and rehabilitation in the months and years ahead. These fires reinforce the urgent need for landscape-scale restoration.

My amendment ensures this body fully funds proactive, large-scale treatments to our national forests that will reduce wildfire risk, ultimately saving the Federal Government from having to use an astronomical amount of money for fire suppression and expensive post-fire rehab.

Specifically, my amendment increases the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program by $10 million, fully funding it at the U.S. Forest Service budget request. Authorized in fiscal year 2009, CFLRP was designed to encourage collaborative, science-based, large-scale thinning and ecosystem restoration. The program recognizes that future forest management will be most effective if it is planned and implemented in a collaborative framework through private-public partnerships at the landscape level.

As an offset, the amendment decreases a related funding account, the Wildland Fire Management-Hazardous Fuel account, by $16.6 million. The Hazardous Fuel account is funded at $334 million in the underlying bill, $80 million above the President's budget request. The Congressional Budget Office has confirmed my amendment does not increase 2012 outlays.

□ 2010

While forest treatments focused solely on hazardous fuel reduction around communities may be appropriate in many cases, they do not achieve the enduring fire protection and ecosystem restoration that are urgently required. There are roughly 80 million acres of forest across the West that are overgrown and ripe for catastrophic wildfire, according to the Landfire multiagency database. We simply cannot afford the status quo, using taxpayer dollars for 100 percent of the large-scale restoration work necessary to prevent unnatural fires like the Wallow fire in Arizona and New Mexico.

If we are going to save what is left of our forests, we must change our priorities and aggressively treat our forests at the pace and scale these fires are occurring. Congress must fully fund proactive collaborative large-scale forest restoration treatments if it truly wants to reverse the degradation of our forests while simultaneously reducing the risk of catastrophic fires.

The private-public partnerships facilitated through the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program empowers private industry to do important science-based ecological restoration work while minimizing the cost to the American taxpayer. In 2010, 10 landscape-scale restoration projects were selected for the CFLR program. These programs are located in nine States: Montana, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington.

In the case of the Arizona project, the Four Forest Restoration Initiative, known as 4FRI, calls for the Forest Service to contract with economically viable, appropriately scaled industries capable of restoring tens of thousands of acres per year. Once a contract is awarded, it is estimated that the 2.4 million-acre project will be completed at little or no cost to the Federal Government.

Because of this promise, the project has garnered bipartisan support in the Arizona House congressional delegation as well as the support of Senators MCCAIN and KYL, Governor Jan Brewer, leaders in the State legislature, the affected counties and cities, and an unprecedented range of environmental groups, such as the Center for Biological Diversity and industry partners.

Full funding for the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program ensures that the 10 existing projects, which are urgently needed, will continue to move expeditiously while allowing the CFLRP to expand into more of the estimated 80 million acres of overgrown and wildfire-prone Forest Service lands across the country that need to be properly treated.

When the Federal Government partners with local government, stakeholder groups, and private industry, together we can create much needed jobs and a safer environment for our citizens. Landscape-scale, fiscally responsible forest restoration treatments are the only way the country is going to make real progress towards proper forest health.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Gosar Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PAULSEN). The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to note that I support the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program, CFLR. This bill funds the program at $30 million. In the CR, it was funded at $25 million; and in fiscal year 2010, it was funded at $10 million. We've supported it enough that we've increased funding for it from the 2010 level through the CR and in this bill. The funding for this program has increased dramatically at a time when other programs are being cut. The offset for this program is hazardous fuels; and because of the budget authority and outlays, the amendment

has to cut $16.6 million to pay for a $10 million increase in this program.

The hazardous fuels program has been extremely effective at reducing the threat of catastrophic fire. I would also argue that hazardous fuels funds get to the ground and actually make a meaningful impact much earlier than the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program, which can take years before a project is even implemented.

I understand and agree with the gentleman that in our bill report we state over and over that the Forest Service needs more active management at a much larger scale. But CFLR is not the only program that does this. There are numerous programs and line items for improving forest health and reducing wildfire risk. We funded all of these at FY11 levels.

I am glad that the CFLR program is working well in Arizona, but it is not working as well in other parts of the country. In some areas, other buckets of funding are more effective at actively managing the forest. As a result, I reluctantly have to oppose the gentleman's amendment and urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, $378,088,000, to remain available until expended, for construction, capital improvement, maintenance and acquisition of buildings and other facilities and infrastructure; and for construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of forest roads and trails by the Forest Service as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 532–538 and 23 U.S.C. 101 and 205: *Provided,* That $35,000,000 shall be designated for urgently needed road decommissioning, road and trail repair and maintenance and associated activities, and removal of fish passage barriers, especially in areas where Forest Service roads may be contributing to water quality problems in streams and water bodies which support threatened, endangered, or sensitive species or community water sources: *Provided further*, That funds becoming available in fiscal year 2012 under the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501) shall be transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury and shall not be available for transfer or obligation for any other purpose unless the funds are appropriated: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided for decommissioning of roads, up to $9,000,000 may be transferred to the ''National Forest System'' to support the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l–4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the Forest Service, $12,500,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache, Uinta, and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Angeles, San Bernardino, Sequoia, and Cleveland National Forests, California, as authorized by law, $955,000, to be derived from forest receipts.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

For acquisition of lands, such sums, to be derived from funds deposited by State, county, or municipal governments, public school districts, or other public school authorities, and for authorized expenditures from funds deposited by non-Federal parties pursuant to Land Sale and Exchange Acts, pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967, as amended (16 U.S.C. 484a), to remain available until expended.

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year, as fees for grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the 16 Western States, pursuant to section 401(b)(1) of Public Law 94–579, as amended, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed 6 percent shall be available for administrative expenses associated with on-the-ground range rehabilitation, protection, and improvements.

GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), $45,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the fund established pursuant to the above Act.

MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS FOR SUBSISTENCE USES

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service to manage Federal lands in Alaska for subsistence uses under title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96–487), $2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for forest fire presuppression activities on National Forest System lands, for emergency fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement, hazardous fuels reduction on or adjacent to such lands, and for emergency rehabilitation of burned-over National Forest System lands and water, $1,805,099,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds including unobligated balances under this heading, are available for repayment of advances from other appropriations accounts previously transferred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be available to reimburse State and other cooperating entities for services provided in response to wildfire and other emergencies or disasters to the extent such reimbursements by the Forest Service for non-fire emergencies are fully repaid by the responsible emergency management agency: *Provided further*, That amounts in this paragraph may be transferred to the ''State and Private Forestry'', ''National Forest System'', and ''Forest and Rangeland Research'' accounts to fund State fire assistance, volunteer fire assistance, forest health management, forest and rangeland research, the Joint Fire Science Program, vegetation and watershed management, heritage site rehabilitation, and wildlife and fish habitat management and restoration: *Provided further*, That the costs of implementing any cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and any non-Federal entity may be shared, as mutually agreed on by the affected parties: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided herein, the Secretary of Agriculture may enter into procurement contracts or cooperative agreements, or issue grants for hazardous fuels reduction activities and for training and monitoring associated with such hazardous fuels reduction activities, on Federal land, or on adjacent non-Federal land for activities that benefit resources on Federal land: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the transfer of funds appropriated for wildland fire management, in an aggregate amount not to exceed $10,000,000, between the Departments when such transfers would facilitate and expedite jointly funded wildland fire management programs and projects: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided for hazardous fuels reduction, not to exceed $5,000,000, may be used to make grants, using any authorities available to the Forest Service under the State and Private Forestry appropriation, for the purpose of creating incentives for increased use of biomass from national forest lands: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be cancelled from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That, before obligating any of the funds provided herein for wildland fire suppression, the Secretary of Agriculture shall obligate all unobligated balances previously made available under this heading that, when appropriated, were designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer not more than $50,000,000 of the funds provided herein to the Secretary of the Interior if the Secretaries determine that the transfer will enhance the efficiency or effectiveness of Federal wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided further*, That of the funds for hazardous fuels reduction, up to $27,100,000 may be transferred to the ''National Forest System'' to support the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program.

FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION RESERVE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for large fire suppression operations of the Department of Agriculture and as a reserve fund for suppression and Federal emergency response activities, $290,418,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts are available only for transfer to the ''Wildland Fire Management'' account and only following a declaration by the Secretary that either (1) a wildland fire suppression event meets certain previously-established risk-based written criteria for significant complexity, severity, or threat posed by the fire or (2) funds in the ''Wildland Fire Management'' account will be exhausted within 30 days.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for:

(1) purchase of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition of passenger motor vehicles from excess sources, and hire of such vehicles; purchase, lease, operation, maintenance, and acquisition of aircraft from excess sources to maintain the operable fleet for use in Forest Service wildland fire programs and other Forest Service programs; notwithstanding other provisions of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft; (2) services pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2225, and not to exceed $100,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; (3) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (7 U.S.C. 2250); (4) acquisition of land, waters, and interests therein pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 428a; (5) expenses pursuant to the Volunteers in the National Forest Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 558a, 558d, and 558a note); (6) the cost of uniforms as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; and (7) debt collection contracts in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3718(c).

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be transferred to the Wildland Fire Management appropriation for forest firefighting, emergency rehabilitation of burned-over or damaged lands or waters under its jurisdiction, and fire preparedness due to severe burning conditions upon the Secretary's notification of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that all fire suppression funds appropriated under the headings ''Wildland Fire Management'' and ''FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund'' will be obligated within 30 days.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for assistance to or through the Agency for International Development in connection with forest and rangeland research, technical information, and assistance in foreign countries, and shall be available to support forestry and related natural resource activities outside the United States and its territories and possessions, including technical assistance, education and training, and cooperation with United States, private organizations, and international organizations.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service up to $5,000,000 shall be available for priority projects within the scope of the approved budget, which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps and shall be carried out under the authority of the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993, Public Law 103–82, as amended by Public Lands Corps Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2005, Public Law 109–154.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, $4,000 is available to the Chief of the Forest Service for official reception and representation expenses.

Pursuant to sections 405(b) and 410(b) of Public Law 101–593, of the funds available to the Forest Service, up to $3,000,000 may be advanced in a lump sum to the National Forest Foundation to aid conservation partnership projects in support of the Forest Service mission, without regard to when the Foundation incurs expenses, for projects on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: *Provided*, That of the Federal funds made available to the Foundation, no more than $300,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That the Foundation shall obtain, by the end of the period of Federal financial assistance, private contributions to match on at least one-for-one basis funds made available by the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to Federal or a non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds: *Provided further*, That authorized investments of Federal funds held by the Foundation may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

Pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of Public Law 98–244, $3,000,000 of the funds available to the Forest Service may be advanced to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation in a lump sum to aid cost-share conservation projects, without regard to when expenses are incurred, on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: *Provided*, That such funds shall be matched on at least a one-for-one basis by the Foundation or its sub-recipients: *Provided further*, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a Federal or non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for interactions with and providing technical assistance to rural communities and natural resource-based businesses for sustainable rural development purposes.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, an amount not to exceed $55,000,000 shall be assessed for the purpose of performing fire, administrative and other facilities maintenance. Such assessments shall occur using a square foot rate charged on the same basis the agency uses to assess programs for payment of rent, utilities, and other support services.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service not to exceed $500,000 may be used to reimburse the Office of the General Counsel (OGC), Department of Agriculture, for travel and related expenses incurred as a result of OGC assistance or participation requested by the Forest Service at meetings, training sessions, management reviews, land purchase negotiations and similar non-litigation related matters. Future budget justifications for both the Forest Service and Department of Agriculture should clearly display the sums previously transferred and the requested funding transfers.

None of the funds available to the Forest Service may be reprogrammed without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the reprogramming procedures contained in the joint explanatory statement of the managers accompanying this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), the Indian Self-Determination Act, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Indian Health Service, $4,034,322,000 together with payments received during the fiscal year pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 238(b) and 238b for services furnished by the Indian Health Service: *Provided*, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts, grant agreements, or any other agreements or compacts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), shall be deemed to be obligated at the time of the grant or contract award and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That $836,685,000 for contract medical care, including $51,500,000 for the Indian Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund, shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, up to $36,000,000 shall remain available until expended for implementation of the loan repayment program under section 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act: *Provided further*, That the amounts collected by the Federal Government as authorized by sections 104 and 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613a and 1616a) during the preceding fiscal year for breach of contracts shall be deposited to the Fund authorized by section 108A of the Act (25 U.S.C. 1616a–1) and shall remain available until expended and, notwithstanding section 108A(c) of the Act (25 U.S.C. 1616a–1(c)), funds shall be available to make new awards under the loan repayment and scholarship programs under sections 104 and 108 of the Act (25 U.S.C. 1613a and 1616a): *Provided further*, That $16,391,000 is provided for the methamphetamine and suicide prevention and treatment initiative and $10,000,000 is provided for the domestic violence prevention initiative and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amounts available under this proviso shall be allocated at the discretion of the Director of the Indian Health Service and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this Act may be used for annual contracts and grants that fall within two fiscal years, provided the total obligation is recorded in the year the funds are appropriated: *Provided further*, That the amounts collected by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under the authority of title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall remain available until expended for the purpose of achieving compliance with the applicable conditions and requirements of titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, except for those related to the planning, design, or construction of new facilities: *Provided further*, That funding contained herein for scholarship programs under the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613) shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts received by tribes and tribal organizations under title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall be reported and accounted for and available to the receiving tribes and tribal organizations until expended: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts provided herein, not to exceed $573,761,000 shall be for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract or grant support costs associated with contracts, grants, self-governance compacts, or annual funding agreements between the Indian Health Service and a tribe or tribal organization pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, prior to or during fiscal year 2012, of which not to exceed $10,000,000 may be used for contract support costs associated with new or expanded self-determination contracts, grants, self-governance compacts, or annual funding agreements: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Indian Affairs may collect from the Indian Health Service, tribes and tribal organizations operating health facilities pursuant to Public Law 93–638, such individually identifiable health information relating to disabled children as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out its functions under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400, et seq.): *Provided further*, That the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund may be used, as needed, to carry out activities typically funded under the Indian Health Facilities account.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, repair, maintenance, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites, purchase and erection of modular buildings, and

purchases of trailers; and for provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a), the Indian Self-Determination Act, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and for expenses necessary to carry out such Acts and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health and facilities support activities of the Indian Health Service, $427,259,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no less than $20,000,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for the planning, design, construction, renovation or expansion of health facilities for the benefit of an Indian tribe or tribes may be used to purchase land on which such facilities will be located: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 shall be used by the Indian Health Service to purchase TRANSAM equipment from the Department of Defense for distribution to the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service may be used for sanitation facilities construction for new homes funded with grants by the housing programs of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2,700,000 from this account and the ''Indian Health Services'' account shall be used by the Indian Health Service to obtain ambulances for the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities in conjunction with an existing interagency agreement between the Indian Health Service and the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 shall be placed in a Demolition Fund, to remain available until expended, and be used by the Indian Health Service for the demolition of Federal buildings.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations provided in this Act to the Indian Health Service shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 at rates not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior-level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of medical equipment; purchase of reprints; purchase, renovation and erection of modular buildings and renovation of existing facilities; payments for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; and for expenses of attendance at meetings that relate to the functions or activities of the Indian Health Service.

In accordance with the provisions of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, non-Indian patients may be extended health care at all tribally administered or Indian Health Service facilities, subject to charges, and the proceeds along with funds recovered under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651–2653) shall be credited to the account of the facility providing the service and shall be available without fiscal year limitation. Notwithstanding any other law or regulation, funds transferred from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Indian Health Service shall be administered under Public Law 86–121, the Indian Sanitation Facilities Act and Public Law 93–638, as amended.

Funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service in this Act, except those used for administrative and program direction purposes, shall not be subject to limitations directed at curtailing Federal travel and transportation.

None of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used for any assessments or charges by the Department of Health and Human Services unless identified in the budget justification and provided in this Act, or approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations through the reprogramming process.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds previously or herein made available to a tribe or tribal organization through a contract, grant, or agreement authorized by title I or title V of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), may be deobligated and reobligated to a self-determination contract under title I, or a self-governance agreement under title V of such Act and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation.

None of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used to implement the final rule published in the Federal Register on September 16, 1987, by the Department of Health and Human Services, relating to the eligibility for the health care services of the Indian Health Service until the Indian Health Service has submitted a budget request reflecting the increased costs associated with the proposed final rule, and such request has been included in an appropriations Act and enacted into law.

With respect to functions transferred by the Indian Health Service to tribes or tribal organizations, the Indian Health Service is authorized to provide goods and services to those entities on a reimbursable basis, including payments in advance with subsequent adjustment. The reimbursements received therefrom, along with the funds received from those entities pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act, may be credited to the same or subsequent appropriation account from which the funds were originally derived, with such amounts to remain available until expended.

Reimbursements for training, technical assistance, or services provided by the Indian Health Service will contain total costs, including direct, administrative, and overhead associated with the provision of goods, services, or technical assistance.

The appropriation structure for the Indian Health Service may not be altered without advance notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For necessary expenses for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in carrying out activities set forth in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, and section 126(g) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, $79,054,000.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

For necessary expenses for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in carrying out activities set forth in sections 104(i) and 111(c)(4) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended; section 118(f) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended; and section 3019 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, $74,039,000, of which up to $1,000 per eligible employee of the Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry shall remain available until expended for Individual Learning Accounts: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in lieu of performing a health assessment under section 104(i)(6) of CERCLA, the Administrator of ATSDR may conduct other appropriate health studies, evaluations, or activities, including, without limitation, biomedical testing, clinical evaluations, medical monitoring, and referral to accredited health care providers: *Provided further*, That in performing any such health assessment or health study, evaluation, or activity, the Administrator of ATSDR shall not be bound by the deadlines in section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for ATSDR to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 2012, and existing profiles may be updated as necessary.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses to continue functions assigned to the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, and not to exceed $750 for official reception and representation expenses, $2,661,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 202 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, the Council shall consist of one member, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, serving as chairman and exercising all powers, functions, and duties of the Council.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 98, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,661,000)''.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,661,000)''.

□ 2020

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about eliminating the wasteful duplication in our Federal Government, specifically dealing with the Council on Environmental Quality. This amendment would eliminate the funding for the Council on Environmental Quality and transfer the savings to the spending reduction account. This amendment will result in about a $2.7 million taxpayer savings.

Specifically, the Council on Environmental Quality, if people aren't familiar with it, is a council of one person with a budget typically around $3 million. Throughout the council's 40-year history, it really has done little to demonstrate additional responsibilities other than what already is being accomplished by the Environmental Protection Agency and NOAA itself. Former Presidents, including President Carter and President Reagan, have proposed reducing the budget for this

council. This council blatantly duplicates the efforts of other Federal agencies, as I already mentioned, the Environmental Protection Agency and NOAA, who are doing an excellent job in these same areas.

This an opportunity to be able to reduce unnecessary waste, duplication, and streamline the bureaucracy and improve agency services to Americans who fund these agencies.

At this critical point in our Nation's history, I recommend that we need to eliminate agencies like this and be able to combine them with existing agencies.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is an organization that was established by President Nixon. It was Bill Ruckleshaus who was the first head of it. What it does is to coordinate the implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act. That act, as I recall, goes back to 1976. 1969. It was President Nixon that put it into effect.

The Council on Environmental Quality does the National Environmental Policy Act reviews, and it's a critical function. In addition to that, it coordinates the environmental programs throughout the Federal Government. If you didn't have CEQ, you'd have to invent it. I know if we didn't have it, we'd be creating it in this appropriations bill because this appropriations bill is replete with requests to the administration to coordinate environmental programs, particularly those related to climate change to avoid duplication. Well, that's the role of CEQ.

The Council of Environmental Quality is very inadequately funded. It's a relative handful of people. So the only thing that I can interpret from this amendment is that it's meant to be punitive. You're hardly saving any money, and what you're doing is eliminating the White House's ability to coordinate environmental programs to continue the same tradition that we have had since Richard Nixon. It's now been 40 years, and no one up till now has thought that the Council on Environmental Quality was not performing an important and valuable function.

I'm surprised that the gentleman would offer the amendment, but I would certainly oppose it. It's one of these things that you're only going to realize the full value of when it's gone. And though the small amount of money to save, this is an organization that, person for person, probably does as much as any other people, even in EPA or any of the other agencies of the government in terms of maintaining a consistent, focused policy on the environment.

I would really hope that this amendment would be soundly defeated. It was funded in the bill. There was no criticism registered in the report with regard to the Council on Environmental Quality.

I know they have been reaching out. They're more than happy to go to any Member's office. They're one of the people that, when you have local issues or State issues, they will respond. They'll explain the intent and purpose of the National Environmental Policy Act. And they want to ensure that the administration's actions are consistent with congressional intent.

This is not the kind of constructive amendment that we would expect to see, and I would really hope that this body would reject it. But I'm stunned that this amendment would have been offered.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I also oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Let me just give you a little more background on what the Council on Environmental Quality does. Its focus is to make government more efficient and more effective, and it does this by interagency working groups and coordination with EEOP and CEQ. And it balances the competing positions, sometimes, even within government coordination. In other words, it makes everybody come around the table and figure out how do we do this the most effectively for the American people.

It brings, as Ranking Member MORAN pointed out, Federal agencies, State and local governments to the table too to say how can we be most effective collaboratively in making our environment work better for America.

Let me give you an example of one of the projects that they're working on, and it's solar energy. Solar energy is booming here in the United States; and if we get solar energy technology right, we will be the leaders for the next generation in how we can have energy efficiency, energy independence through renewable energy.

The Solar Energy Industries Association works with this council. And in the first quarter, the solar industry installed 252 megawatts of new solar electric capacity, 66 percent growth from the same timeframe from 2010. That's 3,000 megawatts of solar electric installed in the United States. That's enough to power 600,000 homes.

They worked with the manufacturing sector, the solar power sector. They worked together, and they caused this 33 percent jump in panel production. With the growth of solar energy, thousands of jobs have been created. In fact, solar energy creates more jobs per megawatt than any other energy source. And according to the Solar Foundation's National Solar Job Census, 93,000 Americans were employed in the U.S. solar industry.

The reason why I bring this up is that not only are they helping to bring everybody around the table to figure out how to move America forward with this; the next thing they do is they work, as I said, with inter-government agencies. So they worked with the Department of Energy to issue loan guarantees for solar projects and manufacturing facilities. That's going to create 26,000 jobs.

They worked with the Department of Veterans Affairs to announce that they will be installing solar panels in their systems in five VA Medical Centers, one in Oklahoma; Temple, Texas; Amarillo, Texas; and in California. Prior to this announcement, the VA had also been awarded dollars for other solar panels in their facilities, and they're seeing that they are being able to control costs and do good things for the environment.

The Department of the Interior has approved solar permits for solar-powered products on public lands that will provide enough energy for 730,000 homes.

The Department of Agriculture actively promotes the deployment of solar energy on farms and ranches working with people and folks out in the private sector. So the list goes on and on.

□ 2030

Coordination is often the key to efficiency. And so I just really think that the Council on Environmental Quality provides America a way forward in making sure that our agencies are talking and being effective with one another when it comes to collaboration on environmental issues. It also reaches out to the local governments, but more importantly, it works in the private sector to create opportunities for jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma briefly to give him a last opportunity to comment.

Mr. LANKFORD. This was a wonderful description that I'm hearing of the responsibility of the Council on Environmental Quality. The problem with it is it's the same responsibilities that EPA has, that the Department of Energy has, that NOAA has. These are executive agencies as well, and to say that you have to create a new executive agency to watch over this executive agency is one of those prime examples of why it's so difficult to be able to combine agencies for efficiency.

We have multiple bureaucracies that are standing out there combining and doing similar functions, and it would save us money. Yes, this is a very small agency, but it's another one of those prime examples why the executive branch has all these multiple agencies doing the same thing, and we have to be able to find ways to be able to combine these.

I understand that we're creating jobs per megawatt in the middle of this, but the reality of this is we've got to be able to find ways to be able to save money.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will point out that the underlying bill reduces CEQ to 2006 levels and caps their full-time equivalence, or their employees, at 2006 levels. So that means that they will have a reduction in force. They will lose three employees.

I might also point out that when I was the general counsel for the Governor in my State, I also ran the Natural Resources Subcabinet. We were actually, at the State level, the mirror image, where I was, of what CEQ does. We were in the position of responding to NEPA documents that were sent to us by the Federal Government from Federal agencies. And as a State, we were attempting to coordinate our responses to NEPA documents for various State agencies—the agency that regulates water, the agency that looks after State land, the agency that does environmental quality in Wyoming, the agency that does State forests, and on and on. And so our Natural Resources Subcabinet was the State equivalent and mirror imagine in the responding avenue to what CEQ is in Washington.

Now, let me give you an example of some of the things that CEQ has coordinated here in Washington and why it makes sense.

We have seen in this debate, earlier, that fighting Asian carp is a priority for the Great Lakes region. Over the past 1½ years, CEQ has brought all the Federal agencies together with the Great Lakes States to combine efforts to fight this invasive specie. So they have coordinated on an interagency, intergovernmental framework. And without the framework, it's hard to pull the Army Corps of Engineers, Department of the Interior, EPA, and these groups together with the States to have a shared response to a multi-State, multijurisdiction, multilevel of government issue like the Asian carp. That is something I believe that makes it appropriate for CEQ's existence to continue.

I understand the frustrations that some people have with it, but, quite frankly, that type of coordination I think could, when managed properly, allow the Federal Government to speak with one voice where their own disparate agencies have different mission statements. So that type of coordination is important.

Mr. Chairman, for those reasons, and for the cuts that have already been undertaken in this bill, I do rise to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I didn't plan on speaking, but I couldn't help after hearing the comments, and I would gladly yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady if she wants to explain further.

I have never heard this used as a measurement before, as a positive measurement, the number of jobs per megawatt for solar power.

Now, I'm from Arizona. I like solar power. It's great. But since when are we using, as a positive, the number of jobs it takes to create a megawatt? Will it be seen as a positive in the future if it takes more jobs to create a megawatt? Is that a good thing for the economy? Is that a jobs program of some type? I mean, it just baffles me sometimes at the arguments that are made as to why we should keep programs like this going and keep spending.

I would be glad to yield time to the gentlelady if she wants to explain that further.

Ms. McCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman.

The point is is that we are creating jobs using less energy, and when we do that, we save energy. But these jobs that are being created are improving our economy, our ability to compete internationally. And these jobs use less energy. So we're not investing in nuclear power plants and we're not investing in coal burning, which leads to—I kind of figured you would want your time back.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentlelady, but that is precisely the opposite of the number of jobs per megawatt. If nuclear creates more energy for fewer jobs and less cost, that's the direction we should go because it's nonpolluting as well. But this notion that we have to keep this going because it just creates jobs and jobs per megawatt, it just baffles me.

I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. We're borrowing 41 cents on every dollar. We ought to save money where we can.

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

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

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

Mr. LANKFORD. 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 Oklahoma will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in carrying out activities pursuant to section 112(r)(6) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, including hire of passenger vehicles, uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902, and for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376, $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (Board) shall have not more than three career Senior Executive Service positions: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the individual appointed to the position of Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) shall, by virtue of such appointment, also hold the position of Inspector General of the Board: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Inspector General of the Board shall utilize personnel of the Office of Inspector General of EPA in performing the duties of the Inspector General of the Board, and shall not appoint any individuals to positions within the Board.

OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation as authorized by Public Law 93–531, $7,530,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act are to be used to relocate eligible individuals and groups including evictees from District 6, Hopi-partitioned lands residents, those in significantly substandard housing, and all others certified as eligible and not included in the preceding categories: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used by the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation to evict any single Navajo or Navajo family who, as of November 30, 1985, was physically domiciled on the lands partitioned to the Hopi Tribe unless a new or replacement home is provided for such household: *Provided further*, That no relocatee shall be provided with more than one new or replacement home: *Provided further*, That the Office shall relocate any certified eligible relocatees who have selected and received an approved homesite on the Navajo reservation or selected a replacement residence off the Navajo reservation or on the land acquired pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 640d–10.

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

PAYMENT TO THE INSTITUTE

For payment to the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, as authorized by title XV of Public Law 99–498, as amended (20 U.S.C. 56 part A), $7,900,000.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by law, including research in the fields of art, science, and history; development, preservation, and documentation of the National Collections; presentation of public exhibits and performances; collection, preparation, dissemination, and exchange of information and publications; conduct of education, training, and museum assistance programs; maintenance, alteration, operation, lease agreements of no more than 30 years, and protection of buildings, facilities, and approaches; not to exceed $100,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for employees, $626,971,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013, except as otherwise provided herein; of which not to exceed $20,137,000 for the instrumentation program, collections acquisition, exhibition reinstallation, the National Museum

of African American History and Culture, and the repatriation of skeletal remains program shall remain available until expended; and including such funds as may be necessary to support American overseas research centers: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein are available for advance payments to independent contractors performing research services or participating in official Smithsonian presentations.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 101, line 10, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $55,624,000)''.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $55,624,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would revert the Smithsonian funding back to the fiscal year 2008 levels. This is simply asking the Smithsonian to tighten their belts, to pull their weight, just like other agencies and departments within the Federal Government are having to do.

Mr. Chairman, this country is broke. We have spent all the money in our bank and then some. We have to prioritize where we can afford to spend money and where we simply cannot afford to. I believe asking the Smithsonian to simply scale back their spending to levels of 2008 is more than reasonable. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the Smithsonian Institution is the world's leading museum complex. People from all over the world come to Washington, oftentimes with the principal intent of seeing the Smithsonian, but it is invariably part of their trip to our Nation's capital. It is something that every Member of the legislative branch should be very proud of. In fact, we should spend more of our time in those museums. They're extraordinary, every single one of them. They tell the story of our Nation's origin. They reflect the evolution of knowledge of the things that are relevant to our very existence.

In addition to the traditional museums along our National Mall, we have a National Zoo—again, known throughout the world. But this amendment that would cut $55 million would wind up eliminating 600 positions from the Smithsonian because 90 percent of the costs of museums are personnel.

□ 2040

We're told that given the existing costs that have continued to increase over the last 4 years, not just personnel but particularly energy costs, the costs of maintaining the world's finest museum complex, that the Smithsonian would have to close at least one if not two major museums, or the National Zoo. It doesn't seem to me that in order to save a relative fraction of a bill—this bill is about $27 billion—in order to save—what is that, half a percent?—that we would want to close one or two of the finest museums in the world.

If you did abolish 600 Federal positions at the Smithsonian, you would also have to pay severance costs and create personnel management turmoil for years. You would be saying to the Smithsonian, which makes us proud for the quality and really the efficiency of its operation, Sorry, but we don't think that you should be a priority. The reality is if you were to ask the Federal taxpayer, not just the people in this region but all over the country how important the Smithsonian is, it seems to me they would make it a priority.

One of the last things we want, it would seem, is that our visitors come from our constituencies, our congressional districts, to Washington, and then we have a sign on the front door of one of the major museums, Sorry, Closed Due to Short-Term Budget Cuts. Now, I trust that that would not be the final reality, but if we were to pass such an amendment when we vote on this, I think it would send a signal. It's a wrong signal. Just as the uncertainty about the debt ceiling is the wrong signal to be sending the rest of the world, for gosh sakes, this is the wrong signal to be sending to the people who work so hard at the Smithsonian to make us proud. It's the wrong signal to send to our constituents. It's the wrong thing to do.

It's kind of shocking that we would have such an amendment, frankly. The committee has looked at every line item, has cut every place they could, with very few exceptions, and we've pointed out those exceptions, but the committee, I'm sure, did not consider closing down one or two of our major museums on the National Mall in order to save a fraction of 1 percent of the cost of this appropriations bill.

So, I would very, very strongly oppose this misguided amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. To follow on the remarks of my good friend from Virginia, I must say, this is almost incomprehensible. The Smithsonian as a collection of museums and zoological park and so forth that my colleague talked about is half the picture, and, indeed, if any of those facilities are closed, there will be a lot of unhappy families from Georgia and Tennessee and Montana and all the 50 States.

But it's a lot more than that. The Smithsonian is a collection of research centers that goes far beyond biplanes and folk art and portraits and jewelry and pandas:

The Smithsonian astronomical observatory, one of the finest collections of research scientists in the world for understanding the workings of our universe.

Barro Colorado Island in Panama, in the middle of the Panama Canal, probably the principal research center for understanding the workings of our biological world.

Oh, yes, there would be a lot of unhappy families if this amendment were to go through, but among those 600 positions that would be lost no doubt would be some of the finest scientists in the United States, in fact, in the world, and there would be a lot of unhappy scientists around the world who would wonder, what in the world were they thinking of? What in the world were they thinking in Washington, D.C., when they cut back on these research efforts?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. I would like to point out that the request for this agency's appropriation under the President's budget was $110 million more than is appropriated and that we as a committee did cut this current budget by $10 million already.

I would also point out something that's more philosophically based and that is my own personal view, and it's shared by many of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle: That we should be funding Federal functions while we are here in Washington and acknowledge that certain functions really can be handled as well or better by the States and that the States created the Federal Government, not the other way around, and so we should be deferring to the States for everything that is not specified either in the Constitution or is purely a Federal function.

The Smithsonian Institution is a purely Federal function. It is something that was given to the United States of America, that the Federal Government and the people of this country through us are stewards of, and I believe it is appropriate as a purely Federal function that we fund it adequately.

Now we have, as I pointed out, reduced its budget during these tough fiscal times, but as something that is purely Federal in its approach and the benefit to our Nation and indeed to the world that is provided by this great gift that was given to the people of the United States of America centuries ago, I do rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is truly one of the less-thought-out amendments, I think, that's been proposed to this bill.

The Smithsonian is truly a gem in this country—ask the American people—if you look at what they are doing and the important role they play.

A lot of people think that it's not important if you don't come to Washington. The Smithsonian doesn't do anything. They only operate some museums here and a few things like that. That's not the truth. The Smithsonian operates all across this country. If you look at what they're doing in digitalization of the things they have in their museum and stuff, and they're reaching out to schools and so forth, it is making an amazing difference. Go on their Web site and see what they're doing in terms of the applications for your iPhone and things like that that are making a difference in people's lives, plus the research that they do on a variety of things around this country is just amazing.

□ 2050

If the gentleman wants to reduce this, and everybody can take a $58 million hit, I guess, but this is $100 million or more below what the President already requested. Another $58 million hit on this would be a substantial hit.

They also raise $158 million in private funds. That tells you that private corporations and citizens all across this country love what the Smithsonian does. And they do a fantastic job. If you want to get the public outraged, slice the Smithsonian's funding so that when someone comes here to visit Washington, maybe a trip that they planned on for quite some time, and their kids want to see the number one thing they came to see, guess what it is. The Air and Space Museum, and the other things that occur here.

But the Smithsonian is so much more than that. Go look at what they do at the National Zoo. Go look at what they do in their collections that they have. This is an incredible organization.

I'm only sorry that in this budget climate, and I appreciate the gentleman's desire to address the budget deficit that we have. Everybody wants to do that. There are some things that we should maintain. The Smithsonian is one of them. So I would hope that not only would the Members of this body vote against this amendment, but that they would vote hopefully unanimously against it and in support of the Smithsonian and the work that they do for this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say I'm the coolest grandmother in this country as far as my grandchildren are concerned, not because I'm a Member of the House of Representatives and have been for 19 years, but because I live within walking distance of the National Zoo. They come here, and they can't get enough of the National Zoo that is sponsored by the Smithsonian. And then when they've had enough of the National Zoo and know they can come back the day after, they are on their way to the Smithsonian; and it depends on their age, and they've developed over the years from wanting the simplest entertainment at the zoo to being very curious and wanting to know more and more.

My 7-year-old grandson who was here over the Fourth of July is committed to be a scientist from what he experienced over his last week and the few times he's been here before.

If you don't have grandchildren, maybe you don't get it. You don't think this is important to the people of this country, but there is nobody who comes into my office of any age who doesn't thank me for the experience they have had at the Smithsonian. I remind them that it is their entity. It isn't ours. They pay for it through their taxes, and they are proud to do that.

I stand here against the amendment and in support of the Smithsonian Institution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FACILITIES CAPITAL

For necessary expenses of repair, revitalization, and alteration of facilities owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institution, by contract or otherwise, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), and for construction, including necessary personnel, $124,750,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $10,000 is for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided*, That beginning in fiscal year 2012 and thereafter, any procurement for the construction of the National Museum of African American History and Culture, as authorized under section 8 of the National Museum of African American History and Culture Act (20 U.S.C. 80r-6), may be issued which includes the full scope of the project: *Provided further*, That the solicitation and contract with respect to the procurement shall contain the ''availability of funds'' clause described in section 52.232.18 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the upkeep and operations of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards, and uniforms, or allowances therefor, for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance, alteration, improvement, and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and purchase of services for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper, $112,185,000, of which not to exceed $3,481,000 for the special exhibition program shall remain available until expended.

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of repair, restoration and renovation of buildings, grounds and facilities owned or occupied by the National Gallery of Art, by contract or otherwise, for lease agreements of no more than 10 years that address space needs created by the ongoing renovations in the Master Facilities Plan, as authorized, $13,938,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or renovation of buildings of the National Gallery of Art may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for the operation, maintenance and security of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, $22,455,000.

CAPITAL REPAIR AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses for capital repair and restoration of the existing features of the building and site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, $13,650,000, to remain available until expended.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 1356) including hire of passenger vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $10,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, $135,000,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts, including arts education and public outreach activities, through assistance to organizations and individuals pursuant to section 5 of the Act, for program support, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 105, line 7, insert ''(reduced by $10,600,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 158, line 25, insert ''(increased by $10,600,000)'' after the dollar amount.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, tonight I am offering an amendment that would reduce funding for the National Endowment for the Arts to fiscal year 2006 levels.

In February, during the consideration of H.R. 1, I offered a similar amendment to cut NEA funding, which the House adopted. The underlying bill funds the National Endowment for the Arts at $135 million which is a $19.7 million reduction from last year's level.

I commend the chairman and the committee for recognizing that this funding has precipitated at an unsustainable rate. Since 2008, the NEA has received increases of over $10 million each year, including $50 million in funding from the stimulus in 2009. These spending increases have coincided with annual trillion dollar deficits.

My amendment would take funding levels back to fiscal year 2006 levels at $124.4 million. If accepted, this cut returns $10.6 million to the spending reduction account.

I want you to know I believe in the fine arts, and of course I know that's defined by individual standards. In the past, I was privileged to serve on a symphony board for a time as the chairman of the finance committee. In my early years, I was brought to the Chicago Symphony Orchestra by my parents, on school trips and otherwise, and appreciate the impact the fine arts can have. Tramping through art museums is not foreign to me as well, and I enjoy much of what I see.

But at a time when our government must cut Federal spending, at a time when our taxpayers cut and fix and repair and alter their own lifestyles and their spending, the primary source of funding for the arts should be through philanthropy, not forcing open the taxpayers' wallet without their choice.

The National Foundation for the Arts does provide benefits to our country and helps fund our true fine arts. However, we are asking them to only fund their true priorities, and they can make those priorities. We know that the public asks questions about some of the programs that the NEA has supported. I'm tempted to, but I will refrain from, giving explicit illustrations of funded programs and projects that they've undertaken with much taxpayer disapproval. But suffice it to say that in recent years the NEA has funded exhibits that disparage religion, promote pornography, and support Presidential campaigns. That is not supported by the general taxpayer and should not be.

My amendment asks the NEA to only fund their true priorities. Now, if they want to determine those priorities, so be it. But if they want to determine priorities for youth concert series or young composers or you name it, that will be a choice as well, and I think most taxpayers would support those choices.

Our country is in financial hardship. The sponsors of the arts should be sponsors of the arts, as I am. But taxpayers ought to know that we will expect them, like the rest of the programs and certainly the rest of society, to be efficient at this time. Our country is in a financial hardship, and we're not taking programs like the NEA off the table; we're just asking them to establish priorities with reduced funding, yes, but an opportunity to efficiently convey to the taxpayers their understanding of what we're going through as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

□ 2100

We're a great country. Great countries understand the importance of the arts. They understand that it's important not only to communicate with one another but to leave a lasting legacy for future generations. The arts have the ability to communicate the most fundamental aspirations of mankind. They have the ability to evoke compassion. They have the ability to evoke the kind of spiritedness that causes countries to show undaunted courage and to rise above the problems of the day in pursuit of far more noble national objectives.

The value of the arts transcends anything that we can quantify in terms of dollars and cents. We should be extraordinarily proud of our National Endowment for the Arts. Denyce Graves, who is one of the finest opera singers in the world, who can stir the emotions just by hearing her beautiful, extraordinary voice, said that she grew up in Washington, where the Kennedy Center is. But it could have been the other end of the world if she had not been able to get into a program funded by the National Endowment for the Arts.

There are any number of men and women, young, middle-aged, old, who have come into contact because of the outreach that the National Endowment for the Arts has provided. And there are any number of communities across the country who, by use of the arts—by setting up a theater, by pulling people together, by getting a small amount of money from the NEA, which is far more an endorsement than it is financial support—have been able to develop local economies.

We've heard from a number of big-name performers now who said they got their entry, the development of their career through the NEA. Some gave back by developing a theater in communities that they thought had seen their best days behind them. And yet by uniting the community, it's clear now their best days are ahead of them because young people want to stay in that community. They're excited about the arts that are provided.

This program does so much with so little. Yet the gentleman wants to cut $10.6 million. That's 0.03 of 1 percent of nondefense domestic discretionary funding. We had $174 million in the fiscal year 2011 bill. It was cut down to $155 million, ultimately, for FY11. Now it's been cut another $20 million—down to $135 million.

I know my good friend from Idaho, the chair of the committee, wishes and knows it should be more. I think most of us, when we reflect, understand that if we continue to take money from programs that provide so much to, really, the heart and the soul of this Nation, we will lose those instruments we have to reduce the harshness and the rancor that divide us. It's the powerful media of the arts that enable us to transcend our differences, to appreciate real beauty, and the truth that comes through the fine arts and the grace that ennobles the human spirit.

NEA is a catalyst. It helps us create and sustain arts. It doesn't really fund much. What it does is to spawn the arts. It generates investment in the arts. In fact, the gentleman mentioned philanthropy. There's a great deal of money out in this country. We're still the wealthiest country in the world, no matter how much people would like us to think that we're poverty-stricken, that we're seeing some of our worst days. We're a great and powerful and wealthy Nation. Philanthropy is the principal source of funding of the arts. But NEA shapes much of that funding. It's a magnet for businesses. Almost 700,000 businesses are involved in creation and distribution of the arts.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MORAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MORAN. I do think that it's important that we make this nominal investment in the cultural lives of our citizens and in our children's futures. I can't imagine how a Nation as rich and prosperous as ours would not consider it a priority to provide funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

There's too much that divides us as a Nation. This is something that should be uniting, Democrat and Republican, liberal and conservative. Everyone can appreciate the arts because it inspires us all. It inspires us to look past the parochial, the small-mindedness to see the big picture and to appreciate greatness.

This amendment should be defeated, and in it we should send a message that we understand what's important to the lifeblood of our national community.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Walberg amendment. First, let me associate myself with the words of my good friend from Virginia and his comments on this. The Walberg amendment would return the NEA funding to the 2006 levels of $126 million. The National Endowment for the Arts—the NEA—is funded in this bill at $135 million, which is a $20 million reduction from the fiscal year 2011 enacted level, a $32.5 million reduction from the fiscal year 2010 enacted level, and a $10 million reduction from the fiscal year 2008 enacted level.

I was asked earlier by a Member if I would support just going back to the 2008 level. We could do that but we'd have to add another $10 million into it. And we, frankly, just don't have it. This would take it back to the 2006 level, as I said. Overall, the committee has cut $2.1 billion in this bill from the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. This is on top of the $2.6 billion we cut from the bill earlier this year.

I think this amendment is excessive. But I will tell you that for some people, voting against any funding for the arts is okay with them. I'm not suggesting that that's what the sponsor of this amendment is proposing. He's only proposing a reduction in this. But there are Members who believe that the Federal Government or a State government—no government—should be involved in the arts at all. I disagree.

When we ran into problems several years ago before I was here—maybe it was when Mr. MORAN was here; I can't remember—but they ran into some controversies with the arts and the funding for individual artists that they've done. Since then, the Interior Appropriations Committee has done, working with the NEA, some reforms. So we don't fund individual artists. We fund what the intent is, I think, of the National Endowment for the Arts, and that is to get the arts out to the rest of America. If you're sometimes in a large city and that type of thing, you have access to arts. But when you're in Salmon, Idaho, you don't have access to the arts like they do in some of the other areas.

So one of the things I've been focused on in working with Chairman Landesman is making sure the arts get out to rural America so that they have an opportunity to see these art performances, whether they're the visual arts or the performing arts or other things. But we need to get them out to rural America. If you want to come to Boyce, Idaho, you will have missed Boyce, Idaho, in the summer if you don't go to the Idaho Shakespeare Festival, partly funded by a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.

□ 2110

Yes, they raise private funds and have sponsorships and other things, but part of their funding comes from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Chairman Landesman was out in Idaho last spring, I guess it was, and we toured around Idaho and looked at some of the arts programs, at the local arts agencies that receive some funding from the NEA, and we looked at the impact it had on their operations. We also went to Jerome High School where the actors who did their performances in Boise City, at the Idaho Shakespeare Festival, toured the schools and gave performances to students. Then they sat there afterwards and talked with the students about what it was to be in the performing arts—how you get into it, what the pluses and minuses of it were, and other things. They helped educate these students in these communities. It's a very important thing.

There are a variety of very popular programs in this bill which are popular on both sides of the aisle. The American Jazz Masters program, the Heritage Fellowships, The Big Read program, and Shakespeare in American Communities have their funding maintained, not at the previous levels, but at a level so that they can maintain these very popular programs. The chairman has introduced a new program that we're working with him on—exactly how it would work and what it would be—called Our Town, which is how the arts can help transform local communities and other things through a grant program, so we've been working with him.

I will tell you that the arts are important, and I think having a Federal investment in the arts is an important thing to have.

Mr. WALBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I just want to make it clear because, as I've listened to the opposition to this, it appears one didn't catch my train of thought. I'm not saying that arts or the NEA is wrong. I'm saying it's time to make priority decisions.

Certain priority decisions, as recently as November of 2010, fund programs such as Fire in the Belly—I won't go into the full description of it—and Hide and Seek, which can be considered pornography and which was, in fact, portrayed as that in an exhibit. Those are things that are priority decisions.

So I'm saying it is time, if we're funding those, to give the taxpayer a break and say, if you want to attend those or support those, do it through philanthropy or do it through initial sponsorships themselves but not through the taxpayer.

Mr. SIMPSON. In reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's concern. The Hide and Seek program, as the gentleman mentioned, was not an NEA program. It was not funded by the NEA, and that was not part of the NEA.

We have a tendency to think that anything that's done in this country or in this State or in this community that is done in the name of arts is done by the NEA. That's not the truth. So, when we attack them because of Hide and Seek, that's just not an accurate statement.

Again, there have been times in the past when there have been criticisms of the NEA, mainly because of the individual artist funding that went on. The committee has addressed that, and they have made reforms in working with the NEA to make sure that those types of things are not funded in this bill and that we don't fund individual artists. The main funding of the program is to get the arts out into the rural communities. Like I said, the American Jazz Masters program and The Big Read program are all vitally important programs that, I think, the American people like and that, I think, Members on both sides of the aisle like.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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. REED) having assumed the chair, Mr. PAULSEN, 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. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 627, BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–184) on the resolution (H. Res. 375) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 363 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. 2584.

□ 2115

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. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment,

and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. PAULSEN (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, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) is pending, and the bill had been read through page 105, line 13.

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The National Endowment for the Arts has a 40-year history of investing in communities across the country to expand access to the arts. The NEA has awarded 2,400 grants, spanning communities in all 435 congressional districts.

The proposed cuts to the NEA would have a crippling effect on a program that has been proven to work. Often when I talk about the arts and how I feel about them, I always say how thankful I am to be able to work in an art building that is a masterpiece, but I'm going to be practical tonight. All we're interested in is money, and that's what I'm going to talk about. I hope that people will pay attention to what we get for that little bit of money.

In FY 2010, the Federal Government invested $167.5 million in the NEA for the purpose of providing funding to nonprofit arts organizations. That funding created $166.2 billion in total economic activity, supported 5.7 million jobs, and—listen to this one—generated to the U.S. Treasury $12.6 billion in tax revenue. That does not include the State tax revenue or the local tax revenue. So we spent $167 million and got back $12.6 billion.

I defy anybody in here to tell us that we get that kind of return on any money we spend here. I wish we could find more ways to multiply our money by such a magnitude while enhancing the public good at the same time. Investment opportunities like these are few and far between, and we should be expanding our investment in such a successful program, not cutting its funding to the bone.

I am the proud co-chair of the Congressional Arts Caucus, a group that has supported the NEA for almost 30 years. The Arts Caucus is composed of 186 dedicated, bipartisan Members who are committed to the growth and the success of the arts. Why? Because the arts make a difference.

The NEA reached its peak level of funding in fiscal year 1992, but it has never fully recovered from a 40 percent cut in fiscal year 1996 when, once again, people mischaracterized the work of the NEA. We have seen progress with increasing NEA funding since fiscal year 2008, but just last year, the NEA was forced to deal with a crippling cut again to its annual budget. If this year's appropriations bill takes effect, the NEA will have had its budget cut by 20 percent in just the last few months. These cuts are not sustainable and do great harm to the success of the arts sector across the country.

There is widespread national support for the NEA and the arts, including from companies like Westinghouse and Bravo. Actually, what really happened so much for us that was so good was when Bravo and Westinghouse particularly said they would rather hire people who had backgrounds in art because of what they were able to do—their innovation and using both sides of the brain. Bravo was wonderful, advertising all the time how important arts are to the children in this country. The bipartisan U.S. Conference of Mayors made art a priority in their 10-point plan, saying Federal resources must also be invested in nonprofit arts organizations through their local arts agencies with the full funding of the Federal arts and cultural agencies.

□ 2120

In addition, I have a letter from 26 national art organizations urging Congress to prevent any further reduction to the investment in our Nation's arts and culture infrastructure, which I would like to submit for the RECORD.

The simple truth is that funding of the arts creates jobs. There are 756,007 arts-related businesses in the United States that employ 3 million people. In my district, there are 1,229 arts-related businesses that employ 15,864 people. And remember what's already been said so well by Mr. SIMPSON is that this is seed money from the National Endowment of the Arts which brings in other money—public money, private money—which is terribly important to make these programs survive. And these programs, as I've already pointed out, are an economic gold mine. They employ creative workforce, they spend money locally, they generate government revenue, and are a cornerstone of tourism and economic development.

Along with creating and supporting jobs, the arts provide job skills to our Nation's youth—this is very important to understand—that are marketable to the innovative companies that drive our economy and push America to the forefront in the global marketplace. I've already mentioned Westinghouse, but there are many more.

Exposure to the arts fosters learning, discovery, and achievement in our country. This is, again, simply a fact. Research has proven participation in arts education programs stimulate the creative, holistic, subjective, and intuitive portions of the human brain.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. SLAUGHTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. For example, from what we've been told by the University of California-Davis, the only doctors who really understand what they hear in a stethoscope are those who have studied music. High school music students score 102 points higher on the SATs than their peers. Students with 4 years of art in high school obtain 57 points more on their SAT.

So we're making an investment in our students and our future.

But they play other important roles elsewhere in the economy.

Businesses are attracted to communities with a strong arts sector. And we see that everywhere there is art in existence, the presence of the arts can revitalize rural areas, inner cities and areas struggling with poverty. Cultural tourism brings in $192 billion every year to the U.S. economy.

Listen to those figures. I hope to goodness everybody is as impressed as I am.

Furthermore, American arts are an important export for our country, bringing in $30 billion more every year.

One statistic that I found particularly telling is that in 2010, the attendance at three New York museums—the Met, MoMA, and the Guggenheim—exceeded the attendance of all of the New York professional sports teams, all of them combined, by over 300,000 visits. People are interested in arts due in part to the NEA, and they come again and again and bring their families.

Along with all of this is a great intrinsic value that we know. I really must say that a lot of people think that art is not important, and they don't think about it or what it does to the human spirit. Art in so many ways tells us who we were, who we are, and who we hope to be. And if you think you're not affected by it, tell me what happens to you when you hear ''Taps,'' ''Amazing Grace,'' ''America the Beautiful,'' and the stirring that it gives in your whole person and makes you want to be better than you are.

Please, please don't decimate this program in which we invest so little but get back so very much.

JULY 25, 2011.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, as the FY12 Interior Appropriations bill comes to the floor for consideration by the full House, we write to urge you to prevent further cuts to funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). The direct federal investment in the artistic capacity of our nation supports thousands of jobs, strengthens communities, improves lifelong learning, and boosts this country's international competitive advantage.

Every U.S. Congressional district benefits from an NEA grant, leveraging additional support from a diverse range of private sources to combine funding from government, business, foundation, and individual donors. The NEA awarded almost 2,400 grants in those districts in FY 2010. The NEA has provided strategic leadership and investment in the arts for more than 40 years. Americans can now see professional productions and exhibitions of high quality in their own hometowns. Among the proudest accomplishments of the NEA is the growth of arts activity in areas of the nation that were previously underserved or not served at all, especially in rural and inner-city communities.

Nationally, there are 668,267 businesses in the United States involved in the creation or distribution of the arts that employ 2.9 million people including visual artists, performing artists, managers, marketers, technicians, teachers, designers, carpenters, and workers in a wide variety of trades and professions. By direct grants and through allocations to each state, NEA dollars are distributed widely to strengthen the arts infrastructure and ensure broad access to the arts for communities across the country.

The NEA funds school-based and community-based programs that help children and youth acquire knowledge and understanding of, and skills in, the arts. The NEA also supports educational programs for adults, collaborations between state arts agencies and state education agencies, and partnerships between arts institutions and educators.

We understand fully the shared sacrifice that we all must make in order to help get our Nation's fiscal house in order. But funding for the National Endowment for the Arts was already reduced by $12.5 million in FY11, and the FY12 Interior bill currently includes an additional $20 million in funding cuts. We urge you to prevent any further reduction to the investment in our nation's arts and culture infrastructure when the Interior Appropriations bill is considered on the House floor.

Sincerely,

American Architectural Foundation, American Association of Museums, American Federation of Musicians, American Institute for Conservation of Historic & Artistic Works, American Music Center, Americans for the Arts, Association of Art Museum Directors, Association of Performing Arts Presenters, Chamber Music America, Chorus America, College Art Association, Dance/USA, Fractured Atlas, League of American Orchestras, Literary Network, Local Learning: The National Network for Folk Arts in Education, National Alliance for Media Arts & Culture, National Alliance for Musical Theatre, National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, National Association of Latino Arts and Culture, National Council for the Traditional Arts, National Performance Network, OPERA America, Performing Arts Alliance, Society for the Arts in Healthcare, Theatre Communications Group.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. In Congress, we have to, of course, responsibly cut spending, but at the same time we also have to make the necessary investments that create jobs now, guarantee the future strength of our economy, and renew the vitality of our communities. And that's why we should absolutely reject this effort to further reduce the investment, our Nation's investment, in the National Endowment for the Arts.

Our targeted Federal investment in the arts through the NEA is very modest and is really crucial to spurring the contributions of corporate and foundation partners through their support through philanthropy, sponsorships, and volunteerism that help to sustain and leverage arts investments in communities all across this country.

This investment in the arts becomes all the more important during a time when States and cities all across this country face greater and greater fiscal constraints and at the same time are searching for opportunities to leverage Federal dollars and to spur economic development and job creation.

I represent a State that has realized an extraordinary return on investments generated by the arts. In Rhode Island, the presence of the arts is really sown into the fabric of our communities and of our economy. According to recent data from Americans for the Arts, in just the First Congressional District, in my district alone, more than 1,400 arts-related businesses employ nearly 6,000 people, and that represents more than 5 percent of the businesses in my district.

As the former mayor of Providence, I've seen firsthand the economic impact of the arts and the power of art to transform people and places.

I know the benefits of the arts in enriching our communities and uniting them as well. Arts nourish our soul.

The United States Conference of Mayors sent a letter to Members of Congress urging us to protect funding in the arts and to reject this amendment, recognizing that arts create jobs and produce tax revenues, that arts put people to work, and that arts attract tourism revenue. Arts in the creative industries are an enormous part of what fuels our local economies, bringing hundreds of thousands of visitors to our cities, generating activity in restaurants, hotels, transportation, and hospitality services.

This activity not only strengthens the vitality of our communities, it generates revenues for State and local governments. Across our country, the arts industry provides much more than aesthetic benefits. It creates meaningful economic benefits and opportunities.

During this period of budget austerity, we shouldn't neglect those investments with a proven positive rate of return. We shouldn't siphon off the fuel that helps power the American arts industry, a sector of our economy comprised of more than 750,000 businesses, employing nearly 3 million people nationwide, and generating more than $166 billion in economic activity.

Cutting the National Endowment for the Arts undermines our responsibility to create jobs and grow our economy, and diminishes us as a Nation.

As one study demonstrates, when we consider the overall direct Federal cultural spending of $1.4 billion, we're achieving a return on investment that's nearly 9 to 1. If we're really serious about strengthening our economy, putting more Americans back to work, and reining in our deficit, then we have to be smart about our investments and about our reductions.

With estimates indicating that every dollar of Federal funds invested in the arts generates $9 in economic benefits, further reductions to the National Endowment of the Arts are counterproductive and, in fact, will move our Nation backwards. It moves us backwards not only in the effect that we lose the immediate economic return on the investments, but this cut also pushes our country further behind our competitors and the global economy.

It was one of the great giants of the United States Senate, the great and passionate leadership of Rhode Island Senator Claiborne Pell, that led to the creation of the National Endowment for the Arts in 1965, the program that we're fighting to defend today. In 1963, Senator Pell opened hearings on preliminary legislation on this issue by stating, ''I believe that this cause and its implementation has a worldwide application, for as our cultural life is enhanced and strengthened, so does it project itself into the world beyond our shores.

''Let us apply renewed energies to the very concepts we seek to advance, a true renaissance, the reawakening, the quickening, and above all, the unstunted growth of our cultural vitality.''

In those words Senator Pell said clearly that this disinvestment that we're discussing today for the National Endowment for the Arts nearly 50 years later is a stark and appalling contrast to the renaissance and reawakening embodied in the National Endowment for the Arts.

For too long, the arts have been the first target for spending cuts in our public schools and here at the Federal level. It is at our own economic peril that we continue to deprive our youth and our communities of their connection to the arts.

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

□ 2130

Mr. CICILLINE. I ask unanimous consent to be given 1 additional minute to conclude.

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

Mr. WALBERG. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. As sure as Wednesday follows Tuesday, you can count on congressional Republicans to propose gutting programs benefiting the arts and humanities. It's as predictable as it is irresponsible and unwise. It's the same old penny-wise, pound-foolish approach we have come to expect from a party that wants to spend lavishly on corporate giveaways while cutting just about every initiative that empowers the American people and improves lives and our communities.

I can't believe that while the Nation stands on the brink of default, while Republican stubbornness puts us less than a week away from economic calamity, we're having a debate about funding for the arts that represents 3

cents, 3 cents for every $100 of nonmilitary discretionary spending. Three cents, Mr. Chairman.

Believe me, the budget for the National Endowment for the Arts isn't breaking the bank. Grants to support museums and theater companies are not what caused a huge deficit, and cutting them will not put us on a fiscally responsible course. In fact, investments in the arts more than pay for themselves. For every $1 spent on arts programs, the country gets back $9 in economic benefit.

My friends on the other side of the aisle love to make arts funding a scapegoat. They never miss an opportunity to turn a spending debate into a culture war referendum on art. But let's be clear: The arts represent a vital economic industry, a mainstream employer of millions of Americans, and an integral part of a functioning society. The nonprofit arts sector generates more than $12 billion in tax revenues and more than $166 billion in economic activity every single year.

Communities that have a vibrant artistic life are magnets for tourism and new businesses that create jobs. There's also evidence that communities that embrace the arts tend to have higher real estate values, more civic activities and volunteerism, less crime, and lower poverty rates.

The arts are also a critical ingredient in the development of our children, with research showing that students receiving arts education perform better academically and are more likely to succeed in life.

But despite all the ways that arts support the common good, Republican leaders want to cut NEA. Instead, Mr. Chairman, I think it's time we cut Big Oil subsidies and cut loopholes for corporate jet owners. Arts programs have already taken a budget hit in recent years and are trying to do more with less. If we can give billions in subsidies to oil companies that are already raking in record profits, then surely we can maintain modest investments in the nonprofit arts sector that makes a vital contribution to American life.

Let's stop blaming small agencies for a fiscal crisis that was caused by three wars and tax cuts for the people who need them the least. Let's maintain robust funding for NEA.

With that, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlewoman.

For too long the arts have been the first target for spending cuts in our public schools here at the Federal level. It is at our own economic peril that we continue to deprive our youth and our community of their connection to the arts. I have seen on so many occasions the power of music and dance and theater to ignite the imagination of a young person, that causes them to stay in school, to follow their passion, and ultimately to realize their dreams.

Today's global economy demands an even greater level of creativity, innovative thinking, and entrepreneurship, a 21st century skill set that is enhanced by exposure to the arts in learning and in daily life. I participated in an arts education roundtable with CEOs from all across the country who said that those skills of creative problem solving, of innovation, of entrepreneurship were skills they were looking for in the workers of the 21st century. And the arts nourishes and enhances those skills.

We cannot underestimate the importance of maintaining critical Federal funding for our arts to fuel our national economic recovery, to grow our local economies, to teach our children, and to expand our civic discourse during these trying economic times.

I strongly urge my colleagues to reject further reductions to the National Endowment for the Arts because now, more than ever, we need the National Endowment for the reawakening, quickening, and unstunted growth of not only our cultural vitality but of our economic prosperity as well.

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

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, when we, in this House, decide how the taxpayers' money is going to be spent, it represents a statement of our values, a statement of our priorities. And the question of whether we should adequately fund the National Endowment for the Arts is one of those that speaks loudly to our values. It speaks loudly to our respect for the creative genius of human beings. It speaks loudly about our understanding of what the human soul is about.

We've heard much documentation of the economic impact of the arts throughout our country, $165 billion annually in economic activity. I certainly can attest to the fact that in my community of Louisville, Kentucky, more than 20,000 of my constituents are involved actively, professionally in the arts. We are one of the only communities that has resident theater, resident opera, ballet, children's theater, a vibrant visual arts community. It is one of the things that significantly enhances the quality of life in my community. It's one of those things that brings people to my community. So the economic importance of the arts is undeniable.

But I ask again about our priorities. The amount of money that we're talking about now, roughly $10 million over a period of years, we spent in the first few minutes of our activity in Libya. The first few Tomahawk missiles we launched there, that was $10 million. We spend $10 million in less than 1 hour in Afghanistan, less than 1 hour. So here we're talking about millions of jobs supported by funding from the National Endowment for the Arts, $165 billion in economic activity, against all of the other things we do where there is so little payback for where we spend the taxpayers' money.

There are two things I would like to mention in addition to kind of the value-added aspects of arts funding.

If you think back over the history of mankind, what has survived of the great civilizations of this world? The only thing that has survived has been the creative product of the minds of men and women throughout history. Literature, music, architecture, paintings, sculpture, these are the only things that have survived.

□ 2140

If you look around this glorious room that we have the privilege of serving in—famous painting of George Washington, Lafayette, the architecture that's represented here—this is all the creative product of the men and women of generations. This is what our soul speaks to the world, to generations to come, and this is what we're talking about funding.

One of the greatest exports that we have from this country is our cultural product. We export music; we export film; we export drama, theater, all of these things, activities funded by the National Endowment for the Arts. So when we say to our taxpayers, our constituents, what are your values, we can say, you know, those Tomahawk missiles are wonderful.

And I certainly understand that we need to defend our country. But when we talk about our contributions to the history of mankind, humankind, it is undeniable that what we invest, the small amount we invest in supporting our creative genius, will be paid back many, many times over.

So I am proud to stand here and support funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, opposing the Walberg amendment, which would further cut the funding that has already been substantially reduced, and stand for the values of the millions and millions of men and women and children who not only participate in artistic activities, but also benefit immeasurably through an enhanced quality of life in our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, last month I gathered almost 200 individuals interested in the arts and humanities to discuss National Endowment for the Humanities and National Endowment for the Arts programs. The turnout was impressive. But considering their eagerness to win endowment grants, it was also a reminder of how tight funding is for these critical programs.

My friend, poet Paul Muldoon, read some poetry to the attendees and reminded all, in his words, the NEA and the NEH are not properly funded. It is a national disgrace. Now, that was before the amendment that is here tonight that would cut the NEA even further.

The NEA and the NEH help ensure a well-rounded education, and result in a well-rounded society. Now, of course the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities are different, but they are similar in what they bring to our Nation.

The arts and humanities inspire our children to explore their own creativity and encourage positive development in the course of their educational careers. The arts and humanities are a fundamental component of our society and they, indeed, warrant Federal funding. The arts and humanities help us know ourselves as a people.

Just a few weeks ago, here on this floor, the House approved a bill that increased the spending for the Department of Defense by $17 billion. The total funding for the endowments is hardly more than a percent of that increase in defense spending that was passed. Talk about misplaced priorities.

I'm reminded of the often told exchange between Scientist Robert Wilson, the Director of Fermilab, when he was testifying before the Senate and Senator Pastore. The Senator asked, with regard to a science experiment at Fermilab, whether it would help defend this country against the Soviet Union. Replied Dr. Wilson, no, Senator Pastore, this will not help defend us against the Soviet Union, but it will help make our country more worth defending.

This amendment is based on the premise that arts and humanities are a luxury. The author of this amendment to cut the NEA further says America is impoverished. Mr. Chairman, I'll tell you what would leave America really impoverished is if we strangle the arts and humanities.

We've heard what the arts contribute to our economy. The Americans for the Arts, in its report, Arts and Economic Prosperity, details that the arts support more than 5 million jobs and generate tens of billions of dollars in government revenue.

Arts are good for our cultural development, yes. They are good for our society at large and good for our economic development as well.

I've heard from a number of my constituents on this matter, and nearly everyone has pleaded with me to preserve as much funding as possible for the arts and for the humanities. As one of them said poignantly, ''A Nation without culture is a Nation without a soul.''

I strongly oppose this amendment and other efforts to strangle the arts and humanities in America and to defund the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Our focus today ought to be on jobs. And as some of my colleagues have already said, funding the arts creates jobs. For negligible investments, we create lots of jobs, because not only are the arts supported, but when you have artistic programs, restaurants and other activities generate jobs all over the community.

And our focus ought to be on education. Those children, for example, who are involved in of the arts, do better in school.

Now we're trying to cut funding for the arts in this amendment, and we cannot ignore why all these cuts are necessary. Last December we passed a tax cut of $800 billion, $400 billion a year. Now, we're looking to make cuts. Most of the projections are that we need $4 trillion over the next 10 years in deficit reduction, $400 billion a year. I hope we don't ignore the fact that that's the same number, $400 billion tax cuts a year, and now we're looking for $400 billion spending cuts a year.

So when we talk about cutting the arts, when we talk about cutting Social Security and Medicare and education and everything else, we cannot ignore the fact that all of these cuts are designed to preserve the tax cuts that we passed last December. And so to preserve those tax cuts—many are going to millionaires, multimillionaires, and oil companies—we find ourselves having to deal with this amendment to cut the arts.

Mr. Chairman, we should not be lulled into accepting caps. Caps just delay the inevitable because caps don't cut anything today. But when you start appropriating under the caps, in a few weeks or a few months, we'll find that there's not enough money for the arts, there's not enough money for Head Start, there's not enough money for education or Social Security or Medicare. So when you accept the caps, you're ultimately going to make these cuts.

We don't have any crisis today, Mr. Chairman, because some don't want to increase the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling is a perfunctory responsibility of this Congress. We've already spent the money. The debt ceiling just acknowledges what we've already done. We need to just pass the debt ceiling and get back to the regular order where we make choices.

Do we want to cut Social Security and Medicare and the arts in order to preserve tax cuts, many going to the oil companies and multimillionaires? I hope not, and we should begin by defeating this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. McCOLLUM. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, in Minnesota we understand that the arts are an essential part of our economy and the number of jobs it creates. The arts are so vital to our economy and our development and civic life that in 2008, Minnesotans voted to amend our State constitution to raise money, yes, to tax themselves and dedicate part of the revenue to the arts.

Minnesota is the only State in the country where there's a dedicated public funding source for the arts. In our Constitution, Mr. Chair, we passed a legacy amendment. Hunters, anglers, conservationists, parents, seniors, all came together to say the arts, along with preserving our environment, is integral to our legacy, to our way of life in Minnesota.

In my district alone, the arts employ over 8,000 people. And the arts and the culture industry contributes over $830 million to Minnesota's economy. Investing in the arts makes economic sense, and it's good public policy.

As has been pointed out, for every dollar that is spent by the NEA, $9 in economic activity is generated. We must make tough choices, given this fiscal crisis, and I believe the NEA's budget has been targeted and it has been shrunk enough.

□ 2150

The NEA's budget has been cut 20 percent since 2010. Our artists, poets, writers, musicians, producers, sculptors, singers, dancers, photographers, and actors contribute millions of dollars to our local economy and create a vibrant social space for us to come together. And we hear time and time again from the major corporations and from the start-up companies, from computer companies to health care companies to our universities that it is American creativity and space for the arts that allows America to move forward.

So I strongly oppose this cut, and I reject any further attacks on the NEA's budget.

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

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, you've heard it. I will explain: I rose previously to claim the time in opposition, now I am rising to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if this was not such a late hour, we would have had five or six times as many Members rising in opposition to this amendment. And I trust they reflect the general sentiment of the country.

Winston Churchill, at the height of World War II, was told by his budget director that to conserve money for armaments, they needed to cut the arts. And he turned to him and said, If we do that, what is it that we're fighting for?

The arts reflect the highest aspirations of our humanity. And in fact, in this country, they're a reflection of the true American spirit—our talent, our ability to communicate, our ability to relate to one another.

Now, let me be specific about what this amendment would do, because every single Member of this body has a direct grant from the National Endowment for the Arts going to that congressional district. If this amendment were to pass, more than $100 million in non-Federal matching funds for NEA awards would be lost. The number of Americans reached as a result will decline by 36 million compared to the number of Americans reached by NEA this year. The number of children and youth will decline by 3.6 million, and in fact there will be a near-17 percent decrease in State and regional partnerships.

I think if the Members fully consider the impact of this, they will realize this is one of the most effective Federal Government programs that we have. We have a gentleman whose name is Rocco Landesman. He could be making considerably more than he's making today in income, but he has chosen to devote his time and attention to leading the National Endowment for the Arts. In fact, he has suggested that, given the fiscal situation that confronts us, perhaps we should reduce the number of platforms for artists so as to save money. But he is determined not to reduce the quality of artistic performance in this country.

We have so many talented people, so much potential, and it is the NEA that reaches out and finds that potential all over the country. This is a fully national program. Every single congressional district benefits from grants from the NEA. And those grants expand the economy, the focus of the grant, multiple times—I'm trying to recall the number, I think it's five or six times at a minimum, many times 10, 20 times—the amount of money that is contributed to a particular artistic focus when the NEA decides that it's worthy of getting a grant.

They have maintained their credibility. In fact, when they were under attack in the 1990s, they made sure that every grant passes a very high level of scrutiny. Even though I think most of us don't believe in censorship, they understand all the competing political pressures. They have navigated those political waters. The Our Town program that the chairman of the subcommittee referred to is a terrific program. It really develops the best of what America is all about.

This has been a long night. We have tried to fight the good fight over here against any number of efforts to cut programs, to repeal legislation; but this is one of the most important.

I would urge this body to reject this amendment, to show our support for the National Endowment for the Arts, and really for the phenomenal artistic talent that it underscores and generates in this country.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak of the importance of the National Endowment for the Arts. I would like to thank my friend and fellow Co-Chair of the Congressional Arts Caucus, Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER, for her tireless efforts in advocating for the arts over the years.

Every day we witness the impact of the arts on our society. The arts in America are an integral component to our cultural vibrancy—fostering creativity and bringing together communities. Museums, performing arts centers, galleries, historical societies, and other cultural institutions not only provide significant contributions to the social fabric of neighborhoods and communities, but also provide significant economic contributions. In my home district in Pennsylvania, 1,410 arts-related businesses provide nearly 6,000 jobs. It is for these reasons that I support responsible investments in the NEA.

As our Nation is facing unprecedented financial challenges, it is critical that we address unsustainable levels of spending. To do this all Federal agencies and recipients of Federal dollars must share in making sacrifices. The fiscal year 2012 Interior Appropriations legislation already includes a 13 percent reduction in spending over fiscal year 2011 and a 20 percent reduction over 2010 for the NEA. Accordingly, I ask that my colleagues not support further cuts to the NEA and oppose the Walberg Amendment.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, $135,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $125,000,000 shall be available for support of activities in the humanities, pursuant to section 7(c) of the Act and for administering the functions of the Act; and $10,000,000 shall be available to carry out the matching grants program pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Act, including $8,000,000 for the purposes of section 7(h): *Provided*, That appropriations for carrying out section 10(a)(2) of such Act shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the Endowment under the provisions of subsections 11(a)(2)(B) and 11(a)(3)(B) of such Act during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 105, line 18, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $13,500,000)''.

Page 158, line 258, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $13,500,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities by a mere 10 percent.

I have stood up here and offered amendment after amendment trying to highlight areas of our budget that we can afford reasonable cuts. If you add up all of those modest cuts, the Federal Government could end up saving a significant amount of money. We are facing a fiscal crisis in this Nation, a financial fiasco; and if we can't make the cuts that need to be made, this country is going to go into a total economic collapse.

Now, if someone's broke, they sell their luxury car and get a more efficient one; they stop eating steak and lobster and eat more hamburger and hot dogs. They turn in their membership to the country club. All those things are beautiful things, nice things, luxury things. We have a lot of luxuries that we've been funding through the Federal Government for a long period of time. But, Mr. Chairman, we can't afford to continue doing so because we are in an economic emergency as a Nation. We are broke. We have unsustainable debt. We have unsustainable debt that's going to cause our children and our grandchildren to live at a lower standard than we live today if we keep this up.

Mr. Chairman, in a race a number of years ago, I said Congress was sick; we need a doctor in the House. I'm a medical doctor, and I do addiction medicine. Government needs an intervention for its spending addiction. In addiction medicine we say, if there's no denial, there's no addiction. We've got a tremendous amount of denial about the economic crisis we face in this Nation. We've just simply got to stop the spending.

When a business goes under water, it's overextended as the Federal Government is, what does it do? It lowers its borrowing level—if the lender doesn't do that—it starts trying to figure out how to reduce the debt, and then it goes through every aspect of its expenditures and tries to cut expenses all across the board in every area. The Federal Government needs to do the same.

□ 2200

And then the business will look at how to raise more revenue. Our Democratic colleagues say that we need to raise revenue by raising taxes, but that will just tax away jobs. We must create jobs here in America. We create jobs in America by getting the tax burden and the regulatory burden off the job creators, the small businesses here in America that are suffering and are suffocating with the burden of over-regulation and taxes. We could create more revenue for the Federal Government,

not by raising taxes but by raising taxpayers, and we do that by putting people to work and creating a stronger economy. It's absolutely critical for the future of this Nation. We can't keep going down this road.

The National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, I've heard all the arguments, and for the Smithsonian Institute and other things that a lot of people think are very beautiful and nice, just like that luxury automobile, but we need to stop it. The future of our Nation depends upon it. I'm fighting for America. I'm fighting for the future of our children and my grandchildren. Funding for the National Endowment for the Arts does not need to be a priority in the midst of these trying times, and I urge my colleagues to support a very simple request to reduce its funding by 10 percent.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The Acting CHAIR. State your inquiry.

Mr. MORAN. If the Committee does now rise, an amendment has been offered, would not the body, the Committee of the Whole, take up the conclusion of that amendment when we reconvene on the same bill the next time the bill is brought up, whether it be tomorrow, Friday, or Saturday?

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment will still be pending.

The question is on the motion to rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROUN of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. PAULSEN, 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. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 846. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 1406. An act to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 510 19th Street, Bakersfield, California, as the Myron Donovan Crocker United States Courthouse, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 28, 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:

2610. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Australia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2611. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting draft legislation to authorize collection of fees under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2612. 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 Oregon; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan and Interstate Transport Plan [EPA-R10-OAR-2011-0035; FRL-9425-3] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2613. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Louisiana [EPA-R06-OAR-2007-0924; FRL-9323-7] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2614. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Determination of Termination of Section 185 Fees [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0404; FRL-9430-2] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2615. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [PA200-4203; FRL-9314-6] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2616. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation To Mitigate the Misfueling of Vehicles and Engines With Gasoline Containing Greater Than Ten Volume Percent Ethanol and Modifications to the Reformulated and Conventional Gasoline Programs [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0448; FRL-9428-2] (RIN: 2060-AQ17) received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2617. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0383; FRL-9427-9] received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2618. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, Kern County Air Pollution Control District, and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0198; FRL-9425-4] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2619. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, Kern County Air Pollution Control District, and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0198; FRL-9429-1] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2620. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implemention Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollutions Control District (SJVUAPCD) [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0907; FRL-9428-7] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2621. A letter from the Chairman, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the broadcasting Board of Governors for Fiscal years 2012 and 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2622. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislation the Department requests to be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2623. A letter from the Inspector General, House of Representatives, transmitting Management Advisory Report — Report No. 11-CAO-05; to the Committee on House Administration.

2624. A letter from the Inspector General, House of Representatives, transmitting Audit Report—Report No. 11-CAO-04; to the Committee on House Administration.

2625. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft bill to authorize $2,174,600,000 for Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) major facility construction projects and $49,292,000 for major facility leases for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2626. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Modification of Treasury Regulations Pursuant to Section 939A of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act [TD 9533] (RIN: 1545-BK28) received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2627. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting proposed legislation to collect certain fees under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA); jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Energy and Commerce.

2628. A letter from the Commission, Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan, transmitting Special Report 5, ''Sustainability: hidden costs risk new waste''; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

2629. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve Veterans' health care benefits and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Oversight and Government Reform.

2630. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform, and Education and the Workforce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 375. Resolution Providing for consideration of the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–184). 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. WELCH (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE , Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut):

H.R. 2663. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to increase the statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 2664. A bill to reauthorize the Water Desalination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LEE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POLIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2665. A bill to phase out the use of private military contractors; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 2666. A bill to neutralize the discriminatory effect of any country that employs indirect taxes and grants rebates of the same upon export if United States trade negotiating objectives regarding border tax treatment in World Trade Organization negotiations are not met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2667. A bill to provide for improvements to the administration of bankruptcy in cases under chapter 7 of title 11 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICA, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. REYES, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BACA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 2668. A bill to designate the station of the United States Border Patrol located at 2136 South Naco Highway in Bisbee, Arizona, as the ''Brian A. Terry Border Patrol Station''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FARR, Mr. MORAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 2669. A bill to restrict the use of offshore tax havens and abusive tax shelters to inappropriately avoid Federal taxation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial 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. BROOKS (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARTER, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 2670. A bill to provide that States and local governments may pass laws that identify illegal aliens, deter illegal aliens from entering the United States, apprehend illegal aliens, or encourage or otherwise cause illegal aliens to leave the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 2671. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of an undiagnosed diseases network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H.R. 2672. A bill to clarify the orphan drug exception to the annual fee on branded prescription pharmaceutical manufacturers and importers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2673. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to modify the disposition of qualified treatment qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 2674. A bill to amend section 340B of the Public Health Service Act to improve the provision of discounts on drug purchases for certain safety net providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. PENCE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. KIND, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 2675. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to authorize producers on a farm to produce fruits and vegetables for processing on the base acres of the farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 2676. A bill to lower health premiums and increase choice for small businesses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 376. A resolution calling for the repatriation of POW/MIAs and abductees from the Korean War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power 'To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers.'

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 2664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2665.

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 14), which grants Congress the power to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.''

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section I and Section 8.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 2669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 2670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. ''The Congress shall have the power . . . to establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization . . .''

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 2671.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 2672.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2673.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 2675.

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. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 2676.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, §8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: ''To regulate commerce among foreign nations and the several states.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 85: Mr. COHEN and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 104: Mr. ISSA and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 136: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 157: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 365: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 436: Mr. GOWDY and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 452: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 530: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 563: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 593: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JONES, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 645: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 721: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 748: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 763: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 772: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 831: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 860: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 878: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 942: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1063: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1172: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1179: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1219: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 1283: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 1381: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 1464: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 1546: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1574: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 1588: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1639: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1703: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1736: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 1744: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1780: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1803: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1834: Mr. BOREN, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. HECK.
H.R. 1852: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 1925: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1936: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1955: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2012: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2023: Ms. FOXX and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2033: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2108: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
H.R. 2123: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 2163: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 2164: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2235: Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2249: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 2257: Mr. POSEY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 2271: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2327: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2381: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2402: Mr. HALL.
H.R. 2429: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 2492: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2505: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2529: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2530: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2541: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2544: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2559: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2580: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2592: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2594: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2600: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2607: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2644: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STARK, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 2653: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2659: Mr. OLVER and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.J. Res. 69: Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H. Res. 19: Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Res. 21: Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Res. 295: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H. Res. 342: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. RAHALL.
H. Res. 361: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H. Res. 364: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H. Res. 369: Mr. CONAWAY.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT NO. 73: At the end of the bill (before the short title) add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior for any new oil or gas drilling above the Outer Continental Shelf within 25-miles of the State of Florida.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY MR. LABRADOR

AMENDMENT NO. 74: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop or implement a comprehensive conservation plan under the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.) for the Lake Lowell Unit of the Deer Flat National Wildlife Refuge.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY MR. CARTER

AMENDMENT NO. 75: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce a State emissions reduction obligation in the final rule entitled ''Federal Implementation Plans to Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone in 27 States; Correction of SIP Approvals for 22 States'' (popularly referred to as the ''Cross-State Air Pollution Rule'') signed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency on July 6, 2011, for a State for which the Administrator did not propose a State emissions budget in the proposed rule entitled ''Federal Implementation Plans To Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone'' published in the Federal Register on August 2, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 45210 et seq.).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

AMENDMENT NO. 76: Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $48,206,000)''.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $48,206,000)''.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY MR. LANDRY

AMENDMENT NO. 77: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO REGULATION OF OFFSHORE SERVICE CONTRACTORS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to regulate, under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), any person that is not a lessee under that Act.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

AMENDMENT NO. 78: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to add the lesser prairie chicken to the list of threatened species or endangered species published under section 4(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)).

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2011 No. 114

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal spirit, Your goodness endures continually. Save us by Your name and vindicate us by Your strength. Bend Your ears to the words of our prayer and do not hide from our supplication.

As our lawmakers face difficulty that tests their powers to the limit, shield them from cynicism and faintheartedness. May they not become weary in doing Your will, knowing that they will reap Your bountiful harvest if they faint not. Lord, as our Nation faces the potentially catastrophic, inspire our lawmakers to seek Your counsel which will stand forever. Illumine their pathway that they may not fail.

We pray in Your merciful 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, July 27, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1420

Mr. REID. Madam President, I am told there is a bill, S. 1420, due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1420) to require that the United States Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public, Social Security benefits, and military pay in the event that the debt limit is reached, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to this legislation at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. REID. Madam President, today our Republican colleagues in the House planned to vote on a bill to lift the debt ceiling for a few months before plunging this Nation and its economy back into a state of uncertainty.

What I mean by that is under their legislation, which would extend the debt ceiling for just a few months, and the latest report, because the numbers they have come up with are all wrong, we would come back in September if, in fact, we ever left here, and we would be debating the debt ceiling all over again. What a way to proceed. It is unbelievable they would come up with such a program.

Last night, Speaker BOEHNER pushed back that vote because his legislation did not even have the support of Republicans in his own Chamber. Group after group, from the Republican Study Committee, the Club for Growth, and many organizations have said they simply do not like his legislation.

But pushing back the vote by a day or rewriting parts of the bill will not solve the underlying problem: A short-term solution is not an adequate solution for our economy. Our country, our economy, and the world demand more.

Why do I say the world? Because our economy is the most robust, strongest economy in the world—the history of the world—and for us to fail to pay our debt would throw the world economy into a tailspin.

Even if the Speaker could get his legislation through the House of Representatives, I can assure everyone it would not pass the Senate. And certainly if by some strange phenomenon it passed, the President would not sign it. We do not have to worry about that. There will be no veto. This legislation is so weak that it will not get out of this Chamber.

Rather than lifting what economists call the fog of default, this Republican plan would usher in an era of bad economic weather that could last for years. A few weeks ago, Speaker BOEHNER said it was a terrible idea to merely postpone a default on the national

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

debt or to push the problem down the road for a few weeks or a few months. That is what he said. Back then he was not interested in a short-term solution. Back then he was right.

This is why: Economists, market analysts, and rating agencies have said the world economy simply cannot bear this kind of uncertainty any longer. They have said a short-term solution to the impending default would still result in the loss of our AAA rating that has kept interest rates low in this country and saved consumers money for more than 70 years. So I trust Speaker BOEHNER and other reasonable Republicans understand the seriousness of a default crisis. Here is what the Speaker said very recently:

> That would be a financial disaster not only for our country but for the worldwide economy. You cannot create jobs if you default on the Federal debt.

But a short-term fix does not get the job done. It would cause many of the same calamitous results as a technical default, including rising interest rates that would essentially raise every person's taxes. American families will pay more for their mortgages, car loans, student loans, credit card bills, and everything else. Higher interest rates would not just be costly for consumers, it would also cost the Federal Government more, and would actually increase our deficits and debt—and very quickly.

A less than 1-percent increase in interest rates, which economists have predicted if the United States debt is downgraded, would cost our government more than $100 billion every year. I repeat: It would cost our government $100 billion extra every single year. In a decade, that would cost this country as much taxpayer money as Speaker BOEHNER's proposal would cut from the deficit. In effect, his short-term plan would yield not a single dime of savings. Nothing.

Republicans would like the American public to believe Democrats in Congress and the White House are insisting on a long-term deal for political reasons. They say Democrats want to push this off until after the Presidential election. That is not true. It is not Democrats who have asked for a long-term solution. It is the economy. The economy has demanded it.

If Republicans in Congress are willing to risk our economy by playing politics in July, why would they not do the same in September, October, November, when his proposal—Speaker BOEHNER's proposal—would run out of money? That is why every economist, every market analyst, every rating agency, has insisted any legislation to avert a default on the Nation's debt must take us through the end of 2012.

The Senate is considering a measure that would avert default and cut $2.7 trillion from the deficit. It is a reasonable measure. Republicans have supported every one of its cuts in the past, and it should be able to pass both Houses of Congress with bipartisan support. I have heard a number of my friends on the other side of the aisle come here and say: But they are talking about the overseas contingency fund. The Congressional Budget Office—the nonpartisan watchdog of Congress—has decided that is worth $1 trillion, just what we put in our bill. The Office of Management and Budget said it is worth $1 trillion. The legislation we are projecting gives each side something it wants. It protects Social Security and Medicare without raising a single penny of revenue. And, most importantly, it is a long-term strategy to safeguard the economy and give the markets the stability they need.

Unlike Speaker BOEHNER's legislation, which economists have rejected, it would not put us through all of this again in a few months—probably only a few weeks—and with even less certainty of achieving a compromise than now.

British Prime Minister David Lloyd George said: ''There is nothing more dangerous than to leap a chasm in two jumps.'' That is true. Congress has a duty to do what it takes to avert a national default in one swift leap.

It will take political courage. I urge all of my friends, Democrats and Republicans, to join hands. We can take courage from one another and make that leap together. Because if we do not clear this chasm, our Nation's economy will go over the edge with us.

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. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

DEBT LIMIT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday afternoon the White House issued a Statement of Administration Policy which said that when the legislation Speaker BOEHNER is now revising reaches the President's desk, unnamed senior advisers will recommend that the President veto it.

I have a question for these senior advisers: what about this legislation is so offensive that you would rather see the Nation default on its obligations than have the President sign it into law?

From what I can tell, the only thing in this bill the President has not already expressed his support for either publicly or privately is that it does not get him through his election without having to engage in another national discussion about the debt crisis that has brought us to this point.

So I would ask these senior advisers whether that is a position they want to put the President in. Do they really intend to suggest that he veto the Nation into default for political reasons?

That is how I read the threat. And I think that is how the rest of the country would read it too.

So this morning I would like to reiterate my strong support for Speaker BOEHNER, the House Republican leadership and this plan to prevent default and reduce Washington spending.

I also want to commend the Speaker for his efforts and his determination.

This has not been an easy process, but I hope through it all the Nation sees how hard the Speaker has worked to ensure our Nation avoids calamity while safeguarding the American dream.

The Nation has had a chance to see the Speaker at his best over the past few days.

Unlike the President, he not only put forward actual legislation to prevent this crisis, he is keeping his promise to cut spending more than any increase in the debt limit—with no tax hikes.

What about the President's plan? When asked about the President's plan, his aides point to a speech and a veto threat.

With all due respect, Congress cannot vote on a speech, and a veto threat would not prevent default. The fact is Republicans have offered the only proposal at this point that attempts to get at the root of the problem and which actually has a chance of getting to the President's desk.

That is why we will continue to press for the legislation Speaker BOEHNER has proposed, and that is why we will fight against anything that pretends to solve the problem but doesn't—including the bill from Senate Democrats that proposes the largest debt limit increase in history, while falling $½ trillion short on the cuts it claims to provide.

This crisis our Nation faces at this moment has a very simple cause and is easily understood: Washington spends a lot more money every year than it takes in. Do that every year and the debt piles up. Now we have reached the point where our deficits and debt are so large they are suffocating job growth, threatening the wider economy, and imperiling entitlements.

It took more than two centuries for Washington to amass a debt of $10.6 trillion. But just 2½ years after President Obama swore the oath of office, it is higher by more than one-third. Based on the President's actual policies, the situation is expected to get much worse.

In just 5 years' time, under President Obama's budget plan, the Federal Government will spend almost as much money just to cover the interest on its debt as it will on national defense. Over the next 10 years, the President's policies will add more than $9 trillion to the debt.

This is why S&P revised its long-term credit outlook for the United States, not because we haven't authorized the President to spend more

money but because he is asking for so much of it.

Yet, incredibly, the President's budgets would do nothing to reverse this trend. So he can claim to be interested in a solution, but what he put on paper makes the problem worse.

Right now, the President is asking Congress to raise the debt ceiling by more than it has ever been raised before in our history—even as the Nation is teetering on the edge of a crisis caused by that very debt.

Let me repeat, our Nation is facing a crisis because of the size of our debt, and the President of the United States, the man Americans elect to be the steward of our economy, is threatening to veto any bill that doesn't add more than $2 trillion to the debt ceiling, the largest increase in history.

The President is not taking a stand on cuts. He is not taking a stand on reform to entitlements. He is not insisting on reforms. Forget all that. What he wants more than anything else is more room under the debt ceiling to get him through the election. He has said that is his bottom line.

I remain as committed as ever to resolving this crisis in a way that will allow us to avoid default without raising taxes and to cut spending without budget gimmicks.

There is only one option that does that and that is the one Speaker BOEHNER has proposed, and that is being improved as we speak.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the second half.

The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

THE DEBT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, yesterday, I came to the floor to talk about where we have been, where we are and where we are going and to discuss how we are going to get out of this mess. I pointed out the President's disappointing record when it comes to the debt issue.

The President originally requested a clean debt ceiling increase that didn't have any spending reductions attached to it. He then submitted a budget that failed to ever balance, and this budget didn't include the recommendations from the Simpson-Bowles commission he had appointed to come up with some suggestions about how to put our country on a more sustainable fiscal path.

According to the CBO, his budget didn't even meet his metric of primary balance, which is balancing the budget not including interest costs. After realizing House Republicans were the only ones with a plan to balance our budget and pay down the debt, President Obama decided to give a speech. Of course, it was just a speech. It did not include numbers. He didn't resubmit his budget, despite requests to do so. He just gave a speech.

As they say, talk is cheap. We need action. The only action he promised, though, is that he will veto plans that would do something to address our debt and deficit problems.

Earlier this month, the administration issued a veto threat for the cut, cap, and balance bill. This was a reasonable proposal that immediately cut spending, put a cap on spending, and would have raised the debt limit after a balanced budget amendment was approved by the Congress.

In fact, this was so reasonable that, according to a CNN poll, 66 percent of the people in this country supported this plan. This bill garnered the support of 234 Members of the House of Representatives, including 5 Democrats. But Senate Democrats voted to table the bill after this veto threat was issued by the President.

So Speaker BOEHNER in the House of Representatives unveiled yet another plan. It certainly isn't perfect, but it begins to deal with our spending problem while also increasing the debt limit to provide a period of time for Congress to pass more substantial budget savings.

Unfortunately, the administration issued a veto threat for this bill. Their reasoning? It doesn't extend the debt limit past the election.

It doesn't take a genius to figure out why. It is not because the markets require a longer term increase; they don't. It is not because Congress generally approves long-term increases in the debt limit; we don't. It is not because a long-term increase would force us to cut more spending; it would not. It is because the President has to face reelection next year. That is it—nothing more, nothing less. It is a political consideration, not an economic one.

So after months of fearmongering about the risk of not raising our debt limit, the President will actually veto a bill because it casts him in a bad political light. This is unacceptable.

Tomorrow, I am hopeful the House of Representatives will pass the Boehner bill. I am hopeful that as soon as we receive it in the Senate, we will take it up, pass it, and send it to the President for his signature.

We need to do it not just for the debt limit increase, which we do, but we also need to do it to start cutting spending and creating a process to reform entitlement programs.

Already, our economy is feeling the impact of these debts and deficits. We know from the Reinhart and Rogoff study that our economy is growing at 1 percentage point less than it should be because of our debt. This is costing us about 1 million jobs every single year.

If we don't take action to cut spending, we know what our future holds: downgrades, interest rate increases, austerity programs filled with tax hikes and Draconian spending cuts, and anemic economic growth.

Looking at Europe right now, Ireland pays 12.9 percent interest on 3-year bonds. Portugal pays 19.4 percent. Greece pays an astounding 28.9 percent. These rates would truly bankrupt our country in short order.

Unfortunately, as former Bush economic adviser and Federal Reserve Board of Governors member, Larry Lindsey, pointed out in a Wall Street Journal op-ed recently and reiterated it yesterday at a Finance Committee hearing, even a normalization of interest rates in the United States to their historical average for the past 20 years would add $4.9 trillion to our projected debt over the next 10 years.

We can't afford the spending we have now, let alone this additional interest. We need to start cutting spending now. Both the cut, cap, and balance plan and the Boehner plan would do this.

We also need to create a process to reform entitlements. The cut, cap, and balance plan does this by capping spending, and the Boehner plan does this through the new joint committee that has a firm deadline for congressional action yet this year.

I wish I could say there was a plan by the President that does this. There isn't. That is why we in the Senate and in the House of Representatives are going to have to take the leadership in this debate. The President has obviously decided this is more about politics and, unfortunately, has not stepped up with the leadership that is necessary to get our country back on a sustainable fiscal path. We are where we are as a consequence of that, and we are facing a deadline in a few days where we will have to increase the borrowing authority of this country.

What I submit to colleagues is, the issue and the challenge and the problem in front of us is not the debt limit, it is the debt. If we don't do something about this debt, we are going to bankrupt this country, we are going to see the kind of interest rates they are seeing in Europe and we are going to see anemic economic growth in this country and it is going to be difficult to get people back to work. So cutting spending, getting our fiscal house in order, making government smaller, not larger, making the government economy smaller and the private economy larger is the way we need to get this country back on track. But it starts by having a plan that puts our fiscal house in order. So we, in the next few days, are going to have a chance to vote yet again on a plan put forward by the

House of Representatives because the President has failed to put forward a plan. I hope our colleagues in the Senate will do the right thing for this country and start to get us on that pathway that will enable us to get past the short-term challenges we face, get us to an opportunity to vote on a balanced budget amendment, which I think is desperately needed in this country, which would put the kind of fiscal discipline we need in place for the long term, so we aren't having year-over-year $1.5 trillion deficits that continue to accumulate more and more debt and put this country at a greater risk in future generations and greater jeopardy.

I hope my colleagues will support a responsible plan that actually does cut spending, does address the issue of entitlement reform, does it without raising taxes, and make sure that come next Tuesday we have taken the necessary action to protect our economy, shield it from any adverse impacts that could occur as a result of us not raising our debt limit but do it in a way that addresses the fundamental issue, which is the debt.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota. Before coming to the floor this morning, I returned 2 phone calls I received yesterday out of 2,000 that came into the office. I picked those two because they were people I have known for a long time but haven't talked to in a long time, and they have never called me in my capacity as a Senator. Both of them are businesspeople, both are neighbors, and both had the same message: the uncertainty that Congress and this administration is now causing in terms of our inability to meet the day of reckoning next Tuesday, when we must do so, is beginning to impact their business, their philosophy, their investments, and their country.

What we are doing as we almost dilly-dally around, putting off a final decision, agreeing to not agree on anything is we are making the situation worse. I think the reports in a couple months will show economic activity in July will show America is slowing down, economic activity is slowing down. That is because Congress and this President cannot get their act together.

History and facts are stubborn. I wish to go over a 2-year history of this debt ceiling crisis because, for years, we have known it was coming. For 2 years, we have talked about it. In fact, a little over 18 months ago on the floor of the Senate, Republicans and Democrats passed a deficit commission amendment, which made it successfully through Congress, was signed by the President, and that deficit commission was created. It was charged with coming up with a solution for our rising spending problems, reduction of the deficit and debt over time, better management of our fiscal policy, and getting Congress's act together, where it could vote up or down on a proposal. That became known as the Simpson-Bowles proposal. It would cut $4 trillion in spending over one decade, reform our tax policy, and weed out a lot of bad things that have been in there for a long time.

What happened is, when it came out in December, the President rejected it out of hand. I am not being partisan, because a bipartisan group of people offered that proposal. I was one of the five Republicans who voted for it on the floor. I thought it was a conscientious way to address the debt and deficit and the problem we faced. For some reason, unbeknownst to me, the President rejected it out of hand. All he had to do was send it to the Senate for an up-or-down vote, and we would at least have begun the process of dealing with the debt and deficit. Instead, he rejected it out of hand.

In the months preceding this debate today and this coming Tuesday when we run up against the debt ceiling, we have had other legislation come to the floor or from the House that has been rejected out of hand. The cut, cap, and balance legislation, which I voted not to table last week, the majority leader decided to not even discuss but to make a motion to table it. But that was a conscientious way to deal with our deficit and debt over time. It was a disciplined process that said we need to make cuts now and begin the process—$51 billion—and watch our spending in the future based on historical spending averages, and we ought to give the American people a chance to say: Does America need a balanced budget?

Instead, the Senate tabled it, when we had a chance to say just say yes to solving our problems, and we just said no.

Last night, Speaker BOEHNER's bill, which was to be voted on today, was pulled off because of a revenue estimate produced by CBO. I hope that will get worked out and will pass the House and will come back to the Senate. It is about time for us to say just say yes to something instead of just saying no.

I wish to talk about the consequences of just saying no for a second. The longer we say no, the longer we send uncertainty into the world markets and our own markets, the worse our problem will be.

Our tax system is based on Americans being prosperous. As America prospers, as we have better economic activity, our revenues go up—not because we raise taxes but because we raise expectations. We are now lowering expectations in America.

The two businesspeople I talked to this morning said they do not know what to do. Quite frankly, I didn't know what to advise them. I ran a company for 22 years, and I know the worst thing about running a business is to have uncertainty in terms of which way to go.

So it is my sincere hope everybody will come together and realize no is not an option. We need to say yes. If the President has a plan, bring it. If the House passes their plan, let's vote for it on the Senate floor. But let's move forward because the price and the cost of uncertainty is destroying what little economic vibrance the United States of America has today.

Let's raise the expectations of our people. Let's raise the productivity of the Senate and the Congress and this President. Let's sit down at the bigger table of common sense and find a solution, and let's find it now.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have spoken with the Republican leader, and I now ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business be extended until 2 p.m. today; that during that time Senators be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wyoming.

A SECOND OPINION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today having listened to my colleagues and looking at the most recent job data, which shows the effects of our struggling economy. Unemployment is going up, wages are going down, and there are concerns all around the country with jobs, the economy, the debt, and spending.

I have to say, I certainly believe, as somebody who has practiced medicine for 25 years in Wyoming and taken care of families all around the Cowboy State and been very involved in the debate over the health care law, that the President's health care law makes matters worse, absolutely makes matters worse.

The President's health care law makes matters worse by forcing employers to either offer government-approved health insurance or pay higher expenses. Each day it becomes obvious to me the new health care law is designed to ultimately end employer-provided coverage altogether and to encourage Americans to join government-run exchanges. That is why, as a doctor, I come to the floor week after week with a doctor's second opinion about the health care law. Under this law businesses are permitted to drop out of paying for employer-provided coverage as long as they pay a fine. The fine is about $2,000 per employee. This number is far smaller than what it would actually cost the business to provide family health benefits to each of their employees.

So what happens with small businesses in this country? Well, they are

going to face an ever-clearer incentive to drop coverage for the people they employ. They are not required to pay this fine for the first 50 workers who lose coverage. So the question is, Where are these people supposed to go? Where do they go for their insurance? How does it work?

The President promised them if they like what they have, they can keep it. Yet the incentives built into the health care law seem to be encouraging employers to drop their employees. So where do they go?

Well, the new health care law sets up what are called health care exchanges for these people to enter. Whether they want to or not they will be forced to go that way. These exchanges are shorthand for insurance markets where as much as 80 percent of the cost of the family's insurance could be actually borne by taxpayers. Under these circumstances, the natural response is for businesses to drop coverage for their employees altogether and then simply offer them some less expensive cash benefits.

Meanwhile, what happens to the employees who are going to lose the coverage they may like and then try to replace it because that is what is going to happen? They will have to replace it with a plan Washington mandates. That is of concern to a lot of Americans, and this may be very bad news for the patient and is really bad news for taxpayers.

Experts predict the annual cost to provide government insurance subsidies could cost up to nine times more than what the White House originally claimed. If that isn't proof enough the health care law is the wrong prescription to help America's job creators continue offering coverage to their workers, let's take a look at some of the things that have just come out in the last week.

This week, on Monday, July 25, the National Federation of Independent Business—a group that represents small businesses all around the country—released an astonishing new report. The NFIB surveyed 750 small businesses. These are small businesses of less than 50 employees. The survey asked these small businesses if they planned to drop health insurance coverage should their employees become eligible for this government subsidy to buy health insurance in the so-called exchange. More than one-quarter of the small businesses who offer coverage today—over one-quarter of the small businesses that offer coverage today—said they were very likely to drop coverage. I repeat: Very likely to drop coverage. Another 31 percent said they are somewhat likely to drop coverage; that they needed to look into it to find the specifics.

When we take a look and add the ones who are very likely and somewhat likely to drop coverage, we are looking at over half the small businesses in this country dropping insurance coverage and effectively dumping their employees into the government-run exchange.

The small business group in the survey and the response from these small businesses prompted the Wall Street Journal to print an editorial highlighting this data. It is entitled ''The Flight to the Exchanges.'' When I read this, I said: Gee, I couldn't have said it better myself.

The President's health care law wraps businesses in reams of bureaucratic redtape and uncertainty. Adding insult to injury, on Monday, July 11, of this year, the Department of Health and Human Services released yet another proposed regulation mandated by the health care law. The Obama administration issued its proposed insurance exchange regulation. What the rules do is give the States the specific framework they must use to set up a program or an exchange with this Washington-approved and mandated insurance. Here we go again, another example of where this administration takes roughly 30 pages from the health care law and turns it into 340 pages of bureaucratic Washington rules and regulations.

Of course, the Secretary of Health and Human Services is trying to sell this new rule as offering competition and uses the word ''flexibility.'' But nothing could be further from the truth. How flexible can a 347-page Washington rule be when it is a rule that contains the word ''must'' 580 times and includes the word ''require'' 811 times? How flexible can that Washington rule actually be?

Well, after examining all the rule's ''musts'' and ''requires,'' one thing is very clear: This administration is paying lipservice to State flexibility while their policy is promoting a Washington-mandated, Washington-dictated, Washington-enforced approach. This regulation details a very complex and confusing process that States are going to have to follow. The States have to follow these confusing rules in an effort to prove to the Department of Health and Human Services they meet its Washington mandates to set up and run the insurance exchanges, and they have very little time to do it. So this administration creates onerous new mandates and then fails to give States ample time to meet their overwhelming set of requirements.

Let's put this into context for the States. Comments of the administration's proposed rules are due this September 28. Typically, it can take the Department of Health and Human Services 6 months to review those comments about the rules and issue a final rule. That means we would likely see a final rule in March of 2012. Remember, there are significant details missing from these exchange regulations. This regulation is only part of the details States need to review before they can decide whether to run a health insurance exchange on their own or let the Federal Government do it.

The administration has yet to release rules explaining the health care law's essential health benefits package, the individual eligibility to participate in the exchanges, quality standards for the exchanges, and quality standards for the participating insurance plans. Those details may not come out until October or November of this year. This means States still do not know what the minimum set—the minimum set—of health services individuals, small businesses, and insurers will have to offer in the exchange. Pending missing details and further rules expected to come from the administration this fall, final rules—final rules—may be in place finally in May or June of 2012. States would then have to be prepared to submit their plan in June of 2012 to Health and Human Services to be certified.

But what happens if the rules aren't out by then? Many State legislatures end their sessions by June, making complying with this tight time line extremely difficult, if not impossible. It seems to me this administration will have had 2 years to post their final regulations while the States may have only 2 months to comply.

What happens if a State isn't ready? They say have no fear; Washington is here to help. That is what they say. If the Department of Health and Human Services says a State's insurance exchange is not in compliance, then Washington will swoop in and set up its own program. This is often called the Federal fallback or the federally facilitated exchange, big fancy words for Washington bureaucrats telling States what they have to do.

The irony of all this is the administration's rules offer very few details explaining what this Federal fallback exchange will look like, so the States don't even know what happens if the Federal fallback comes into play.

Is the Department of Health and Human Services creating a stealth, back-door Federal exchange? If a State doesn't have adequate time to meet all the operational program requirements and the burdensome review process, it sounds to me like the Obama administration will then take control of the States.

Why should a State such as Utah, for example, that has created an especially designed insurance marketplace be forced to comply with onerous and costly requirements of this rule? If they are not willing to comply, will they face the consequences that Washington will make the final decision? States should be encouraged to create innovative solutions that meet the unique needs of their constituents, not forced to follow a one-size-fits-all laundry list of Washington mandates.

This is why I returned to the floor today, as a physician who has practiced medicine for a long time, with a doctor's second opinion, to tell you I believe this health care law is one that is bad for patients, it is bad for providers—the nurses and the doctors who take care of those patients—and it is bad for taxpayers. It is why I believe it

is important we repeal and replace this health care law.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, how much time am I allowed?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ten minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Chair.

THE DEBT LIMIT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I come to the floor today with a great sense of urgency. We are less than 1 week away from reaching our debt limit. If we fail and we falter, the United States of America will be irrevocably fractured. We aren't at an impasse; we are at the edge of a cliff. Unless Congress acts, we are going to go over it.

What will be the consequences of it? If we do not meet our obligations to pay our debts, it will result in a default, and default will result in enormous increases in interest rates. For Americans who are so worried about tax increases, I've got to send a real red alert. When interest rates go sky high because of our failure to act, it will be the biggest tax on America that we could have, and it will be a tax at the kitchen table. It means if anyone has a variable-rate mortgage, it will skyrocket.

If you have a student loan, that interest is going to increase. If you have a car loan, forget it. The payments are going to be enormous. So we need to face what this means: raising the debt limit. We need to prevent the default so our bond rating is not lowered.

I have never been big on talking about bond ratings, but this is a crucial one. We now have a AAA bond rating. So what does that mean? It means when they buy our Treasury bills or other government-secured investments, but particularly our T-bills, it is as good as gold. If we are downgraded, we could just be a tinhorn, tin-cup nation. This is not the United States of America. This is not what people fought and died for.

When people say they represent a party that wants to defend the Constitution, we all have to defend the Constitution. Right now, defending the Constitution and defending America is to lift our debt ceiling and get to the hard work of, No. 1, dealing with our debt but also dealing with job growth.

We have to get to work. Instead, we are busy at work playing the blame game. Squabbling is not a solution. But I believe we Democrats do have a solution, and I think the solution does lie in the Reid proposal. The Reid proposal the majority leader has offered is substantive, it is real, and it is achievable.

I was on TV yesterday, and they said: Oh, you are a liberal Democrat. Well, I don't know if I am a liberal, I don't know if I am a conservative, but I will tell you what I am. I am a diner Democrat. I think about the people. I think about the ordinary people, and I think about their day-to-day needs. When people talk about what kind of solutions they mean, they want everything on the table. What I want on the table are the things that affect the kitchen table. That is why I support the Reid proposal. It is an achievable framework for avoiding default and downgrade of our bond rating now.

What does it do? It has three important elements.

One, timing, to take us through 2012. It is not about the next election. It is showing we are serious and we are substantive.

Second, it has important content where we do cut Federal spending. It's observable, it's quantifiable, and it's verifiable.

No. 3, it gives us a path forward to deal with the important issues of entitlement and revenue reform. Wow.

So why can't they take it? I am puzzled about why they can't take it. Is it 2012? OK. Who knows who is going to be in control of either the White House or the Congress then? But it can't be about us. It is not about me. It is about we—we, the people.

Let's go to the content. There are substantial cuts there in discretionary spending. And there are substantial cuts to defense spending that do not affect readiness or military health care. These are actually cuts that the House voted for in the Ryan budget. So a few weeks ago, they said yes to the cuts. But when we say yes to the cuts, they say no to the proposal. I don't get it. But it's not whether I get it. It is that we have to make sure we get a solution.

What I think is important about the Reid proposal is it is $2.7 trillion in cuts. I understand CBO has scored it and they say it is $2.2 trillion. Well, $2.2 trillion, $2.7 trillion, that is real money. That is real money, and it shows we are serious.

It also provides this important path forward called a Joint Committee. It is not a commission where it is going to be outsiders who are experts from think-tank environments and hoo-ha, hoo-ha. It's Members of Congress, both sides of the aisle, both sides of the Dome. Let's get it together with them, and then let's have this committee where we then move forward on the reform of revenue as well as looking at entitlement reform.

I want to be clear that if, the horror of all horrors comes where we fracture the standing of the United States of America, not only in the financial markets but in the standing of the world, it will have very serious consequences.

The President is going to have to pay the bills based on whatever money is coming in. He would not be able to borrow. America would not be able to borrow. So our T-bill will not have the same value it once did. He is going to have to pay our bills.

What are the consequences on federal benefits? One is paychecks. The first paycheck he is going to meet is the paycheck for our troops. He has to make sure that if they are fighting to defend America while we are squabbling around and screwing around, we are going to pay our troops. My God, did it ever occur to anyone that our troops wouldn't get paid? Yes, it is going to be tight.

So we pay the troops. We are going to certainly pay our veterans' benefits. They might not be the same amount the first month, but we will kind of squeak through. Then, it will be Social Security. Well, maybe the checks will go out, but maybe it will only be at half the amount. But the Social Security offices will be closed. So benefits will have a direct impact.

Where is he going to slow down the trickle of money? To State and local governments. So what does that mean? Community development block grant money, education, and so on. That is going to cause enormous layoffs of public employees and contractors at the State and local level. The asphalt contractor, the person who handles the office machinery, minority contractors, and so on—all that small business they love to romanticize over are going to have a big impact.

Then the Federal Government will definitely have to slow down or not pay at all contractors, whether it is the big defense guys that employ thousands and thousands of people or it is the small- to medium-sized businesses, like the ones in my own State that do information technology?

We are about to destroy the reputation and solvency of the United States of America. We are about to destroy the reputation and solvency of the United States of America not only for one day but for a decade and maybe the rest of the century. This is not being done by an outside power. We are spending $700 billion on defense, and we are destroying ourselves by a self-inflicted wound because of political dysfunction, political rigidity, and political ideology. What the heck is this? I could even use more intense language. What we are about to do, we cannot allow this to happen.

One of my colleagues said to me yesterday, Senator MIKULSKI, what would it take to get you to the table? I said: Get me a plan and 30 Republican names behind it; I will see if I can support the plan and get 30 others.

I know my time is up, but I don't want the time to be up on America. Let's come together. Let's stop being Democrats, let's stop being Republicans, let's call us what we should be called: Americans.

What do Americans do? When the times are tough, the tough get going. Let's get going. Let's make the tough decisions. Let's put politics aside, put America No. 1, and get us back on track.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I wish to thank my good friend and colleague

from Maryland for her great words. She comes from the heart of Maryland and the heart of America. Very few people I have met in politics in my many years in this endeavor have an understanding of how average people feel and think and tick than the great Senator from the State of Maryland, and I wish to thank her for her outstanding remarks. If this body on both sides of the aisle would listen to her and her commonsense intelligence, we would be in a lot better shape than we are now. So I thank my colleague from the great State of Maryland, the senior Senator.

I rise to discuss the deadlock we have reached in the debate over raising the Nation's debt ceiling. Two nights ago, the President spoke and put the current stalemate in the context it belongs: The result of a small block within the House Republicans that refuses to compromise even one inch, it is on their shoulders.

We have perhaps 100 Republicans at the extreme right who seem to be leading the Congress and the Nation over a cliff. They don't even care about the idea that we might default. It is appalling. Yet they seem to be calling the shots.

For the last few weeks, the President has met over and over with House Republicans trying to meet them halfway and in some instances more than halfway. He has offered to cut record amounts from our debt and make cuts in programs that would be extremely painful to our side of the aisle. This minority in the House has come to think of ''compromise'' as a dirty word, and it appears as if they can't take yes for an answer. If you don't care about debt reduction, if you don't care about debt ceiling, rather, you can't get something done.

Speaker BOEHNER, who is a good and reasonable man, wants to do the right thing and compromise, but he is struggling to rein in his caucus. Instead of leading the House, Speaker BOEHNER is being led by a fringe in his caucus that thinks default is OK. This week, Speaker BOEHNER offered a two-step plan that simply kicks the can down the road. It resolves the debt ceiling only for the next few months. With the new CBO numbers, it will inevitably resolve it for even a shorter period of time, and that puts us, within a few months, right back at square one, all over again, with the same anxiety, the same gridlock, the same problems we face today. What sense, in the good Lord's name, does that make to just repeat this over and over until we drive off the cliff? It makes no sense.

All we have to do is look at how difficult this crisis has been to resolve after a year of negotiations. Does anyone think it would be a good idea to do this all over again in less than 6 months? The Speaker's approach is not only wrong, it is dangerous. It would leave a cloud of default hanging over our heads for the next several months, undermining confidence in U.S. bonds.

Market analysts have rejected the Speaker's approach, saying it could actually bring some of the same bad consequences as a default itself. It could even cause a credit rating downgrade.

Just yesterday, the CEO of Nasdaq testified before the Judiciary Committee and said:

> The longer the deal, the better it is for the markets.

Christian Cooper, a currency trader, was quoted by Bloomberg News this morning saying:

> From the markets' point of view, a two-stage plan is a nonstarter because we now know it is amateur hour on Capitol Hill and we don't want to be painted in this corner again. There is significant risk of a downgrade with a deal that ties further cuts to another vote only a few months down the road.

He said it better than any of us could say it, and he is a currency trader.

Mohamed El-Erian, the CEO of PIMCO, one of the most respected investors in the markets—and he invests, as I understand it, hundreds of billions of dollars. Mr. El-Erian expressed concern the other night that ''the political ground is being prepared for a short-term stop-gap compromise.'' He warned this could push stocks down and leave the U.S. debt rating ''extremely exposed to a damaging downgrade.'' Let me again quote Mr. El-Erian, one of the great experts on our credit markets. What he said is, the kind of plan that came over from the House that is attempting to be debated in the House—I don't think it will even make it over, but the kind of plan being debated in the House would ''create an extremely exposed damaging downgrade to our credit, to our Nation's debt rating.''

Even Republicans rejected a short-term increase in the debt ceiling as recently as last month. DAVE CAMP, Republican chairman of Ways and Means, said:

> It doesn't give you certainty. Ideally, you'd like to get that settled and not have to continually have it a continually hanging-over issue.

That is the Republican head of the Ways and Means Committee.

House majority leader ERIC CANTOR said:

> If we can't make the tough decisions now, why would [we] be making those tough decisions later. I don't see how multiple votes on a debt ceiling increase can help get us to where we want to go. It is my preference we do this thing one time. . . . Putting off tough decisions is not what people want in this town.

That is from House Majority Leader CANTOR. Yet he is leading the charge to send over the very type of plan he has criticized only a few weeks ago.

Republicans have apparently flip-flopped on this point. They are now saying they want the same kind of short-term debt ceiling increase they opposed on substantive grounds previously. Republicans have flipped-flopped on this point. Make no mistake about it, a short-term deal is still a nonstarter in the Senate and nothing more than a glidepath to a credit downgrade, and we will not allow it.

While Republicans continue pushing for an unproductive plan, Senator REID's plan, the Senate plan, offers real potential to finally break this impasse. It makes difficult choices. It includes almost $1 trillion in domestic discretionary program cuts, including defense. This is serious belt tightening that will have consequences, good consequences, for years to come.

The plan received a major boost this morning when Congress's official scorekeeper confirmed that the first draft cuts more—a lot more—than the Boehner plan. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Senate draft bill achieves almost $1.3 trillion more in deficit reduction than the Boehner plan.

The report also affirms that the $1 trillion in savings the Senate planned from the Iraq and Afghanistan wars is real. That is CBO saying it, not some Democrat who is hoping and praying for an easy fix. This completely undercuts the arguments by Republicans who have tried to call these savings a gimmick, even though they included them in their own budget and voted for them a few months ago. If it was OK in their budget, it has to be OK in our budget. You cannot just change your mind based on whose budget it is. Substance should matter to some extent.

Plus, since the CBO only measured the plan's first draft before additional planned savings were incorporated into the bill, the final version of the Senate plan will achieve even deeper savings when it is filed on the Senate floor. As Politico reports this morning:

> In the battle of budget scores, the Senate Democratic deficit reduction bill is the clear winner thus far over an alternative by Speaker John Boehner.

Lastly, Senator REID's proposal allows for a joint committee that has the potential to achieve even deeper savings down the road to get our country back on the path to economic growth. All in all, this is an offer that Republicans cannot refuse. All of the cuts in Senator REID's proposal have been supported at one point or another by the Republican side. It meets the two main requirements laid out by the House Republicans: First, Speaker BOEHNER said the amount of the debt ceiling increase must be matched by the amount of spending cuts. Our proposal will do just that.

Second, Speaker BOEHNER said the tax increases must be off the table. Even though most of us would prefer tax increases, our proposal includes no revenue raisers whatsoever. We don't want tax increases on the middle class; we want tax increases on the wealthy and elimination of corporate loopholes. To not have them is a hard decision to many on our side who know we are going to need to do that for serious debt reduction.

The bottom line: In conclusion, we are getting dangerously close to August 2. Over and over Democrats have shown a willingness to move in the direction of Republicans. It is time for

Speaker BOEHNER to cut off his extreme Republicans who refuse to support even the plan that he crafted to meet their reckless demands. The Reid plan is our best route to a compromise. It is a compromise we need soon before the markets render a truly ominous judgment that will set our economy back for years.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank my colleague from New York, Senator SCHUMER, as well as Senator MIKULSKI from Maryland for coming to the floor this morning and speaking about the crisis we face. The debt ceiling default, which will occur in 6 days if we do not act, will have a profound, negative impact on America's standing in the world and our economy at home. It threatens to stifle job creation and to slow down the business growth we need to get out of this recession. It is the most serious impact one could imagine at a time when we are facing this kind of recession.

This debt ceiling is being extended, or should be extended, under a law that was passed in 1939. We have extended the debt ceiling 89 different times: 55 times under Republican Presidents, 34 times under Democratic Presidents, and virtually every President has done it.

The President who holds the record for the most debt ceiling extensions in history is Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan extended the debt ceiling 18 times in his 8 years, during that period of time tripling the national debt. The President who holds the record next is President George W. Bush, who doubled the national debt in his 8 years and raised the debt ceiling 9 times.

This should have been done, and done routinely. Many of the Members of Congress, House and Senate, who come to the floor and say we will never vote to extend the debt ceiling are not being honest with the American people. The debt ceiling is paying for what Congressmen and Senators voted for. They came to the floor and said: Let's go to war, let's stay at war, let's spend $10 billion a month. And the President said: That was Congress's decision. Now I have to borrow the money to keep that promise. And these Members of Congress are saying: Oh, no, we don't want to have any fingerprints on the debt ceiling extension.

We cannot have it both ways. Members of Congress cannot ask for spending and then fault the President when he has to borrow money to make it happen. That is exactly what they are doing.

The President has tried to work out a bipartisan agreement to deal with this debt ceiling crisis. He invited in Republicans and Democratic leaders with Vice President BIDEN to sit down and work out an agreement, a bipartisan agreement. About 4 weeks ago, the House Republican majority leader, ERIC CANTOR of Virginia, stood up and walked out. He said: I am walking away from these bipartisan negotiations. I am not going to be party to them. Leave it up to Speaker BOEHNER.

Speaker BOEHNER then went into negotiations with President Obama, talking behind the scenes about ways to resolve this issue. That was a positive thing. But then he announced he was walking away from negotiations not once but twice, most recently last Friday.

Monday night, television sets around America were tuned in as the President of the United States explained this crisis and then Speaker BOEHNER explained his point of view. Speaker BOEHNER said Monday night he had a plan, a plan that would solve this crisis in a responsible way. That was Monday night. But then came Tuesday, and as the dawn came on Tuesday morning and people took a close look at the Boehner plan, here is what they found.

They found that business leaders across America were saying it was a terrible idea, the idea of a 6-month extension to the debt ceiling; going through this mess again and again would harm our economy.

Then the Congressional Budget Office took a look at the Boehner plan. They talked about it Monday night and said it does not add up. It does not cut the spending Speaker BOEHNER said it would. Then, finally, 100 members of Speaker BOEHNER's Republican caucus walked out on him yesterday, saying it was a bad plan.

So here we are, 6 days away from a deadline, 6 days away from a manufactured political crisis. It is time to do what is right. Senate majority leader HARRY REID has a proposal which addresses this responsibly. It cuts spending—and it has already been scored, has it not, by the Congressional Budget Office? It turns out that unlike Speaker BOEHNER's plan, Senate majority leader HARRY REID's plan does cut spending to move us toward a balanced situation.

Second, it extends this debate beyond the next election, beyond the next year, so we do not put our fragile and weak economy through this again and again. That is sensible. It also calls for the creation of a joint committee to deal with the long-term deficit. I have been involved in this conversation with the deficit commission, again, with the Gang of 6. We can do this on a bipartisan basis if we are honest and open with one another, and Majority Leader REID leads us in that direction.

We face a deadline 6 days from today. The Boehner plan of Monday night has disintegrated before our eyes. It has been rejected by business leaders. It has been rejected by the Congressional Budget Office. It has been rejected by the House Republican caucus. It is time for a little humility on both sides of the aisle from both parties.

Let's put all this squabbling aside. Let's focus on America's economy, putting people to work, saving businesses, and handling our debt in a responsible way. We can do it. We can do it if we stop listening to the political extremists and start dealing with the center of America which calls for leadership and wants us to put an end to this squabbling.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 194.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gary Locke, of Washington, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China.

Mr. REID. I ask that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate resumes legislative session.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for additional time, if necessary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, as the Senator from Illinois just pointed out, today we are 6 days away from a possible default which could plunge this country into a serious crisis. In fact, there are some who view maybe it is not exactly 6 days; it could be a few days more. There are those who argue that somehow—in a bizarre fashion—that somehow we could prioritize our payments to the most urgent requirements, such as our veterans, such at Social Security and others.

I wonder, what if the Greek Government came up with that same proposal as they went into bankruptcy, that they would prioritize spending that is remaining?

The point is, today we are 6 days away. The point is, markets are jittery. Investors are concerned. Most importantly, our constituents are frustrated. They are confused and they are

angry. Today, on the front page of USA Today, there is a headline that says:

The Debt: What Americans Think About The Political Debate.

It goes on to say:

Just get it done, work it out.

Another person:

''I'm sick of it,'' says Davis, 73, a retired economist. . . . ''They're playing games. Here we are, trying to pull ourselves out of recession, and they can't come to an agreement.''

If anyone thinks that the reputation and the approval rating of Congress and the Presidency has improved during this situation we find ourselves in, obviously they are out of touch with their constituents and the American people. Not only are the American people concerned, not only are the American people upset, but I will quote from and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 26, 2011]

FRUSTRATED EXECUTIVES SAY POLITICAL IMPASSE SLOWS HIRING, INVESTING

(By Neil Irwin)

CHICAGO.—Business leaders are growing exasperated with Washington. And they say the dysfunction in the political system is holding them back from hiring and investing.

A new sort of risk to growth is emerging, not from the kind of economic forces that led to the recent recession but from elected officials' inability to agree on how to deal with them. This angst in the executive suite is reflected in this month's uptick in lobbying by business groups eager to see a deal on the federal debt ceiling, in surveys showing falling confidence among business leaders—and, in the American heartland, by the deepening frustrations of corporate chiefs.

In interviews in this great industrial capital, senior executives in the area said they lack confidence that political leaders can execute the basic nuts and bolts of governing, as exemplified by the brinksmanship over raising the debt ceiling. Indeed, the frustration over the political climate and Washington's seeming inability to solve problems appears to weigh more heavily in their minds than any specific government policy.

The executives are hostile to President Obama and his agenda and say higher taxes would damage their business prospects and make them less inclined to invest and hire. But in contrast to congressional Republicans' claims that any tax increases would stop job creation in its tracks, many executives say they could tolerate somewhat higher taxes if they were part of a broader plan that offered clarity on the nation's future policies, particularly one heavy on spending cuts.

''What are the rules of the game going to be in the long term?'' said Lyle Heidemann, chief executive of the 5,000-store hardware chain True Value. ''What our retailers would like to have is consistency and predictability. We can handle decisions we don't agree with, but that's easier than not knowing what the decision is going to be.''

For example, he said, several True Value franchisees have sold their stores in the past year—even though they would have preferred to hold on to them for a few more years—because they feared that the 15 percent capital gains tax will rise at the end of the year, when it is scheduled to expire.

The loss of confidence in Washington seems to be a driver of a more fundamental lowering of expectations in America's executive suites. The Conference Board, a business research group, found in its most recent survey of chief executives that 43 percent expected economic improvement in the next six months, down from 66 percent at the beginning of the year.

The groups that represent businesses in Washington, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Business Roundtable, have been urging Congress to raise the debt ceiling to avoid the risk of a default or downgrade of the U.S. credit rating, even as many newly elected Republican members of the House—who received support from business interests when running—are reluctant to vote for such a measure. A group of major business groups sent a letter to the president and every member of Congress two weeks ago, imploring them to raise the debt ceiling.

The tenor of the debates in Washington has damaged the executives' sense, long taken for granted, that the taxes and regulatory policies they face will be predictable and reasonably constant. The executives are horrified that the nation might be on the verge of losing its AAA credit rating, and they have a deep hunger for a grand bargain: a master plan to determine the nation's fiscal future over the coming decade.

There is no telling what the tax code will look like next year or who will ultimately bear the burden of reducing the nation's budget deficits. That makes it an ominous time to consider even buying a new piece of equipment or hiring another worker, businesspeople said.

''Clarity is everything, even if it's negative clarity,'' said Rick Bastian, chief executive of Blackhawk Bank, which has eight branches in northern Illinois and southern Wisconsin. The mid-size manufacturers to whom the bank lends money have made it through the worst of the recession, Bastian said. But now they are resistant to upgrading equipment or expanding production capacity because they don't know what the tax burden will be on their revenue.

''Let's say you make an investment that will return $100,000,'' Bastian said. ''I don't know if I'll be paying $10,000 more in taxes or $15,000 more. That could be the difference between whether you can afford to service a loan to pay for it or not. I'm not going to make a long-term investment that requires me to commit cash flow for years if I don't know what taxes are going to be.''

There has been plenty of political bickering in the nation's history, and the current situation bears some resemblance to the standoffs between President Bill Clinton and the Republican Congress that shut down the government twice in 1995 and 1996.

But executives describe a very different environment this time around. The economy was in generally strong shape in the mid-1990s, and business confidence—then high—was little phased by the showdown in Washington. Now, with 9 percent unemployment and an exceptionally weak two-year-old recovery, confidence is far more fragile.

''We're still coming out of a deep crisis and recession,'' said Kevin Kelly, chief executive of Heidrick & Struggles, a leading executive-search firm, who said his conversations with executives in recent weeks have frequently featured fretting over the debt-ceiling talks. ''There have been fits and starts toward stronger growth, and now the outlook hinges on what happens in Washington.''

At Quality Float Works, a Schaumburg, Ill., company that makes metal float balls for industrial use, the debt impasse has General Manager Jason Speer nervous that it could cause interest rates to spike and make the line of credit the firm uses to finance its inventory more expensive to manage.

As a result, even with business up 30 percent this year and more long-term orders coming in, ''we're kind of holding back on hiring and major purchases,'' Speer said. ''We're waiting and seeing what effect all this will have on our credit and on our ability to do business overseas.''

Many executives describe the uncertainty around taxes and spending as only one in a series of confidence-sapping challenges coming from Washington.

For example, BrightStar Care provides staffing services for home health-care workers through 225 franchisees worldwide with a combined 6,000 employees. Shelly Sun, the company's founder and chief executive, said that as she works with potential franchisees, many are held back by uncertainty over whether they will have to pay for their workers' health-care costs once last year's health-reform legislation is fully enacted, and if so, what it will cost.

''This is a very price-competitive business,'' Sun said. ''Consumers are already having difficulty scraping together funds to pay for services, and if the franchisees have to bear an extra dollar, $1.25, or $1.50 per hour for health-care costs, what could be a viable business may not be.''

And at Discover Financial Services, the large credit card and transaction processing firm with 11,000 employees, President Roger Hochschild has had to grapple with great uncertainty about how the financial system will evolve under changing regulations.

''It's really challenging to enter the mortgage business with no clear understanding of what Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac will look like down the road,'' Hochschild said.

But for many executives, the uncertainty about how the United States will lower its budget deficit over time and who will pay for it looms most heavily over their decisions.

''Among the other presidents and CEOs I interact with, the only consensus of opinion is none of us has any idea where things are going,'' said Scott Morey, chief executive of Morey Corp., a 700-employee company in Woodridge, Ill., that makes electronic equipment. ''And in my observation, the uncertainty we are experiencing is caused almost entirely out of Washington and other governments around the world.''

Mr. MCCAIN. That article says:

Frustrated executives say political impasse slows hiring and investing.

Business leaders are growing exasperated with Washington. And they say the dysfunction in the political system is holding them back from hiring and investing.

So where we are is, average American citizens are worried, Social Security recipients who are entitled are calling our offices, and the markets are already jittery. Most economists believe, if we allow this deadline to pass, that we will see a cratering of the financial markets, which, obviously, has a significant impact on savings, on people's holdings in the stock market, 401(k)s, et cetera. Meanwhile, here we are with a situation, and over on the other side of the Capitol, our Republican friends are trying to come up with a proposal that will receive the support of their majority. Over here, we have individuals who believe somehow there is still a chance, at least in this Congress, to pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

I will take a backseat to none in my support of the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I have voted for it 13 times. I will vote for it tomorrow. What is amazing about this is, some Members are believing we can pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution in this body with its present representation, and that is foolish. That is worse than foolish. That is deceiving many of our constituents by telling them that just because the majority leader tabled the balanced budget amendment legislation that, through amending and debate, we could somehow convince the majority on the other side of the aisle to go along with a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. That is not fair. That is not fair to the American people to hold out and say we will not agree to raising the debt limit until we pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. It is unfair. It is bizarro. Maybe some people who have only been in this body for 6 or 7 months or so believe that. Others know better. Others know better.

I am confident, one, someday we will pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Two, I am confident the overwhelming majority of the American people support it. Three, I am convinced that is the only way that at the end of the day, we will get spending under control because I have seen in the past Congress enacting very strong restrictions on spending, such as the Gramm-Rudman legislation, which required spending cuts with increases in spending and all of them failed because Congresses cannot bind future Congresses.

That is why I remain committed to a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. To somehow think or tell our citizens that if we have enough debate on amendments in the Senate, in the short term, in the next 6 days, we will pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution is unfair to our constituents. It is unfair to our constituents, frankly, to come up with a plan—the so-called Reid plan—that is full of smoke and mirrors, and, frankly, does not entail any increase—real spending cuts. It is unfair of the President of the United States to lead from behind. It is unfair of the President of the United States not to come forward with a specific plan that perhaps could be considered by both bodies but only to go out and give lectures and act in as partisan a fashion as I have seen in his addresses to the American people. It is no wonder the approval ratings of the American people of the President and of Congress are literally at alltime lows.

I wish to talk for just a minute about an editorial in The Wall Street Journal this morning. The Wall Street Journal is not known to be—especially on its editorial page—a liberal periodical. It is entitled ''The GOP's Reality Test.'' It talks about:

The debt-limit debate is heading toward a culmination, with President Obama reduced to pleading for the public to support a tax increase and Speaker John Boehner and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid releasing competing plans that are next-to-last realistic options. The question is whether House Republicans are going to help Mr. Boehner achieve significant progress, or, in the name of the unachievable, hand Mr. Obama a victory.

Mr. Obama recognizes these stakes, threatening yesterday to veto the Boehner plan in a tactical move to block any Democratic support.

It goes on and talks about the two-phase Boehner plan.

Congress would authorize $1 trillion in new debt in return for $1.2 trillion.

It has since been scored by CBO, and now I believe that on the House side—they are struggling but I hope will succeed in coming up with a proposal that will authorize the cuts we have advertised.

But I go on to read:

Unless the plan passed, Mr. Obama couldn't request the additional $1.6 trillion debt ceiling increase that he would soon need. The political incentive is for a reasonable package, and many Senate Democrats also don't want to vote for tax increases before 2012.

It talks about the critics, about people putting out statements, telling Republicans, telling the Speaker to come up with a better solution.

The usually sensible Club for Growth and Heritage Action, the political arm of the Heritage Foundation, are scoring a vote for the Boehner plan as negative on similar grounds.

But what none of these critics have is an alternative strategy for achieving anything nearly as fiscally or politically beneficial as Mr. Boehner's plan. The idea seems to be if the House GOP refuses to raise the debt ceiling, a default crisis or gradual government shutdown will ensue, and the public will turn en masse against Barack Obama. The Republican House that failed to raise the debt ceiling would somehow escape all the blame. Then Democrats would have no choice but to pass a balanced budget amendment and reform entitlements, and the tea party Hobbits could return to Middle Earth having defeated Mordor.

This is the kind of crack political thinking that turned Sharon Angle and Christine O'Donnell into GOP Senate nominees. The reality is that the debt limit will be raised one way or another, and the only issue now is with how much fiscal reform and what political fallout.

If the Boehner plan fails in the House, the advantage shifts to Mr. Reid's Senate plan, which would raise the debt ceiling by $2.4 trillion in one swoop through 2012. That would come without a tax increase but also $2.7 trillion in mostly fake spending cuts like less government ''waste, fraud, and abuse.''

How many times have we heard we are going to cut waste, fraud, and abuse?

And a $1 trillion savings from troop drawdowns in Iraq and Afghanistan that are already built into the baseline. As fiscal reform, this is worse than Mr. Boehner's plan.

The Speaker has made mistakes in his debt negotiations, not least in trusting that Mr. Obama wants serious fiscal reforms. But thanks to the President's overreaching on taxes, Mr. Boehner now has the GOP positioned in sight of a political and policy victory. If this plan or something close to it becomes law, Democrats will have conceded more spending cuts than they thought possible, and without getting the GOP to raise taxes and without being able to blame Republicans for a debt-limit crackup or economic damage.

If conservatives defeat the Boehner plan, they'll not only undermine our House majority. They'll go far to re-electing Mr. Obama and making the entitlement state that much harder to reform.

Let me say, again, I believe the plan crafted by Senator MCCONNELL that would call for significant cuts in spending, which would not have raises in taxes, would, in the short term, be a most reasonable solution. I hope that on both sides of the aisle we could work together and negotiate a way through that. I also think the much derided by some idea of a committee composed of Members of Congress—of Members of Congress only—from both sides of the aisle, from both sides of the Capitol, to sit down and work out a long-term solution to our fiscal calamities we are facing and those results and those recommendations by that committee be subject to an up-or-down vote only is the only way we can go.

How many times have we had a budget resolution that tasks the various committees to come up with savings and always those savings are phony or they are dismantled on the floor of the Senate? The only way we are going to have the courage to make these cuts is with a committee composed of an equal number of Republicans and Democrats on both sides of the Capitol who come up with tough measures that need to be taken. I believe the American people will support it. If it is not an up-or-down vote, we know what happens around here. Let's be honest. Let's have some straight talk. The special interests prevail, and they would dismantle the tough provisions this committee would come up with. I say to my friends on this side of the aisle, this is a balance, Republican and Democrat. We only control one-third of the government, and that is the House of Representatives. It seems to me a balanced, equal representation is to our advantage.

I just wish to say a word, again, about the Reid plan. First of all, I congratulate the majority leader for coming up with a plan because certainly the President has not. Spectrum auctions is part of it. That is going to provide auction of billions of dollars. I have been in this body for a considerable period of time. I can't tell you the number of times we have called for auction of spectrum. It is an annual basis. It is a copout that prevents us from making tough decisions. Most egregiously, the majority leader's plan provides $1 billion to pay television broadcasters who return unused television broadcast spectrum. The television broadcasters got the spectrum for free, and now we are supposed to ask the taxpayers to give them $1 billion to give back the spectrum they own?

Then, very interestingly, savings in Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. There

are $30 billion in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac reforms. There is nowhere in this proposal that mentions that, but I would point out we have already spent $150 billion on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac that we have never seen the end of. Then, of course, the large claim that there is $1 trillion in savings from winding down the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and, of course, that is phony. Everybody knows we are winding down the war in Afghanistan and Iraq.

So here we are 6 days away, and we still have members of Congress who are saying we have to pass the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. We have Members on the other side who are saying we have to raise taxes. We have a President of the United States who so far has refused to come forward with a detailed plan of his own. That is called leading from behind. It is time we listened to the markets. It is time we listened to our constituents. Most of all, it is time we listened to the American people and sit down and seriously negotiate something before we face a situation where we are depriving the American people of the fundamental right of having a government that doesn't deprive them of the essential services, goods, and entitlements which they have earned.

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. CORKER. 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. CORKER. Madam President, I wish to speak for 10 minutes or so. When I have 2 minutes remaining, if the Chair could tell me, I would appreciate it.

Madam President, I am here today with a sense of optimism. I know all of us are very concerned about what is happening in our country with the debt ceiling. I know we are getting lots of calls from constituents.

I think we have made remarkable progress over the last couple of weeks. If we think back to just a couple of weeks ago, people were crafting legislation for sort of a political vote, if you will, and I understand that. But here we are today, and we actually have the leader of the U.S. Senate—a Democrat—who has proposed a bill that has to do with spending. The Republican leader of the House has introduced a bill that has to do with spending. Candidly, I am kind of uplifted. We are finally on the right topic now. Candidly, to use a colloquial term from Tennessee, we are beginning to cook with gas. What I mean by that is people are actually now focused on the right issue.

We have all talked about this August 2 date. We have talked about the fact that our debt ceiling has to be raised by then. Certainly, there are a lot of ambiguities in the financial markets right now. A lot of them have been watching the Treasury Department and think the Treasury Department has actually made some ways of causing that to last a little bit longer. But I think one thing we can all agree to in this body at present is that we have until August 2. I think everybody would agree with that. Some people think we have longer. I think the one thing almost everyone would agree with in this body is that we have until August 2 to solve this problem, and I hope we will do so.

The other thing that I think is becoming part of sort of the mantra and the understanding throughout our country is that many of the financial markets, the people who actually buy our Treasurys, are now not as concerned about the debt ceiling. They want it raised, don't get me wrong, and as I just mentioned, we all understand August 2 is the date we have until to do that. But now they are more concerned about the fact that we may raise the debt ceiling and not actually do what we need to do to actually get our deficits in order.

First of all, we have the ratings agencies saying that if we don't get at least $4 trillion in savings in some form or fashion, then some of them are going to downgrade us. But our office over in the Banking Committee—our folks are constantly talking with folks who buy Treasurys, and the actual purchasers of these Treasurys are now telling us in our office that if we don't do something that at least shows $4 trillion in savings, then they believe we don't have the political will to cause our country to be as worthy of a borrower and that we are going to be paying more in the way of rates.

The other point I wish to make is that we have a proposal on the floor. Personally—and I may catch some grief back home for saying this—I think Senator REID has actually tried to put something forward to help solve this problem. I believe that. I think he has been working closely with Senator MCCONNELL. I think Speaker BOEHNER also—I know he has a different set of circumstances—is trying to solve this problem.

Here is the point: We are at a place where we are now actually talking about the right topic, and we now know that if we don't put forth a solution that is at least $4 trillion or in that order of magnitude, we are going to be downgraded.

It seems to me that people on the other side of the aisle—my Democratic friends—would not want to support a proposal that extends the debt ceiling that is less than $4 trillion because their President would be presiding over a country that was downgraded while he was President.

It seems to me that the Republicans who have worked hard to press this issue—and everybody has gone through tremendous acrimony, and certainly people who are watching this are incredibly frustrated and angry—it seems to me that Republicans who are on the verge of potentially being able to craft something that actually solves this problem would not want to support something that is less than $4 trillion either.

In fact, I would make this statement which I think is true: Anybody who votes for a package in this body to address the debt ceiling and our deficits simultaneously that isn't of the order of magnitude that is real and scorable—those are two different definitions, real and scorable—of $4 trillion is actually voting for a package that likely will cause our country to be downgraded.

So here is what I think. Senator REID, has offered a proposal, and I think they scored it at $800 billion. I know it says $3 trillion; his scores at about $800 billion. Speaker BOEHNER has offered a package, and he, too, has some scoring issues with his package.

It seems to me that all of us in this body should be pressing the leaders on both sides of the aisle to at least present a package that is scorable and real in the area of $4 trillion, depending on what we decide to do with that package. But if a Senator voted for a package that was less than that, they would be casting a vote to raise the debt ceiling and at the same time probably cast our country into a situation where we are downgraded, and that doesn't make any sense to me.

So we have 6 days left. I know people back home are nervous. I did a teletownhall last night. We had thousands of people on the phone. People are angry that we have waited this long to actually get serious about this issue. They are concerned about Social Security checks, disability checks, veterans' checks. I understand that. I empathize with them. But we haven't quite finished our work. We actually are on the right topic, finally.

Again, Senator REID has offered a proposal. The House has offered a proposal. Neither one of them is strong enough.

For what it is worth—I know the Presiding Officer knows this, but I am talking to people on both sides of the aisle—I think people are reading what the markets are doing and becoming increasingly concerned about considering voting for a package. I know the Presiding Officer comes from the center of the universe as it relates to those kinds of issues. People are rising up. There are a lot of private phone calls taking place, and people are saying: Wait a minute, let's think about this. The markets—which matter, by the way, because they are the ones that buy our bonds—are now saying to us that they know we are going to deal with the debt ceiling—and I think we are—they know we are going to deal with the debt ceiling by the time we have to—and I think we are—but now they are beginning to think we are not

going to do something that is actually the real solution.

So I am here today to talk to my friends on both sides of the aisle to say let's communicate with our leadership and say that we have 6 days left. We have an opportunity to do something—we have all been saying this—that really does rise to the seminal moment to actually solve this problem. This is not a Republican issue. It is not a Democratic issue. It is something that is going to affect everybody in our country. And we are finally, after all of this time, focused on the right subject matter. I mean we really are.

I just met with a group of Senators. I am going to meet with another group of Senators here in a little while. Let's make sure our leadership on both sides of this Capitol understands that we believe voting for a package less than $4 trillion in savings over this next decade that is not real and scorable really isn't getting the job done.

I know Senator REID's approach has been to do it all at once, and maybe there is a way to craft a package between now and next Tuesday that people can vote on that has $4 trillion in real savings. I think that might be difficult, but maybe something is happening behind closed doors that we are not aware of. I know that on the other side of the building, people are concerned about—well, actually, on the other side of the building they are looking at a short-term extension.

I know the President has been concerned, candidly, about a short-term extension. In fairness, I think the business community around our country would be concerned about a long short-term extension—in other words, one that carries out months and months and we still don't have a solution to this problem. I understand that creates the kind of uncertainty that many of the people on my side of the aisle and, candidly, people on the other side of the aisle, to some degree, have talked about as it relates to the business environment.

So, sure, I would love to vote for something that solves this problem and does it all on the front end. But I assume our leadership, knowing the acrimony that is taking place—but, again, at least we are on the right subject matter, finally—the acrimony that is taking place, I assume they have some really short-term extension in their back pocket that, to the extent we don't come to a conclusion by next Tuesday, they are ready to pull out and they know it is something that can actually pass both bodies.

Again, I think we are so close now because we are finally focused on the right thing. I think we are close to getting to something that solves our country's problems for a while, causes people around the world and the country to know we actually have the will and the courage to deal with these issues and at the same time addresses the debt ceiling.

Should we not quite get there by this Tuesday—and I know there are a lot of complications, and we have bodies that are made up of two very different groups of people—I would assume our leadership, who understand what is at stake here, have in their hands, in their back pockets, a very short-term extension that could be used as a bridge for the kind of solution that maybe takes us to a place that we can all agree helps solve our country's problems.

Again, I have heard people have been coming down to the floor back and forth and criticizing each side of the aisle. I am actually more optimistic today—I am not over the top, but I am more hopeful than I was 2 weeks ago when we were not even focused on the right issues, at that time focused on casting blame. Now what we have is both bodies looking at packages to actually address the deficit we have before us.

I hope people on both sides of the aisle will talk to leadership, will let them know they have no desire to support something that does not solve the problem with all we have gone through as a country and as a body over the course of the last couple of months. I am hopeful we will figure out a solution that actually meets that test—in other words, avoids the crisis on Tuesday and, at the same time, avoids the crisis that will occur if people look at our country as a downgraded entity because we have not shown we are willing to at least deal with $4 trillion.

I think most people know I wish to do a lot more than that, and I offered a bill that was bipartisan that did a lot more than that. But I think we all now know that baked into the expectations about where our country is today is the fact that it has to be a minimum of $4 trillion. I think a lot of people have worked toward that goal. To even set up a process that is short of that does not make any sense to me. It is kind of as though you have to be kidding me: We are going to go through the aggravation of the next 6 months working toward an aspirational goal that we all know does not solve the credit rating issue?

Madam President, I thank you for the time. I hope we come to a successful conclusion soon. I stand ready and am talking with people on both sides of the aisle to try to come up with a solution so we either solve this on the front end or put in place a process, a very quick process, that takes us to a place where we know we have actually dealt with the problem.

With that, 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. FRANKEN. 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. FRANKEN. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the urgent need to raise the debt limit. I wish to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues of our obligation to represent our constituents' best interests and those of our great Nation, for at this late hour, with the deadline for an agreement fast approaching, the consequences of inaction are clear. They have been made clear by economists, they have been made clear by credit rating agencies, they have been made clear by the Federal Reserve and by our Treasury Secretary, and they have been made clear by respected leaders of each side of the aisle. And soon, if we do not act, they will be made clear by the market itself.

I keep hearing from some Members talking about the August 2 deadline as if it is no big deal. They say they have their own theories about when the real deadline is. That leaves me dumbfounded. I, for one, am going to take the Treasury Secretary and virtually every economist at their word. We need a solution before August 2 or we risk economic catastrophe.

There are some Members who are essentially saying the Treasury can prioritize payments to avoid default, but getting Social Security checks out should not be a problem. I heard a Republican Member of the House Budget Committee on Public Radio this past weekend say the money for Social Security checks is in the trust fund.

Well, yes, we have $2.6 trillion in assets in the trust fund, but they are all in Treasury securities, not cash. I find it stunning that a Member of Congress, let alone a member of the Budget Committee, would not understand the most basic functioning of our government. If there is no debt limit increase, Treasury may be able to juggle payments to get Social Security checks out on August 3, and I am sure they will do everything they can to do so, but August 3 would be just day one of Treasury's improvised prioritization strategy. August 3 is a date that about half of the Social Security checks go out. But we have another round scheduled to out on August 10, and another on August 17, and another on August 24. In fact, the Treasury sends out over 70 million checks a month. August 3 is not the end of the problem, it is the beginning.

About 1 month ago, the Bipartisan Policy Center briefed members of the House Republican caucus on the actual implications of the August 2 deadline, what we can pay and what we could not pay. Jay Powell, the former Under Secretary of Treasury under President George H.W. Bush, presented at the briefing. He outlined his research on what is likely to happen on August 3. He suggested that in the month of August we could pay our debt interest, Social Security checks, Medicare and Medicaid, vendors for Defense projects, and unemployment insurance benefits. That is what we could pay, but no pay for active-duty military, no benefits for veterans, no Federal loans for low-income students about to head off to college in the fall, no Pell grants, no

Federal Government employees, including counterterrorism agents in the FBI, for example, no border agents.

Before we default, we could have time to make this sign for all points of entry. This is the tip of the iceberg. That is a symbol of things we definitely could not afford to do.

That does not even address the global economic impacts of playing it so close to the edge. The dollar would be devalued, our credit rating would be downgraded. It would cost us much more—much more—to borrow and to pay the interest on our debt, and thus our debt would actually increase.

More importantly, all adjustable interest rates would rise, including credit cards and mortgages and student loans. New loans, of course, would be more expensive. These impacts could have a legacy that dogs us for decades, if not centuries.

This is serious business and we should not be testing this deadline. Yet that is exactly what some of my colleagues are doing. I worry that Republicans in the House are blind to research, deaf to reason, and are simply ignoring facts that are contrary to what they want to hear.

Throughout this debate, conservative House Republicans have stood in the way of a deal. We have offered them some pretty sweet deals, and they have walked away. They treated the August 2 deadline as advisory, as optional. They suggest that the Treasury can figure out something to prevent a default.

Now they are opposing Senator REID's sensible deficit reduction plan because of how it calculates some of its savings. Specifically at issue is the Reid plan's $1 trillion in savings from winding down the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, which Republicans are calling a budgetary gimmick, not real savings.

Yet the Ryan budget, which almost every House and Senate Republican voted for, counted the same cuts almost identically. So to say it is real savings in the Ryan plan but fake savings in the Reid proposal—I am sorry, but you cannot have it both ways.

Further, Senator REID's plan is actually all cuts. I do not necessarily like that. It contains dollar for dollar spending cuts to match the debt ceiling increase. And as much as I do not like this aspect of it, it does not include any revenues, even though a Washington Post-ABC News poll says that 72 percent of the American public believe we should have those making over $250,000 pay more—72 percent.

But a cuts-only plan is what Republicans have been saying they wanted all along. Now we have given it to them, we have it out there, it is there, and all of the cuts in the Reid plan have been supported by Republicans in the past. So we are presenting a plan that is all cuts, no revenue. The pretense they are using to reject it does not pass the smell test. According to CBO, it saves $1.3 trillion more in savings than the Boehner plan, such as it is. You know, I often hear Republicans say corporations are sitting on trillions of dollars of cash instead of investing, expanding, and creating jobs, because businesses are facing so much uncertainty. Well, Senator REID's plan offers certainty.

But suddenly Republicans want a short-term deal, one that would very well put us in this same crisis again in 6 months. What kind of certainty is that? No, a short-term deal will not offer our businesses and markets the certainty they need. A short-term deal may very well induce a credit downgrade, according to Standard & Poor's. Yet Republicans say they prefer a short-term deal over Senator REID's plan, which would take us through the end of next year.

I do not get it. It sounds to me as though they care more about politics and winning than they do about their constituents' well-being and the prosperity and economic security of the Nation. Their hard line and cavalier attitude is frankly dangerous—very dangerous.

Playing fast and loose with the facts is reckless. The American people deserve better. We need to raise the debt ceiling now, and Leader REID has shown us the way forward. I do not like all of the cuts in his package. I wish there were increases in revenue from those who can afford it. But I know we have to pass it because it will keep us from defaulting, and it will do so responsibly and sensibly.

We owe it to the American people to pull back from the brink and pass the Reid plan so we can avert disaster. We owe it to our constituents, and we owe it to our children.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the FAA bill. On Friday, authorization for the Federal Aviation Administration was allowed to expire. Four thousand workers were placed on furlough. The airport and airways trust fund now lacks the authority to collect user fees that fund air traffic services, airport maintenance, and other things that Americans rely on.

Let's be clear. This should not have happened. It happened because a few Members of the other body made a conscious choice to negotiate in bad faith. Clear and simple.

Let me recap it. Under the able leadership of Senator ROCKEFELLER, the Senate again passed our long-term FAA authorization in February, with a bipartisan vote of 87 to 8. Later, the House passed its bill, but largely along party lines.

In April, the Senate named conferees to negotiate a final bill. However, our friends in the House have yet to appoint conferees to join us at the negotiating table.

Meanwhile, since 2007, we have passed 20 extensions to allow this program to continue operating while we work to negotiate a long-term solution. Not a single one of those extensions has been met with controversy—not one.

However, as we undertook what should have been the latest clean extension, the House unexpectedly eliminated 13 rural airports that rely on Essential Air Service just days before the authorization expired. The House refused to reconsider and chose instead to shut down the Federal Aviation Administration.

The House seeks to save approximately one-tenth of 1 percent of overall aviation spending by attacking essential air services. I agree with anyone who wants to control Federal spending and invest in real priorities—we all do—but it simply doesn't make sense to focus on saving fractions of pennies on the dollar instead of coming to the negotiating table to hammer out long-term solutions.

At the same time, the House rejected an opportunity to protect our troops from exorbitant baggage fees. Congressman NICK RAHALL introduced an amendment to the House extension that would have prohibited air carriers from charging a baggage fee for members of the Armed Forces while traveling on official military duty, especially those checking four or fewer bags. In one instance, an airline reportedly socked a poor servicemember with a baggage fee of $3,000. Regrettably, the House rejected this offer to protect our troops, and the rejection was on a party-line vote. Those of us negotiating in good faith here in the Senate were left scratching our heads. The House would reject a clean extension to save a mere one-tenth of 1 percent by attacking rural jobs and commerce, but it would reject an opportunity to protect our troops from getting gouged by baggage fees on the same bill. It doesn't make sense.

Later, we learned through the press that the House's erratic strategy had apparently nothing to do with potential cost savings at all, but, instead, these antics were about rulemaking by the National Mediation Board. This is a labor issue that has nothing to do with essential air service and nothing to do with the daily operations of the Federal Aviation Administration, both of which could be operating right now under a clean extension. This labor issue should be worked out in a conference—the conference committee we can't have because the House has yet to name conferees.

One of the rural communities the House Members chose to cut down as a

political pawn is Glendive, MT. Glendive is growing in the energy sector. It is in the Bakken formation, with lots of oil and gas wells drilled, and it is a huge potential new energy source. Energy companies from Texas and Louisiana are rapidly sending personnel up to Glendive, and hotels in the area are running at near-full occupancy year-round. We are working hard to quickly build housing and infrastructure in order to capitalize on this great opportunity to create much needed jobs. Today, unemployment in Glendive is half the national average. But Glendive is located 230 miles from any larger airport. Glendive needs essential air service to maintain its lifeline to national commerce and continue to grow and create jobs.

We can discuss at length the merits of essential air service, the promise made to rural America, and the lifeline it provides to towns such as Glendive. In fact, this is a conversation we should have. Any changes should be made as part of thoughtful and transparent discussion, with input from the folks on the ground who are most affected. Again, that is precisely what conference negotiations are for—yet, again, negotiations we can't hold. Why? Because the House has yet to name its conferees.

The House antics have halted as much as $2.5 billion in airport funding—funding that employs as many as 87,000 workers on construction projects around the country. At Glacier International Airport in Kalispell, MT, much needed upgrades to the taxiway are now on hold indefinitely, and so are the much needed construction jobs this project would support.

Even more troubling, 4,000 mothers and fathers and breadwinners are now out of work. These are folks such as Kristina Richardson, an administrative support specialist at Billings Logan International Airport's air traffic control tower. Over the weekend, Kristina wasn't able to go grocery shopping. She didn't know if she could count on her next paycheck to buy food and pay her bills. Kristina described the pit in her stomach when she went in to clean off her desk and shut down her computer. Kristina told my office she worried about who would help the people she had been working with. She described the pride and fulfillment that comes from working and the blow that comes when that is taken away.

Luckily, Kristina was told on Tuesday she would be able to return to work. But 4,000 other folks across the country haven't been so lucky. Like most Montanans, Kristina is one tough lady, and she understands the vital importance of essential air service to rural communities. Even when she thought she had been furloughed, she hung in there. She contacted my office to voice her support for a clean FAA extension that rejects arbitrary cuts to rural communities.

I am increasingly concerned about the nature of our political discourse. Lately, it seems some folks are more focused on making 30-second sound bites than making laws. What happened with the FAA bill is an example of this misguided focus. Whatever the House's true reason for suspending 4,000-plus jobs and halting construction to improve airport safety, it just wasn't right.

Still, I know we can do good things around here when we work together, and I hold out the hope that we will return our focus to what is important and start getting work done, and it is not just here but on debt extension and a lot of major matters around here. But in the meantime, we need to fix this mess. This is easier to fix—much easier.

Along with Senator ROCKEFELLER, I introduced a clean FAA extension that would put 4,000 employees back to work, let us start construction projects around the country to create jobs and improve the safety of our airports, and continue to fund the trust fund. Then together we can continue working on a longer term solution. I urge my colleagues to support a clean extension.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, we have three separate issues facing the Congress. First, the authority of the Treasury Department to borrow to meet the Nation's obligations will be reached on Tuesday. In order for borrowing to continue after Tuesday, Congress needs to raise the debt ceiling. That is the first of the three issues.

The second issue we face is the need to help our economy to become prosperous again. Unfortunately, the debate in Congress has totally lost sight of this issue, the issue of how we can grow the economy and how we can create jobs.

The third of the three issues is the need to put in place a long-term plan to reduce the deficit and the debt. The issue of raising the debt ceiling and reducing the long-term deficit and debt have, unfortunately, come to be seen by many in Congress as a single issue. So I want to urge all colleagues to take a step back and to recognize, first, that these issues are separate and, second, that failure to responsibly deal with the first of these issues; that is, failure to raise the debt limit, will greatly hamper our ability to deal with the other two issues that I mentioned.

The failure to raise the debt limit will not return our economy to prosperity; instead, it will postpone the day when that prosperity returns. Failure to raise the debt limit will not help reduce our debt and deficit. It will add to the debt and deficit by raising interest rates for the government and for all Americans.

So let's review how we got here.

Since the beginning of this Congress nearly 7 months ago, the Republican majority in the House has had a laser focus on one issue; that is, cutting spending. To achieve that objective, the first strategy adopted by the Republican leadership in the House was to threaten a shutdown of the government unless sufficient spending cuts were agreed to. Spending cuts were agreed to, and at the final hour Republicans agreed to pass the bill that was needed to fund the government for the balance of the fiscal year. By that I mean through September 30 of this year.

So as soon as that crisis was averted and the threat to close down the government was behind us, at least for a few months, the effort shifted to a new strategy. This strategy was to threaten a first-in-history default by the government on its financial obligations if enough additional spending cuts were not agreed to; that is, spending cuts in addition to what were agreed to, in order to avert a shutdown of the government. The device for bringing about that default was refusal to extend the debt ceiling when the government's borrowing authority was scheduled to be reached August 2, next Tuesday.

We should remind ourselves of what an artificial device is being used for leverage in this negotiation. Congress passes the laws that determine how much revenue the Federal Government collects, and Congress passes the laws that determine how much we obligate the government to spend. When the revenue we collect is less than the amount we are committed to spend, the Secretary of the Treasury has no alternative but to borrow money to meet the obligations that Congress has taken on.

So in a period like today, when the government is receiving in revenues much less than is required to meet its obligations, there are two logical actions for Congress to take. First, it can raise more revenue; second, it can reduce the obligations of the government. But in refusing to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow, we are taking neither of these logical steps. Instead, we are telling the Secretary of the Treasury to default on the obligations which this and previous Congresses have already taken on on behalf of the American people.

We are told by the Secretary of the Treasury that unless Congress acts he will be forced to default or renege on our obligations beginning next week, August 2. The refusal to raise the debt ceiling and the threatening of default on our obligations has achieved much of what Republicans set out to achieve in this Congress. It has precipitated a crisis and in order to avoid that crisis,

Democrats have agreed to or acceded to the primary demands the Republican majority in the House have made.

What are those demands? There are two primary demands. The first of those demands was that all of the deficit reduction be accomplished with cuts in spending. No revenue could be raised from the wealthiest in our society to help close this gap between revenues and spending; no loopholes could be closed; no subsidies could be eliminated from the Tax Code.

Democrats have agreed that the deficit reduction would not be accomplished with a balanced package of spending cuts and revenue increases as the previous deficit reduction packages have been under President Reagan, under President George H.W. Bush, and of course under President Clinton. This deficit reduction that we are now considering would be done with spending cuts only. So that was the first demand and it was one that Democrats have acceded to.

The second demand of the Republican leadership was the totally arbitrary demand that the size of the increase in the debt ceiling not exceed the amount of spending cuts projected in the Federal budget over the next 10 years. This is a demand totally lacking in any logical justification, but, again, Democrats have agreed in order to achieve a solution to the immediate impasse.

In order to avoid the threatened default on our obligations, Senator REID has put forward a proposal that would lock in, according to the Congressional Budget Office, about $2.2 trillion of deficit reduction over 10 years with cuts in both discretionary spending and mandatory spending. The Treasury Secretary would be given authority to borrow to meet the obligations that Congress has undertaken for approximately another 18 months. The proposal also puts in place a bipartisan and a bicameral committee with responsibility to present Congress with legislation to further reduce the deficit.

Unfortunately, it appears this proposal that Senator REID has made will be opposed by many on the Republican side. Some say the cuts are not sufficiently deep and that they would rather push the country into default rather than agree to a mere $2.2 trillion in spending cuts.

Some others say they want to extend the debt ceiling for a shorter period so we can have another showdown with another threatened government default 6 or 7 months from now. Some say that causing the Federal Government to default will not have the adverse consequences the Secretary of the Treasury has predicted and that in fact it will have a salutary effect on both our economy and our politics.

I strongly disagree with all of these views. I believe a refusal to honor our obligations will have a major adverse consequence for our economy. I believe Congress should act now to raise the debt limit in order to avoid these adverse consequences and that, although the proposal Senator REID has brought forward fails the test of balance between spending cuts and revenue increases which I would prefer, it is a plan I am willing to support in order to head off a default on our Nation's obligations. I understand additional deficit reduction will be required in the months and years ahead, but clearly the responsible course is to do what can be done today and that is adopt the Reid plan. Only by doing so can we once again focus on the steps we can take to return our economy to prosperity. That is the first priority for most Americans today. It should be our first priority as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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. BROWN of Ohio. 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. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, this week we have a unique opportunity to reduce the deficit to the tune of $2.2 trillion. That is $2.2 trillion to protect Medicare, to protect Social Security, to protect Medicaid, and to make sure the United States of America doesn't do something we have never done; that is, go into default.

We can debate how we got here. We can debate why we have this huge budget deficit. We can debate whether it is Barack Obama's fault or George Bush's fault. We can debate whether it was the Recovery Act or whether it was the two wars President Bush didn't pay for. We can debate whether it is the health care bill of President Obama or the giveaway to the drug and insurance companies that President Bush did in the name of Medicare privatization. We could talk about President Bush's tax cuts. We could do any of that, but the urgency of this situation is not a question for debate. Never before has the full faith and credit of the United States of America been held hostage to a major budget agreement.

In the past three decades before President Obama—so let's take him out of this picture for a minute—we have avoided default by raising the debt limit 38 times in the last 30 years before President Obama. Out of those 38 times, 34 of those times—almost 90 percent—were under Republican Presidents. Again, 34 of 38 times were under Republican Presidents. We didn't do a hostage-taking. We didn't try to scare people. Even if we didn't like doing it, we simply raised the debt ceiling.

As I and many Democratic colleagues have said, we can balance the budget as we did under President Clinton. I came to office in 1992 in the House. I voted for a controversial budget. No Republicans joined us. We had almost 8 years of economic growth, with 21 million net private sector jobs created, and we got to a balanced budget. We know how to do that. We do it with a balance between spending cuts and revenues, especially closing tax loopholes, giveaways to the oil companies, tax breaks for companies that outsource jobs, and tax breaks for hedge fund operators on Wall Street. We can close those tax loopholes. We can do spending cuts, and we can do what we need to do to move toward a balanced budget.

During those 38 times, there were freestanding votes. Each time it was raised, there was a freestanding vote. Neither party played these games. Neither party held our Nation hostage to these political games.

Rather than a freestanding vote on the debt limit, we are in a last-minute scramble. Democrats have said: OK, we will reach an agreement. Never has one party insisted that the amount of the increase in the debt limit be offset by an equal amount of spending cuts. We have even agreed to that approach. Never before has one party insisted that a major budget agreement exclude provisions that address revenue. We have even said yes to that. Now having had their demands met, the people in the party who insisted on all these conditions are saying no. They are saying no again.

The debate on the debt and the deficit has been complicated, it has been contentious, it has been angry, but a default should be unimaginable. A default should be unimaginable. A default would risk what would amount to a permanent tax hike.

I hear many of the radicals in the House of Representatives who say they will never vote for a debt increase, as if it is something we should never, ever do in a country. They all talk about tax cuts, but a default on the part of the United States of America would amount to a permanent tax hike on all Americans. Interest rates would rise for anyone owning a home, paying a home mortgage, applying for a home mortgage, anyone with a car loan, anyone with a college loan. Credit costs for all borrowers would climb for governments at every level, businesses, nonprofits, small businesses, large businesses, credit card holders. There would be repercussions for pension funds and money market funds that guard the retirement savings of middle-class families.

Basically, everybody in the Presiding Officer's home State of Minnesota, in my home State of Ohio—everybody would be afflicted with this tax increase, if you will, from higher interest rates. Several States have already been placed on a credit watch. Every State would be hurt by a Federal default, which is why Governors of both parties are saying: Make a deal; get to this. This is not alarmist thinking.

There is a reason Ronald Reagan went to Congress 18 times to raise the debt ceiling. Here is what President Reagan said:

The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of a default—

That is where we are right now, in a serious prospect of default—

by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar.

None of us is being alarmist because we really don't know, but we know people whom most Americans respect—President Reagan, President Clinton, others who have asked for a debt ceiling increase, economists, businesspeople—nobody knows for sure what would happen, but nobody has ever wanted to take that risk. We have always paid our bills. Default could affect Ohioans receiving Medicare and Social Security. It could affect veterans in hospitals and universities. President Obama has said he can't guarantee payments to senior citizens, to bondholders, or other obligations of the United States of America. You cannot fake cashflow. These are real consequences.

When it comes to jobs, to seniors living on fixed income, in the midst of an economic growth that is as fragile as ours is, lawmakers ought to suspend their politics. Today, the harm of inaction would be immense.

President Obama put several proposals forward to reduce the deficit in a big way, modeled after these bipartisan commissions where there has been pretty good bipartisan agreement. But efforts to forge a grand compromise bringing the deficit down by $4 trillion have been abandoned by Republican leaders over and over.

I have not supported every detail on these grand compromise efforts. I don't want to do anything to undermine Medicare or Social Security or Medicaid, programs that have worked for generations now and programs that millions of Ohioans depend on, from Middletown to Ashtabula, from Toledo to Athens and Gallipolis. I wanted a more balanced approach. I know the Presiding Officer did too. But as days and weeks and months go by, we are now only days away from default. We are simply running out of time. That is what the Senate bill is about—protecting us from default.

In the spirit of continued compromise, again, the majority leader has come forth with a plan to reduce the deficit by $2.2 trillion. It is truly a compromise because it meets the Republicans' main criteria. It contains spending cuts to roughly match the debt ceiling increase through 2012. The spending cuts in the Reid plan are ones to which Republicans have previously agreed. It contains no revenue increases. All three of those have been what Republicans asked for. But now it is not good enough. What do they want to do when we basically met their demands?

Beyond all that, this compromise we have offered—mostly what they have asked for—contains an important priority of mine—not one of the Republicans, to be sure—and that is that we protect Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

I know that major Republican budgets—the so-called Ryan budget, the Republican House budget—undercut our major important programs, Medicare and Medicaid especially. We know the so-called cut, cap, and balance proposal the Republicans have passed that is being voted on here didn't protect Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. So we know Republicans want to go after those programs. Under this compromise, we have been able to protect that, but we need to make sure we put country ahead of party, national interest above partisanship. That is why we have been willing to compromise.

Speaker BOEHNER's plan is being revised, but so far it provides significantly less than the savings in the Reid proposal. By design, the Boehner plan would put us back in this situation in a few months. What rational economist, what responsible elected official, what businessperson in St. Paul or Columbus, in Rochester or Mansfield—what businessperson would say: Let's put the U.S. in this situation again in 6 months?

We know what has happened in this country in the last month or so. As we approach default, as businesses particularly watch the way this is being debated and how this is being handled, people are way less certain, people are way more concerned about our ability to raise the debt ceiling and keep us out of default. Businesses are holding on to their cash reserves because they are not willing to invest now because they don't want this to happen.

So why would we want to go through this again in 6 months? Why would we possibly think this is good for the United States—for people in Chillicothe and Dayton, in Youngstown and Akron, in Canton and Kenton, Wauseon and Bowling Green? Why would we want businesses in our country to go through this again in 6 months?

We need to get this done quickly. We have to raise the debt ceiling to keep us out of default. We need to make sure we focus on deficit reduction, and we need to put our efforts into job creation. People all over my State—when I am in Dayton, Springfield, Cuyahoga County or Mahoney County, as I was this past weekend—people are mostly saying they want us to focus on job growth. We need to do budget cuts and raise the debt ceiling to keep us out of default. We mostly need to make sure we move forward on job creation.

We prevent a default and reduce the deficit with the Reid plan—a critical imperative for our children and our grandchildren. It protects Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid.

My office is being swamped with calls and e-mails from Ohioans who simply can't believe we are this close to default. Within the week, Congress must pass and the President must sign an increase in the debt ceiling. It is essential if we want to prevent an absolutely unnecessary, an absolutely uncalled for, yet catastrophic default. It is necessary to move on to address the issue of jobs. Too many recent college graduates, too many people who have been in the workforce for too many years, too many people who are unemployed are looking for jobs. That is where our focus should be.

We need to pass the Reid plan, work on deficit reduction, and work on job growth.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. 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. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, as I think many of my colleagues have, to speak to the topic at hand, which is the debt ceiling debate we are having in the Congress of the United States.

I have to say, I think Americans across the country are looking at us with disbelief, anxiety, and—I think rightly—anger. They awoke this morning hoping to find that cooler heads had prevailed and that all of us were working together on a plan that keeps our country from default and our economy from looming collapse. Instead, the headlines read that the Speaker of the House was again refusing to negotiate and that he is, in fact, delaying action in the House because of Republican upheaval against his own plan.

I have to say, even if the House of Representatives passed a bill preventing default this evening, within hours, we would still be pushing our country right up to the edge of an economic catastrophe. In other words, what I am saying is, even though economists, market analysts, business leaders, credit rating agencies, world leaders, and the American people are begging us to find an agreement to avoid default on our debt obligations, we are no further along today than we have been in the many weeks we have been debating this issue.

As the Presiding Officer knows, as a former Member of the House, I take no pleasure in criticizing the people's House. But it does take two to tango, and when it comes to courting the House of Representatives, it feels as though they have one shoe nailed to the dance floor. I can't figure out for the life of me what it is going to take to reach an agreement on behalf of the American people. The House of Representatives just can't take yes for an answer.

The real problem, at least in my estimation, seems to be that a small group of people are set on running up the political score rather than doing the

right thing for our country. If that is the case, now is the time to finally come to the table.

Here is the truth: Many of us here are trying to prevent our economy from driving off a cliff, but others seem to be busy cutting the brake lines. On that point, I was proud of the Senate and the Democrats and Republicans who came together on the bipartisan Bowles-Simpson Commission and came up with a plan on reducing the deficit. They were willing to be a part of the solution.

The Bowles-Simpson Commission recommended taking important but difficult steps to reduce our debt by $4 trillion over the next decade. That plan is the right one for the country, and despite the significant political risks attached to taking those positions, Senators in both parties were willing to support it. The House Members, on the other hand, when the fiscal commission offered them the bipartisan deficit reduction plan, walked away, both Democrats and Republicans, to be fair.

Unfortunately, this has become a pattern. When Vice President JOE BIDEN and House Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR were close to finally reaching an agreement on a deficit reduction plan, it was the House Republicans who walked away. When President Obama and Speaker BOEHNER sought to strike a ''grand bargain,'' to do something great for the country, the House walked away. President Obama likened this to being left at the altar, but I cannot think of any description that is more apt than ''irresponsible.''

For my friends and my colleagues who know me, I am not quick to anger. But I have to say, time is not our friend here and we cannot delay action any longer. I was pleased to see Senator ALEXANDER, the third ranking Republican in the Senate, say last night:

> What would be best, instead of having a Republican plan competing with a Democratic plan, would be to have the Speaker, Senator Reid, and Senator McConnell recommend to us a single plan.

I understand the Senate leaders are speaking frequently, and I have all the faith in the world that the Senate could work this problem out. But that is only half the problem. We need statesmen, we need patriots, we need problem solvers over in the House to emerge. Campaign politics and partisan talking points do not take courage. Now is the time for courage and leadership.

Instead of going back to the drawing board on the Boehner plan, we need to refocus our efforts on a plan that meets three tests. Such a plan has to, No. 1, raise the debt limit to avoid a first ever Federal Government default; No. 2, provide enough certainty to investors that America will pay its bills to stave off a downgrade in our credit rating; and, No. 3, reduce the deficit enough that we can begin the hard work to get our fiscal house in order.

The Reid plan, in my estimation, achieves each of those goals. While I am disappointed we could not all come together on a larger $4 to $5 trillion deficit reduction package that would be both bipartisan and comprehensive, the Reid plan adequately addresses the most pressing issues that confront us, which are preventing a default and staving off a downgrade in our credit rating.

The Boehner plan, on the other hand, is only a short-term fix, and a host of economic forecasters and business leaders have said it would almost certainly lead to a downgrade in our, in America's, credit rating, which would raise interest rates, could sabotage seniors' retirement savings, and increase consumer costs on almost every American.

Bank of America, Standard & Poor's, JPMorgan Chase, and other major players have all warned us that future economic instability and short-term political solutions will almost certainly lead to a downgrade in our credit rating. That is some serious business.

What is sad about all of this is that the unstable political climate—which one observer called ''amateur hour on Capitol Hill''—itself may lead to a downgrade.

I respect the Speaker's desire to go back to the drawing board to try to secure more Republican votes, but the fact is we do not have time. The Reid plan is ready to go, and it meets the three-part test I laid out. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office stated that the Reid plan reduces the deficit by twice as much as the House Republican plan. As reported this morning ''in the battle of budget scores, the Senate Democrats deficit reduction bill is the clear winner thus far.''

Our economy has been in critical condition, and I think we are feeling recently that it is beginning to come back to life, that we have been nursing it back to health. The last result we need is a self-inflicted heart attack caused by an overdose of partisanship. People wonder why we cannot get it done.

I know the Presiding Officer is a mountain climber, as am I, and we are both, I guess, old mountain climbers in more ways than one. I can tell you that there are some similarities between attempting to climb the world's highest peaks and our work here in Washington. But the difference seems to be, especially when the going gets tough here on Capitol Hill, that not only are you trying to conquer mountainous and challenging and difficult terrain, you seem to have a team of saboteurs here who are trying to push the rest of us off the mountain as we are trying to climb it. The Scots have a saying: It is not the falling off that hurts. It is the sudden stop at the bottom. I can tell you, if we do not raise the debt ceiling, that is going to involve a sudden stop at the bottom for all of us.

The people of Colorado have told me—and I suspect the rest of the Nation feels this way—they do not care who wins politically. Frankly, I do not care who wins politically either. What I care about is passing legislation that will stave off government default and a downgrade in our Nation's credit rating. At this point, the Reid plan is the only option that meets that criteria. Let's get it done. Let's get it done.

TRIBUTE TO HILLARY DANIELS

Mr. President, as I close, I want to change the tone of my remarks a little bit because there are wonderful people who work here on Capitol Hill and make a difference day in and day out, and I want to recognize Hillary Daniels, who has been one of my budget and appropriations legislative assistants, who joined my team when I first came to the Senate 3 years ago.

She is a native of Colorado's western slope, the great county of Mesa and the town of Grand Junction. She is going to be leaving my office next month to go to law school at Washington University in St. Louis, MO.

She has been an invaluable team member, and I can speak for my entire staff when I say we are both excited for her to take this next step in developing her career and I am very grateful for the guidance she has given me over the last few years.

It is for the Hillary Daniels of the world, who will be leaders of our country in the next decade and the decade after that, that I think we owe an obligation to getting this job done as soon as we possibly can, assuring the markets that the full faith and credit of the United States will be preserved and protected and nurtured.

Let's turn back to job one here, which is to focus on our economy and job creation. The longer we are stalled out in a political crisis of our own making, the less we are concerned and focused on putting the American people back to work.

Mr. President, thank you for your interest, thank you for your attention.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

SPECTRUM AUCTIONS

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I just filed an amendment to S. 1323 to BRAC the spectrum. This would give us the maximum auction revenue and access to spectrum for economic development and deficit reduction. I am proud to have the amendment endorsed by Americans for Tax Reform.

It is very important for the Congress to authorize spectrum incentive auctions. While we should protect broadcasters who choose not to participate in such actions and their customers who rely on over-the-air broadcast for entertainment and public emergency information, incentive auctions would free up much needed spectrum for the civilian side in making sure that broadband communications are fully available in the United States.

It should be, in short, the policy of the United States to offer the widest

amount of broadband spectrum to empower the 21st century economy here—cell phones were invented in the United States, in fact, mostly in my home State of Illinois—and making sure this is the country where not just 1G and 2G and 3G were invented and deployed, but to make sure 5G and 6G and 7G are also deployed first in the United States and not in a country such as China or India.

According to the Federal Communications Commission, the U.S. Treasury has already collected $50 billion in spectrum receipts since 1993. Senator REID's plan does authorize such auctions, but it is missing a key element to ensure they are very successful. Unfortunately, like many other agencies in the administration, the Federal Communications Commission has worked to promulgate regulations that stifle innovation and economic growth. It is important for Congress to prohibit the FCC from establishing new, similar rules or conditions that are outside the scope of technical, ethical, or geographic qualifications. Such conditions, for example, the ''net neutrality'' provisions, will only serve to depress the market value of the spectrum; therefore, decreasing government revenues and lowering our ability to reduce the deficit in this way.

One recent study found that ''Congress has tremendous discretion about the amount of proceeds it could raise in exchange for spectrum'' because ''the amount of money that an auction can raise for the [U.S.] Treasury [and the government] is impacted at least in part by controllable decisions about how the auction configures the spectrum for sale and the conditions imposed on it.'' The study analyzed a previous spectrum auction to estimate the potential receipts from future actions based on conditions the FCC may or may not impose. The researchers found that the full auction potential of the broadcast spectrum with no conditions imposed would raise as much as $91 billion, whereas the same auction with heavy and unappealing conditions, such as net neutrality, would only raise $26 billion. That is a difference of $65 billion. We could raise, to lower our deficit, 250 percent more in funds with an incentive auction if we ensure that the FCC does not impose market-killing restrictions.

My proposal would place limits on the FCC, in addition to establishing a number of other prohibitions to make sure the FCC does not artificially reduce the spectrum value, to lower our deficit. The Kirk amendment would prohibit the FCC from restricting participants in any auction and from prescribing certain rates, terms, or services that may be offered by bidders in order to encourage the most robust participation and license bidding. To avoid future devaluation of spectrum licenses, the amendment would also prohibit the FCC from changing the rules of the game after an auction was completed.

But simply selling spectrum voluntarily given up by broadcasters is not enough to solve our credit crunch. We know that wireless subscribership in the United States has increased more than 400 percent in the last 15 years, and experts expect mobile data traffic to be 35 times higher in 2014 than it was back in 2009. Yet only 22 percent of all viable wireless frequencies are licensed for mobile broadband. Industry experts anticipate spectrum will be exhausted in the most populous markets by 2014. Such a restriction then would stunt wireless and other technological development in the United States because we will not have enough bandwidth to continue innovating. Internet service will then slow and calls will be dropped. We should not let this scenario unfold. We should reach our full technological potential because broadband development is a key job creator for the 21st century.

According to one estimate, the information and communications industry contributed more than $1.7 trillion to the U.S. gross domestic product in 2009 or over 12 percent of our total national income. Another study found that broadband provides additional annual consumer benefits of roughly $32 billion per year. It is widely acknowledged that wireless broadband also generates productivity gains of approximately $28 billion annually, and one cost estimate even puts productivity gains from the development and use of wireless broadband at almost $860 billion in 2016. In my own State of Illinois, this study estimates that the savings from increased productivity will reach about $5.8 billion in 5 years. This demonstrates that every sector of our economy benefits from wireless development.

For example, broadband development will vastly improve health care services for seniors. One study finds that reduced medical costs, reduced costs of institutionalized living, and increased output generated by seniors and disabled individuals will save about $927 billion between 2005 and 2030. Advancements in wireless technologies aim to reduce the burden on the chronically ill by providing remote monitoring of medical functions and to save lives through public safety interoperable networks.

Yet very little of this will be achievable unless we make more spectrum available to the civilian sector. Not surprisingly, the Federal Government itself is the largest and most stubborn squatter on the spectrum. According to the Technology Policy Institute, the government currently has exclusive or shared ownership of more than half the ideal spectrum for wireless development.

Much of the spectrum is not even being used or used efficiently by the government. Unfortunately, it is largely unknown how exactly Federal agencies and departments are using the spectrum and which spectrum we could better use on the civilian side.

My amendment, in short, would establish a process identical to the successful Base Realignment and Closure Commission to determine which Federal spectrum should be offered for sale or shared use by the private sector. While the government has much of this authority, it consistently fails to utilize it.

A BRAC-like commission for the spectrum is a key model for its reallocation and would help accelerate the development of broadband in the United States, without the standard congressional roadblocks that would inhibit development.

The amendment also provides assurances that the government will vacate spectrum once the process is complete and requires the Office of Management and Budget to intervene in the relocation process if agencies are failing to comply with the relocation plan and penalizing agencies if they do not meet the BRAC timeline.

The Kirk amendment would provide the telecommunications industry with a certain path forward for reliably clear spectrum to advance employment in the United States through wireless advancement.

I urge congressional leaders to consider this proposal. It comes from neither Republican nor Democratic sides. It is one of the most valuable assets that the government is currently squatting on and could be part of an overall deficit reduction plan totalling upward of $90 billion, but I think that benefit understates the true potential. Because if we set a goal of the United States being the country that offers the most broadband wireless spectrum, then we ensure that this critical 21st century industry remains in the United States and that the pace of innovation in wireless always is fastest in America as opposed to Asia or Europe.

That is why I put the amendment forward. I would seek its adoption as part of our deficit negotiations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Senate majority leader HARRY REID has presented a plan to address our deficits and to end the debt ceiling impasse that threatens to cripple our economy.

The Treasury is projected to run out of money next week and time is running short. Senator REID has shown great leadership with his pragmatic package. Leader REID's proposal would give the Treasury the authority to ensure the United States does not default on its debt, while at the same time cutting $2.7 trillion from our budget.

The unprecedented set of cuts would have a significant effect in balancing

our budget and restoring fiscal sustainability to the Federal Government. I wish to highlight one key fact. Unlike the House Republican budget and unlike the so-called cut, cap, and balance plan, Leader REID's plan will preserve Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Protecting Social Security and Medicare benefits is particularly important. The Republicans have long coveted Social Security and wanted to turn it over to Wall Street. George Bush tried and failed to do this because the American people wanted none of it, but they tried.

The House Republican budget attacked Medicare, effectively turning it over to the private health insurance industry in 10 years. When the American people found out this was hidden in the Republican budget, they wanted none of it. Huge majorities of the American public disapproved of the Republican budget attack on Medicare.

But instead of relenting, the Republicans came back with cut, cap, and balance. Hidden behind that slogan was an even worse attack on Medicare. The House budget would have raised senior's costs more than $6,000 a year. Cut, cap, and balance would have gone $2,500 beyond that. Cut, cap, and kill Medicare was a better name for it.

Against that relentless Republican effort to go against the will of the American people and kill off Medicare, Leader REID's proposal protects this vital program and the freedom and security it provides to American families.

Make no mistake about it, our deficit reduction plan will not be easy. It will cut discretionary spending by $1.2 trillion over the next decade. These budget reductions will require some tough but necessary choices. The plan would also count for an accelerated wind-down of U.S. forces in Iraq and Afghanistan, saving $1 trillion in the process.

Our troops in the Middle East deserve our admiration and praise for so successfully carrying out their missions. We must, however, continue to press for a strategy that will bring our troops home as soon as we safely can.

The Reid deficit plan would find an additional $40 billion savings by cutting fraud and abuse in tax compliance and a number of nondefense Federal programs and $60 billion in other savings, including cutting unnecessary spending on agricultural subsidies and auctioning off electromagnetic spectrum that the government currently holds.

Finally, by cutting the budget by over $2 trillion, we will have to borrow less money than anticipated, and that will save an additional $400 billion in projected interest costs. In total, the Senate Democratic plan on which we will vote would cut the deficit by $2.7 trillion over the next 10 years.

While Senator REID's proposal would not address the tax gimmicks and loopholes throughout our Tax Code that help favor the well-connected, this omission does not mean Democrats have given up on ensuring that there is shared sacrifice as we work to balance the budget.

Instead, this package acknowledges the political realities of the moment. Many House Republicans have flatly refused to entertain raising any revenue: not one tax loophole, no cutting of taxpayer subsidies to profitable oil companies, no closing down of offshore tax havens. That is wrong. The Reid package reserves the tax side of budget reform for another day.

We look forward to a robust discussion in the weeks and months ahead over Republican priorities that put special interest loopholes ahead of the interests of American families and ahead of the interests of the American economy.

The Reid plan would establish a bipartisan commission to recommend budget changes and those recommendations would then be guaranteed an up-or-down vote in both Houses of Congress before the end of the year. These recommendations should focus on cutting the unjustifiable tax giveaways—the tax earmarks—that allow profitable companies to avoid taxes entirely and permit megamillionaires and billionaires to pay lower effective tax rates than do middle-class families.

The Reid plan meets the Republicans' initial demands in the debt ceiling negotiations. It cuts $2.7 trillion from the budget—greater than the amount by which the debt limit would be increased—and leaves tax reform for the next round of budget reform. But it does not yield to the Republican attack on Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid.

I hope Republicans in the Senate and the House will appreciate the balance of Senator REID's approach and support it. But what if they do not? The House is in disarray. The Speaker does not appear to have the votes. Some of the extremists will not take yes for an answer, and some of the most extreme appear to relish the prospect of America's economy colliding with the debt ceiling.

Let's consider what should occur if Congress fails to lift the debt ceiling. Congress will have sent President Obama three different messages, and they create an irreconcilable conflict. Think about it. Message 1 is: We want him to spend money on all these things. We want him to conduct our wars and our national defense. We want him to send out Social Security checks. We want him to pay the doctors and the hospitals that provide Medicare services. We want him to keep guards on our borders and in our prisons, keep air traffic controllers in the towers, run the rest of the Federal Government.

We tell the President to do that by passing laws. It is by law that the President does these things. Message 2 that we send is: Here is the money we will allow him to collect for the Treasury to pay for all those things. Again, it is by law that we authorize the President to collect that money for the Treasury—by law.

There is a slight problem. The things we have instructed the President to do by law add up to a lot more expense than the money by law we allow him—the executive branch—to collect. So the executive branch has had to borrow—and borrow they have—up to $14 trillion.

If we do not lift the debt ceiling, we send message 3: Do not borrow any more. We do not change message 1, and we do not change message 2. We just add message 3: Do not borrow any more.

As anyone can see, there is no way to reconcile those three instructions. One, by law, we tell the executive branch to send out all these checks and make payments; two, by law, we appropriate too little money to pay for what we have told the executive branch to do; and, three, by law, we would tell the executive branch of government they cannot borrow the difference.

That creates an irreconcilably mixed signal. Do this, but there is not enough money, and do not borrow. This is irresponsible and it is bad government. If Congress wants to stop paying the troops, stop sending out Social Security checks, shutter agencies of the Federal Government or defund Medicare, we should have a proper debate and say so and be responsible for it.

But we have not, and that failure creates an impossible situation for the executive branch under our constitutional principles of separation of powers. Remember why officials in the executive branch pay the soldiers and contractors who support our war efforts. Because Congress has told them to. Congress has the power of the purse.

Remember why the executive branch sends out Social Security checks and payments to doctors and hospitals for providing Medicare services. Because Congress has told them to. Congress has the power of the purse. Remember why the President pays the salaries of Border Patrol agents and prison guards and air traffic controllers and FBI agents and staff in our veterans hospital. Because Congress has told him to do that. Congress holds the power of the purse.

Who is responsible for not giving the President enough money to pay for all of this, for forcing the Treasury to borrow? Congress has set how much the executive branch can collect because Congress has that power of the purse.

Now we are telling the President to do all we have told him to do but without enough money and do not borrow. We all learned in civics that Congress has the power to make laws and the power of the purse. We learned that the President has the solemn obligation to faithfully execute the laws Congress has passed. That is the basic structure of American Government.

Outside of a few narrow and specific areas that are assigned exclusively to the executive or judicial authority by

our Constitution, the constitutional rule is clear: Congress instructs the President by law what to do, and the President faithfully executes those laws.

But what happens if Congress will not instruct clearly? What happens under our Constitution when faithfully executing one law Congress has passed requires the President to fail to faithfully execute another law? How can the President faithfully execute irreconcilably conflicting instructions from Congress?

As a matter of constitutional principle, there is only one logical resolution I can see to this constitutional predicament which Congress has created.

When the matter is sufficiently grave to merit the President's attention, and when Congress sends irreconcilable messages for the President to faithfully execute, a zone of executive discretion must necessarily open to allow the President to make the best decisions for the American people in the area where Congress has sent those irreconcilable mixed signals.

Of course, the instant Congress resolves its conflicting signals, stops speaking out of both sides of its mouth, and sends a clear direction, that zone of executive discretion disappears. Congress has the power. Congress makes the laws. Congress controls the purse. Whatever fiscal path Congress instructs the President to embark on, he must faithfully execute that instruction from Congress.

But Congress can't put the President in the untenable position of having to fail in the ''faithful execution'' of one set of laws in order to ''faithfully execute'' another. That is exactly where it seems to me we would put the President if we failed to lift the debt ceiling.

The damage to the country from such failure would be profound. At least 40 cents of every Federal dollar would suddenly stop flowing into the economy. Considering what would have to be done with the remaining 60 cents, it is not very likely that the Federal regulatory process would keep running. That means every job in the country, depending on a Federal permit or Federal approval or a Federal grant or a Federal contract, would likely grind to a halt.

There would be a jump in interest rates that would hit Federal, State, municipal, corporate, and family budgets. A lot of other stuff might also go wrong, but those three are a bare minimum, and they alone would constitute a brutal shock to our struggling economy. The damage would be grave.

Bad enough if Congress instructed the President to do this kind of damage, but do we really expect him to do that sort of damage without our clear instruction? The scale of this damage lights up in sharp contrast to the constitutional predicament Congress would create through Congress's failure and inaction to send clear direction.

The 14th amendment provision, that the public debt of the United States of America ''shall not be questioned,'' may or may not be controlling here. That specific amendment is not my point. My point is a more basic one: How, under our separated powers, when Congress gives conflicting directives, does the President ''faithfully execute'' those conflicting directives? The conflicting directives problem is ultimately a problem for Congress to solve. But until Congress sorts itself out and gives a clear directive, all that can be constitutionally expected of the President is to do the best he can for the country. He cannot ''faithfully execute'' conflicting directives.

In a sense, conflicting directives by Congress are a form of abdication by Congress—an abdication of the duty imposed on Congress by article I of the Constitution to make and pass laws. It is only reasonable and proper to infer that the constitutional duty of Congress to make and pass laws implies that the Congress will make and pass laws that are capable of faithful execution by the executive.

A Congress that cannot meet that standard is in no position to complain that the executive branch has usurped its authority. More to the point, the constitutional cure is always right in Congress's hands: Sort out your differences; give the executive branch the direction it is Congress's duty to provide.

To me, at least, this is a reading of the separation of powers in the U.S. Constitution that makes sense, that is consistent with the underlying principles of that great document, that is practical and workable, and that allows for governance rather than paralysis in circumstances when congressional dysfunction deprives the President of the clear legislative direction that by clear implication is Congress's duty to provide.

I hope before we pitch over the looming fiscal precipice, the executive branch gives these views thoughtful consideration.

I yield the floor.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pursuant to the order of July 21, 2011, and after having notified the Republican leader, we proceed, at 2 p.m. today, to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 276, Robert S. Mueller III, of California, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is my understanding this debate is to take 2 hours; is that true?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of July 21, the Senator is correct.

Without objection, the majority leader has the authority under that order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

THE DEBT LIMIT

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I will address the issue of the pending debt limit.

Although the President's most recent speech on this did not give me great cause for confidence, I still hope he will drop his insistence on the huge tax increase in return for making the meaningful spending cuts and reforms that we need. I hope, most of all, he will drop his opposition to putting our budget on a path to balance.

That is the big item I think we need in this debate. I think we ought to be willing to raise the debt limit, as I am, if in return for that we would have a commitment of the President to put us on a path to a balanced budget, as President Clinton committed to and he achieved with a Republican Congress back in 1995. I hope we will reach an agreement that solves the underlying problem prior to August 2.

I am here this afternoon because I think we all have to acknowledge that we are late in the process, and I think it is indisputable that there is at least a possibility that August 2 will arrive without having raised the debt ceiling, whatever our personal preferences might be about that.

In my view, since that is a possibility, it is essential that the Federal Government have a plan for what we will do if those circumstances arise. Specifically, what is going to have to happen is the government will have to spend some period of time—probably a very brief time, but a period of time nevertheless—operating exclusively on the ongoing tax revenues that will be coming in without the ability to go out and borrow additional money. That means necessarily that somebody is going to make decisions about prioritizing payments, by some criteria that somebody will come up with.

Rather than simply wait and stumble into this period and discover what somebody has come up with, I think we ought to lay out a plan. So that is what my recently introduced legislation is meant to do.

Some of us have made this argument for a long time. We saw this day coming, and we have known that we would face a difficult time raising this debt ceiling. It has always been possible that we would not do it by August 2. I have been arguing that we ought to have this plan.

Unfortunately, the administration has persisted in denying that it is even possible to prioritize. It is ridiculous. It is going to happen. They are predicting that we are going to default on our bonds if we go past August 2 without having raised the debt ceiling.

In a letter to Congress, Treasury Secretary Geithner said:

> This would be an unprecedented event in American history. A default would inflict catastrophic, far-reaching damage on our Nation's economy.

President Obama said this in May of this year:

> If investors around the world thought that the full faith and credit of the United States

was not being backed up, if they thought that we might renege on our IOUs, it could unravel the entire financial system.

These are scare tactics. These things need not happen. I am afraid they are meant to intimidate Members of Congress into voting for a debt limit increase without the underlying reforms and spending cuts that the President resists. I think its irresponsible to make these suggestions because it is entirely within the power of the administration to avoid a catastrophic default even if the debt limit is not raised.

Now we have published reports that Treasury officials are making private phone calls to senior executives at big banks informing them that the Treasury will not allow a default—will choose not to default on our bonds. I think they should not default on our bonds, but it is all well and good to tell the big banks this. How about ordinary Americans who wonder: What about our savings, and what about Social Security payments?

This is unacceptable. That is why we introduced a bill called Ensuring the Full Faith and Credit of the United States and Protecting America's Soldiers and Seniors Act. We have over 35 cosponsors.

Our bill would instruct the Treasury Secretary that in the event, however unlikely, that the debt ceiling is not raised prior to August 2, they make certain obligations and priorities so they will be paid in full, on time, and without delay. Those three priorities are: interest on our debt, so we will not default and plunge our country into economic chaos; No. 2, Social Security payments because millions of senior citizens, including my parents, depend on Social Security payments. They have earned that benefit by virtue of the payments they have made. We can and must honor that obligation. Next is payroll for Active-Duty military personnel because those risking their lives for us deserve this certainty.

The fact is, there are far more than enough resources for the administration to make these payments. As this chart illustrates, the green bar reflects total minimum revenue expected to come in in August. The combination of interest on our debt, Active-Duty military pay, and Social Security benefits would add up to less than half of the revenue that we are going to take in in August alone. These are not my numbers. They come from the Bipartisan Policy Center. They illustrate clearly that we have the ability to pay these items and many others.

Let me be very clear. I am not suggesting this is a desirable outcome. I am not suggesting this bill is the substitute for raising the debt ceiling.

Mr. President, this chart illustrates that there clearly are more than enough financial resources that will be coming into the Treasury day in and day out in the form of ongoing tax revenue to easily be able to afford interest on our debt to avoid a default, Social Security payments to seniors so that they can be assured of the income they deserve, and Active-Duty military pay, with a great deal left over.

These are not my numbers. They come independently verified by many organizations, including the Bipartisan Policy Center. This bill is not meant as a substitute for raising the debt limit. It is a mechanism for minimizing the disruption that might otherwise occur if the debt limit is not raised prior to August 2.

It is my hope that this legislation never needs to be implemented. But I believe it would be irresponsible for us to go into this period without having planned for how we will handle it in the event this happens.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ROBERT S. MUELLER, III, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 276, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Robert S. Mueller, III, of California, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a term expiring September 4, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, before I begin, unless all time is yielded back, we have 2 hours on this debate. I ask unanimous consent that any quorum calls during that 2 hours be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate will consider the President's nomination of Robert Mueller to continue serving as the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This is consistent with the President's May 12, 2011 request that Congress pass legislation to enable the Director to continue serving, in light of the leadership transitions at several key national security agencies.

Prior to the President's request, I had discussed this with President Obama, and one of the things he noted was that we were going to have a new Secretary of Defense, a new Director of the CIA, and that he did not want to have yet a third key member of the national security team be replaced at this time. I applaud the President for this, as he could have taken another route and named somebody who would serve for 10 years, beyond any time the President might be in office. Instead, the President decided to do what is best for the country and extend Director Mueller for 2 years. With the tenth anniversary of 9/11 approaching and the continued threat from al-Qaida, we find ourselves facing unique circumstances. We need leadership, stability, and continuity at the FBI as the President makes necessary shifts to his national security team.

After I met with the President and heard his request, I immediately went to work with a bipartisan group of Senators to draft and introduce a bill to create a one-time exception to the statute that limits the term of the FBI Director to 10 years. I worked in a bipartisan manner to hold a hearing and report the legislation to the full Senate on June 16, 2011. We worked in such a way it could not be seen as a Democratic or Republican bill but as bipartisan. Unfortunately, it then took a month to get consent from the other side to consider the bill. Once we obtained consent, the Senate was able to pass a version of it on July 21. The House of Representatives, to their credit, followed suit on July 25 and the President signed the bill into law yesterday.

The President's nomination of Director Mueller shows there was never any effort to impose a legislative appointment upon the President. The request to extend Director Mueller's term originated with the President, not Congress. Nor was it Director Mueller's idea. The President has prevailed upon Director Mueller and his family, for the good of the country, to alter their plans for Director Mueller to leave the FBI. Instead, both Director Mueller and Mrs. Mueller have answered the call of the country. Incidentally, I don't think I am disclosing anything inappropriate by saying that in my discussions with the President, when he was talking about extending the term of Director Mueller, I asked him: How does Director Mueller feel about this? The President said: I haven't talked with him yet, but he is a good, loyal American, a good Marine, and he will answer the call. And that is precisely what he did.

When we passed our legislation, I did insist we include a unanimous consent agreement to expedite consideration of this nomination when others insisted we adopt a form of statute that would require Director Mueller's renomination. The Majority Leader now has consent to take up the nomination, and after the use or yielding back of time for debate, the Senate will vote on the nomination. Some asked why I insisted upon such a unanimous consent agreement. I did it to prevent a recurrence of the delays and obstruction that have been used to complicate consideration

of so many of the President's nominations, especially in the area of national security, such as the Deputy Attorney General, the Assistant Attorney General for National Security, and so many others.

We have Senators who speak on the floor about the importance of protecting the security of the United States, but then at the same time delay and delay the people the President needs in place to protect our national security. The irony is that after these nominees have been held up month after month, they pass overwhelmingly in this body. In fact, there was even a hold originally on the legislation making Director Mueller's nomination possible. But now that is behind us and the Senate can vote to reconfirm Director Mueller to a new 2-year term before the August 2 deadline and avoid any lapse in leadership at the FBI.

Let me speak a little about the Director. He took over as FBI Director just days before the attacks of September 11, 2001. Since then, he has overseen and guided the Bureau through a major transformation and evolution. Of course, as in any major transformation, there have been problems, but the Director has consistently displayed professionalism and focus in increasing the FBI's national security and counterterrorism efforts, while still carrying out the Bureau's essential law enforcement responsibilities. So I applaud Director Mueller's commitment to ensuring that the FBI adheres to the values and freedoms Americans hold dear, while vigorously pursuing important law enforcement national security objectives.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I intend to continue to conduct vigorous oversight of the FBI, and will work closely with the Director on these important issues. After all, oversight is one of Congress's most important responsibilities. For example, on June 17, I wrote a letter with Ranking Member GRASSLEY to Director Mueller about the proposed changes in the FBI's revised edition of the Domestic Investigations and Operations Guide. I remain committed to ensuring that this revised guide provides the FBI with the latitude it needs to carry out its duties while not infringing upon the civil liberties of Americans, and ensuring the Judiciary Committee and public are kept informed from its implementation.

I will continue to monitor the implementation of the USA PATRIOT Act, which Congress extended this past May. At the start of this Congress, I introduced legislation that would have extended the three expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, while improving oversight, promoting transparency, and expanding privacy and civil liberties safeguards in current law. Unfortunately, despite the fact that legislation was reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee, it was never allowed to receive an up-or-down vote during the debate to extend the expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act earlier this year. Nonetheless, I will work with Director Mueller, the Department of Justice, and all Senators of both parties to ensure oversight of the USA PATRIOT Act authorities.

It is important that we vote for this renomination this afternoon, given the ongoing threats to our Nation, and I appreciate Director Mueller's willingness to continue his service. At the Judiciary Committee hearing on the legislation allowing for this extension, while I noted that Director Mueller has dedicated his life to public service, I also made a point to mention his wife, Ann. All of us who serve in public office know that it puts extra strain on our family members. I know how much of a partner she has been with him in bringing him to where he is, and I know it has to have been a large part of their life together. I am certain that they both were hoping to be able to have some time without the pressures of being in such demanding public service. So I thank him for being willing to serve, but I thank Mrs. Mueller, too. So often we forget that. Director Mueller has dedicated his life to public service, and we are grateful to him and his family for their continued sacrifice.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished ranking member on the floor, so I yield the floor to Senator GRASSLEY. And I note for the Senator from Iowa that I have already asked consent that when there is a quorum call, the time be divided equally.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am very pleased to support the renomination of Robert Mueller to be Director of the FBI.

Director Mueller has served as Director since days immediately preceding the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. In the wake of that tragedy, he has overseen a top-to-bottom transformation of the FBI from a domestic law enforcement agency to a national security agency and with a necessary global presence to combat terrorism.

Director Mueller has led the charge to ensure that the FBI's transformation is successful. This includes upgrading the workforce from an agent-driven agency to one that includes an ever-increasing number of intelligence analysts. I applaud the hard work that has been done, and I also applaud the leadership of Director Mueller. But more work remains.

Despite the recent successes, the FBI also has its share of black marks and skeletons in the closet. I have been an outspoken critic of the FBI's culture for many years because of its unwillingness to own up to mistakes. Too often, officials sought to protect the agency's reputation at the expense of the truth. My concerns are magnified by the way the FBI has treated internal whistleblowers who come forward and report fraud and abuse. But these problems are not necessarily the fault of Director Mueller, and many of these problems were in place long before he arrived.

The Director has been forthright in coming before Congress and explaining these mistakes and not simply passing the buck. I appreciate his candor, and I believe the FBI is in good hands with his leadership. But I will continue, as he knows, to conduct extensive oversight of the FBI to ensure that taxpayers' dollars are spent appropriately and that the civil liberties of Americans are protected.

In 1976, following the excesses of J. Edgar Hoover, Congress limited the term of the Director of the FBI to one nonrenewable 10-year term. Congress did so to prevent the accumulation of excess power by a Director as well as to provide some political independence for the FBI.

Despite his knowing about Director Mueller's impending term limit and his initiating a search for a successor led by Attorney General and Vice President BIDEN, President Obama chose not to send the Senate a nomination for the Director of the FBI. Instead, the President decided, notwithstanding those statutory provisions, Director Mueller should continue to serve in this position for another 2 years.

Presidential decisions to make transitions in other national security positions are not a special circumstance supporting the extension of the Director's term. Those personnel changes were entirely within the control of the President. However, we do live in extraordinary times and currently face unusual national security threats. Between the recent death of Osama bin Laden and with the upcoming 10th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks, there is an increased threat of a possible terrorist attack. Against this backdrop and with a heavy heart, I agreed to support the President's request to provide a one-time exception to the 10-year term limit on the FBI directorship.

With some reluctance, I joined as a cosponsor of the original S. 1103. The President recently signed into law a modified version of that bill that provides a one-time extension of the FBI Director's term. Early in the process, I said that as a requirement for my support of any legislation extending the 10-year term, regular procedure be followed. The purpose of this requirement was to set a substantial precedent against pursuing a simple process eviscerating the 10-year term limit.

The process of getting to today's confirmation vote has met my early requirement. A precedent has been set that the FBI Director's term would not be routinely extended—the process of holding a hearing where the FBI Director testified, a legislative markup, and a floor vote in both the House and Senate. Further, the bill was coupled with a unanimous consent agreement requiring a vote on the renomination of

Director Mueller. Taken together, this process has established a historical record that we do not take this extension lightly and that any future extensions should have to go through no less than this same process.

The 10-year limit has achieved its intended purpose. Until Director Mueller, no Director subject to the limit has served the full 10-year term. The limit has been successful in reducing the power of the Director and in preserving the vital civil liberties of all Americans.

It has also provided important political independence for the FBI Director. Only one Director has been fired in this period, and this did not occur for political reasons. The prohibition on reappointment has also preserved the Directors's independence by eliminating any potential that the Director will attempt to curry favor with the Presidents to be reappointed.

Director Mueller has done an admirable job on some areas of reform in an agency under difficult circumstances. I strongly support Director Mueller and believe he will continue to provide steady leadership at this agency during what continue to be extraordinary times, and you can say extraordinary times going back to at least September 11, 2001, but as you look on the history of the war on terror, it probably started 25 years before that in one form or another. However, it is clear to me, as the legislation the President signed requires, that in 2 years Director Mueller will need to move on and the President will send the Senate a new nominee to fill his shoes.

In the meantime, we all ought to thank Director Mueller for his willingness to serve for another 2 years in this very important position because I am sure he was already ready to move on. So the people of the United States as well as this Congress need to say thank you, Director Mueller, for being willing to serve your people again.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I support the President's nomination of Robert Mueller to be the Director of the FBI for an additional 2-year term.

I believe Mr. Mueller is a fine Director of the FBI. I had the opportunity to observe him within the Department of Justice for a number of years. I served as U.S. attorney in Alabama for 12 years, and during that time he was the U.S. attorney. He was an attorney in the Department of Justice, and he was one of the top administrators of the Department of Justice. Director Mueller was a decorated Marine officer and served in Vietnam. I truly believe he represents the highest and best ideals of American patriotism and capability.

He had the opportunity over the years to go into private practice and make a lot of money. He has stayed and committed himself to public service according to the highest ideals, I believe, of public service.

He had a 10-year term. Normally, we would expect that it would be just that, a 10-year term. The Director has given that long a period of time because there was a concern that when people stay too long, problems can arise in the system because it becomes personality driven rather than meritocracy and people can become entrenched in that sort of thing. So we have a 10-year term. I am not sure that is a perfect period of time, but that was the one that was decided, so it should not be lightly changed to a longer period of time without some serious thought.

Are we violating the very purposes of the act that limited his term? I am pleased that, instead of moving forward with the proposal as originally drafted, we are now moving forward with the proposal Senator COBURN offered, his substitute amendment. I think that is the better way to extend the term. I would like to talk about that a little bit.

The original proposal would have just amended the statute providing that the Director serve for only one 10-year term and created an exception to allow Director Mueller to serve an additional 2 years. I am concerned about the potential for creating a dangerous precedent that the 10-year term limit applies depending on who is the Director, his or her political popularity, and the political dynamics of the White House and the Congress. That was not our goal.

I do understand the President's desire to retain Director Mueller during this time in our Nation's history and to do so expeditiously and not to have some sort of interim uncertainty. Actually, I congratulate the President on his judgment in concluding that Director Mueller can do a good job and has done a good job. While it is true that the original legislative proposal would have accomplished those things, I believe it was the easy way out and would not only have been a temptation to future generations to replicate it, but, more important, it might have run afoul of the Constitution.

At the hearing before the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, concerns were raised about the original proposal. Those were raised by University of Virginia James Madison Distinguished Professor of Law John Harrison.

As we all recall, James Madison was considered to be the Founder of our Constitution, the most active member of our Constitutional Convention, the one whose notes told us what went on, the one who went to the convention with an outline, a framework for the structure of government that eventually became our Constitution.

Mr. Harrison testified that it was an unconstitutional ''attempt by Congress to exercise directly through legislation the appointments power.''

Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, the appointments clause—it is in the Constitution—states that the President ''shall nominate and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors and other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court and all other Officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law.''

In the case of Buckley v. Valeo, the Supreme Court held that ''any appointee exercising significant authority pursuant to the laws of the United States is an 'Officer of the United States' and must, therefore, be appointed in the manner prescribed by [section] 2, [clause] 2, of that Article.''

In addition, the Supreme Court has long recognized that ''the power of removal [is] incident to the power of appointment.'' Therefore, Congress may not involve itself in the removal process insofar as it interferes with the ability of the President to exercise Executive power and to perform his constitutional duty.

Professor Harrison explained that because ''an appointment is a legal act that causes someone to hold an office that otherwise would be vacant or held by someone else,'' a ''statutory extension of the term of an incumbent causes the current incumbent to hold an office that otherwise would have been vacant upon the expiration of the incumbent's term. It is thus a statutory appointment.''

Professor Harrison further testified that the original proposal would have also run afoul of the fundamental constitutional principle that underlies the appointments clause. This is a fundamental principle because the President has the ultimate veto—the power to decide whether to appoint someone at all—and he has the absolute responsibility for their nomination, good or bad. He nominates them.

Indeed, the rationale for the structure of the appointments clause dates back to Federalist No. 76 in which Alexander Hamilton explained:

> The sole and undivided responsibility of one man will naturally beget a livelier sense of duty and a more exact regard to reputation. He will on this account feel himself under stronger obligation and more interested to investigate with care the qualities requisite to the stations to be filled, and to prefer with impartiality the persons who may have the fairest pretensions to them.

That is pretty effective language.

Dilution of the President's sole responsibility for nomination and appointment is inconsistent with constitutional principles.

Given that constitutional concerns were raised by these scholars, it was at

least arguable that had we proceeded with the original proposal, a judge could find Director Mueller's appointment and term of service to be unconstitutional if it were to be challenged by someone in court, and that was possible.

Particularly concerning was the suggestion that in a properly presented case involving an individual subject to a purported exercise of government power by the Director who was appointed pursuant to a statute such as the original proposal, a court could find that exercise of power to be invalid, either prospectively or retrospectively. In the past, courts have enforced the appointments clause by holding invalid the actions of purported officers whose appointments did not comport with the Constitution.

When questioned about this possibility at the hearing, both Director Mueller and former Deputy Attorney General of the United States James Comey agreed that if serious constitutional concerns could be raised, they would favor proceeding with the reappointment process in a different way, one that would pass constitutional muster and not raise questions.

Professor Harrison advises an alternative constitutional method, which is the proposal Congress passed and the President signed into law yesterday. He gave us a suggested way to proceed that would be constitutional, and we drafted it, agreed with it, and passed it.

I think it speaks pretty well of Congress that we are attuned to the complexities of the Constitution and are committed to being faithful to that document, not just taking convenience and going faster but taking the time to hear professors, to think it out, because in that way we respect the Constitution, we venerate it, we strengthen it. When we just bypass it or slide by, dismiss lightly concerns that actions of Congress or the President may be in violation of the Constitution and don't give due weight to that, we disrespect the document.

This law creates a new 2-year term that would run until September 4, 2013. It assumed that President Obama would nominate Director Mueller to that new term with the advice and consent of the Senate, requiring the confirmation vote we will proceed to shortly. Under the new law, Director Mueller is not eligible for another term after September 4, 2013, and after the expiration of that new term, the term for the Director of the FBI will revert to the previous law, the 10-year term; therefore, whoever is the President in 2013 can appoint a new Director to a 10-year term.

While I agree Congress should work to expedite the confirmation process in this unique situation, I also saw no reason to proceed in a constitutionally unsound manner. The formalities of the Constitution may sometimes create obstacles to getting things done as quickly as some would like, but the Constitution and its formalities exist for a very important reason; that is, our constitutional tradition of the adherence to the rule of law. We cannot circumvent those formalities in the interest of some expediency or because it is a convenient means to a desired end. The words of the Constitution have meaning. They are not suggestions that we are free to ignore if it is inconvenient today.

I believe in the process by which we are now proceeding—creating a separate 2-year term and then calling on the President to make a new nomination. He didn't have to renominate Director Mueller, but he indicated that was his desire, and we have accorded him the opportunity to do that. He has renominated Director Mueller, and I hope in a few moments we will confirm him to this important position.

One of the discussions we had at that hearing was with Professor Van Alstyne. I heard him make a speech many years ago—I was a U.S. attorney, so it must have been 15, 20 years ago—at the Eleventh Circuit Conference, I think, in Georgia. He spoke to the judges. He said he had come to the belief that if one really respected the Constitution, they would follow it faithfully, the good and the bad parts, because that was the only way you respected the Constitution, that was the way to honor the Constitution. That is the way to respect it, to follow what it says.

To the extent to which we are tempted to move around the plain words, the plain intent of the Constitution for convenience, we weaken that document. In the long run, a weakened document will be less of a bulwark protecting our liberties and our freedom as individual Americans.

I thank the President, I thank the leadership, and I thank Senator LEAHY, the chairman of our committee, for responding to the professor's request and ideas and proceeding in a way that I think raises no question about constitutionality—or if it does, it is small—and in a way that took a little more effort.

I once again express my deep admiration for Director Mueller. He is a thoroughly professional law enforcement officer. For virtually the entire time of his law enforcement career, he has tried individual cases, prosecuted individual defendants for all kinds of crimes and depredations. He has understood the reality of courtroom experience. He has worked as a prosecutor with the FBI investigative agents over his entire career as a law enforcement officer, and now, as the Director of the FBI, he brings a unique experience to it. I believe he has done a fine job, and I believe he will continue to do a fine job for the people of the United States.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of FBI Director Robert Mueller continuing in his current position for another 2 years. He valiantly served our country in the Marine Corps, earning various commendations including the Purple Heart. He also served our country in a variety of other important positions including as a Federal prosecutor, as the head of the of the criminal division at the Department of Justice, and as Acting Deputy Attorney General. He is the second-longest serving director in the FBI's history.

Robert was sworn in as the FBI Director exactly 1 week before the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. He inherited an agency ill-equipped at that time for detecting the emerging threats posed by terrorist organizations such as al-Qaida. Change does not come easily to Federal Government agencies, but Director Mueller immediately committed to Congress that he would alter the status quo that dominated and redefined the culture of the Bureau to effectively address the new emerging threats facing our Nation.

As Congress began looking at providing the FBI with badly needed terror investigation tools such as the USA PATRIOT Act and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, Director Muller was a prominent and critical part of the process. In the 10 years since that terrible attack on our Nation, the agency that Director Mueller leads has detected numerous plots aimed at attacking Americans both at home and abroad. At the same time, the FBI still carries out its function as the Nation's leading criminal investigative agency at the Department of Justice.

Robert Mueller had a baptism by fire in those first days and weeks of his tenure. His leadership, character, and poise have remained constant and the net result has been a revamped FBI that is smarter, more nimble, and better equipped to meet the continuing threat of terrorism that America faces every day.

I not only support this opportunity for Director Mueller to serve for another 2 years, but I am very pleased that we achieved this end through a constitutional means. The initial legislation would have simply extended Director Mueller's statutory term without a new nomination and confirmation. That would have amounted to an appointment by the Senate. The Constitution, however, gives the appointment power to the President. We must not use unconstitutional means to achieve even desirable political ends.

I applaud the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. COBURN, who offered the alternative of creating a single separate 2-year term that would be available only to Director Mueller. That approach leaves in place the statutory 10-year term for the position of FBI Director and respects the constitutional process of nomination and confirmation. It is indisputably constitutional. We have all taken the same oath to support and defend the Constitution, and that at least means we should choose a path that is constitutionally firm over a path that is constitutionally shaky. We did in this case, and I think it is a win-win. It achieves a

good purpose through a constitutional process.

So I am proud to vote once again to support Robert Mueller's nomination to be FBI Director. He is a great public servant and the right leader for these challenging times.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to support wholeheartedly the nomination of Robert S. Mueller III to continue serving as the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, for an additional 2 years.

I have three criteria for nominees: (1) competence; (2) commitment to mission of the agency; and (3) highest integrity. Director Mueller surpasses all those tests with flying colors.

His competence cannot be questioned. Director Mueller came to the FBI just a week before the 9/11 terrorist attacks of 2001. Since then, he has provided steadfast leadership as the FBI has transformed from a traditional domestic law enforcement agency into a global counterterrorism and anticrime police force that has successfully kept Americans safe from terrorist attacks here at home and abroad. Prior to the FBI, he served our Nation as a decorated marine in Vietnam, and as a Federal prosecutor who tackled cases ranging from the bombing of Pan Am flight 103 to the prosecution of Panamanian dictator Manuel Noriega.

He has shown unwavering commitment to the FBI's mission. Director Mueller is the only FBI Director to serve out a full 10-year term. From his first day on the job, he fought to make sure the hardworking men and women at the FBI have the tools they need to carry out their extraordinary responsibilities. As chairwoman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that funds the FBI and as a member of the Intelligence Committee, I am proud to call Director Mueller my steadfast partner in that fight. Together, we work to provide the FBI with the capabilities to stop terrorists before they attack us here at home, go after schemers and scammers who prey on hardworking American families, prevent cyberterrorists from devastating our technology infrastructure, and catch sexual predators before they harm our children. I look forward to continuing our strong partnership for the next 2 years.

Lastly, Director Mueller has strong integrity. He speaks truth to power, even when the truth is unpopular or inconvenient. He answered the call to service when President Bush asked him to serve as FBI director in 2001. And he has answered the call of President Obama when asked to serve 2 more years.

We live in extraordinarily critical times, facing threats from both within and outside our Nation, and the President's national security team has experienced major leadership changes in recent months. Keeping Director Mueller at the FBI for another 2 years means that one of the tested ''Nighthawks'' will continue guarding our Nation's national security. The broad bipartisan support in the Senate to have him continue serving as Director is a testament to the faith we place in this proven leader. We are privileged to have such a committed and dedicated public servant leading the FBI, and I am proud to support his nomination.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in strong support of the nomination of Robert Mueller to continue as the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for an additional 2 years.

In his 10 years at the FBI, Director Mueller has served admirably, instituting important reforms at the Bureau and strengthening its counterterrorism capabilities. An extension of his term will insure that those efforts can continue and provide important stability to the President's national security team during this challenging time.

It is not surprising that when searching for a replacement for Director Mueller, the President determined that it would be best if the Director would continue his service. Director Mueller has a long and distinguished career in public service and we are fortunate that he has agreed to continue in his position.

I know that my colleagues are generally familiar with Mr. Mueller's background, but I think this is an appropriate time to review his many accomplishments.

Director Mueller first began his service to our Nation when he joined the U.S. Marine Corps after graduating from Princeton University. He served as an officer for 3 years, leading a rifle platoon of the Third Marine Division in Vietnam. He received the Bronze Star, two Navy Commendation medals, the Purple Heart, and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry.

After receiving his law degree from the University of Virginia Law School, Mr. Mueller headed to my home State of California to begin his legal career. He worked in San Francisco as a litigator until 1976, when he joined the U.S. Attorney's Office in the Northern District of California. Eventually, he would become the chief of the criminal division in that office.

In 1982, he moved to Boston to serve as an assistant U.S. attorney. He investigated and prosecuted major financial fraud, terrorism, and public corruption cases.

After serving in several positions in the public and private sectors, in 1998 Mr. Mueller was named U.S. attorney in San Francisco. That was when he first came to my attention as a skilled and committed prosecutor.

Mr. Mueller continued in that role until he was nominated to be FBI Director by President George W. Bush on July 5, 2001. That was an extremely challenging and difficult time to take on this responsibility, as he came to office only a few months before the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001.

Director Mueller more than rose to the occasion. He provided strong and steady leadership, and worked to transform the Bureau into an agency that can better detect and prevent terrorist attacks against the United States.

Under Director Mueller's direction, the FBI has played an essential role in more than 20 significant counterterrorism operations, while infiltrating and arresting groups of individuals charged with planning attacks against our country.

The FBI has also built its cyber investigation capability, focused on counterintelligence, investigated public corruption cases, and tracked and disrupted gang activity.

Time and again, Director Mueller has met the many challenges facing the Bureau, and it is now one of our most respected government institutions.

Of course, Congress had good reasons for placing a term limit on the Director of the FBI. History has shown that the enormous power wielded by the Director and the FBI can be subject to abuse in the wrong hands.

Congress has recognized those concerns with regard to the extension of Director Mueller's term. With the implementing legislation that has passed Congress, and this subsequent nomination, Congress and the President have created a one-time extension that would only apply to Director Mueller. Future FBI Directors would still be limited to a 10-year term.

Extending Director Mueller's term at the FBI for an additional 2 years will ensure that the important reforms and progress he has made will continue. Additionally, it will provide important stability to the President's national security team during this sensitive and challenging time and while it is otherwise going through important leadership changes.

This summer Leon Panetta has succeeded Robert Gates as Secretary of Defense. Although General David Petraeus has been confirmed to be the next Director of the CIA, he will not arrive at Headquarters in Langley to take leadership of the Agency until after Labor Day.

There are additional changes in key military leadership positions, as well as at the National Counterterrorism Center.

In the midst of these changes, Director Mueller will be an experienced, steady hand among the President's national security advisors. Keeping Director Mueller in his position will provide important continuity and leadership during this transition.

Personally, I have deep admiration and respect for Director Mueller. His integrity, courage, and dedication are an inspiration, and his leadership and effectiveness serve as an example for all. I am very pleased to call him my friend, and thank him for his willingness to continue to serve for another 2 years.

I urge my colleagues to support his confirmation.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUDGET CUT IMPACT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, we are clearly at a momentous moment in American history. We are getting tens of thousands of people visiting our Web site, sanders.senate.gov, every day. People want to know what is going on. As the longest serving Independent in history in Congress, let me give my view of where we are right now.

First, I do wish to say I get a little bit tired of hearing some of our pundits and some of the politicians around here blithely talking about trillions of dollars in cuts. I see some of these guys making huge salaries on TV saying: Why don't they just come to an agreement—$2 trillion in cuts, $3 trillion in cuts. That may be OK if one is making a whole lot of money on television doing a television show, but, clearly, those people have not been talking to real Americans.

Let me go over what the media and many of us in Congress have not been talking about, and that is what the impacts of these trillions of dollars of cuts are about. These are not just words on a piece of paper. These are cuts which are going to have devastating impacts on people who are already suffering as a result of the worst recession since the Great Depression. Some people come up with this great idea and they say: The cost-of-living adjustment for Social Security is too high today, seniors and disabled vets are getting too much, and ''noted economists''—I have not heard from these noted economists—think it is too extravagant.

Mr. President, go back to Baltimore and I will go to Vermont and we will ask seniors whether they think the COLAs they are getting now are too extravagant, given the fact they haven't gotten a COLA in the last 2 years. Studies I have seen say not only are the COLAs today not too extravagant for Social Security and disabled vets, they are, in fact, too low because they underestimate the real expenses of seniors, which largely have to do with health care and prescription drugs. The costs are soaring. Any of these pundits or any of these economists who go out and talk to real people and say Social Security COLAs are too high are going to get laughed right out of the room because it isn't true.

If we come forward with this so-called chained CPI, this new formulation for COLAs, this is what it will mean in the real world: If someone is 65 today, when they become 75 in 10 years, that will result in a $560 decline in what they otherwise would have gotten in Social Security benefits, and when they are 85, 20 years from today, that will be a $1,000-a-year decline. I know in DC, with the lobbyists making millions a year, when we talk about $1,000, that is what these guys spend on a fancy dinner. It is laughable. They don't know what goes on in the real world.

There are millions of seniors today hanging on, trying to pay their prescription drug costs, trying to pay their out-of-pocket costs for health care, and $1,000 a year in 20 years is a lot of money for those people. In my view, it would be immoral and unacceptable to do what a number of plans out here are talking about; that is, to cut Social Security benefits very significantly. Clearly, that is where the Republicans are coming from, but it distresses me that I hear the President and Democrats in Congress also talking about that. This Senator will do everything he can to protect this enormously important program which, by the way, just in passing, has not contributed one nickel to the deficit because it is funded by the payroll tax and has a $2.6 trillion surplus. From a moral perspective, we cannot and must not cut Social Security.

There are other geniuses out there who are saying: Well, the way Medicare health care costs are going up, maybe it is time we did something like make major cuts in Medicare, including raising the eligibility age from 65 to 67. What is the problem? What is 2 years? Clearly, those folks have not talked to anybody who has been struggling when they are 60 or 63 and looking forward to Medicare at 65. What happens if a person is a modest-income person and they are 66 years of age and they are dealing with a health care crisis? Maybe they were hospitalized, but the government has said, pundits have said, my Republican friends have said, we are going to raise the Medicare age to 67. Tell me what happens. Let the American people tell me what happens to those millions of people? What are they supposed to do? They get diagnosed with cancer, they have a serious heart problem, they are 66, have no money in the bank, what happens to them? How many of those people will not survive?

Then other people say: Well, Medicaid is an easy program to cut. I mean, let's be politically honest about Medicaid. Medicaid is for lower income people. They don't have lobbyists, they don't make large campaign contributions. Many low-income people don't vote. They are easy to go after. Let's cut hundreds of billions of dollars from Medicaid. Let's be clear. According to a recent study at Harvard University, some 45,000 Americans die each year unnecessarily because they don't get to a doctor on time. That is 45,000 Americans, 15 times what we lost in the disaster of 9/11. Every single year those people are dying.

What happens if we make savage cuts in Medicaid? How many children do we throw off the Children's Health Insurance Program? What happens to the older people who are now in nursing homes on Medicaid? What happens to all those people? I guess we don't have to worry about them. Their lobbyists are not here. What happens to people on disability? We turn our back on those people, that is what we do.

One of the very interesting aspects of this whole debate and why the American people are so angry, so frustrated, and so disillusioned is that Congress is moving in a direction of exactly the opposite way that the American people want us to handle deficit reduction. Every single poll I have seen and in my experience in talking to people in the State of Vermont, people want shared sacrifice. People understand that the wealthiest people in this country are doing phenomenally well. Over a recent 25-year period, 80 percent of all new income went to the top 1 percent. The rich are getting richer, and you know what. Their effective tax rates today are one of the lowest in American history, about 18 percent. So the richest people in America who are doing phenomenally well are paying a lower tax rate than nurses, teachers, and police officers. The American people who see the middle class declining and the rich getting richer are saying: Hey, it is only fair that the wealthiest people help us contribute to deficit reduction. We can't place the whole burden on the backs of people who are getting poorer and poorer as a result of the recession.

The American people also understand we have large multinational corporations, such as General Electric, ExxonMobil, and many others that have been making billions of dollars in profits in recent years and don't pay a nickel in Federal taxes. Then, on top of that, we have the absurdity of a tax policy which allows the wealthy and large corporations to stash huge amounts of money in the Cayman Islands and in other tax havens so we are losing about $100 billion a year in revenue. The American people are looking around and saying: That is crazy. The wealthy and large corporations, which are doing phenomenally well, which are not paying their fair share of taxes, have to contribute to deficit reduction. It cannot simply be on the backs of the elderly, the children, the sick, the poor. That is what the American people are saying in poll after poll.

There was a poll that just came out the other day—just one more of many polls. Washington Post: Should the wealthiest people in this country be asked to pay more? That is the question. They asked: In order to reduce the national debt, would you support or oppose the following: raising taxes on Americans with incomes of over $250,000 a year. The response in that poll was 72 percent of the American people said yes, 27 percent said no. Overwhelmingly, every poll we see says the wealthy have to pay more in taxes, and then the same polls say: Protect Social Security, protect Medicare, protect Medicaid, protect education. Here is the irony: We are marching down a

path which will do exactly the opposite of what the American people want. Our Republican friends have been absolutely fanatically determined that no matter what happens, billionaires and large corporations will not pay a nickel more in taxes. That has been their religious belief, not a nickel more from the wealthiest people in this country. I have to say Democrats have not been particularly strong in opposition to that nor has the President been strong, with retreat after retreat.

In recent months, we have heard more and more discussion from Democrats about cuts in Social Security, cuts in Medicare, cuts in Medicaid. Now there is apparently a willingness to come forward with a proposal that would include only cuts and no revenue at all—no revenue at all.

I think the American people are angry. I think they are frustrated. I think they are disillusioned because what they want to see happen is deficit reduction done through shared sacrifice, although with the wealthy and large corporations playing their role appears not to be happening. And when they have said loudly and clearly that we must protect Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, they are also seeing that it is not happening.

So I just conclude by saying I think there is a path toward deficit reduction which is fair and responsible. It does ask the big-money interests to understand that they are Americans also and they have to play a role in deficit reduction. It does say that at a time when we have tripled military spending since 1997, we have to make significant cuts there as well.

I hope our Republican friends give up their fanatical opposition to asking billionaires and millionaires and large corporations to play a role in deficit reduction. I hope my Democratic friends will stand tall. And I hope that at the end of the day, we have the deficit-reduction program the American people will feel good about.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, we all know we are running against the deadline of Tuesday, August 2, on raising the debt of our Nation, and there is a real risk that if we don't make that deadline on Tuesday, there will be checks from the Federal Government that will not be able to go out. The number of 70 million is used as the number of checks written each month by the Federal Government that go to employees, that go to contractors, that go to recipients of certain benefits.

Let me talk about 4,000 Federal workers who already have been furloughed. It doesn't have to do with raising the debt ceiling; it has to do with the failure of the House of Representatives to send a clean extension of the Federal Aviation Administration—the FAA reauthorization bill—for us to consider. As a result of the failure to pass the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration or to pass a short-term extension of the FAA, 4,000 workers at the Federal Aviation Administration have been put on furlough. That in and of itself has a major impact on our economy. That is 4,000 Americans who are no longer receiving a paycheck. It affects people who work for the FAA in such fields as safety engineers, computer scientists, aeronautics engineers, physical scientists—the list goes on and on—jeopardizing the progress we have made in keeping our airways safe and jeopardizing the convenience to those who travel by air. Many of those workers live in the State of Maryland, so it is having a direct effect on the State I have the honor of representing in the Senate.

It goes beyond just the Federal workforce who have been put on furlough as a result of the failure to pass a short-term extension of the FAA. It also goes to construction contracts that are funded through aviation funds. At many airports around the Nation, there have now been stop orders on construction of runways, construction of towers, and construction of other improvements that are important to keep our airports modern and safe and convenient in handling the increased number of air passengers.

Let me tell my colleagues that, yes, it affects those large contractors who are doing the work of the Federal Government. It is going to affect their payrolls and their workforce, but it also affects a lot of small businesses in Maryland and around the Nation.

Let me give one example. Chappy Corporation is an electrical and mechanical operations small business specializing in airport landing systems and lighting. Chappy Corporation is the lead contractor implementing BWI's—the main airport in Maryland—ASDE–X project, a runway safety mechanism that enables air traffic controllers to detect potential runway conflicts by providing detailed coverage of movement on runways and taxiways. For the safety of all of us, I hope we would want to move forward with those types of improvements in our major airports in the Nation, including the one which most Marylanders use—BWI Airport. Chappy Corporation has been told to stop work on this important aviation safety project, thus decreasing their value and making it more difficult to make payroll. It is already tough for small companies out there today, and now, because of the failure of the House to send over to us a clean extension of the FAA bill, which we have done many times in the past, we have a company such as Chappy which is running the risk of its strength to continue with its current workforce and to do important work at airports for safety.

It also goes beyond the Federal employees and the contractor employees who are not getting a paycheck and the contractors whose work has been stopped and they are not getting their construction contract payments. It also affects the Federal Aviation Administration's revenues. They collect a lot of revenue. There is a ticket tax. When a person buys an airline ticket, they pay a tax that goes into the Federal Aviation Administration's funds which are used for improvement projects at our airports. That amounts to about $30 million that will not be collected. What happens to that money? Well, we lose it in the Federal Treasury. People say: Well, maybe it will make it less expensive for people to travel. But that is not the case.

Let me quote a headline from Reuters: ''Airlines Raise Fares as Taxes Lapse.''

I am quoting:

> Many U.S. airlines have raised fares in recent days to take advantage of a lapse in U.S. ticket tax collection after Congress failed last week to fully fund the Federal Aviation Administration's budget, but passengers are not likely to notice any price difference.
>
> JetBlue Airways Corp. and Southwest Airlines Co. began raising ticket prices by at least 7.5 percent on Friday, according to FareCompare.com. Other airlines, such as Delta Air Lines and United Continental Holdings Inc., boosted prices on Saturday.

So we can't collect the 7.5-percent tax and the airlines are pocketing the money. The people who are purchasing tickets are still paying the same amount even though none of that money is going to improve our airports. It makes no sense whatsoever.

All of these occurrences—the Federal workers not getting a paycheck and being put on furlough, contractors not getting paid and construction work not being done, revenues not being collected that are necessary for the Federal Government—are hurting our economy. All are making it more difficult for our recovery.

Why has this happened? The reason, quite frankly, is that we have not been able to pass the reauthorization bill. We passed the reauthorization bill early in the session, the Senate did. The House passed a bill about 100 days ago but has refused to appoint conferees to work out the differences. Then the House sends over—because we didn't meet the deadline—an extension bill that includes a partisan labor provision, an antilabor provision. Now, that should never be in an extension bill. It shouldn't be in any legislation. But it should be negotiated between the conferees of the House and Senate so we can get a reauthorization bill done. They shouldn't use an extension bill in order to get that done, and that is what they have done. As a result, we have the consequences of Federal workers being furloughed, contractors not being paid, and revenues necessary for our airport improvements not being collected.

So what should we do? What do we need to do? Well, we need to first pass a short-term extension, a clean short-term extension without these killer amendments attached to allow our workforce to be able to work and to get their paychecks, to allow contractors to continue the work they are doing, and to allow the government to collect the revenue necessary to keep our airports modern. That is the first thing we should do.

Secondly, we need to negotiate in good faith between the House and the Senate conferees so we can pass the Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization bill. That bill contains many very important provisions, including what we call NextGen, which is the way in which we can operate our air service in a much more efficient way, using less fuel, less time, and helping our economy. The FAA reauthorization bill is estimated to create hundreds of thousands of jobs for our country. We need to get that done. So we need to negotiate the bill, get that done, and all of that will help create more jobs for our community.

I urge my colleagues, particularly those in the House, to send us a clean extension bill, negotiate in good faith, and let's get the FAA bill done.

Actually, I see the ranking member of that committee, our colleague from Texas, who may wish to talk about it or some other issue.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am here to talk about the renomination of FBI Director Mueller, but I certainly heard my colleague from Maryland, and I agree we must pass a clean extension of the FAA. We are losing the revenue, and we are losing the capability for projects that are ongoing to continue. Work has stopped at many of the airports that have building and repair projects that are supported by the FAA.

Honestly, the House needs to send a clean extension. There is a clean extension pending in the Senate. It has been objected to by one Member. This is not the way to go forward. I happen to agree with much of what the House wants to do, but not in this way. We have to put that in the context of the whole bill, which we certainly should be doing, and I hope the House will send us a clean extension so there will not be another weekend of disruption and people can get on with the projects.

I come to the floor today to speak about FBI Director Robert Mueller. He has been FBI Director since 2001. During a critical time when our country has experienced such major leadership changes on our national security team, this nomination offers the necessary stability and continuity from a proven leader who has wide support.

Director Mueller has strong bipartisan support. He was appointed on August 2, 2001—just before the 9/11 tragedy—by President Bush, and he began serving a week before the September 11 attacks. His term is said to expire next week on August 2.

The FBI has never experienced a larger transformation than while under his leadership, adding counterterrorism, counterintelligence, and cyber security to the Bureau's traditional crime-fighting mission. In the 10 years Mr. Mueller has been Director of the FBI, he has worked tirelessly to ensure that no international terrorist attacks have occurred on U.S. soil since 9/11, and there have been several plots that have been uncovered and kept from occurring.

Director Mueller has ensured that the FBI is a full member of the U.S. intelligence community and serves as a critical and singular link between the intelligence and law enforcement communities in the United States. He served our Nation with valor and integrity as a marine in Vietnam and as a Federal prosecutor. He answered the call to service from President Bush to be FBI Director and is once again answering the call by agreeing to serve 2 more years under President Obama. He is an admirable public servant, and I urge his swift confirmation.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. President, we are less than 6 days away from the date the Department of the Treasury has signified would shut down the Federal Government and exhaust all borrowing authority.

We all know we are at this point because we have a fundamental difference in the principles on how our government should be run. We all know we are at this point because the financial viability of our Nation is at stake.

I believe this debt ceiling debate presents Congress with a critical opportunity to get our country back on a sustainable and prosperous path. We must send a message to the markets, to the American people, and to American businesses that we are going to get our fiscal house in order with spending cuts, caps on future spending, and permanent budget reform in the form of a balanced budget amendment.

What we need now is a serious proposal to provide certainty and clear commitment to a reform measure that ensures spending cuts before the debt ceiling is raised. The Senate majority leader's and the House Speaker's plans have similarity, and I believe a common ground can be found in the two.

First, neither of the plans proposes tax increases to achieve deficit reduction, and both plans aim for significant deficit savings in the amount of $1.2 trillion over the next 10 years.

Now, is that what we wanted? No. I would have had more cuts. We should be reaching for $4 trillion in cuts, not $1.2 trillion. But we have had plans put forward for $4 trillion, we have had plans put forward for more, and we could not get those through. We could not get one through the Senate. Furthermore, entitlements are not in the plans that are before us, and entitlement reform is essential for us to address. We can certainly put Social Security on the fiscally responsible path that will make it secure for 75 years with very minor changes and gradual changes if we do it now. This is an opportunity. Because we have only 6 days, we are not going to be able to do it in this vehicle.

But there is a plan going forward that our leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and Senator REID, along with a bipartisan group of Senators, have put forward a plan. I think we need to look towards the long term and not let this opportunity pass to do something that will be enduring for the fiscal responsibility of our country.

But we have 6 days, and now we have to do something as responsible as possible with the time we have left and keep open the option of doing what we should be doing for the long term before the end of this year. That is what Senator MCCONNELL, Senator REID, and many other Senators have put on the table. That is what we need to try to achieve.

But we have made great strides. What Republicans said from the beginning is, they are not going to support tax increases of any kind in this economic climate. Businesses are not hiring. A 9.2-percent unemployment rate is unacceptable. Our businesses are afraid of the Obama health care plan and its costs. They are factoring that into their plans, and they are not hiring people because of the expense. Add more tax increases on top of that and our economy is going to be stagnant for a long time. So tax increases are off the table.

But I do hope we can also make the cuts that will put us on a fiscally responsible plan so we will not have to address this debt ceiling ever again.

So we have made a major achievement. Sometimes it seems as though when we have to come together to do something that is not ideal, we do not take acknowledgment of the fact that we are making one smaller step in the right direction. I think in order to avoid a fiscal calamity, we do need to make the strongest step we can make, which is cutting spending and doing it without increasing taxes.

The idea that we could tax our way out of debt has been totally discounted. Neither of these plans includes tax hikes to offset the deficit reduction, and that is a strong endorsement. Both proposals also include budget enforcement of discretionary caps by requiring automatic across-the-board cuts if the caps are not met. That will put a Governor on future spending that will keep the promise we are making to cut spending.

Both proposals establish a bipartisan committee to identify further deficit reduction that would include tax reform and fix the broken entitlement programs. I hope we will not throw that out the window. Having a commission—I know people roll their eyes and say: Oh, another commission. Really?

Well, if we have a finite end date and have the opportunity to make more real cuts, it is worth another chance. We do need to make entitlement reforms.

If we can do tax reform that lowers the tax rate for everyone and brings in revenue by having more people hired off the unemployment rolls, that is a win. We raise revenue by putting more people back to work. That is the way you raise revenue, not by tax increases that put a lid on hiring.

So I think we have some good things that can be put together. We need to make sure we go forward, as much as we can with a divided Congress, and try to make a step in the right direction. Then, hopefully before the end of the year, we will be able to take stronger steps that will have a more lasting impact.

I, for one, think it is not even a possibility that we would allow the debt ceiling to be met and start the process then of watching the President decide who gets paid and who does not.

I have a bill I have introduced with strong support that would make the priority paying the interest on our debt and paying our soldiers, our men and women who have boots on the ground in harm's way. If you are Active-Duty military, you should not waste 1 minute thinking about whether you are going to make your mortgage.

I want to say that I commend USAA. USAA is the corporation that serves so many of our military personnel. They have put out their policy that in case the debt limit is reached, USAA has stated that for those military members, who are on active duty and have their paychecks directly deposited into their USAA account, they are going to provide a one-time, interest-free advance for their paycheck.

They also know the stresses on those members of the armed services. USAA is doing a wonderful thing by putting the families of loved ones across the sea fighting for our security at ease.

So I commend USAA. At the same time, I would like for my bill to be passed that assures that those military servicemembers who are not customers of USAA will also have the comfort of knowing their paychecks will be there on time. So I hope if all else fails in this body, we can pass the legislation that says we will pay our debts and we will pay our military and Social Security recipients will also be paid.

But I do not think we ought to get that far at all. That is why I am urging our Members to work with our leaders. Do not throw stones at our leaders. They have a tough job corralling 100 pretty big egos, and we ought to be helping them get to the point where we are all comfortable that we are doing the right thing. Sometimes we cannot get 100 percent of what we want when there are 100 people who have their individual ideas as well.

So I hope we will take this chance to do so much for our country that we have the opportunity to do. We may have to do it in smaller steps to reach that goal, but if we reach the goal, we will have secured the future for our children, and that is what we are here for.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I would like to express my support for the majority leader's plan to raise the debt ceiling and reduce the deficit. Our Nation, as we all know, faces a looming crisis.

The markets have already warned us. Businesses are already postponing investments. We know the consequences of inaction. They are predictable. Borrowing costs for businesses and individuals will escalate. Interest payments on the debt will grow. Already anemic job growth will decline. Our Nation will run the risk of another financial catastrophe and possibly a return to recession. As Chairman Bernanke recently stated, the outcome would be ''calamitous.''

Many Americans are struggling. Far too many remain out of work. They cannot be asked to absorb the shock waves of yet another failure to act. It is time, as the Senator from Texas just pointed out—and others have—for both sides and both Chambers to find common ground.

Reasonable and responsible editorials from across the country have endorsed the majority leader's proposal. Well-meaning people on all sides have a genuine concern and have shown genuine concerns. We all—most all of us—share those concerns about the implications of not acting.

There are in the other party some individuals who view themselves as revolutionaries in the best sense of the word. They appear less concerned with the here and now than with where they want to take the country in the future. We all understand the two are connected and that looking to the future is vital to the country. The question, though, is the harm that might be caused by precipitous action.

Columnist George Will wrote a column a few days ago likening the tea party movement of today to the beginning of the Goldwater-Reagan conservative era; that the Goldwater movement of 1964, even though it did not bring Senator Goldwater to the Presidency, was the first step toward the conservative revolution that culminated in Ronald Reagan's election in 1980.

I am going to quote a couple of sentences Mr. Will wrote:

> The tea party, [which in his view is] the most welcome . . . development since the Goldwater insurgency in 1964, lacks only the patience necessary when America lacks the consensus required to propel fundamental change. . . .

Mr. Will goes on to say:

> If Washington's trajectory could be turned as quickly as tea partyers wish . . . their movement would not be as necessary as it is.

Those are Mr. Will's words. That is Mr. Will's considered opinion. That may be so, and it may not be so. But the first rule of good governance is to do no harm. That does not mean we should not make cuts. That does not mean we should not look toward some of the directions this debate has taken us. But it means be careful when you are dealing with a fragility of national policy at a time like this.

Some things sound better in a speech to a room full of activists than they actually are in the reality of how to govern and the practicality of how to actually bring about change, where change is needed.

Senator Goldwater did not attempt to torpedo the economy in order to get his way. Ronald Reagan, in whose administration I proudly served, by the way, raised the national debt 18 times—more than any other President.

I fought in Vietnam as an infantry marine. I am very proud of that. Those of us who did fight in Vietnam all remember the regretful quote of one infantry officer who lamented that during one battle he had to call in heavy artillery and airstrikes on a populated village; that he had to destroy a village in order to save it.

I do not think the Republicans who are using this issue as a lever to bring about their view of radical change want to look back at a fractured economic recovery, a downgraded credit rating for the world's No. 1 economy, a citizenry that has become more angry and less capable of predicting its own financial future, and then say, as if all of this were not predictable, that they destroyed the American economy in order to save it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, I know my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia, is going to be seeking recognition, and perhaps others. I certainly have no objection to that. I realize we are on the Mueller nomination.

I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any interruption for other business, the Mueller vote still be at the time we originally planned, which is around 4 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, last week I came to the Senate floor to

ask unanimous consent to pass something called—a very easy thing—a clean extension of the FAA bill, something the Senate has done 20 times. This is the 21st time—4 years waiting to pass a reauthorization bill.

But for the first time in these 4 years, the Republicans objected to this extraordinarily routine request. Shortly, I will renew my request to pass our 21st short-term extension of the FAA. But before I do, I want to highlight the very painful consequences of failing to pass this bill, which we can only do by getting a clean extension.

By objecting to my request last week, Republican Senators made sure that 4,000 hard-working FAA employees were furloughed already. Hundreds of critical airport safety capacity air traffic control projects were brought to a halt. Payments were stopped to hundreds of small businesses dependent upon reimbursement from the FAA for their work.

The Federal Government is being forced to forego almost $30 million a day in aviation tax revenue that is critical, obviously, to supporting our overall airport infrastructure program. The introduction of the newest Boeing aircraft is being delayed because the FAA cannot certify that the planes operate safely.

I know in Washington we have a tendency to view these fights as purely policy disagreements that have no real impact on people. I stress that there is an enormous effect on people and businesses, large and small, and on the economy of the United States. Because some Republicans have refused to allow another clean extension of the FAA programs, something we have done 20 times in the last 4 years, we are inflicting real pain on very real people.

People are suffering. Small businesses are hurting. We are losing jobs and will lose a lot more. Even consumers are losing out on the airline ticket tax holidays.

The majority of the airline industry has greedily chosen to pocket those revenues rather than reducing ticket prices. In other words, they have a tax holiday because the expiration of the tax has already taken place a number of days ago. So they are taking this tax holiday, and rather than leaving at the present level the cost of a ticket for consumers—as Alaska Airlines is doing and Virgin Airlines is doing and one other airline is doing—they are taking the money to themselves, giving it to themselves.

I find that extraordinary. It reminds me of ''Too Big to Fail''—the movie—the greed, the promise to help with small mortgages and they got all the money and didn't spend a dime to help with small mortgages.

The damage we are doing to our aviation system is incredibly real. If we fail to act in a timely manner, it may be so devastating as to become irreversible. It makes sense when we think about it. If one were to operate on somebody and cut beyond a certain point, they can't reverse the damage.

With so much pain being inflicted on so many, one may ask why my Republican colleagues have refused repeated requests to pass a clean extension—something we have done 20 times in the past 4 years.

They are willing, evidently, to hurt so many of these people for the benefit of one company. It is called Delta Airlines. As the chairman of the House Transportation Committee has stated publicly, the House inserted language on the Essential Air Service Program to leverage the Senate on including provisions relating to the National Mediation Board.

What do I mean? What they sent to us was all about essential air service. But that is not what it is about at all. The chairman, my counterpart in the House told me many times that essential air service is not a big deal to him. He doesn't particularly have a dog in this hunt. We need to do some reform on it, which we offered to do. He didn't mention a thing about the National Mediation Board. That is the only thing that motivates the House.

Delta Airlines is nonunion. The other airlines, for the most part, are union. Delta Airlines has had four elections in the last several years to unionize. Each time the company has prevailed over the union. So one might ask: Why is it that they are so strongly suggesting they need this National Mediation Board, which they changed in their bill.

It had been changed 2 years ago to say the number of votes that were cast were the number of votes that were reflected. In their bill, they want to say that anybody who does not vote in a union certification election, by definition, has voted no. I have never heard of that in America anywhere else. It is a rather ridiculous ploy.

This is not policy, this is pettiness. It has become the typical ''my way or the highway'' thinking of the House Republicans.

I note that we have forgone almost $150 million in tax revenues by failing to act. It will go up by about $25 million a day, which, when we think about it, would come close to paying for the whole Essential Air Service Program anyway, in just a week or so. Again, by the end of the week, we will have lost more revenue used for aviation infrastructure spending than on the entire Essential Air Service Program cost all of last year. It is embarrassing.

I wish my Republican colleagues would have defended the prerogatives of the Senate. Instead, some chose to back the House leadership.

Last week, as my friend from Utah—who is here now—outlined so honestly, Senate Republicans are not permitting the Senate to pass a clean extension because they want the Senate to accept language altering 85 years of labor law and legal precedent.

I wish I understood why the policy objections of one company—Delta Airlines—mattered so much to so few and also mattered so much more than the livelihood of thousands of American workers who have or will be furloughed.

Last year, the CEO of Delta made $9 million. Whether that was a salary or salary plus options, I know not. Delta paid its top executives almost $20 million. Yet it is fighting to make sure its employees cannot organize—they already had four elections, and in all four Delta has prevailed—for fear they may secure a few extra dollars in their paychecks.

At the same time, it is pushing for special interest provisions in the FAA bill. Delta is not shy. Delta announced it was abandoning air services to 26 small, rural communities—leaving many of them, obviously, without any air service. One only has to live in a small, rural community or a State such as mine to understand what that means and what the cost truly is.

Delta then had the gall to announce publicly it would seek EAS subsidies to continue this service. Maybe Mr. Anderson and his colleagues can forgo some of their own salaries to help subsidize the air service. That is not my business. Maybe they could use some of the millions of dollars they are collecting in a tax holiday windfall to pay for this service. That is not my business, but it is theirs, and it is shameful.

Let me be clear. House Republicans and their Senate allies have thrown nearly 4,000 FAA employees out of work already, stopped critical airport safety projects, hurt hundreds of small businesses, and gutted the Aviation Trust Fund—or began to—so Delta Airlines—that one company—doesn't have to allow its employees to organize in a fair or timely manner, if they chose to.

The needs of one company should not, in any deliberative body, dictate the safety and soundness of our aviation system. We need to pass a clean extension that will get people back to work and businesses and their employees back to work and build out our airport infrastructure.

It is so simple to pass a clean extension bill. We have done it so often. We have done it 20 times. The one time where there was some policy attached was 2 years ago, when the House and the Senate totally agreed on what was in the extension, and it passed. But it is such a simple thing to do. By not doing it, it is holding up our whole process.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2553

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 109, H.R. 2553; that a Rockefeller-Hutchison substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read the third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. I object, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I will take a few minutes to explain why I am, once again, objecting to the legislation offered by my dear friend from West Virginia, my Finance Committee colleague. I wish to make it absolutely clear that a long-term FAA reauthorization is a priority for this country, and it is a personal priority for me.

Once again, I point out that I have worked with Chairman BAUCUS on reporting a Finance Committee title to the bill that passed the Senate earlier this year. The current lapse in FAA taxes and expenditures authority from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund is a detrimental situation brought on by the Senate majority's refusal to discontinue granting excessive favors for big labor and their refusal to cut any wasteful spending.

As I have said, I share House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman MICA's frustration that favors to organized labor have overshadowed the prospects for a long-term FAA reauthorization.

Last year, the National Mediation Board changed the rules under which employees of airlines and railroads are able to unionize. For decades, the standard has been that a majority of employees would have to agree in an election to form a union. However, the National Mediation Board rules changed that standard so all it takes to unionize is a majority of employees voting. This means the NMB wants to count an employee who doesn't vote as voting for big labor. Somehow, organized labor is able to claim it is democratic to appropriate someone else's vote without that person's input and participation.

The FAA reauthorization bill that passed the House earlier this year undoes this heavyhanded rule and lets airline employees decide for themselves how to use their own votes. The House bill would merely undo a big partisan favor done at the behest of big labor and put efforts to unionize airline workforces on the same footing they have been on for years.

The House bill does not create a new hurdle to unionization. Instead, it restores the longstanding ability of airline employees to make decisions for themselves. The House bill only undoes the NMB action that was taken to reverse 70 years of precedent for narrow political gain.

In addition to an impulse to cater to big labor, the Senate majority also is resistant to any attempt to cut any government spending, no matter how wasteful that spending may be. The House bill I am going to ask unanimous consent for in a few minutes has aroused the ire of the majority because it contains a provision that would limit essential air service eligibility to communities that are located 90 or more miles from a large- or medium-hub airport. This would save $12.5 million a year. That is right, million with an ''m'', not a ''b'' or a ''t.''

The majority is resisting a provision that already passed this body as part of the Senate's long-term reauthorization bill that would save $12.5 million a year, and they are willing to put the FAA's finance at risk in the process. The House bill I am going to offer also contains an additional proposal to limit essential air service subsidies for communities where the cost per passenger is greater than $1,000. This provision would affect a grand total of three airports in the whole country. It is my understanding these three airports would also have ceased to receive EAS subsidies under another provision in the Senate-passed, long-term FAA bill that limited subsidies to airports averaging 10 or more passengers a day.

To sum this up, our friends on the other side, the Democrats, are holding this up over wasteful spending and handouts for President Obama's big union allies.

The point is, the Senate majority has cut the FAA off from its primary source of financing and created confusion for travel companies and tax-paying passengers by objecting to a short-term extension measure that doesn't do one single thing that is not done by a bill that passed the Senate by unanimous consent on April 7 of this year.

I wish to briefly discuss and hopefully clear away some of that confusion. Passengers who bought tickets while the taxes were still being collected may be entitled to a refund if they are traveling during a period in which the taxes have lapsed. I wish to make it clear that the inability of the Senate majority to process legislation should not constitute an additional burden to the already beleaguered travel industry. It is the responsibility of the IRS to refund ticket taxes, and while I recognize they want to do the right thing for taxpayers, I encourage the IRS to work closely with the travel industry. The travel industry is not responsible for the lapse in FAA taxes, and they should not bear extra costs because of that.

The lack of a long-term bill is bad for airports all across the country because they don't have the funding stability to plan and complete projects. Kicking the can farther down the road is not a viable alternative to actually doing what is in the best interests of all parties.

As a Senate conferee to the FAA bill, I stand ready to do everything I can to get to work with my House and Senate colleagues on a long-term FAA reauthorization, as soon as they are willing to get down to work.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2553

Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2553, which was received from the House. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Is there objection?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the Mueller nomination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Mueller nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, how much time remains until the vote on the Mueller nomination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I hope all Senators will step forward and vote for this nomination. I can think of no reason why they should not. Director Mueller is typical of many in our government who serve the people of America tirelessly, without any gain to themselves but instead for what is best for all Americans and for our country. Director Mueller has worked—along with the thousands of individuals at the Department of Justice and the FBI who work around the clock every day to keep America safe to protect us from crime and to protect us from terrorists. Unfortunately some people try to lump together and deride government employees. The fact is the people at the FBI and Department of Justice are very brave men and women, many of whom put their lives on the line for us day by day, and we ought to acknowledge that.

Bob Mueller is the public face of the FBI, as its long-serving Director. Amazingly, he and Ann, his wife of many years, along with their grown children, are able to separate that their private life from the public life. Like so many who serve this country, Director Mueller's public life takes an inordinate amount of his time, and I think it is a testament to his dedication that he was willing to do this job for another two years, but it is also important to acknowledge the sacrifice of his wife Ann and his children. I think all Americans share in the good fortune that when the President asked Director Mueller to step forward and serve for another 2 years, he answered the call.

I also want to compliment President Obama. He knew he had the opportunity to name somebody who would be there as long as he, Barack Obama, may be President, whether he serves one term or two, and beyond. Instead, the President, as he has often done, did what he thought was best for the country.

Director Mueller is a fine public servant, and I would urge all Senators to vote ''aye'' on this nomination.

Madam President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I see no one else seeking the floor, so I yield back the remainder of the time, which is now about 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert S. Mueller, III, of California, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a term expiring September 4, 2013.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 118 Ex.]

YEAS — 100

Akaka	Gillibrand	Moran
Alexander	Graham	Murkowski
Ayotte	Grassley	Murray
Barrasso	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Hatch	Paul
Bennet	Heller	Portman
Bingaman	Hoeven	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hutchison	Reed
Blunt	Inhofe	Reid
Boozman	Inouye	Risch
Boxer	Isakson	Roberts
Brown (MA)	Johanns	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Burr	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Cantwell	Kerry	Schumer
Cardin	Kirk	Sessions
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Kohl	Shelby
Chambliss	Kyl	Snowe
Coats	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coburn	Lautenberg	Tester
Cochran	Leahy	Thune
Collins	Lee	Toomey
Conrad	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Corker	Lugar	Vitter
Cornyn	Manchin	Warner
Crapo	McCain	Webb
DeMint	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	
Franken	Mikulski	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, a motion to reconsider is considered made and laid on the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have spoken to the Republican leader fairly recently—it is all relative time, I guess. There will be no more rollcall votes tonight.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business until 6:30 p.m. tonight, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. Senator COBURN is not on the floor, but I understand he wanted to speak for more than 10 minutes. I ask that Senator COBURN be recognized at 5:30 p.m. for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would like to get 20 minutes to speak following Senator COBURN.

Mr. REID. Sounds good to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. The rest of the Senators will be limited to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 6:30 p.m., I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kansas.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I have spoken several times over the last several weeks with regard to the issue at hand. Clearly, the time continues to escape us, and the day of reckoning is coming in regard to the debt ceiling issue. I have said from the very beginning that in my view it would be irresponsible not to raise the debt ceiling, but it would be as irresponsible if not more so to raise the debt ceiling without reducing the spending, getting our books more in balance, and moving us in the right direction toward a balanced budget in the future. I recognize this cannot be accomplished overnight, and I recognize there are those who bring different points of view and perspectives to the Senate floor. This is a body of people who represent individuals who live in all 50 States and have points of view and philosophies and backgrounds that are different than perhaps the constituents I represent from the State of Kansas.

I have been a strong supporter of the legislation entitled ''cut, cap, and balance.'' I actually believe it is not just cut, cap, and balance; it is cut, cap, balance, and grow. We could do so much for our country both in the fiscal sense and with the idea that we could better pay our bills if the revenues are increased by putting people to work, by creating a climate in which people could find jobs, people could improve their situation in regard to their jobs, and in the process of doing that the revenues increase to the Federal Treasury.

It was back in the days of President Clinton that we came the closest to having our books balanced. While there was spending restraint and disagreement among Republicans and Democrats about new spending programs or bigger government, in my view, the real reason we had a balanced budget was because the economy was growing.

So I again ask my colleagues to pay attention to what I believe was the message of the 2010 election: It is the economy. It is the desire of people to have a better life, to save money for their children's education, to save money for their retirement, and to be satisfied that the job they have today is the job they will have tomorrow.

I believe there is much that we can do with regard to the regulatory environment, making the Tax Code fair and certain, issues regarding access to credit, a trade policy that will allow us to increase exports—both agricultural and manufactured goods—and a trade policy that reduces our reliance on foreign energy and gives us greater control over its costs. But the time has come for us to reach an agreement, and we anxiously await what action the House of Representatives may take.

In light of this point in time, I would like to share with my colleagues in the Senate an e-mail I received from one of my constituents, a Kansan named Gina Reynolds. Gina is from Shawnee. She expresses this point of view I think very appropriately for where we are today. In asking Gina if I could share with you what she wrote to me, she indicated this was the very first time she had ever written a Member of Congress. Here is what she had to say that I hope we will take into account. Again, while we bring philosophies and viewpoints and approaches to government to Washington, DC, there is an opportunity for common sense and good judgment to prevail.

Here is what she says:

> I firmly believe the United States needs to start living within our means. However, I am frustrated beyond belief with the inability of Congress to do their jobs and ensure that we do not throw the country back into recession. While I and my husband are employed, we feel lucky to have jobs. We work hard, pay our taxes and try to raise our children the right way. It absolutely boggles my mind that we cannot come to a compromise on the debt ceiling issue that is so critical to the financial markets and the average American citizen.
>
> For it is us, the middle class, that will suffer the most; from lost jobs, to lost 401Ks, and lost savings. We need real tax reform, real entitlement reform (for even though I am 42 years old, I do not believe I will ever see a dime of Social Security) and real spending cuts. Congress has had months to work on this issue, and now the time is to act in the best interests of the People, not the political interest groups, not some ideology.

It is sad to say, but I honestly don't know if my children will have a better future than me. I know that there are a lot of tough decisions yet to be made regarding spending and taxes, but we only make it harder by defaulting on any of our country's obligations. I am fiscally conservative and generally vote Republican, but I do not blindly follow any one path. I try to use my vote wisely and pledge my loyalty to my God and my country, not a political party.

I believe we have the greatest country on Earth, but our inability to compromise, to stop acting like spoiled children, saddens me. The Founding Fathers were able to compromise and write a document that has stood the test of time for 235 years. Can we not now do the same? Please do the right thing for the American People, the ones frustrated and angry and hurt by this self-produced impasse.

I thank Gina Reynolds for her message to me and Members of the Senate, for taking the time to communicate with her Senator, with me as a Member of Congress. I think she in many ways expresses a conservative yet commonsense point of view so many Kansans have.

I often think too many times we are caught in a circumstance that we find an inability to resolve. Sometimes we are trapped by our political party. In my view, while we ought to have strong opinions and ought to have a solid philosophy, we need to make certain that we are motivated for the right reasons and that the good of America is at the forefront of our minds.

I indicated in my maiden speech when I spoke here on the Senate floor 4 months ago as a new Senator that when I need a perspective as to what we need to do here—and sometimes we get bogged down in those things that are a lot less important—I will put my walking shoes on, my running shoes, and I will walk up to the Lincoln Memorial. You go by the World War II Memorial, you walk on past the Vietnam Wall, and you walk by the Korean War Memorial, and in each one of those locations, I am reminded that no American memorialized in those settings fought and died, sacrificed for their country for purposes of Republicans or Democrats but because they believed they had an obligation to serve our country and because they believed that in that service, they had the opportunity to make life better for their family and for future generations of Americans. We need to remind ourselves that we need that perspective. It is not a fight between the Republicans and Democrats. It is about doing what is right for America. We owe it to those who sacrificed in military service for our country, and particularly those who have died in that service, we will do what is right. I know my colleagues share that point of view. I think from time to time we have to be reminded about what the priorities have to be, what the focus must be.

Again, I appreciate the sentiments expressed by this Kansan and would indicate that we, as American citizens, and certainly me, as a Member of the Senate, our primary responsibility as citizens is to make certain we pass on to the next generation of Americans this country called the United States of America in which we maintain the freedoms and liberties guaranteed by our Constitution and we allow the next generation of Americans, our children, our grandchildren, and young men and women yet to be born, people we don't even know, the opportunity to pursue the American dream.

I think this Kansas constituent of mine expressed those sentiments very well, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to see that we do what is right for the future of our Nation and that this next generation of Americans can pursue that which we all idolize and believe in, the American dream.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, let me, first of all, compliment my friend and colleague, the Senator from Kansas, for his comments and for his approach. He made a few comments we haven't heard much of in this Chamber or in the other Chamber in the last few days. He said before he was a Democrat and before he was a Republican, he was an American. I want to compliment him on those sentiments, and I want to rise in that same vein because whether you are somebody from Kansas or somebody from North Carolina or folks I hear from Virginia who keep saying to me: Why can't you guys get this thing done? Why can't you both be willing to give a little to put our country first? As somebody who has had the honor of serving as Governor of Virginia and somebody who served as a businessman for 20 years, I never thought that I would be standing on the floor of the Senate 6 days, 5½ days away from the United States of America potentially defaulting on our obligations. Yet most of the debate and, Lord knows, almost all of the press conferences have been less about solutions and more about who is to blame.

Whether they are sitting in the gallery or they are watching at home or, like most Americans, trying to get through an unbearably hot summer, they wonder who are these folks they hired to get the people's business done.

I have been involved with a group of Senators over the last 9 months who have done something I didn't think was extraordinary, but unfortunately today is pretty extraordinary. There is a group of Democratic and Republican Senators who have said the most important issue we face in our country is to get our debt and deficit under control, and who have said that the only way we can get that under control is to sit together for hours on end, reason together, argue, and do something as basically American as compromise.

After months and months of going back and forth, last Tuesday, when we revealed the so-called plan—which, frankly, the Gang of 6 has built upon the work of a previous year's work of Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and business leaders, the President's deficit commission—a remarkable thing happened for a couple of days in this body. Instead of everybody coming out and saying why this couldn't happen, they said: Hey, this isn't perfect, but this would actually lower our deficit by close to $4 trillion, take on tax reform, take on entitlement reform, and cut spending. It might just be a path out.

Well, that lasted a couple of days, and then we got back to who was going to score points in the next 24-hour news segment.

Well, I desperately hope and pray that at this moment in our country we will rise to the task and make sure, with the eyes of not only the Nation but the world on us, that we do our basic job. Let's make sure the United States of America doesn't default next Tuesday.

The only way I think we are going to get there is if we lower the rhetoric, lower the finger-pointing, and recognize it is going to take ideas from both sides. It is going to take a change in attitude from some.

There is a Congressman who gave a press conference sometime in the last day or two who paraphrased Winston Churchill. He said:

> We're going to fight you on the beaches. We're going to fight you at sea. We're going to fight you in the air to make structural changes in the way this place known as Washington, DC, operates.

Who is the ''you'' he is going to fight? Is he going to fight people who say maybe America and Americans want us to actually work together and compromise? I mean, this kind of sentiment goes beyond the pale in a moment when our Nation is in this kind of crisis.

There has been a lot of talk recently—particularly coming from the other body—that the only way to solve this problem is an amendment, a constitutional amendment. Well, I would point out 49 States have that kind of amendment. They have to balance their books. My State, Virginia, and the Presiding Officer's State, North Carolina, meet that goal. There are an awful lot of States that have that kind of amendment in place. I don't know what kind of accounting they use, but I have not heard many folks point to the California State budget and say: That is a balanced budget.

So some kind of process argument isn't going to solve the problem. We have to make the hard choices. We have to cut spending. We have to reform our entitlements. We have to reform our Tax Code to generate additional revenues.

The numbers don't lie. We are spending at an all-time high, 25 percent of our GDP. We are collecting revenues at only 15 percent of GDP. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out any time our Nation's budget has been in relative balance is when we have been with spending and revenues at 19.5 percent to 20.5 percent. Why can't we come together to put a plan in place that does that?

Folks who are watching are saying: Well, there is actually a plan. More than one-third of the Senate has said: We will be with you—about an equal

number of Democrats and Republicans. But instead we are going back and forth, ping-pong, who is going to have which plan? Who is going to win each day? It is also pretty remarkable at this moment in time—I don't know who this Congressman is, but when we have roughly one-fifth of the House who at least on record saying they will never vote to increase the debt limit, I wonder when they took the oath to uphold the laws of our country, which said we have to pay our bills, how that commitment matches with those promises or those political positions.

My sense is they want to have an amendment to the Constitution. What they are advocating, this we will never change, our way or the highway approach, the amendment they ought to talk about is basically restructuring our whole Constitution and turning our government into a parliamentary system. There are a lot of places around that if you win an election, you get to choose the chief executive. You get to control the legislature. You can pass anything you want. Yet these very same folks are the ones who say they want to support the Constitution.

Well, the Constitution and the genius of our Constitution was the fact that the Founders said the most basic American principle was checks and balances. We have a House, we have a President, and actually they have to work together. Somehow the attitude of some of these Members in the House, do it our way or let's drive our country over the cliff, is dramatically as un-American as anything I have ever seen.

At the same time, we hear other Members who say: Maybe we just need a little more economic shock to make us do the right thing. What are these folks thinking of? The stock market closed down 200 points today. It has been down about 400 points this week. There are an awful lot of Americans who only now are starting to recover from the financial crisis of 2 years ago. There are an awful lot of retirees who saw their 401(k)s plummet 2 years ago, who slowly have seen that nest egg that is going to get them through rough times recover.

Now 400 points—how much more stock market decline do we need before we all have the courage to do the right thing, 1,000 points? Do we need to put another 1 million Americans out of work? Do we need to throw more people out of their homes because of the tax increase that will result—the real increase that will result with the rise in interest rates that will happen next week?

There are others who say: Let's do it short term. Let's kick the can down the road for a short while, something that is being discussed in the House. It doesn't matter whether it is Democrat or Republican. It matters because that approach will result in a lowering of our debt rating. I know people's eyes glaze over when they hear about debt ratings. Unfortunately, debt ratings matter—and we are the only country in the world with a AAA debt rating. That means we are kind of the gold standard.

If we have that debt rating reduced, it is not only a black eye for America, it not only means that what we have to pay in interest rates will go up, not just for government but if you have a school bond, if you have a State bond, the prices are going to go up. You have an auto loan, a home mortgage, you have a student loan, you are a business trying to expand, the cost of that is all going to go up.

The very same folks who say they will never look at raising more revenues don't seem to mind at all that if we have to have an interest rate rise because of a default or downgrade of our debt, doesn't that take more money out of Americans' pockets? I just don't get it.

Frankly, as the Presiding Officer knows, I have been pretty obsessed about this issue for months on end. I hope that we will check our Democratic and Republican hats and go with what my colleague, the Senator from Kansas, said and recognize when we get out of bed tomorrow morning we get out of bed as Americans, not as Democrats or Republicans; that we not only get over the debt limit, which, hopefully, through some convoluted process we will, but we also recognize that getting past August 2 doesn't mean, OK, we are done, everybody go have a nice August. All that does is buy us a bit of time to decide whether we are going to come back to the really hard issues of not only how we start with some spending cuts, which will be part of our down payment, but how we really make sure the entitlement programs—important to so many of us on both sides of the aisle, but particularly on this side of the aisle—are actually there 10, 20, 30 years from now.

The notion that they are not going to change, that they cannot continue to be sustainable at the current rate, it is not Democratic or Republican.

Thank goodness a lot of us are living a lot longer. When I was a kid there were 15, 16 people paying in for every Social Security retiree. Now there are 3. We have to make sure that for my kids, your kids, that there is Social Security in their framework. At the same time we have to have our colleagues on the Republican side recognize that we have to reform our Tax Code in a way that makes it simpler, flatter, and, yes, generates some additional revenue.

The only way we are going to get there, if and when we get past this August 2 date, is if we combine that effort with long-term debt reduction. I am more than open to any valid, balanced comprehensive bipartisan plan that is around.

For the effort of the so-called Gang of 6, a third of the Senate said, yes, this is worth considering. It isn't perfect, I can assure you. Some would even say, from some of the descriptions I have heard, that it may not meet all of those. But I will tell my colleagues three things it is: It is comprehensive, bipartisan, and, under any analysis, it does what our country desperately needs: It starts to drive our debt-to-GDP ratio in the right direction, which is a fancy way of saying we can maintain our books on a path to lead us to fiscal stability. Frankly, what that would also allow us to do is get back to what we should be spending our time on, which is creating growth in this economy and starting to unleash American creativity and innovation. But that is not going to happen if we spend all of our time pointing fingers back and forth about how we got here or which short-term plan best meets the short-term interests of the next 5 or 6 days.

I, for one, believe the plan Senator REID has laid out is not perfect, but it gives us the time to deal with this debt and deficit problem in a serious way. It gives us the ability to ensure that we don't have a credit downgrade. Unfortunately, the plan being debated in the House right now may have some merits, but the one thing that is clear is that it will lead to a downgrade—not my words, but the words of all the rating agencies. Whether we like them or not, they are the folks who set that standard.

Again, I urge folks who are making statements such as ''We are going to fight you on the beaches, we are going to fight you at sea, we are going to fight you in the air,'' to consider your fellow Americans here. If you don't like our system of government, then be honest and propose a change to a parliamentary system. If you do honor and respect the Constitution which we all took an oath to uphold, recognize that it is a Constitution that puts in place checks and balances to have us all work together, give a little, and recognize that when we get out of bed in the morning, we are not a Democrat or a Republican but an American first and foremost.

I hope and pray we will find the path through these next 5 days and that we won't do the unthinkable. I have said on a couple of occasions—I am sure it will come back and bite me—that if we don't do this we should all get fired, because the fact is the most basic promise we make is to uphold the laws and rules of our country. Frankly, I can't think of anything that is more quintessentially American than making sure we pay our bills and that we honor our obligations. So let's get that done, and then let's work together to make sure we put in place the long-term, comprehensive, bipartisan approach that is needed so we can get this Nation back on the right fiscal path but, more importantly, back on the right path to ensure that everybody gets that fair shot for that economic growth we all seek so much.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. 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. COBURN. I ask to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPENDING

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, we have a lot in front of us as a nation. Our perception is that our country is anxious, and I think it has good reason to be anxious, but it doesn't have anything to do with the debt ceiling debate. It should be anxious because we are not listening. We are not paying attention to the anxiety and fear and worry that the country they know and the freedoms and liberties they have are slipping away from them. They are slipping away because we are putting America into debtor's prison. We are slowly losing our ability to make free choices about our future because we failed to be responsible in the past with the money the American people have given us.

We have had a lot of debates and a lot of statements over the last couple of weeks, but no one ever talks about what the real problem is. The real problem is we are spending money on things with good intentions that don't accomplish their purposes. We are spending money we don't have on things we don't absolutely need, and the programs we do have, we fail to oversee to see that they are running both efficiently and effectively. As a consequence, we find ourselves in the midst of an economic downturn with a $1.5 trillion to $1.6 trillion deficit, borrowing $4 billion a day. That means every day and a half, we borrow more money than the State of Oklahoma spends in a year. We hear all of the political speeches and all of the fingerpointing, but we don't hear the real solutions to our problem.

Let me explain what I mean. Everybody agrees we are going to have to make some cuts, but not everybody is honest about the numbers associated with those cuts. Everybody agrees we are going to have to tighten our belt, but nobody wants to offer specifically where to tighten our belt. What I wish to do today is offer specific places where the government today—right today, in this body and the one across the Capitol—could make a big difference in the outcome of our future by cutting specific programs this week and next week.

That is the one rare thing we never hear in Washington. Everybody says we need to cut, but when it gets down to talking about what to cut, nobody wants to come up with any cogent ideas because they don't want to take the political heat, because every program, no matter how well intended and how inefficient, has those people who are going to fight for that program because it has money coming into the coffers for something.

The other point I wish to make is the reason we are anxious and the reason we are worried is we have abandoned the very principles our Founders gave us that would keep us healthy, and that was the Constitution and its enumerated powers section, which spelled out very succinctly what was our responsibility and what was the States' responsibility.

So we have whole departments. One, for example, would be the Department of Education that Thomas Jefferson said if we ever have the Federal Government doing anything on education, we would have to change the Constitution. That is a direct quote of his. He was one of our Founders. He, as well as Madison and Monroe and others, wrote extensively about what their intentions were in the Federalist Papers. Yet we have allowed ourselves to be walked, like in a dream state, into the contention that the Constitution does not make any difference and that it would, in fact, if we paid attention to it, limit our opportunities for the mistakes we have made. The mistakes we have made—though well-intentioned—are that we can be the answer for every problem in America. We cannot.

What made our country great was self-reliance, individual freedom and initiative, personal responsibility and accountability. That is what built our country, in a system that said: If, in fact, you work hard, the opportunity is there for you to gain, for you and those you love. Now we have a government that at every place, for every decision that is for the economic benefit of those individuals who would grab that dream, they are confronted with layers upon layers of bureaucracy, with rules and regulations, to the point where no longer are they presumed innocent by the Federal Government, they are presumed guilty, and they have to prove themselves innocent to the bureaucracy to be able to accomplish that which would set them free, that which would put them ahead, that which would establish an opportunity to gain the wealth this country promised.

I put forward a week ago last Monday $9 trillion in potential cuts. Now, I know people are not all going to agree with me, but every one of these cuts is backed up with a government study that says what we are doing in these programs is not effective. Whether it is the Congressional Research Service, the inspector generals, the Government Accountability Office, OMB, or the Congressional Budget Office, there are over 3,000 footnotes to the 600 pages that are in here that explain very well why we should not be doing this $9 trillion worth of stuff.

I understand we can have a great debate on whether, one, it is our constitutional responsibility. Some of it certainly is when it comes to defense. No. 2, we can have a great debate on what we think are priorities, those things that fit within the Constitution that are our responsibility. But we cannot debate the facts of the outright waste, the outright fraud, the outright abuse, and the outright duplication of multiple sets of programs.

This is far from a complete list, as shown in this chart. But over the next 10 years, we could save $150 billion to $200 billion just by eliminating duplicative programs. We have over 100 programs on surface transportation. That is 100 sets of bureaucracies, 100 offices, 100 sets of regulations, 100 sets of rules. The question we ought to ask is, If we have responsibility on surface transportation, why in the world do we have 100 different programs?

We have 82 teacher improvement and training programs run by the Federal Government. Nobody will come down here and answer me why. It is indefensible we have it. Yet nobody will come down here and join me to eliminate it. We have to be asking the question: Do we have good reason to be anxious when we will not do the obvious?

We have over 180 economic development programs, but we have 88 economic development programs that we spend $6.8 billion a year on run by four separate agencies, and not one of them has a study that shows they are effective in developing economic activity—not one of them. So why would we continue to send money into programs with good intentions that are not working? Yet we have over 180 of them, 88 within four departments. We have not been able to find all the rest of them, but we know they exist.

That is 88 sets of bureaucrats, well-intentioned Federal Government workers doing what this Congress and Congresses before us have told them to do but not accomplishing the purpose for which that money—almost $7 billion a year—is sent.

We have 80 other separate programs for transportation assistance. You see the little community vehicles, the ones to help those who have a disability. Why do we have 80 separate programs? Nobody can answer that. It is easy to figure out how they happen. They are well-intentioned. We ought to help people who cannot get around. The question that ought to be asked is, Is that a State responsibility or a Federal responsibility? If it is a Federal responsibility—that is debatable, but if it is, why would we have 80 separate programs?

We have 56 different programs run by seven different agencies to teach Americans financial literacy. We have to ask ourselves the question: How can a government that is running a $1.6 trillion deficit and has $14 trillion of debt—and our debt-to-GDP ratio is 100 percent—how do we have any authority to teach anybody about financial literacy? That is No. 1.

No. 2, where is it in the Constitution that we are responsible for teaching people financial literacy? That is both a State function, a city function, and a

family function. Yet we have 56 programs, and not one of them has a metric to study whether it is effective—not one of them.

Job training: We spent $18.8 billion on job training this last year. We have 47 different programs. The Government Accountability Office says, of those 47 programs, all of them overlap except 3. So based on the study of the people we pay to study this, the most we should have is 4 job training programs. And we are going to spend almost $19 billion on that? Here is what we know. The results cannot justify that we are spending the money because the results do not show performance. Yet we are spending $18 billion.

We have 20 different programs for homeless assistance and prevention. That is a great role. We all want to help the homeless. We want to do whatever we can to get them in a stable situation, to assist them. But 20 different programs? Why would we do that? Why wouldn't we have one? And why wouldn't only the one program be administered through a State if, in fact, it is our role? I happen to think that is the State of Oklahoma's role to take care of the homeless people in Oklahoma, not the Federal Government's. But if it is the Federal Government's role, why would we have 20 programs?

Food for the hungry: 18 separate programs, 5 different agencies. Again, I am all for helping those people who need to have food. Why would we have 18 sets of bureaucracies, 18 different sets of rules—18 different sets? And 2 of these actually work; 16 do not, but we have not eliminated them. We are still sending the money out the door.

Disaster response and preparedness inside FEMA: Just for disaster response and preparedness, there are 17 programs just inside FEMA. That does not count all the disaster response and preparedness programs in all the other government agencies. That is just inside FEMA. We have to ask the questions: What are we doing? One, what have we done in the past? And what are we going to do about the problems that are in front of us today?

So I would propose that we are off base, and we have a good reason to be anxious about us because we will not address these problems. When we bring amendments to the floor, they get routinely defeated. Why is that? Is it that we are being dishonest about the facts or is it we are protecting the politicians so they are not attacked by the very people who are benefiting indirectly—not directly, but indirectly—from these programs, the bureaucracies and the other quasi-governmental agencies that feed off these programs?

So where do we go to start fixing this $1.6 trillion deficit? I had some wonderful employees of the Social Security Administration come to me about a year and a half ago, and they said—and they wanted to remain anonymous; and I understand why—they said our disability program is broken. We are giving disability checks to thousands of people every year who are not disabled.

So we started looking at it in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and here is what we found. If we take veterans totally out of the mix—this does not apply to veterans—1 in 18 people in this country today is collecting a disability check.

As a physician, I have done all sorts of disability examinations. What we are finding is about 40 percent of the people who are on disability are not disabled because the law says to be disabled in this country, and to receive a check from the rest of us for that disability, there can be no job in the economy they can do.

Yet we have judges who never deny anybody when they come through the disability program. We have people on disability who are working full time at other jobs. Once they are eligible for a disability check, 2 years after that they are eligible for health care.

So now we have undermined the system that was designed to help the truly disabled by having thousands upon thousands upon thousands of people collecting a disability check, which means there is not going to be a check for somebody else.

The disability trust fund, which we pay into when we work—as well as SSI, which is a separate fund that comes just from our tax dollars—is belly up. Next year, the Social Security disability trust fund runs out of money. The reason it is running out of money is the Social Security system does not say: If you were disabled and now you are not, why are you still taking the money when you are back at work? They do not do their job because the leadership at Social Security does not demand that the job is being done.

So we have significant ways of improving that to make sure we are helping those people who are truly disabled. But we cannot get anybody to help us get that law passed. To say we want to clean up Social Security disability does not mean we do not care about the people who are disabled. It means we care about those who are going to be disabled in the future, so we will have a dollar to help them when that need arises for them.

So it is just one of those areas. It has not been looked at in 25 years. The Social Security system—once you are on, you are on. They rarely take anybody off. The fraud associated with collecting a disability check and working for cash in our economy—and working not for cash, even working full-blown jobs—we had three instances where we had the Government Accountability Office film people, two of whom actually worked as salaried employees for the Federal Government, who were collecting disability at the same time they were collecting checks from the Federal Government as a Federal employee. And it is not small; it is big.

So there is $60 billion over 10 years that we could save just by reforming the Social Security disability system. That does not say we do not want to help people who are disabled. It says we want to do the best for our country and help those people who are disabled. But we have undermined self-reliance. We have found people who want to take advantage of our charity and love and care. So, therefore, they cheat the system. We have an incompetent bureaucracy that does not take them off the system, and we have an incompetent system of jurisprudence within the Social Security Administration that puts people on who should never be on. But the attack comes that we do not care about people if, in fact, we want to fix this program.

Social Security: Everybody says do not touch Social Security. This Congress and the Congress before it has stolen $2.5 trillion from the money we put into Social Security. They have written a little, bitty IOU note and said: Well, when you need the money, we will pay it back.

What does that mean? That means the full faith and credit of this country has to be good enough that when we get ready to pay the $2.5 trillion back, we can borrow the money at an acceptable interest rate to be able to pay it back.

So what do the Social Security Administration trustees say we need to do? They say we have to make it sustainable. And, oh, by the way, wouldn't it be nice if the poorest people on Social Security could get a little bump so we could help those who are truly dependent on it and make it sustainable so we never have to discuss Social Security again? Even with the baby boomers, we ought to do that.

So what we have done is designed a solvent path over 75 years based on Social Security where we are likely to achieve it. We did not raise anybody's taxes. We help those the most who are in need the most, and for those who are the most well off, we said: You cannot have quite as much. In other words, we means tested it.

We said: If you are very wealthy, you will eventually get your money out, but not like everybody else will. The people who need it the most, we are going to help the most. It alters the retirement age just to go along with life expectancy. It does not alter life. It alters that 2 years over 60 years.

But the fact is, our life expectancy is far advanced from what it was when we first started Social Security.

When we first started, we had almost 50 people working for everybody who is on Social Security. Now we have less than five, and it is not going to be long where we are going to have less than three. It is not sustainable unless we change that. So the point is, I understand Social Security is important to people in this country. But if we do not change it, in 2035, we are going to get two-thirds of the benefits you put in. We are not going to get any more than that.

So do we fix it now and make it sustainable forever or do we just wait until it goes belly up, knowing we cannot borrow the $2.5 trillion that was

stolen from it and let it go belly up? The typical politician says: I do not want to do that because I do not want to take the heat to have to explain that to people on Social Security or coming on Social Security.

I do not have any problems trying to explain it. It is the right thing for us to do. We have to fix it, and we can fix it, if, in fact, we are going to save our country. That is one of the things we have to do to make sure the people who buy our bonds, loan us the money, recognize we have a salvageable situation. Ignoring Social Security—it is our second biggest issue now, other than health care—it is our second biggest issue. To ignore it and not fix it says we will not be able to borrow the money for it or anything else.

Let me spend a minute going through a couple things we can do next week that would save a lot of money—not hard, not controversial. The question America ought to ask is, Why have we not already done it? Let me give some examples. We ought to quit paying unemployment compensation to millionaires. Do you realize last year we paid $20 million out in unemployment compensation to people who were making $1 million that year. Is that nuts or what?

Unemployment is to help those people who are in need who are unemployed. It is not to give money to people who do not need it because they are unemployed. Yet we spent almost $20 million last year paying people unemployment compensation who made $1 million last year.

We could save $1 billion over 10 years if we quit making payments to dead people. You say: Oh well, you do not make payments to dead people. Yes, we do—$100 million a year that bureaucracies pay to people who are dead and a good portion of it we never get back. It is gone. We do not follow that up.

We know we can save $5 billion a year minimum—minimum—if we just eliminated some of the overlapping programs I talked about. That is a very conservative estimate. It is probably more akin to $25 billion a year. But let's say it is one-fifth of that—$5 billion a year. That is $50 billion. That would keep us from borrowing money for 14 days just by eliminating duplication in government programs.

We could eliminate $2 billion over 10 years by eliminating sweetheart contracts and bonuses to contractors who work for the Federal Government who do not earn their bonuses. Yes, we do that. We pay bonuses to people who both do not perform and do not perform on time. You would not do it. If someone came in to do something for you on a fixed price with a bonus based on quality and time and they did not meet it, you would not pay them the bonus. But your Federal Government does anyway.

We could save $1 billion over 10 years by collecting unpaid taxes owed to us by our own Federal employees. Taxes that are owed, they have been adjudicated, there is nothing else going on, it is final, it is set, but we do not take the money out of their pay. That number is growing every year, the amount of money they owe.

We could save $3.82 billion by reducing the amount of money Congress spends on itself by just 15 percent. Would it be too much to ask of the Congress to tighten its belt by 15 percent and save 1 day's borrowing? No. I turn back, on average, about $500,000 to $600,000 a year on what is allocated to my Senate office. I do not do that to be able to say I do it; I do it because I do not need it because I know how to run an office efficiently and pay people effectively. But the fact is, we have too big a budget, and we need to trim it. We need to lead by example.

We could save $480 million a year just by having HRSA, the Health Resources and Services Administration, pay the right prices for drugs in their programs versus paying too high prices—prices higher than what they contracted for. One-half billion dollars does not sound like much. But $½ billion over 10 years, that is $5 billion. That is one three-hundredths of what our problem is right now in terms of the deficit.

We could save $5 billion by eliminating unnecessary government printing. We could do that tomorrow—$5 billion.

We could get $15 billion back by getting rid of unnecessary government buildings we are not using, that are costing us $8 billion a year to maintain. I cannot remember the exact number. I think we have 63,000 facilities right now the Federal Government owns—63,000 that are underutilized or not utilized at all. That is 12,000 more than we had 2 years ago, and we are signing new leases for buildings all the time and abandoning the buildings the government owns.

The Federal Government should dispose of excess property within 5 years. According to President Obama's own administration, we could save, at a minimum, $15 billion. Every time we have tried to do this, somebody stops it in the Senate.

We can end subsidies for ethanol blending. We voted on it, had 74 Senators vote on it, but it did not happen. That is $2 billion we could save this year if we passed it tomorrow. We can decrease the number of limousines owned by the Federal Government, save $115 million. We could reduce the Federal vehicle fleet, $5.6 billion.

The Federal Government—you will not believe this number—the Federal Government owns 662,000 cars—662,000. The average mileage on them is less than 20,000 miles. The fleet has grown by 5 percent and the cost of maintaining and servicing the fleet has grown over 25 percent in the last 2 years—$4.6 billion a year just maintaining these 600,000-plus cars.

The amount of vehicles in our fleet could easily be decreased by 20 percent. We have all the capability of having GoToMeeting, of having Internet, of having live chats, of having telecommunications with visual conferencing. We have all those things available. We do not need the cars we have. Even the Obama administration agrees we can do that.

We could save $43 billion by decreasing travel by government agencies—same reason. We spend $15 billion a year on travel—$15 billion. Anything that is not mission critical and that could be done through teleconferencing ought to be done. We advertise. The advertising budget for the Federal Government, $5.6 billion a year. They do not pay for public service ads. These are ads outside of public service ads—$5.6 billion. We spend $1 billion a year hosting government conferences. The Federal Government now owns 685 million acres in the United States. The cost to maintain that, we are not funding. The land is falling in worse disrepair. We are adding land every year. There is lots of land we could give up that is not a precious resource, is not a heritage area, is not forest, is not a park. Yet we own it.

We could save a lot of money by not having so much land and put it back on the tax rolls. We could save $4.1 billion just on our last 2 years' average, in terms of slowing down and not buying additional land, unless there is a direct necessity for the Federal Government to have it.

We could save $19 billion over 10 years by combining the PXs and exchanges on our military bases—$19 billion just by putting them together. That is what we could save.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 30 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—I shall not object—but I would like to add 3 minutes to my time as well.

Mr. COBURN. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. Let me end with this. It costs us, to educate a student on our military bases, an average of $51,000 a student. If we look at the locations where all those are located, the cost outside is one-fourth of that. We could easily do that and pay the community. But we will not.

I will end with this. We can solve our problems. There is $9 trillion worth of specific savings in this. We do not have to agree with all this. We do not even have to agree with half of it. If we agreed with one-third of them, we would be well on our way. The fact is, nobody wants to be specific. We need to be specific. Everybody wants to talk in generalities. Nobody wants to make the hard choices. Hard choices are what we are here for.

Our time has come to stop living the next 30 years on the backs of our kids. It would be my hope that as we go through this process the next 2 weeks,

we will see a renewal in the spirit of our country that says: We are going to live within our means, we are going to reward self-reliance, we are going to reward individual accountability, we are going to reward personal responsibility, and we are going to put the role of the government back where it should be both at the Federal and State level and have commensurate policies that will reflect that, that will renew our country, that will create jobs, that will create opportunity for the future of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

DEBT CEILING

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that standing and going through the list of things that offer opportunities for saving is very important. I have a list as well. For example, on my list, we know of well over $1 trillion of money owed to the United States of America by people who have not paid it. If we even got a portion of that over a 10-year period—that is over a 10-year period—we could do that. I look forward to working with the Senator on that.

But tonight we are not facing a 3-week timeframe as my colleague perhaps suggested, we are just facing down a 5-day timeframe and we are facing a manmade crisis and, by that, I have to say a Republican-made crisis on raising the debt ceiling.

We have never in the history of this country faced a situation such as this. Why do I say this? Because the debt ceiling has been raised 89 times—89 times—and I can tell you because I voted for it a number of times and voted no four times.

Yes, on occasion you vote no on it and send a message, but you don't bring it down. I have never seen anything like this. We are going down a dangerous path. When I say we have raised the debt ceiling 89 times, that is in the RECORD—55 times under Republican Presidents, 34 times under Democratic Presidents. The debt limit was raised the most times during Ronald Reagan's Presidency. During his 8 years, the debt limit was increased by 200 percent. And this is what President Ronald Reagan said when it was time to raise the debt ceiling, which, again, under his Presidency was raised 18 times:

> The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of default—by the United States are impossible and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have a substantial effect on the domestic financial markets and on the value of the dollar in exchange markets. The Nation can ill afford to allow such a result.

That was in a letter written to Senator Howard Baker in 1983.

The debt limit was raised seven times during the Presidency of George W. Bush. During his 8 years, the debt limit was increased by 90 percent. Honest to goodness, I don't remember one Republican colleague—and I could be wrong on this—who suggested that we don't raise the debt ceiling when George W. Bush was President.

I will tell you something. We all know that when you raise the debt ceiling, it is for debts already incurred.

George W. Bush took a surplus of over $200 billion a year and he turned it into a deficit. The reason we have to raise the debt ceiling, mostly, is because of George W. Bush. I never heard one Republican in those years say: Let's bring this down; let's not raise the debt ceiling. They went on a binge. They put two wars on the credit card. They never paid for those wars. They put a tax cut for the richest people in America on that credit card. They didn't care. They put a prescription drug benefit which tied the hands of Medicare and said: You can't negotiate for lower drug prices, and instead of being affordable for the government, it became a budget buster—they put that on the credit card. I never heard them say: Let's not raise the debt ceiling, even though, under their policies, they took a surplus and turned it into a deficit. They took us off a path where we were about to finish up with our debt, frankly, and added debt as far as the eye could see.

The hypocrisy, honestly—and I am being cautious in the way I express myself—doesn't even begin to describe what is going on here. It is disingenuous, it is just plain wrong to play politics with this.

We know politics is at play here. I have run for election many times in my career—I think 11 or 12 times—and I know you have to pay attention to politics when you are running. We all understand that. We are not naive about it. We are tough on the trail. We know. But there is a time to govern. There is a time to set aside the politics and govern. If ever there were a moment in history, it is now.

I have to say that my friend Senator COBURN said people are anxious in the country, but they are not anxious—he basically said specifically that their anxiety has nothing to do with the debt ceiling. I disagree respectfully. Anybody who has a 401(k) and has seen the stock market down 400 points is worried. Anyone who gets a Social Security check is worried. Anyone who fears we could default is worried. Anyone on Medicare is worried. Anyone on veterans disability is worried. Every Federal employee is worried. Every Federal private contractor in business is worried. Every worker who works for those people is worried, too, because they know very well that if we don't come together in a fair compromise, we will not be able to pay all of our bills. Again, raising the debt ceiling is something you have to do because you have already incurred all of the debt.

I would like to talk a little bit about how we got into this unnecessary crisis and how we need to get out of it. We got into it because Republicans said they would not vote for a clean increase in the debt ceiling, as has been done 89 times before. They wanted to extract a pound of flesh and say: We demand that you cut spending now, tie it to this debt ceiling, and that is what we want. We said: OK, we are ready to talk.

As a matter of fact, the Democrats on the Budget Committee put out an excellent plan. It cut not $850 billion, as JOHN BOEHNER's plan does, but $4 trillion, and it protects Social Security, Medicare, and it basically said: We have a problem, and we are going to solve it with $2 trillion in cuts and $2 trillion in revenues—50–50, which is kind of a fair way to approach it—and we are going to ask millionaires and billionaires to pay their fair share.

Frankly, that plan is the ideal plan. It is a fair plan; it gets us on safe, good, solid fiscal ground; and it says we will have cuts and we will have revenue, and we will move forward and look at Medicare and Social Security to make them stronger—not to cut benefits. If I were acting like the Republicans over in the House, I would stand here and say: That is the only plan I will ever consider. I love that plan. It speaks to my values. It speaks to my State's values. But I understand that in a negotiation, in a situation such as this, no side gets everything they want.

Now President Obama says: Let's all come together and work on a plan. Let's do something big, something real. First, ERIC CANTOR, the Republican whip, marched out of there with his teddy bear and his blanket, and then a few weeks later BOEHNER walks out.

I have to say that I watched Speaker PELOSI sit at the White House many times. She sat across from George W. Bush. She did not agree with him. She felt that he had added to the debt, that he had added to the deficit. She disagreed with him on protecting millionaires and billionaires. She disagreed with him on the environment and on the war in Iraq. NANCY PELOSI never stalked out of a meeting. I find it, frankly, appalling that that is what happened.

But the President keeps reaching out because he will take the personal hits because this country gave him everything, and he is not going to allow it to fall and to default and become a deadbeat nation.

Speaker BOEHNER said: I am going to put together my own plan. So he puts together his own plan. Frankly, it hardly has any cuts. He comes back very short—$850 billion in cuts—and doesn't get past this problem we are facing. He only says it is for 4, 5, or 6 months, and then we are going to be back in the soup, in this mess, in this chaos, and back into the market selloffs, back into the uncertainty, back in the time when people can't even sleep well at night because Speaker BOEHNER and his people over there

want to keep this thing boiling over. They think somehow it is good for them. I say it is not good for them.

But you know what, I don't care if it is good or bad for them or whether it is good or bad for us. What I care about, what you care about, what we care about is this Nation that is everything to us. We have to stand up for this Nation. That means we have to leave the political labels at the door and set aside our favorite plan, as I have set aside my favorite plan, and support a real compromise.

Let me tell you the real compromise we have before us. It is the Reid approach. It is a real compromise because what does compromise mean? Nobody gets everything they want, but everybody gets something they want. What do the Republicans say they want? They wanted cuts and no revenues. They got that in the Reid plan. Our leader, Majority Leader REID, has heard them. Not only does he have cuts, he has twice as many cuts as the Boehner plan—cuts that hurt a lot of the things that many of us don't want to hurt, but we understand we have to give something. So they get that. What do we get? We get certainty. We believe it is very important that we take this issue of the debt ceiling and get it past the election, past January or February of 2013, and get back to the business of job creation and all of the things we need to do—we get that.

We also talked about a committee that would look at the long-range problems of this deficit and debt and the need to do reforms and the need to look at what revenues make sense. There is a committee in that bill. This is a true compromise. I agree that the other things the Democrats got are no cuts in Social Security and Medicare.

But if you really, truly look at this, the Reid plan gives the Republicans more than even he gives the Democrats. But it is worth it to us to get certainty in the markets, protect Social Security and Medicare, avoid the chaos of the Boehner plan, and avoid the danger we face if our bonds are downgraded.

The Boehner plan risks catastrophic default, and we are concerned that if it were to pass, we would again see this economy being held captive; we would again be facing deep cuts in Medicare and Social Security; we would again be facing all kinds of hostage-taking to protect the millionaires and the billionaires.

I believe that no one who loves this country, regardless of political label, should take any action to result in America becoming a deadbeat nation.

I am a first-generation American on my mother's side. My mother never even went to high school because during her time in high school her father got very ill and she had to go to work. Because I was born in this country, even though we had barely anything, I was able to get an education. I was able to go toe-to-toe with my colleagues who went to fancy schools. I remember when I went to Brooklyn College in New York, they raised the tuition from $9 a semester to $14 a semester. My dad said, ''Honey, you are getting awfully expensive.'' But I got a college education in this country. I got to the Senate in this country.

But I have to say, if we are going into a circumstance where everything we do to fight for the middle class is held hostage to protect the richest among us—the billionaires, the millionaires, the multinational corporations—if that is the pattern we are getting into here, I fear for this country. We can't let it happen, and that is why we have been very clear that the Boehner plan just continues this hostage taking. So the Reid alternative is the true compromise. It gives us substantial cuts in deficits, it gives us a process for more deficit and debt reduction, and it gives us certainty in the marketplace.

In closing, I would say this: When each of us has won our election, we go up there to the place where the Presiding Officer is sitting and we put our hand on the Bible and we swear to uphold the Constitution. I had the honor of serving with Senator Robert Byrd—and most of us here have—and he always carried around this Constitution in his pocket. Today, I took a look at section 4 of the 14th amendment, and it says: The validity of the public debt of the United States shall not be questioned.

I held up my hand and I swore to uphold this Constitution. It says the validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, shall not be questioned. So I am not going to play games with this, and I am not going to allow the public debt to become a political football.

Before I leave the floor, let me show a couple more charts. This is what Speaker BOEHNER said on July 22 of this year. He said:

> I'm not really interested in a short-term increase in the debt limit.

And on May 9 he said:

> Our economy won't grow as long as we continue to trip it up with short-term gimmicks from Washington.

That is what Speaker BOEHNER said. So what does he give us? A short-term extension of the debt limit. A few months. We can't do that. In his own words he says that would hurt the economy.

ERIC CANTOR said to Politico:

> If we can't make the tough decisions now, why would we be making those tough decisions later? It is my preference we do this thing one time. Putting off tough decisions is not what people want in this town.

Yet what do they do? They send us—and we don't know if they will get the votes to send us, but they are planning to send us—a short-term deal which leaves this great Nation in chaos.

You talk to every businessman and they will tell you the thing they worry about the most is uncertainty. And that is the path of uncertainty. ERIC CANTOR said it, BOEHNER said it: No short-term deal. But they are sending us a short-term deal.

I will close with this from the New York Times. The headline reads: ''The Mother of All No-Brainers.''

> If the debt ceiling talks fail, independent voters will see that Democrats were willing to compromise but Republicans were not. If responsible Republicans don't take control, independents will conclude that Republican fanaticism caused this default. They will conclude that Republicans are not fit to govern. And they will be right.

I appeal to our Republican colleagues in this Senate Chamber who have shown, working with Senator DURBIN, working with Senator WARNER, working with others on our side—Senator CONRAD—they are willing to come forward and do something meaningful and put the politics aside. I hope they will do just that. They will find in Leader REID someone who understands the art of compromise, who understands we have to put aside our party labels and do what is right for this Nation.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). The Senator from West Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO WEST POINT CADET JACOB BOWER

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay honor to a life cut tragically short, to a young man whose service to this country went beyond the call of duty.

West Point Cadet Jacob Bower, from my great State of West Virginia, and my hometown of Fairmont, died at the age of 18 last week and will be laid to rest Friday at a family cemetery with full military rights.

Cadet Bower was the sort of young man who would make any—any—parent proud. He was a three-sport athlete at East Fairmont High School, where he graduated in 2011. He was in the National Honor Society and was valedictorian of his graduating class. He was a role model and led his peers by example.

Cadet Bower had something that set him apart: He was a young man who felt the spark to attend West Point. I learned from his mother Ginger that as a young man—or a boy, really—he was very interested in history. He studied the paths that have formed our greatest leaders—the men and women whose names are in the history books. He learned the best of the best have attended our military academies, and he told his mother that is what he wanted to do. I think he wanted to be in the history books. He wanted to be a part of that. He wanted to give something back. He told his mother: Mom, I have had everything given to me. It is time for me to give back now.

Cadet Bower was 18 when he died during a land navigation exercise Thursday of what may be a heat-related cause, though we are not sure yet and it is too early to tell. We do know that Cadet Bower trained vigorously before

the exercise and had successfully completed the first 3 weeks of his 6 weeks of basic training.

Nothing can explain a death so tragic, a life cut so unfairly short. This is the one time, above all others, that you have to believe and trust in your faith. My wife Gayle and I send our prayers and thoughts to Cadet Bower's mother Ginger, his father Dean, his brother Ryan, and the entire Bower family and all their friends. We continue to pray every day for the safety of the brave women and men who put their lives on the line every day for all of us.

Mere words cannot pay tribute to the magnitude of this tragedy and the depth of his sacrifice. In these challenging times, our entire country would do well to think of Cadet Jacob Bower as we work together to put this country first, as he did, before our own interests. Our thoughts and prayers are with this family. May God bless them through this difficult time, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE ECONOMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me salute my colleague from West Virginia. It is a sad task that we have to come to the floor to recognize those who have passed. He pays tribute to a young man whose life was cut too short but who was determined to serve our country, and I thank him for bringing that man's life to our attention in the Senate and to those who follow this across the Nation. I am sure the Senate joins him in expressing our sympathy to the family on the tragic loss of their son. I thank Senator MANCHIN for coming to the floor.

Many people have asked about the state of the recession in our Nation and what it will take to turn this economy around. There is a lot of speculation, and I don't profess to be an expert, but I think there are two things that are hurting us and that we will have to deal with to bring ourselves out of the current state we are in. One of them is the price of real estate. I don't think we have quite reached the point where we know where the bottom is in the real estate values in many parts of America. That has been a real problem, because for many homeowners and buyers it means they are underwater—the value of their home has gone down below the value of their mortgage. Some of them have given up, others have to give up when they lose their jobs. This real estate market and its volatility, the foreclosures that have followed, still haunt us years after the subprime mortgage fiasco that led us into the recession.

But I think there is another element that is even more basic. My mother and father were married in 1928. My first brother was born in 1930 and the other in 1932. They started their family in East St. Louis, IL. My dad was working for a railroad. My mother, an immigrant, began working as a switchboard operator at a telephone company in East St. Louis, IL. They each had eighth grade educations and they were hard-working folks. That is the way they were raised. They started their family as the Great Depression started, and they never forgot it as long as they lived.

I used to take a look at their lifestyle and think that is the lifestyle of every family in America, because that was all I knew. Now that I look back on it, it was a lot different. My mom and dad, because of that Depression experience and starting a family, had some basic rules in our house: Never borrow money. Save it. When you have saved enough, buy what you need. Otherwise, wait and do without. I thought that was the way everybody lived. It certainly was the way I was raised, and my brothers.

They also had some basic things they did to save money. Even after years had passed—decades had passed, and they were comfortable, by middle-class standards—they were always very careful in the way they spent their money. I always felt perhaps there was a fear that those bad times might come back and they wanted to be ready. That was the way I was raised. It is the way my wife and I raised our children, and it was the way my wife was raised, being from Depression-era families who had lived through that experience. They modeled their lives afterwards based on the fears and concerns they had during the Great Depression.

Something happened over the last several years which calls that to mind. In 2007, households across America had borrowed the equivalent of 127 percent of their annual income—127 percent. In the 1990s, the average was 84 percent. So it was literally a 50-percent increase in household indebtedness in a matter of 15 or 16 years. Though Americans have been working hard to reduce that debt, because they understand what a drag it is on their lifestyle and their wages, the debt-to-income level in America is still 112 percent—still substantially higher than it was back in the 1990s, when it was 84 percent. That slows down economic recovery. People who are trying to shed debt are careful not to incur new debt, not to buy the things that would put them in debt, and that slows down the purchase of goods and services, which is exactly the opposite of what you need when you are recovering from a recession.

So I think those two elements—the value of real estate and household debt—are holding us back in this economic recovery. There is one aspect of household debt I wish to call to the attention of the Senate in our record of proceedings, and that is the fact that in October of last year we reached a milestone in America, though most people didn't notice. For the first time in the modern history of our country, total student loan debt exceeded total credit card debt in the United States, with $850 billion outstanding in student loan debt across America.

Mr. President, I don't know your circumstance, but mine was borrowing money to go to school with National Defense Education Act loans. This will date me for sure, but when I graduated law school in the late 1960s, and they accumulated all the money I had borrowed—undergraduate and law school—they came to me and said: Now you have to start paying it back, 12 months from graduation. You had to pay 10 percent a year until you paid it off, with a 3-percent interest rate. I gulped and said: How much is it? They said: It is $8,500. I thought I was finished. I couldn't imagine coming up with $8,500 a year, plus interest, to pay off my student loan. My wife and I had a baby and another on the way, and I was starting a new job that didn't pay a lot of money. I couldn't imagine how I was going to do that, but I did.

Now that I look back on that, and consider what students face today, it is no wonder they laugh when I tell that story—$8,500. They would be lucky to get through the book store for $8,500 at most colleges and universities today. I may be exaggerating a little bit. The cost of college has been skyrocketing, with the average 4-year nonprofit college tuition last year at $27,000. The in-State tuition at a public 4-year university averaged $7,600.

The cost of room and board, of course, would raise that higher. Tuition has been running faster than inflation for the last 20 years, sometimes growing at more than double the rate of inflation. But household income hasn't been growing. More and more families, unable to pay for their kids' education, join their kids in borrowing money, student loans. Sometimes they cosign. In a bad economy, some students who never anticipated having to take out student loans were forced to do it, and others have had to borrow more than they expected they would.

In 2009 alone, student borrowing grew by 25 percent. Today, two-thirds of college students borrow to pay for college. The result is a generation of young Americans beginning their professional lives with unprecedented levels of debt. The average student leaves college with $31,000 in student loan debt, but it is not unheard of to run into students who have a lot more debt, sometimes as high as $100,000, for an undergraduate degree. Going on to graduate school or law school is very expensive.

I went to Georgetown Law School. I can't even remember what the tuition was when I went there, but I would be amazed if it was more than $1,500 a year. It is now $50,000 a year at Georgetown Law School, which means if you borrowed the money to finish law school on top of your undergraduate debt, you just added $150,000 in debt to your life before you draw your first paycheck.

If you are lucky and one of the best law students, you might get into a law

firm that pays you a huge amount of money. Most law school graduates will not. They will make life decisions then based on their indebtedness and how to pay it off.

Students who begin their adult lives paying $600 or $1,000 a month on their student loan payments have to make some difficult choices. They may put off doing the job they really wanted to do or buying a house or even getting married. They may end up moving back home with their parents, which more and more students do. It is tough to imagine how you get out of that debt burden and create a life that leads to savings and happiness and retirement.

High levels of household debt keep these borrowers from contributing to our economic recovery. We need young people to invest in the economy and help it. Some of these students will find they can't afford monthly payments and they face default.

Here is something we cannot say enough to students today who are considering a college education: There is something you ought to know about a student loan. It is not like your car loan. It is not even like your home loan. It is not like your credit card debt because student loan debt is not dischargeable in bankruptcy.

What does that mean? If you get in deeply over your head and cannot possibly make the payments, you are stuck. You can't discharge that debt in bankruptcy. You will carry it with you to the grave. It is with you for the rest of your life.

That is the difference between student loan debt and a lot of other loans people take out.

Mr. President, as tuition growth has outpaced Federal student loan limits, private banks and lenders have entered the higher education marketplace with private student loans. I don't know why, and I certainly wish I would have been more attentive to this when it happened, but we decided years ago to treat government student loans the same as private student loans, which means if a private entity loans money for school, they are protected as creditors like the government.

In other words, even if you borrowed $10,000 from a local bank to go to college as a student loan, you can't discharge that in bankruptcy either. You are stuck with that for a lifetime. It doesn't apply to virtually any other debts, other than perhaps a tax liability under the Bankruptcy Code. So it is an unusual situation we have created, an unusual burden on young people.

Federal student loans for most undergraduates are capped at $5,500 for the first year of school and go up to $7,500 a year by the time a student graduates. That doesn't always cover the cost for students when tuition can exceed $30,000 at private colleges, so students turn to private student loans to fill the gap. This can be disastrous. These private loans are made with interest rates and fees as high as credit cards. There are reports of private loans with variable interest rates reaching 18 percent. Unlike Federal student loans, there are few consumer protections. Students don't have access to flexible repayment plans, free deferment, or loan forgiveness with private student loans. Some students who take out private loans find themselves trapped under an enormous amount of debt. Because of the bankruptcy law, it is a debt they are stuck with the rest of their lives.

Now, I want to say a word about another phenomena. Today, Secretary Ernie Duncan spoke before Chairman HARKIN's Appropriations Subcommittee on Education. I think Secretary Duncan is one of the President's best appointments, not to mention the fact we have been personal friends for a long time, and I have watched as he struggled to change the Chicago public school system. It goes beyond his efforts in public service. He has given a lifetime to education. His mother was a teacher. He used to tutor kids after school. He has it in his blood, and it shows, and I think he is a man of great, immense personal talent and integrity, and he has done some remarkable things in the tenure that he has had at the Department of Education.

Today when he came to testify, we talked about a phenomena that relates to this. I explained to him how I borrowed money to get through college and how students today borrow more than ever, with student loan debt passing credit card debt. Then we talked about the phenomena of for-profit colleges. Here is what the facts are:

When we look at students who have finished high school, 10 percent of them go to for-profit schools. These for-profit schools are not the local community colleges or even the traditional public or private universities. They are businesses. Ten percent of the students go to these private for-profit schools, but the for-profit schools end up receiving 25 percent of all Federal student aid, far in excess of what you might expect with 10 percent of the students. Twenty-five percent of the Pell grants and Federal student loans go to for-profit schools.

Then there is the default rate. The student loan default rate is highest at the for-profit schools. For-profit colleges represent 44 percent of all defaults on student loans. The rate for public colleges and universities is in the single digits, but 25 percent for for-profit schools. What it tells us is these students who are attracting more Federal student aid end up defaulting more when it comes to the payment of their debt.

For-profit colleges are the fastest growing sector of higher education. In Illinois, enrollment has more than doubled over the last decade in these schools.

The largest chain of for-profit colleges, the University of Phoenix, has become the second largest higher education system in America. There are over 450,000 students in the University of Phoenix, more than the combined enrollment of all the big 10 colleges and universities.

A for-profit college education isn't cheap. Tuition at for-profit schools is 5½ times the price of community colleges and twice as much as public 4-year colleges. Two-thirds of the for-profit students receive Pell grants which target low-income students and don't have to be repaid. But Pell grants aren't enough to pay for for-profit schools. To make up the difference, students take out loans. At 4-year, for-profit schools, 96 percent of students are borrowing money. When students leave school, many for-profit college students find their training didn't prepare them for a job, and employers don't recognize their degrees.

Buried in debt, without good career and job prospects, these students simply can't keep paying the loans. That is why the default rate is so high.

Within 3 years, 25 percent of students who leave a for-profit college will default on their student loans. Let me tell you the story of two of them.

Christine lives in southern Illinois. She received a degree in medical billing and coding from Sanford-Brown College. She took out student loans to pay for college, and she now owes a total of $24,000 for her 2-year associate's degree. She now refers to that degree as, and I quote, ''completely worthless.'' Christine said that when she went interviewing for jobs, one company told her her degree was a strike against her. Another said they don't hire Sanford-Brown graduates because they have to retrain every one of them. She wasn't able to find a job, and she put her loans in deferment to go back to school and borrow more money.

Another student, Michelle, spoke at a forum I held in Chicago a year ago. Michelle received a degree in criminal justice from Westwood College, and she wanted to be a police officer. After graduating, she learned that the law enforcement agency she applied to in Illinois would not recognize her diploma from Westwood. She was left with nearly $90,000 in debt. She has no career prospects.

Michelle is living at home with her parents in their basement. She is working part-time seasonal retail jobs struggling to pay about $900 a month on her student loans. She can't borrow any more money now to even go back to school and get a degree that might help her. Instead of contributing to society, she is trapped. Michelle's school loaded her up with Federal and private student loans for a degree that wasn't worth anything when she graduated.

Because of her student loan debt, she is not going to be buying a house, she can't save for retirement, she certainly can't invest. She can't even go back to school to start over. And because there is no escape for her, no bankruptcy protection, she may be burdened with this debt for the rest of her life.

Mr. President, we can't continue on this path. When I sat down on the budget negotiations, one of the things President Obama put on the table was extending Pell grants. There was a time when I would have instinctively said: Sign me up. I believe if you don't help that generation of students, like myself, who don't have the resources to go to school, you are denying them the opportunity that I had. I think young people deserve that opportunity.

But I have to say now when I hear Pell grants and student loans and consider these for-profit schools, I stop and think. We have to step back and ask which of these schools are good and worth supporting and which are not.

I said to Secretary Duncan today we should have accreditation standards so these schools are known to be worth the money the students are paying to attend. We should follow their progress to make sure if they are steering young people in debt and then dumping them into a jobless situation in life, that we stop subsidizing them with Federal student loans and Pell grants. That is incumbent upon us.

The administration recently took up the for-profit college cause. They are asking for more reporting. It is a step in the right direction. As I said to Secretary Duncan, we should have done more. We are going to find the worst of the worst. Maybe we will stop them from exploiting the students, but there are going to be a lot of awful schools still in business because our standards are not as strong as they should be at the Federal level.

Mr. President, as we consider the future of higher education, let's consider the fact that the cost of it is outstripping the resources of many families, the debt that students incur will change their lives, and there is a process of exploitation at many of these for-profit colleges that we should not tolerate. It is not fair to the students nor their families. It certainly isn't fair to America's taxpayers because, as they default on these student loans, the American taxpayers will be the ultimate losers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we move to Calendar No. 196; that the nomination be confirmed; 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 related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate resumes legislative session.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we extend the morning business hour until 7 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I also ask that the consent agreement be modified that Senators be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each during that period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HENRY D. MOORE PARISH HOUSE AND LIBRARY

• Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President. On August 22, 1911, more than 1,000 people, including Governor Frederick Plaisted, gathered in the small downeast Maine town of Steuben to dedicate the Henry D. Moore Parish House and Library. Given that the crowd was far larger than the entire population of the town and the difficulty of travel from the State capital to Maine's easternmost county in those days, this clearly was an important event.

Its importance was twofold. First, the people of Steuben worked hard to wrest a living from the sea; it was a life that offered the rewards of independence in surroundings of great natural beauty, but few of the amenities found in more prosperous, less remote towns. Now, thanks to this marvelous gift, they had a center for intellectual and spiritual growth, a place to come together as a community.

Just as important as the gift was the giver. Henry Dyer Moore was born in Steuben in 1842, the son of a carpenter and shipwright. From that modest start, he went on to achieve remarkable success in business, with interests that ranged from snuff to railroads and banking. His career took him to the centers of commerce, but his heart never left Steuben.

In the century since, the people of Steuben have turned that gift into a treasure. Today, the Henry D. Moore Parish House and Library hosts concerts, plays, adult education classes, and many other events. The library resources are considerable and modern, and are a great asset to the entire region, including the students at the Ella Lewis Grammar School. The building is more used than ever, and more beautiful than the day it was dedicated.

There is another fascinating aspect to this story. Henry D. Moore had a cousin, 6 years younger. He, too, came from a seafaring family of Steuben, and he, too, went on to achieve astonishing success. John Godfrey Moore was a pioneer in the telegraph industry and one of the most prominent international financiers of his day. Like his older cousin, he never forgot the place of his birth. The land he bought, preserved, and kept open to the public on the Schoodic Peninsula near Steuben is now one of the most spectacular sections of Acadia National Park.

One might simply observe that philanthropy ran in the Moore family. The greater truth is that such generosity runs throughout Maine and across America. Achieving success and then giving back to the place and the people that instilled the values that led to success is among the highest qualities of our national character.

Cherishing the gift and building upon it for the generations to come is another. That quality is demonstrated today by the people of Steuben, ME, and I offer my congratulations as they gather again to celebrate the centennial of the Henry D. Moore Parish House and Library.•

FARMERS AND MERCHANTS UNION BANK

• Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, today I recognize the 150th anniversary of Wisconsin's own Farmers and Merchants Union Bank. I am honored to have the opportunity to celebrate this extraordinary milestone.

The year 1861 will forever mark the beginning of one of the most trying times in American history. With the onset of the Civil War, financial and banking institutions suffered as a result of the division of our Nation. Inspired by the courage and determination of President Abraham Lincoln, businessman John Wheeler chose that year to open two banks in the town of Columbus, WI. On September 5, John Wheeler became the first president of the Farmers and Merchants Union Bank of Columbus.

Wheeler's passion and commitment to customer service continued in those who followed him as bank leaders. His grandson J. Russell Wheeler was committed to honoring the legacy his grandfather left behind and expanding the bank's profile, reach and influence. He commissioned renowned architect Louis Sullivan who has often been called the ''father of the skyscraper,'' to design and oversee the construction of the new Farmers and Merchants Union Bank building. Sullivan acted as a mentor to architect Frank Lloyd Wright and was diligent in making sure

every detail lived up to the standards on which the institution was founded. The product of Sullivan's work has become one of Wisconsin's prized architectural attractions. On October 18, 1972, the bank was entered on the National Register of Historic Places, and later designated a national historic landmark.

Today, Farmers and Merchants Union Bank strives to provide the best in modern banking to customers in Columbus, Fall River, Friesland, Juneau, and the areas that surround those Wisconsin communities. Their mission endures as ''an independent bank known for maintaining a reputation for integrity and fair dealing and promoting growth and stability in the communities they serve.''

I have great admiration for independent banks that are focused on building communities in both the good and hard times. For 150 years, Farmers and Merchants Union Bank has done just that; continued to represent the importance of local ties and their critical role in the health and vitality of the Wisconsin communities they serve.

So for their commitment to providing every customer with the highest quality banking service and to reaching out to the community—a dedication that has helped sustain this institution for a century and a half—I am proud to celebrate this historic occasion and the 150 years of service that the Farmers and Merchants Union Bank has provided to the people of the State of Wisconsin.●

TRIBUTE TO STEVE LEVESQUE

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Steve Levesque, the executive director of the Midcoast Regional Redevelopment Authority, or MRRA, which is the entity charged with the transition of the former Brunswick Naval Air Station into a vibrant commercial center. Steve has been a longtime leader in economic development in the State of Maine, having previously served as commissioner of the Maine Department of Economic and Community Development. His most recent efforts have earned him recognition from the Association of Defense Communities, which presented Steve with its Base Redevelopment Leadership Award last week at its annual conference in Norfolk, VA.

An era came to an end on May 31 when the Brunswick Naval Air Station, also known as BNAS, was officially closed as an unfortunate casualty of the base realignment and closure process. As the executive director of the MRRA, Steve Levesque was charged with the unenviable task of overseeing the reuse of the 3,200-acre former air station. Many anticipated that the closure would be a devastating blow to the Midcoast economy, but under Steve's leadership the air station's closure has transformed into an exciting redevelopment project with much hope for the future.

Always reluctant to accept credit for the successes at Brunswick Landing, Steve is always quick to laud the efforts of those around him. While the MRRA staff and board unquestionably embody the finest attributes of Maine's legendary work ethic, Steve's buoyant outlook, foresight, and true leadership capacity have undoubtedly accelerated the redevelopment of BNAS into Brunswick Landing, which is home to an ever-growing number of businesses focused on projects as diverse as aviation, advanced composites, and education. Tenants include both new and existing business from across the globe, including Kestrel Aircraft, Molnlycke Health Care, Southern Maine Community College, and Bowdoin College.

Under Steve's leadership, there are presently 10 companies in the process of relocating to Brunswick Landing, and many other businesses are actively considering moving to the site because of the proactive efforts of Steve and his team at MRRA. There are 90 jobs associated with those 10 firms, and an additional 515 are projected. In April, Steve also oversaw the successful launch of Brunswick Executive Airport, and just over a month later hosted the first annual Brunswick International Fly-In for pilots from across the region and the entire country.

In acknowledging Steve's commitment to Brunswick Landing with its prestigious Base Redevelopment Leadership Award, the Association of Defense Communities noted that ''[m]uch of the success so far in promoting the base's redevelopment can be attributed to Levesque's strong working relationship with the Navy, the state's congressional delegation, the governor's office, the legislature, local officials and the business community.'' I can attest that Steve has been a reliable partner and a tremendous asset to the redevelopment effort as he has labored tirelessly to ensure that the Midcoast region is an attractive locale for businesses seeking to open, expand, and grow.

Steve exemplifies the very best of Maine. Aside from his professional duties, he has been active in the local community as the founder of the Maine Moose Junior Hockey team. From 2006 until 2010, Steve served as the president and general manager of the Maine Moose, sharing his love of hockey with kids from across the State. Steve's passion for and commitment to public service and the people of Maine is truly commendable.

I have long respected Steve Levesque for his intelligence, confidence, and ability to accomplish great things. At a time when job creation and economic growth are paramount to revitalizing midcoast Maine's economy, I know no one more suited to the task than Steve Levesque. I thank Steve for his incredible work thus far, and wish him success as he continues his efforts to construct Maine's Center for Innovation at Brunswick Landing.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 9:33 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1383. An act to temporarily preserve higher rates for tuition and fees for programs of education at non-public institutions of higher learning pursued by individuals enrolled in the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs before the enactment of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Improvements Act of 2010, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

At 12:13 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1938. An act to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2608. An act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

At 2:59 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1309. An act to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, 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. 1309. An act to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1420. A bill to require that the United States Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public, Social Security benefits, and military pay in the event that the debt limit is reached, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 1938. An act to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KERRY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 175. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to ongoing violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Georgia and the importance of a peaceful and just resolution to the conflict within Georgia's internationally recognized borders.

By Mr. KERRY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 216. A resolution encouraging women's political participation in Saudi Arabia.

From the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Con. Res. 17. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Taiwan should be accorded observer status in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

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 Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 1422. A bill to establish a grant program in the Department of Transportation to improve the traffic safety of teen drivers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1423. A bill to clarify the orphan drug exception to the annual fee on branded prescription pharmaceutical manufacturers and importers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. KYL):

S. 1424. A bill to clarify the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior in making a determination whether to take off-reservation land into trust for gaming purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. VITTER, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1425. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to ensure fairness in election procedures with respect to collective bargaining representatives; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KERRY:

S. 1426. A bill to authorize certain authorities by the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 1427. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to authorize producers on a farm to produce fruits and vegetables for processing on the base acres of the farm; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1428. A bill to phase out the use of private military contractors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida:

S. 1429. A bill to establish a bipartisan commission on insurance reform; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 1430. A bill to authorize certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 1431. A bill to amend section 242 of the National Housing Act to extend the sunset provisions for the exemption for critical access hospitals under the FHA programs of mortgage insurance for hospitals; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida:

S. 1432. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the exception from the 10 percent penalty for early withdrawals from governmental plans for Federal and State qualified public safety employees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CARDIN, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1433. A bill to pay personnel compensation and benefits for employees of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KOHL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KYL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURR, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WEBB, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 240. A resolution condemning the horrific attacks on government buildings in Oslo, Norway, and a youth camp on Utoya Island, Norway, on July 22, 2011, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 241. A resolution expressing support for the designation of November 16, 2011, as National Information and Referral Services Day; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. Con. Res. 26. A concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the designation of the year of 2011 as the International Year for People of African Descent; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 48

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 48, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of pharmacists in National Health Services Corps programs, and for other purposes.

S. 195

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 195, a bill to reinstate Federal matching of State spending of child support incentive payments.

S. 274

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 274, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to medication therapy management services under the Medicare prescription drug program.

S. 347

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 347, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for reporting and disclosure by State and local public employee retirement pension plans.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a Pancreatic Cancer Initiative, and for other purposes.

S. 398

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve energy efficiency of certain appliances and equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 418

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 418, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 555

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 555, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Services for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 866, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the perfiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for nonregular service.

S. 913

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 913, a bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe regulations regarding the collection and use of personal information obtained by tracking the online activity of an individual, and for other purposes.

S. 951

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1025, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the National Guard, enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and improvement of Federal-State military coordination in domestic emergency response, and for other purposes.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1048, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to the Islamic Republic of Iran, North Korea, and Syria, and for other purposes.

S. 1049

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to lower health premiums and increase choice for small business.

S. 1061

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1061, a bill to amend title 5 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the award of fees and other expenses in cases brought against agencies of the United States, to require the Administrative Conference of the United States to compile, and make publically available, certain data relating to the Equal Access to Justice Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1087

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1087, a bill to release wilderness study areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management that are not suitable for wilderness designation from continued management as de facto wilderness areas and to release inventoried roadless areas within the National Forest System that are not recommended for wilderness designation from the land use restrictions of the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Final Rule and the 2005 State Petitions for Inventoried Roadless Area Management Final Rule, and for other purposes.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1094, a bill to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–416).

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1251, a bill to amend title XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1258

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1258, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, and for other purposes.

S. 1335

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1335, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide rights for pilots, and for other purposes.

S. 1350

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1350, a bill to expand the research, prevention, and awareness activities of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health with respect to pulmonary fibrosis, and for other purposes.

S. 1365

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1365, a bill to provide funds to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian personnel continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a funding gap caused by the failure to enact interim or full-year appropriations for the Armed Forces occurs, which results in the furlough of nonemergency personnel and the curtailment of Government activities and services.

S. 1392

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1392, a bill to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes.

S. 1403

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1403, a bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

S.J. RES. 21

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 21, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KOHL (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 1431. A bill to amend section 242 of the National Housing Act to extend the sunset provisions for the exemption for critical access hospitals under the FHA programs of mortgage insurance for hospitals; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Health Care Capital Access Reauthorization Act. This

legislation will allow Critical Access Hospitals, CAHs, to continue to access the Federal Housing Administration's, FHA, 242 program.

There are approximately 1,327 CAHs throughout the United States. These hospitals are vital to our health care system because they provide individuals who live in rural areas care they might not otherwise have. Many of these hospitals were built over 40 years ago and are in need of significant renovations. Without the exemption, many rural hospitals would not qualify for the low-cost loan insurance based on patients' average length of stay or because the hospital operates a nursing home, and as a result, many rural hospitals would face higher financing costs on construction and renovation loans.

Many CAHs provide a significant level of non-acute or long-term services, and therefore do not qualify for the FHA 242 program based on length of stay. Additionally, some CAHs operate nursing homes, further lengthening the average stay and causing the hospital to be ineligible for the 242 program. In 2006, Congress recognized the uniqueness and importance of these hospitals and passed the Rural Health Care Capital Access Act. This Act provided an exemption from the acute care provision in the FHA 242 program for Critical Access Facilities. The exemption expires on July 31.

After July 31, CAHs applying for financing will be unable to receive financing if the exemption is not extended. Since the initial exemption was passed in 2006, 10 rural hospitals in 10 states have received mortgage insurance through the program as a result of the exemption in Edgerton, Wis., Columbus, Mont., Springfield, Ga., Monticello, Ill., L'Anse, Mich., Cambridge, Neb., Hot Springs, S.D., Grand Coulee, Wash., Moab, Utah and Holyoke, Colo. The program has provided financing for these hospitals on loans ranging from $14 to $31 million and totaling more than $241 million.

The legislation I am introducing today would provide a five-year extension of the exemption in the Rural Health Care Capital Access Act, allowing the many rural hospitals that provide significant levels of non-acute or long-term care to continue applying for financing under a FHA 242 program. Without the exemption, these rural hospitals would not qualify for an FHA loan based on patients' average length of stay, resulting in fewer options for construction and renovation loans.

I would like to thank the original coponsors of this bill: Senators CONRAD, TIM JOHNSON, THUNE, JOHANNS, and TESTER for their leadership and support for Critical Access Hospitals. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue to move the Rural Health Care Capital Access Reauthorization Act towards passage.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 240—CONDEMNING THE HORRIFIC ATTACKS ON GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS IN OSLO, NORWAY, AND A YOUTH CAMP ON UTOYA ISLAND, NORWAY, ON JULY 22, 2011, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KOHL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KYL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURR, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WEBB, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 240

Whereas, on July 22, 2011, at least eight people were brutally killed when government buildings were bombed in Oslo, Norway;

Whereas, also on July 22, 2011, at least 68 people, a majority of them children and young adults, were brutally killed when a youth camp was attacked on Utøya Island, Norway;

Whereas, also on July 22, 2011, as many as 96 people were injured by these dual attacks;

Whereas these twin attacks brought horrific violence, pain, and suffering upon innocent Norwegians and their families and friends;

Whereas the Government and people of Norway have condemned the terrorist attacks and called the events an ''atrocity,'' a ''nightmare,'' and a ''national tragedy'';

Whereas Norway is recognized around the world as a country that is both peaceful and peace-seeking;

Whereas Oslo, Norway, is home to the Norwegian Nobel Committee, which annually selects winners of the Nobel Peace Prize;

Whereas Norway was a founding member of the United Nations in 1945, a Norwegian was the first Secretary-General of the United Nations, and Norway was a founding member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949;

Whereas Norway has for years offered safe haven to refugees and the politically persecuted from around the world;

Whereas over 4,500,000 Americans of Norwegian ancestry now reside in the United States, with the state of Minnesota being home to the largest number of people of Norwegian heritage outside of Norway itself;

Whereas the Prime Minister of Norway, Jens Stoltenberg, has said, ''We must never let our values, our way of life, be destroyed by blind violence,'' and pledged that Norway ''will respond with more democracy, more openness, and more humanity, but never naivete'';

Whereas the Foreign Minister of Norway, Jonas Gahr Støre, remarked, ''The nature of the Norwegian democracy will not change. Norway will continue to stand for engagement in the world where we commit our resources and our convictions.'';

Whereas President Barack Obama remarked that ''[i]t's a reminder that the entire international community has a stake in preventing this kind of terror from occurring,'' and later said, ''You should know that the thoughts and prayers of all Americans are with the people of Norway and that we will stand beside [Norway] every step of the way.'';

Whereas, on Monday, July 25, 2011, there was a moment of silence throughout Norway and other Nordic countries, followed by a memorial attended by more than 150,000 people outside the city hall in Oslo for a ''Rose March,'' in which participants carried white or red roses; and

Whereas Crown Prince Haakon of Norway told those gathered at the memorial, ''Tonight the streets are filled with love.'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns in the strongest terms the senseless terrorist attacks that occurred in Norway on July 22, 2011, causing many deaths and injuries;

(2) further condemns all terrorist actions, including those motivated by hatred and religious or cultural intolerance;

(3) expresses deep sympathy, solidarity, and condolences to the victims of the atrocious acts, their families, and the people and Government of Norway;

(4) emphasizes the bonds of friendship and shared heritage between the United States and Norway;

(5) expresses unwavering support to the Government and people of Norway as they recover from these horrific attacks;

(6) affirms its resolve to combat all forms of senseless violence and terrorism, both domestically and abroad; and

(7) calls on all people to join together to denounce acts of hatred and fear and promote peace and tolerance in their communities and around the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 241—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF NOVEMBER 16, 2011, AS NATIONAL INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SERVICES DAY

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 241

Whereas information and referral services link the consumer who has a need or problem with the most appropriate service to address that need or solve that problem;

Whereas quality information and referral services are the keystone point of entry to the entire human services structure delivery system;

Whereas information and referral services have been recognized in Federal legislation for more than 35 years since the 1973 reauthorization of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), and the subsequent establishment of the national Eldercare Locator and the development of Aging and Disability Resource Centers;

Whereas, as of the date of agreement to this resolution, the United States is served by information and referral through 2-1-1 programs, aging information and referral services, Aging and Disability Resource Centers, child care resource and referral services, military family centers, and other specialty information and referral services;

Whereas individuals who understand the variety of services available are better equipped to make decisions;

Whereas, in 1997, the national 2-1-1 initiative began with the United Way of Metropolitan Atlanta creating the first 24-hour telephone information and referral service using the easy-to-remember 2-1-1 dialing code for access;

Whereas, in 2000, the Federal Communications Commission reserved the 2-1-1 dialing code for community information and referral services, intended as an easy-to-remember and universally recognizable number that would serve as a vital connection between individuals and families in need, and appropriate community-based organizations and government agencies, on a regular basis and in times of disaster;

Whereas the Alliance of Information and Referral Systems has been providing professional standards and credentialing programs for those operating information and referral services;

Whereas expanding access to information about, and referrals to, services provides individuals with lower-cost and safer options for managing their needs, and is likely to reduce confusion, frustration, and inaccessibility to services; and

Whereas requests for assistance through information and referral services and 2-1-1 have increased across the United States due to the economic crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support for the designation of November 16, 2011, as National Information and Referral Services Day—

(A) to raise public awareness about the existence and importance of information and referral services available to all people in the United States; and

(B) to more effectively target those services to reach individuals most in need;

(2) encourages activities in communities across the United States involving schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and other entities to ensure information and referral services are part of everyday life in addition to emergency preparedness programs; and

(3) reaffirms the importance of clear and consistent professional standards to govern every aspect of quality information and referral services.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 26—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE DESIGNATION OF THE YEAR OF 2011 AS THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR PEOPLE OF AFRICAN DESCENT

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 26

Whereas the year of 2011 is recognized as the ''International Year for People of African Descent'';

Whereas the African Diaspora is expansive, spanning the globe from Latin America and the Caribbean to Asia, with persons of African descent living on every continent, including Europe;

Whereas in recognition of the African Diaspora, on December 18, 2009, the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 64/169, designating the year of 2011 as the ''International Year for People of African Descent'';

Whereas the historical bonds and shared experiences that tie the African continent with the world must be recalled;

Whereas the global contributions of people of African descent must be recognized as a means of preserving that heritage;

Whereas a central goal of recognizing the year of 2011 as the International Year for People of African descent is to strengthen national actions and regional and international cooperation for the benefit of people of African descent in relation to—

(1) the full enjoyment of economic, cultural, social, civil, and political rights for people of African descent;

(2) the participation and integration of people of African descent in all political, economic, social, and cultural aspects of society; and

(3) the promotion of greater knowledge of, and respect for, the diverse heritage and culture of people of African descent; and

Whereas the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, done at Helsinki August 1, 1975, states that ''participating States will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms . . . for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the designation of the year of 2011 as the International Year for People of African Descent;

(2) encourages the recognition and celebration of the collective history and achievements made by people of African descent;

(3) reaffirms the importance of inclusion and the full and equal participation of people of African descent around the world in all aspects of political, economic, social, and cultural life;

(4) recognizes bilateral and multilateral efforts to promote democracy, human rights, and rule of law, including those efforts that target the eradication of poverty, hunger, and inequality; and

(5) reaffirms the commitment of Congress to address racism, discrimination, and intolerance in the United States and around the globe.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 586. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 587. Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1188, to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 586. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1323, to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—MAXIMIZING SPECTRUM EFFICIENCE AND VALUE

SECTION 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Maximizing Spectrum Efficiency and Value Act of 2011''.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Demand for spectrum is sharply rising due to the growing advanced network of communications devices that rely on spectrum to transmit and receive information.

(2) It is necessary for the United States to maintain its investments in innovation of spectrum and broadband infrastructure to ensure the United States is a global leader in the wireless age.

(3) Spectrum is a finite resource, and in order to spur innovation, the United States must provide for better and more efficient spectrum management.

(4) Many spectrum holders do not efficiently use their frequency assignments, and a re-structuring of the usable spectrum is a viable solution to make up for this lost opportunity.

(5) Making available additional spectrum to meet the demands of broadband technologies and services will prevent dropped connections, blocked service, decreased connection speed, and even higher prices for certain advanced applications.

(6) The availability of increased spectrum will allow advanced technologies such as 4G mobile services, high-speed wireless, high definition television, and more to continue operating without network problems and interferences.

(7) The United States public debt totals more than $14,300,000,000,000.

(8) Congress should look for ways to increase the government's revenues without additional taxpayer burdens.

(9) Auctioning spectrum is the most economically sound method for accurate valuation and assignment of spectrum to develop the next generation of wireless technologies, expand broadband service to under served areas of our county, develop an interoperable public safety network and reduce our deficit.

(10) Recent spectrum auctions in Germany and India raised a combined $20,000,000,000.

(11) Frequencies within the spectrum have substantial market value and could raise near $30,000,000,000 in a public auction.

(12) Barriers such as regulatory and administrative delays are not conducive to the free market approach and can hurt innovation.

(13) Government spectrum, while extremely important, is vast and should be included in any spectrum reform initiative.

SEC. 203. AUTHORITY FOR INCENTIVE AUCTIONS.

Section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking subparagraph (F) and inserting the following:

''(F) for any auction of eligible frequencies described in section 119(f)(1) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act, the recovery of 110 percent of estimated relocation costs as provided to the Commission under section 119(e)(1)(D)(iii) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act.''; and

(2) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''subparagraphs (D), and (E)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) VOLUNTARY INCENTIVE AUCTION REVENUE SHARING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) and except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), if the Commission determines that it is consistent with the public interest in utilization of the spectrum for a licensee to relinquish voluntarily some or all of its licensed spectrum usage rights in order to permit the assignment of new initial licenses subject to new service rules, the proceeds from the use of a competitive bidding system under this subsection in granting such rights to another licensee shall be shared, in an amount or percentage that the Commission considers appropriate, with the licensee who voluntarily relinquished such rights.

''(ii) AMOUNTS DEPOSITED INTO THE SPECTRUM RELOCATION FUND.—The Commission shall deposit in the Spectrum Relocation Fund, established under section 118 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 928) (47 U.S.C. 928), $13,000,000 of the proceeds described in clause (i) to carry out the requirements of section 119(b) the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act.

''(iii) AMOUNTS NOT SHARED DEPOSITED IN TREASURY.—In any case in which a licensee voluntarily relinquishes licensed spectrum usage rights under clause (i), the Commission shall deposit in the Treasury, where such amounts shall be dedicated for the sole purpose of deficit reduction, any portion of the proceeds described in clause (i) that the Commission does not share with the licensee (except proceeds retained under subparagraph (B), the deposits described in subparagraph (C), and the deposits described in subparagraph (F)(ii)).

''(iv) ESTABLISHMENT OF RULES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Maximizing Spectrum Efficiency and Value Act of 2011, the Commission shall establish rules for the implementation of voluntary incentive auction revenue sharing under this subparagraph.

''(v) CONTENT OF RULES.—In establishing rules under clause (iv), the Commission shall ensure that—

''(I) the rules—

''(aa) identify the initial spectrum band or bands that will be eligible for incentive auctions under this subparagraph;

''(bb) establish a maximum revenue sharing threshold applicable to all licensees within any auction, unless the establishment of such threshold would increase the amount of spectrum cleared or would increase the net revenue from the auction of such spectrum; and

''(cc) minimize the cost to the taxpayer of the transition of the spectrum to be auctioned to its newly identified use; and

''(II) any licensing conditions established are restricted to interference, ethical, geographical, and qualifications of licensees.

''(vi) PROHIBITIONS.—

''(I) The Commission may not establish any licensing condition relating to the Federal Communications Commission's final order with regard to Preserving the Open Internet; Broadband Industry Practices (GN Docket No. 09–191, WC Docket No. 07–52)(adopted December 21, 2010).

''(II) The Commission may not restrict the number, type, or specific bidders from participating in any public auction.

''(III) The Commission may not prescribe rates, terms, or condition services that may be offered by bidders.

''(IV) The Commission may not impose any new license requirements or rules on the successful bidders once the public auction has been completed.

''(vii) SCHEDULE FOR AUCTIONS.—

''(I) INITIAL AUCTION.—The Commission shall commence incentive auctions under this subparagraph not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Maximizing Spectrum Efficiency and Value Act of 2011.

''(II) OTHER SPECTRUM.—The Commission may, in its discretion and at any time after the date of enactment of the Maximizing Spectrum Efficiency and Value Act of 2011, use the authority provided in this subparagraph in connection with the auction of other licensed spectrum, provided that the auction of such other spectrum is conducted pursuant to the rules established under this subparagraph.''.

SEC. 204. FEDERAL SPECTRUM REALLOCATION COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part B of title I of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 921 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 119. FEDERAL SPECTRUM REALLOCATION COMMISSION.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'Chairperson' means the chairperson of the Reallocation Commission designated under subsection (b)(3)(B);

''(2) the term 'Director' means the Director of the Reallocation Commission appointed under subsection (b)(5);

''(3) the term 'executive agency' has the meaning given the term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

''(4) the term 'Federal entity' means any department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government that utilizes a Government station license obtained under section 305 of the Telecommunications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 305);

''(5) the term 'Reallocation Commission' means the Federal Spectrum Reallocation Commission established under subsection (b)(1); and

''(6) the term 'relocation costs'—

''(A) means the costs incurred by a Federal entity to achieve comparable capability of systems, regardless of whether that capability is achieved by relocating to a new frequency assignment or by utilizing an alternative technology; and

''(B) includes—

''(i) the costs of any modification or replacement of equipment, software, facilities, operating manuals, training costs, or regulations that are attributable to relocation;

''(ii) the costs of all engineering, equipment, software, site acquisition and construction costs, as well as any legitimate and prudent transaction expense, including outside consultants, and reasonable additional costs incurred by the Federal entity that are attributable to relocation, including increased recurring costs associated with the replacement facilities;

''(iii) the costs of engineering studies, economic analyses, or other expenses reasonably incurred in calculating the estimated relocation costs that are provided to the Commission under subsection (e)(3)(C) and approved by the Office of Management and Budget under subsection (e)(3)(D);

''(iv) the one-time costs of any modification of equipment reasonably necessary to accommodate commercial use of such frequencies prior to the termination of the Federal entity's primary allocation or protected status, when the eligible frequencies are made available for private sector uses by competitive bidding and a Federal entity retains primary allocation or protected status in those frequencies for a period of time after the completion of the competitive bidding process; and

''(v) the costs associated with the accelerated replacement of systems and equipment if such acceleration is necessary to ensure the timely relocation of systems to a new frequency assignment.

''(b) COMMISSION.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an independent commission to be known as the 'Federal Spectrum Reallocation Commission'.

''(2) DUTIES.—The Reallocation Commission shall carry out the duties described in this section.

''(3) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(A) APPOINTMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Reallocation Commission shall be composed of 9 members appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS FOR MEMBERSHIP.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Of the 9 members appointed by the President under clause (i)—

''(aa) not more than 1 member may be a current employee or contractor of the Department of Defense;

''(bb) not more than 1 member may be former employee or contractor of the Department of Defense;

''(cc) not less than 1 member shall be a representative of the commercial mobile technology industry; and

''(dd) not less than 1 member shall be a representative from a standards setting-body that is accredited by the American National Standards Institute to develop voluntary industry standards.

''(II) PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATION.—In making appointments under clause (i), the President shall ensure that there is robust private sector representation on the Reallocation Commission.

''(iii) TRANSMISSION OF NOMINATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Maximizing Spectrum Efficiency and Value Act of 2011, the President shall transmit to the Senate the nominations for appointment to the Commission.

''(iv) CONSULTATION.—In selecting individuals for nominations for appointments to the Reallocation Commission, the President shall consult with—

''(I) the Speaker of the House of Representatives concerning the appointment of 2 members;

''(II) the majority leader of the Senate concerning the appointment of 2 member;

''(III) the minority leader of the House of Representatives concerning the appointment of 1 member; and

''(IV) the minority leader of the Senate concerning the appointment of 1 member.

''(v) NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF APPOINTMENT.—No political test or qualification may be used in selecting, appointing, promoting, or taking other personnel actions with respect to officers, agents, or employees of the Reallocation Commission.

''(B) CHAIRPERSON.—At the time the President nominates individuals for appointments under subparagraph (A), the President shall designate 1 of the individuals nominated to serve as the Chairperson of the Reallocation Commission.

''(C) TERMS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Reallocation Commission may serve until the Commission sunsets.

''(ii) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson shall serve until the confirmation of a successor.

''(iii) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Reallocation Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

''(D) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Each member, other than the Chairperson, shall be paid at a rate equal

to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which the member is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Reallocation Commission.

''(ii) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson shall be paid for each day referred to in clause (i) at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

''(4) MEETINGS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each meeting of the Reallocation Commission, other than meetings in which classified information is to be discussed, shall be open to the public.

''(B) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—All the proceedings, information, and deliberations of the Commission shall be open, upon request to—

''(i) the Chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, or such other members of the Subcommittee designated by the Chairman or ranking member of the Subcommittee;

''(ii) the Chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, or such other members of the Subcommittee designated by the Chairman or ranking member of the Subcommittee; and

''(iii) the Chairmen and ranking members of the Subcommittees on Commerce, Justice and Science, and Financial Services and General Government of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, or such other members of the Subcommittees designated by such Chairmen or ranking minority party members.

''(5) DIRECTOR OF STAFF.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Reallocation Commission shall, without regard to section 5311(b) of title 5, United States Code, appoint a Director.

''(B) PAY.—The Director shall be paid at the rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

''(6) STAFF.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Director, with the approval of the Reallocation Commission, may appoint and fix the pay of additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Reallocation Commission to perform the duties of the Reallocation Commission.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The Director may make such appointments without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and any personnel so appointed may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that an individual appointed under this paragraph may not receive pay in excess of the annual rate of basic pay payable for GS–18 of the General Schedule.

''(C) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Upon request of the Director, the Secretary of Commerce may detail any of the personnel of the Department of Commerce to the Reallocation Commission to assist the Reallocation Commission in carrying out its duties.

''(D) GAO AGREEMENT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall provide assistance, including the detailing of employees, to the Reallocation Commission in accordance with an agreement entered into with the Reallocation Commission.

''(7) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The Chairperson may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

''(8) OTHER AUTHORITY.—The Chairperson may lease space and acquire personal property to the extent funds are available.

''(9) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be transferred to the Reallocation Commission from the Spectrum Relocation Fund $13,000,000 to carry out the duties of the Reallocation Commission under this subsection, and such funds shall remain available until the term of the Reallocation Commission sunsets. The funds remaining after the sunset of the Commission shall be returned to the Treasury for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

''(10) POSTAL AND PRINTING SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails and obtain printing and binding services in the same manner and under the same conditions as other agencies of the United States.

''(11) SUNSET.—Section 119(b) is repealed effective 60 days after the President submits his approval of the Reallocation Commission recommendations, pursuant to subsection (d)(4)(B).

''(12) OBTAINING INFORMATION.—The Reallocation Commission may secure directly from any agency or department of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out its duties under this section. Upon request of any member, the head of that agency or department shall furnish that information to the Commission in a full and timely manner.

''(c) SPECTRUM UTILIZATION PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the budget justification documents submitted to Congress in support of the budget for each fiscal year, the head of each Federal entity shall include a spectrum utilization plan.

''(2) CONTENTS.—A spectrum utilization plan submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) the total spectrum authorized for the entity (in percentage terms and in sum) in each band the entity uses;

''(B) the approximate number of transmitters, end-user terminals, or receivers, excluding unintended radiators, that have been deployed or authorized;

''(C) if such information is available—

''(i) the type of transmitters, end-user terminals, or receivers, excluding unintended radiators, operated by the entity and whether they are space-, air-, or ground-based;

''(ii) the type of transmitters, end-user terminals, or receivers, excluding unintended radiators, authorized to be operated by the entity and whether they are space, air, or ground-based;

''(iii) contour maps or other information that illustrate the coverage area, receiver performance, and other parameters relevant to an assessment of the availability of spectrum in each band used by the entity;

''(iv) the approximate geolocation of base stations or fixed transmitters;

''(v) the approximate extent of use, by geography, of each band of frequencies, such as the amount and percentage of time of use, number of end-users, or other measures as appropriate to the particular band;

''(vi) the activities, capabilities, functions, or missions supported by the transmitters, end-user terminals, or receivers; and

''(vii) the types of unlicensed devices authorized to operated by the entity;

''(D) the opportunity cost borne by the entity for each spectrum band the entity uses;

''(E) the planned uses of technologies or expanded services requiring spectrum of a period of time agreed to by the entity; and

''(F) suggested spectrum-efficient approaches to meeting the spectrum requirements identified under subparagraph (E).

''(3) REQUIREMENT.—The head of each Federal entity required to submit a spectrum utilization plan under paragraph (1) shall submit a copy of each plan submitted under paragraph (1) to the Reallocation Commission, the Secretary of Commerce, and the NTIA.

''(4) NATIONAL SECURITY; CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the head of a Federal agency determines that disclosure of information required under paragraph (1) would be harmful to the national security of the United States, the agency shall—

''(i) notify the Secretary of Commerce of such determination;

''(ii) provide to the Secretary—

''(I) the other publicly releasable information required by paragraph (1);

''(II) to the maximum extent practicable, a summary description of the information with respect to which the determination was made; and

''(III) an annex containing the information with respect to which the determination was made.

''(B) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—If the head of a Federal agency determines that any information required by paragraph (1) is classified in accordance with Executive Order 13526 of December 29, 2009, or any successor Executive Order establishing or modifying the uniform system for classifying, safeguarding, and declassifying national security information, the agency shall—

''(i) notify the Secretary of such determination;

''(ii) provide to the Secretary—

''(I) the information required by paragraph (1) that is not classified;

''(II) to the maximum extent practicable, a summary description of the information that is classified; and

''(III) an annex containing the information that is classified.

''(C) ANNEX RESTRICTION.—The Secretary shall make an annex described in subparagraph (A)(ii)(III) or (B)(ii)(III) available to the NTIA and the Relocation Commission. The NTIA, the Secretary, and the Relocation Commission shall not make any such annex available to the public or to any unauthorized person through any other means.

''(d) PROCEDURE FOR MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SPECTRUM REALLOCATION.—

''(1) COMMERCE RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the President submits the budget documents that include spectrum utilization plans described in subsection (c) to Congress for the first fiscal year following the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Reallocation Commission a report identifying and recommending for reallocation bands of frequencies—

''(A) that are allocated on a primary basis for Federal Government use;

''(B) that are not required for the needs of the Federal Government at the time the report is submitted, or in the identifiable future; and

''(C) that can feasibly be made available, as of the date of submission of the report or

at any time during the 5 year period beginning on the date on which the report is submitted, for use under section 309(j) the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)).

''(2) CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFICATION.—

''(A) NEEDS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—In determining whether a band of frequencies meets the criteria specified under paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall—

''(i) consider whether—

''(I) the band of frequencies is used to provide a communications service that is or could be available from a commercial provider or other vendor; or

''(II) the communications services provided on such frequencies could be relocated to other frequencies used by the Federal Government;

''(ii) seek to promote—

''(I) the maximum practicable reliance on commercially available substitutes;

''(II) the efficient use of spectrum by Federal Government stations;

''(III) the development and use of new communications technologies; and

''(IV) the use of nonradiating communications systems where practicable; and

''(iii) seek to avoid—

''(I) serious degradation of Federal Government services and operations;

''(II) excessive costs to the Federal Government and users of Federal Government services; and

''(III) excessive disruption of existing use of Federal Government frequencies by amateur radio licensees.

''(B) LIMITATION ON REALLOCATION.—None of the frequencies recommended for reallocation under paragraph (1) shall have been required or scheduled for previous reallocation.

''(C) DIRECT DISCUSSIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall encourage and provide opportunity for direct discussions among commercial representatives and Federal Government users of the spectrum to aid the Secretary in determining which frequencies to recommend for reallocation under paragraph (1).

''(ii) HEARINGS AND PUBLIC COMMENT.—As part of the review required under clause (i), the Reallocation Commission shall conduct public hearings and accept public comment on the recommendations. All testimony before the Reallocation Commission at a public hearing conducted under this clause shall be presented under oath. All testimony and public comments collected under this clause shall be made available on a public website.

''(iii) REPRESENTATION.—A representative of the Reallocation Commission, and of the Secretary at the election of the Secretary, shall be permitted to attend any discussion held under clause (i).

''(iv) COMMENT.—The Secretary shall provide the public and the Reallocation Commission with an opportunity to comment on the results of a discussion held under clause (i) before the Secretary submits the recommendation required under paragraph (1).

''(3) REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE REALLOCATION COMMISSION.—

''(A) REVIEW.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—After receiving the recommendations from the Secretary under paragraph (1), the Reallocation Commission shall review the recommendations.

''(ii) HEARINGS.—As part of the review required under clause (i), the Reallocation Commission shall conduct public hearings on the recommendations. All testimony before the Reallocation Commission at a public hearing conducted under this clause shall be presented under oath.

''(B) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the Secretary submits recommendations under paragraph (1) to the Reallocation Commission, the Reallocation Commission shall submit to the President and the appropriate congressional committees a report on the findings and conclusions of the Reallocation Commission from the review conducted under subparagraph (A), including any recommendations for Federal spectrum reallocation.

''(ii) REQUIREMENT.—A report submitted under clause (i) shall contain an explanation and justification of any recommendation of Federal spectrum reallocation included in the report that is different from the recommendations submitted by the Secretary under paragraph (1).

''(C) TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION TO CONGRESS.—After the Reallocation Commission submits recommendations to the President under subparagraph (B), upon request by a Member of Congress, the Reallocation Commission shall submit to the Member of Congress any information used by the Reallocation Commission in making the recommendations.

''(D) GAO REQUIREMENTS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

''(i) assist the Reallocation Commission, to the extent requested, in the review and analysis of the recommendations made by the Secretary required to be conducted under subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) not later than 90 days after the Secretary makes recommendations under paragraph (1), submit to Congress and to the Reallocation Commission a report that contains a detailed analysis of the recommendations and selection process of the Secretary.

''(4) REVIEW BY THE PRESIDENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the Reallocation Commission submits recommendations for Federal spectrum reallocation under paragraph (3)(B), the President shall—

''(i) determine whether to approve the recommendations made by the Reallocation Commission; and

''(ii) submit to Congress and the Reallocation Commission a report that describes the determination made under clause (i).

''(B) APPROVAL.—If the President approves the recommendations under clause (i), the President shall transmit a copy of the recommendations to Congress.

''(C) DISAPPROVAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the President disapproves the recommendations under clause (i), the President shall submit to Congress and to the Reallocation Commission a report that describes the reasons that the President disapproves of the recommendations.

''(ii) REALLOCATION COMMISSION REVISIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the President submits to the Reallocation Commission a report under clause (i), the Reallocation Commission shall submit to the President a revised list of recommendations for reallocation of Federal spectrum.

''(iii) APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL OF REVISIONS.—

''(I) APPROVAL.—If the President approves the revised list of recommendations submitted by the Reallocation Commission under clause (ii), the President shall submit the revised list to Congress.

''(II) DISAPPROVAL.—If the President disapproves the revised list of recommendations submitted by the Reallocation Commission under clause (ii), the President and the Reallocation Commission shall complete the requirements described in clauses (i) and (ii) until the President approves recommendations from the Reallocation Commission.

''(5) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AND NONDISCLOSURE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the head of an executive agency, the Chairperson, or the President determines that public disclosure of any information contained in the reports, recommendations, testimony, or comments required under this section would reveal classified national security information or other information for which there is a legal basis for nondisclosure and such public disclosure would be detrimental to national security, homeland security, public safety, or jeopardize law enforcement investigations, the head of the executive agency, the Chairperson, or the President shall notify the Secretary of that determination prior to release of such information.

''(B) ANNEX.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the head of an executive agency, the Chairperson, or the President notified the Secretary of a determination under subparagraph (A), the information required to be disclosed under this section shall be included in a separate classified annex, as needed.

''(ii) REQUIREMENT.—A classified annex described under clause (i)—

''(I) shall be provided to the appropriate Congressional subcommittees in accordance with appropriate national security stipulations; and

''(II) shall not be disclosed to the public or provided to any unauthorized person through any other means.

''(e) REALLOCATION OF FEDERAL SPECTRUM.—

''(1) AGENCY ACTION.—

''(A) NTIA REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the President submits approved recommendations for the reallocation of Federal spectrum to Congress under subparagraph (B) or (C)(iii)(I) of subsection (d)(4), the NTIA shall provide to each Federal entity that is required to take action under the recommendations information regarding an alternative frequency assignment to which the radio communications operations of the Federal entity could be relocated for purposes of calculating the estimated relocation costs and time line required under subparagraph (C).

''(B) REQUIREMENT.—To the extent practicable and consistent with national security considerations, the NTIA shall provide the information described in paragraph (1) by the geographic location of the facilities or systems of the Federal entity and the frequency bands used by the facilities or systems.

''(C) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the President submits approved recommendations for the reallocation of Federal spectrum to Congress under subparagraph (B) or (C) (iii)(I) of subsection (d)(4), the head of each Federal entity required to relocate spectrum under the recommendations shall prepare and submit to the President, the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, the NTIA, the Federal Communications Commission, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Comptroller General of the United States a plan for implementation of the recommendations related to the Federal entity.

''(ii) CONTENTS.—An implementation plan submitted under clause (i) shall include—

''(I) a description of how the Federal entity will comply with the approved recommendations for the reallocation of Federal spectrum submitted to Congress under subparagraph (B) or (C)(iii)(I) of subsection (d)(4);

''(II) any statutory or regulatory barriers that will prohibit the Federal entity from complying with the recommendations described in subclause (I);

''(III) the estimated cost to the Federal entity of frequency withdrawal or relocation; and

''(IV) the estimated timeline of the Federal entity for frequency withdrawal or relocation.

''(D) REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the plan is submitted under subparagraph (C), the Office of Management and Budget shall review the implementation plan and determine whether to approve the plan.

''(ii) DISAPPROVAL.—If an implementation plan submitted under subparagraph (C) is disapproved by the Office of Management and Budget, the Federal entity shall submit a revised implementation plan under paragraph (3)(A) until the implementation plan is approved.

''(iii) APPROVAL OF ALL PLANS.—Not later than 7 days after the date on which the Office of Management and Budget approves the plans submitted under paragraph (3)(C), the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the Federal Communications Commission of the estimated relocation costs and timelines of all Federal entities required to submit a plan under paragraph (3)(C).

''(iv) REVIEW OF PROGRESS.—At the beginning of each fiscal year following approval of a plan required under subparagraph (C), the Office of Management and Budget shall review the progress of each Federal entity in meeting the cost and timelines of the implementation plan. If at any point, the Office of Management and Budget determines the Federal entity will not meet the implementation plan timelines or cost, the Office of Management and Budget shall take action to enforce the approved plan.

''(E) COMPLIANCE.—

''(i) INITIATION OF REQUIRED ACTION.—Not later than 2 years after the date which the President submits approved recommendations for the reallocation of Federal spectrum to Congress under subparagraph (B) or (C)(iii)(I) of subsection (d)(4), the head of each agency shall initiate all such actions required to comply with the approved recommendations.

''(ii) COMPLETION OF REQUIRED ACTION.—Not later than 5 years after the date which the President submits approved recommendations for the reallocation of Federal spectrum to Congress under subparagraph (B) or (C)(iii)(I) of subsection (d)(4), the head of each agency shall complete all such actions required to comply with the approved recommendations.

''(2) CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No agency may initiate any action in accordance with the approved recommendations for the reallocation of Federal spectrum submitted to Congress by the President under subparagraph (B) or (C)(iii)(I) of subsection (d)(4) if Congress enacts a joint resolution disapproving the recommendations before the earlier of—

''(i) the end of the 45-day period beginning on the date on which the President submits the recommendations to Congress under subparagraph (B) or (C)(iii)(I) of subsection (d)(4); or

''(ii) the adjournment of Congress sine die for the session during which the recommendations described in clause (i) are submitted.

''(B) COMPUTATION OF TIME PERIOD.—For the purpose of subparagraph (A), the days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment for more than 3 days to a day certain shall be excluded in the computation of the time period described in subparagraph (A)(i).

''(3) NOTIFICATION OF SUCCESSFUL RELOCATION.—The President shall terminate the authorization of a Federal entity and notify the Secretary and the Federal Communications Commission of the termination if—

''(A) the NTIA determines that a Federal entity has achieved comparable capability of systems by relocating to a new frequency assignment or by utilizing an alternative technology; or

''(B) the Federal entity has unreasonably failed to comply with the timeline for relocation submitted by the Federal entity under paragraph (1)(C).

''(f) AUCTION OF AVAILABLE FREQUENCIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the President submits approved recommendations for the reallocation of Federal spectrum to Congress under subparagraph (B) or (C)(iii)(I) of subsection (d)(4), the Federal Communications Commission shall establish rules for the conduct of auctions of frequencies that will be made available according to the recommendations for the reallocation of Federal spectrum for assignment of new initial licenses subject to new service rules or for other purposes, in which a portion of the auction proceeds are provided to the Spectrum Relocation Fund, consistent with the public interest in maximizing utilization of the spectrum. The remainder of the proceeds shall be deposited in the Treasury, where such amounts shall be dedicated for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

''(2) REQUIREMENT.—In promulgating rules under paragraph (1), the Federal Communications Commission shall—

''(A) minimize the cost to the taxpayer of the transition of the spectrum to be auctioned to its newly identified use;

''(B) ensure that any licensing conditions established are restricted to technical, ethical, geographic, and financial matters; and

''(C) establish rules in accordance with section 309(j)(8)(F)(vi) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(F)(vi)).

''(3) SCHEDULE FOR AUCTIONS.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the President submits approved recommendations for the reallocation of Federal spectrum to Congress under subparagraph (B) or (C)(iii)(I) of subsection (d)(4), the Federal Communications Commission shall commence auctions under this subsection.

''(g) RELOCATION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT STATIONS.—

''(1) ELIGIBLE FEDERAL ENTITIES.—Any Federal entity that operates a Federal Government station assigned to a band of frequencies and that incurs relocation costs because of the reallocation of frequencies from Federal use to non-Federal use pursuant to this section shall receive payment for such costs from the Spectrum Relocation Fund, in accordance with section 118.

''(2) FEDERAL ACTION TO EXPEDITE SPECTRUM TRANSFER.—Any Federal Government station which operates on electromagnetic spectrum that has been identified in any reallocation report under this section shall, to the maximum extent practicable through the use of the authority granted under this section and any other applicable provision of law, take action to relocate its spectrum use to other frequencies that are reserved for Federal use or to consolidate its spectrum use with other Federal Government stations in a manner that maximizes the spectrum available for non-Federal use.

''(3) FAILURE TO COMPLY.—If a Federal entity does not comply with the timeline established in the implementation plan required under subsection (e)(C), Congress may decrease the amount appropriated to the entity in the following fiscal year by up to ½ of 1 percent.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION 309(J) OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.—Section 309(j) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (8), as amended by this Act, by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

''(D) DISPOSITION OF CASH PROCEEDS.—Cash proceeds attributable to the auction of any eligible frequencies described in section 119(f)(1) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act shall be deposited in the Spectrum Relocation Fund established under section 118 of such Act, and shall be available in accordance with that section.''; and

(B) in paragraph (16)—

(i) by striking paragraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

''(A) SPECIAL REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall revise the regulations prescribed under paragraph (4)(F) of this subsection to prescribe methods by which the total cash proceeds from any auction of eligible frequencies described in section 119(f)(1) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act shall at least equal 110 percent of the total estimated relocation costs provided to the Commission pursuant to section 119(e)(1)(D)(iii) of such Act.

''(B) CONCLUSION OF AUCTIONS CONTINGENT ON MINIMUM PROCEEDS.—The Commission shall not conclude any auction of eligible frequencies described in section 119(f)(1) of such Act if the total cash proceeds attributable to such spectrum are less than 110 percent of the total estimated relocation costs provided to the Commission pursuant to section 119(e)(1)(D)(iii) of such Act. If the Commission is unable to conclude an auction for the foregoing reason, the Commission shall cancel the auction, return within 45 days after the auction cancellation date any deposits from participating bidders held in escrow, and absolve such bidders from any obligation to the United States to bid in any subsequent reauction of such spectrum.''.

(2) SPECTRUM RELOCATION FUND.—Section 118 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 928) is amended striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) USED TO PAY RELOCATION COSTS.—The amounts in the Fund from auctions of eligible frequencies are authorized to be used to pay relocation costs, as defined in section 119(a)(5), of an eligible Federal entity incurring such costs with respect to relocation from those frequencies.''.

SA 587. Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1188, to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''All-American Flag Act''.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT FOR PURCHASE OF DOMESTICALLY MADE UNITED STATES FLAGS FOR USE BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subsection (b), only such flags of the United States of America, regardless of size, that are 100 percent manufactured in the United States, from articles, materials, or supplies 100 percent of which are grown, produced, or manufactured in the United States, may be acquired for use by the Federal Government.

(b) WAIVER.—The head of an executive agency may waive the requirement under subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis upon a determination that—

(1) the application of the limitation would cause unreasonable costs or delays to be incurred; or

(2) application of the limitation would adversely affect a United States company.

(c) AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council established under section 1302 of title 41, United States Code, shall amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation to implement this section.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

(2) FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—The term ''Federal Acquisition Regulation'' has the meaning given the term in section 106 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 2 shall apply to purchases of flags made on or after 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. CONSISTENCY WITH INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.

This Act shall be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Thursday, July 28, 2011, at 2:15 p.m. in Room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Enforcing the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act—The Role of the National Indian Gaming commission and Tribes as Regulators.''

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224–2251.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Thursday, July 28, 2011, at 2:15 p.m. in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a business meeting to consider: S. 546, a bill to extend Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes; S. 379, a bill to extend Federal Recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe; S. 1218, a bill to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes; S. 703, a bill to amend the Long-Term Leasing Act, and for other purposes; and S. 636, a bill to provide the Quileute Indian Tribe Tsunami and Flood Protection, and for other purposes, to be followed by an oversight hearing entitled ''Enforcing the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act—The Role of the National Indian Gaming Commission and Tribes as Regulators.''

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224–2251.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Wednesday, August 3, 2011, at 10 a.m. in SD–106 to mark-up the following: S. 958, the Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2011; S. 1094, the Combating Autism Reauthorization Act; and, any nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the committee on (202) 224–5375.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 27, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''CEO Perspectives on How the Tax Code Affects Hiring, Businesses and Economic Growth.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. REID. 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 July 27, 2011, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Ten Years After 9/11: Emergency Communications.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 27, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Fulfilling Our Treaty Obligations and Protecting Americans Abroad.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 27, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session on July 27, 2011, in room SD–562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building beginning at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION, PRODUCT SAFETY, AND INSURANCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 27, 2011, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 27, 2011, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS, ATMOSPHERE, FISHERIES, AND COAST GUARD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 27, 2011, at 10:30 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Charles Vallejo Anderson, an intern in Senator MERKLEY's office, have the privileges of the floor for the balance of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALL-AMERICAN FLAG ACT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I rise to discuss legislation called the All-American Flag Act of 2011 and make some comments about what has happened to American manufacturing and how this is a small step but an important step in beginning to convince this body that ''Made in America'' is something we should focus on, that a manufacturing strategy from the White House is something they should focus on, and that putting people back to work to make things in America again is the right strategy to pull us out of a recession.

The Labor Department's most recent jobs report confirmed what workers in my State are already aware of—that employers are still not hiring. Workers who have jobs are seeing smaller paychecks, and they are barely keeping up with bills and insurance costs.

In too many cases, soldiers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan are facing even greater challenges in the labor market. I was at Youngstown State University recently talking about the specific programs there. In Cleveland, through MAGNET—a group called MAGNET in Youngstown and in northeast Ohio is helping soldiers and sailors

and marines leaving the service, integrating into the classroom, and helping them find jobs in that region—someplace we have fallen woefully short.

Manufacturing, which was moving along steadily earlier this year—we had seen 12, 13, 14, 15 months of job growth in manufacturing, not enough job growth but some—that is even slowing down. Steps that were taken through the auto rescue and other things we did in the last couple of years dealing with this terrible recession created in 2007 and 2008—the auto rescue and other efforts saved millions of Americans from joining the unemployment rolls. We are seeing a better auto industry, an auto industry coming back, especially in places such as Defiance and Toledo and Northwood and Cleveland and Lawrenceville, OH. But the challenges remain severe.

Like many in this Chamber, I believe manufacturing is the key not only to our economic recovery but to the strength and vitality of our Nation. To many, manufacturing is also a ticket to the American middle class.

In the last 12 years, we have witnessed the closure of more than 54,000 factories in the United States. Last year, we lost 8,000. That is 5,400 factories per year, 15 per day in the last 12 years. The manufacturing sector, since the beginning of the Bush administration, 2001, has lost 5 million jobs. Only 11.5 million people are employed in manufacturing jobs now. The last time it was that low was in 1941, before the country scaled up for production for World War II.

When Members of this body talk about the need to support manufacturing, others will say that is ''picking winners and losers'' and that ''the government has no role in helping manufacturing.'' First of all, that makes no sense, but second, I have heard all those before. I think the government already has picked winners and made choices. Manufacturing in the early 1980s exceeded 25 percent of our GDP. Now it is only 11 percent of our GDP. Over that same time period—financial services back 30 years ago was about 11 percent of our GDP, and now they are about 21 percent. So a government that put way too much focus on and interest in and support for financial services at the expense of manufacturing has clearly cost us far too many middle-class jobs.

It is a result of tax policy; it is a result of not investing in innovation; it is a result of the China PNTR, the permanent normal trade relations; it is a result of NAFTA; and it is a result of not enforcing our trade laws. There is blame to go around, but the blame will not create a job that a former autoworker in Youngstown or a rubber worker in Akron or a chemical worker in Columbus or a steelworker outside Cincinnati—that will not create a job they are looking for, nor reduce the rising cost for them of food and gas and shelter.

I urge my colleagues to consider taking big steps, not just slight changes at the margin, in rebuilding our manufacturing base and rebuilding the middle class. Those steps include rebalancing our economic policies, reinvesting in education, reinvesting—putting real support into workforce training, and enforcing trade laws that increase our exports and reinforce trade, three examples of enforcing trade laws that happened in the last couple of years, thanks in part to a more aggressive Obama administration finally on trade law. We have seen hundreds of jobs created in Lorain, OH; in Youngstown, OH, because of enforcement of trade laws on Oil Country Tubular Steel. We have seen rubber worker jobs, tire manufacturing jobs created in Finley, OH, because of enforcement of international trade law. We have seen coated paper jobs, paper manufacturing jobs in Butler County, OH, again, because of an aggressive Federal policy about enforcing trade law, but we don't see enough of that.

There are other steps more modest but demonstrate a commitment to our manufacturing sector—one step requiring the Federal Government when purchasing flags to purchase only those flags 100 percent American made. That sounds fairly amazing that they are not made in America today. It sounds fairly amazing that would make much difference but really it does.

Currently, Federal law requires that American flags purchased by the U.S. Government contain a minimum of 50 percent American-made products or components. So the U.S. Department of Defense, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security or the U.S. Capitol buys the American flags and under law they only need to be 50 percent made in the United States of America. These are American flags. This legislation we will offer today, which has the support of Senator ROCKEFELLER, a Democrat from West Virginia, Senator COLLINS, a Republican from Maine, Senator SANDERS, an Independent from Vermont, have joined me as cosponsors. It honors our country by ensuring American flags flown over government buildings are actually American flags.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the value of imported American flags to the United States was $3.2 million with $2.8 million coming from China. When I think about all of the production in China, I often think about young workers—and when I say young workers, I mean young workers in China—who make things people in the United States buy. I have to think Chinese workers, if they think about this while they are working, must be a bit amused that they are making American flags in China and selling them to us. They must think what kind of country is this that doesn't make their own flags. It just occurred to me that would be amusing if it weren't somewhat tragic.

The Congressional Research Service said there are at least eight all-American flag manufacturers in the United States. There are eight companies that can do this. This isn't a question of rare Earth materials that we can't get enough of. I know the Senator from Colorado has been interested in that issue, the Presiding Officer.

The increased demand for made in the U.S.A. flags will lead to more jobs. Thanks to this legislation we will have more production.

In a time when we face economic hardship, it is critical to invest in the manufacturing base. There is no product that deserves a U.S.A. label more than American flags. Manufacturing built a strong middle class. When you think of the combination of large-scale manufacturing of all kinds of products and collective bargaining laws that let people come together and bargain and negotiate collectively, it clearly is the way we built the middle class in this country.

It is critical today that the government lead by example. That is why the Ohio Senate bill 5 is so important, the repeal of the repeal of collective bargaining. It is why manufacturing is so important.

This legislation today that I will bring up in a moment is a modest step towards building that manufacturing strategy, moving forward on made in America and a modest step towards enhancing and strengthening our manufacturing base.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Homeland Security Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1188 and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1188) to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Brown of Ohio substitute amendment at the desk, which we just discussed, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 587) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''All-American Flag Act''.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT FOR PURCHASE OF DOMESTICALLY MADE UNITED STATES FLAGS FOR USE BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subsection (b), only such flags of the United States of America, regardless of size, that are 100 percent manufactured in the United

States, from articles, materials, or supplies 100 percent of which are grown, produced, or manufactured in the United States, may be acquired for use by the Federal Government.

(b) WAIVER.—The head of an executive agency may waive the requirement under subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis upon a determination that—

(1) the application of the limitation would cause unreasonable costs or delays to be incurred; or

(2) application of the limitation would adversely affect a United States company.

(c) AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council established under section 1302 of title 41, United States Code, shall amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation to implement this section.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

(2) FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—The term ''Federal Acquisition Regulation'' has the meaning given the term in section 106 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 2 shall apply to purchases of flags made on or after 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. CONSISTENCY WITH INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.

This Act shall be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.

The bill (S. 1188), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CONDEMNING THE HORRIFIC ATTACKS IN NORWAY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 240, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 240) condemning the horrific attacks on government buildings in Oslo, Norway, and a youth camp on Utoya Island, Norway, on July 22, 2011, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 240) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 240

Whereas, on July 22, 2011, at least eight people were brutally killed when government buildings were bombed in Oslo, Norway;

Whereas, also on July 22, 2011, at least 68 people, a majority of them children and young adults, were brutally killed when a youth camp was attacked on Utøya Island, Norway;

Whereas, also on July 22, 2011, as many as 96 people were injured by these dual attacks;

Whereas these twin attacks brought horrific violence, pain, and suffering upon innocent Norwegians and their families and friends;

Whereas the Government and people of Norway have condemned the terrorist attacks and called the events an ''atrocity,'' a ''nightmare,'' and a ''national tragedy'';

Whereas Norway is recognized around the world as a country that is both peaceful and peace-seeking;

Whereas Oslo, Norway, is home to the Norwegian Nobel Committee, which annually selects winners of the Nobel Peace Prize;

Whereas Norway was a founding member of the United Nations in 1945, a Norwegian was the first Secretary-General of the United Nations, and Norway was a founding member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949;

Whereas Norway has for years offered safe haven to refugees and the politically persecuted from around the world;

Whereas over 4,500,000 Americans of Norwegian ancestry now reside in the United States, with the state of Minnesota being home to the largest number of people of Norwegian heritage outside of Norway itself;

Whereas the Prime Minister of Norway, Jens Stoltenberg, has said, ''We must never let our values, our way of life, be destroyed by blind violence,'' and pledged that Norway ''will respond with more democracy, more openness, and more humanity, but never naivete'';

Whereas the Foreign Minister of Norway, Jonas Gahr Støre, remarked, ''The nature of the Norwegian democracy will not change. Norway will continue to stand for engagement in the world where we commit our resources and our convictions.'';

Whereas President Barack Obama remarked that ''[i]t's a reminder that the entire international community has a stake in preventing this kind of terror from occurring,'' and later said, ''You should know that the thoughts and prayers of all Americans are with the people of Norway and that we will stand beside [Norway] every step of the way.'';

Whereas, on Monday, July 25, 2011, there was a moment of silence throughout Norway and other Nordic countries, followed by a memorial attended by more than 150,000 people outside the city hall in Oslo for a ''Rose March,'' in which participants carried white or red roses; and

Whereas Crown Prince Haakon of Norway told those gathered at the memorial, ''Tonight the streets are filled with love.'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns in the strongest terms the senseless terrorist attacks that occurred in Norway on July 22, 2011, causing many deaths and injuries;

(2) further condemns all terrorist actions, including those motivated by hatred and religious or cultural intolerance;

(3) expresses deep sympathy, solidarity, and condolences to the victims of the atrocious acts, their families, and the people and Government of Norway;

(4) emphasizes the bonds of friendship and shared heritage between the United States and Norway;

(5) expresses unwavering support to the Government and people of Norway as they recover from these horrific attacks;

(6) affirms its resolve to combat all forms of senseless violence and terrorism, both domestically and abroad; and

(7) calls on all people to join together to denounce acts of hatred and fear and promote peace and tolerance in their communities and around the world.

INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR PEOPLE OF AFRICAN DESCENT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 26, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) supporting the goals and ideals of the designation of the year 2011 as the International Year for People of African Descent.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 26

Whereas the year of 2011 is recognized as the ''International Year for People of African Descent'';

Whereas the African Diaspora is expansive, spanning the globe from Latin America and the Caribbean to Asia, with persons of African descent living on every continent, including Europe;

Whereas in recognition of the African Diaspora, on December 18, 2009, the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 64/169, designating the year of 2011 as the ''International Year for People of African Descent'';

Whereas the historical bonds and shared experiences that tie the African continent with the world must be recalled;

Whereas the global contributions of people of African descent must be recognized as a means of preserving that heritage;

Whereas a central goal of recognizing the year of 2011 as the International Year for People of African descent is to strengthen national actions and regional and international cooperation for the benefit of people of African descent in relation to—

(1) the full enjoyment of economic, cultural, social, civil, and political rights for people of African descent;

(2) the participation and integration of people of African descent in all political, economic, social, and cultural aspects of society; and

(3) the promotion of greater knowledge of, and respect for, the diverse heritage and culture of people of African descent; and

Whereas the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, done at Helsinki August 1, 1975, states that ''participating States will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms . . . for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the designation of the year of 2011 as the International Year for People of African Descent;

(2) encourages the recognition and celebration of the collective history and achievements made by people of African descent;

(3) reaffirms the importance of inclusion and the full and equal participation of people of African descent around the world in all aspects of political, economic, social, and cultural life;

(4) recognizes bilateral and multilateral efforts to promote democracy, human rights, and rule of law, including those efforts that target the eradication of poverty, hunger, and inequality; and

(5) reaffirms the commitment of Congress to address racism, discrimination, and intolerance in the United States and around the globe.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1938

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1938) to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL Oil pipeline, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 28, 2011

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, July 28; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; further, that following morning business, the majority leader be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. 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 6:55 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 28, 2011, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 27, 2011:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GARY LOCKE, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

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.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ROBERT S. MUELLER, III, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 4, 2013.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN CELEBRATION OF MISS SADIE THOMAS' 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to stand before you today to celebrate the 100th birthday of one of my constituents, Miss Sadie Thomas.

Sadie Thomas was born on July 27, 1911 in Jeffersonville, Georgia. Aunt Sadie to her family, Sadie spent most of her life on her family farm with her brother John. Sadie and John began their lives as sharecroppers, eventually moving on to their own plot of land. As a small farmer, she worked hard all her life, picking cotton and growing tomatoes, corn, squash and other crops.

From the very beginning, Sadie has remained a deeply religious woman, devoted to her family. When her sister passed away, leaving two children behind, Sadie helped raise both children on her farm with her mother.

To this day she remains a lifelong member of the Lizzie Harrell Baptist Church in Jeffersonville. She now resides near her family in a nursing home in my district.

As her friends and family celebrate her 100th birthday, we are all thankful that she is of sound mind and body. Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues, I hope you will join me today in wishing Miss Sadie Thomas a very happy birthday. May God continue to bless her with a long life.

IN HONOR OF CHURCHILL GRIMES

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Churchill "Church" Bragaw Grimes, who on August 31 retires as the Fisheries Ecology Division Director of the Southwest Fisheries Science Center in Santa Cruz, California. The Fisheries Ecology Division of the Southwest Fisheries Science Center provides research focused on Pacific Coast groundfish and Pacific Salmon. Results of their research help to manage fisheries as well as threatened and endangered species in the area. Churchill has made very important contributions to resource conservation and management as the Director of the Fisheries Ecology Division.

Church has been active in the field of fishery science and management for over 40 years. He received both his B.S. and M.S. in biology from the East Carolina University at Greenville, North Carolina and his Ph.D. in Marine Sciences from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. In 1977 he became the Assistant Professor of Marine Fisheries at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey and was promoted to Associate Professor in 1983. The following year he joined the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) as a Fishery Ecologist in Panama City, Florida. He has since been with the NMFS serving as Chief (acting) Resource Survey Division in Pascagoula, Mississippi; Leader, Fishery Ecology Investigations and Laboratory Director in Panama City; and Laboratory Director and Fisheries Ecology Division Director in Santa Cruz.

Some of Church's many contributions to the field of fishery science and management are his countless publications from his many years of "hands on" research in the lab and at sea. He has received numerous honors and awards including the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Bronze Medal in 1996 and again in 2006.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House as I commend Churchill "Church" Bragaw Grimes for all he has done and all he will undoubtedly continue to do. I extend my most sincere thanks and warmest wishes for his success and much happiness in his retirement.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I want to speak in favor of Mr. BASS' amendment to restore funds to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

More than 40 years ago, Congress made a commitment to the American public—a commitment to use a small portion of revenues from offshore drilling toward natural resource conservation and outdoor recreation programs—a commitment to partially offset the depletion of limited natural resources that belong to us all.

Diverting these funds goes against the promise that Congress made to the American public back in 1965 and the American public doesn't support it.

A new bipartisan poll released today by the LWCF Coalition shows that 85 percent of Americans support full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The nation's primary tool to conserve land for parks, wildlife refuges, forests, rivers, trails, historic and cultural sites.

Cuts to the LWCF undermine the economic asset that our Federal, State, and local public lands represent in this country.

And rob the American public of the opportunity to enjoy and recreate in these special places.

According to the Outdoor Industry Foundation, outdoor recreation activities, including hunting, fishing, camping, and other activities contribute a total of $730 billion annually to the economy.

Supporting 1 of every 20 jobs in the U.S. and stimulating 8 percent of all consumer spending.

Support jobs, support our natural treasures, and keep our commitment to the American public.

Vote "yes" on the Bass Amendment to restore funds to the LWCF.

HONORING MONSIGNOR GABRIEL GHANOUM

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Monsignor Gabriel Ghanoum for his dedicated service to the Miami area. Monsignor Ghanoum has been a fixture in the community since 1994, and currently serves as pastor of the St. Nicholas Melkite Greek Catholic Church in Delray Beach, Florida.

In 1999 Monsignor Ghanoum started the Spanish Ministry at St. Jude's Melkite Catholic Church, and served as its pastor until 2010. He still celebrates mass with St. Jude's, often given to a standing room only crowd consisting of people from all over the state of Florida, and all over the world. He also provides mass for the homeless community of Miami, the JFK Medical Center and his current parish, St. Nicholas'. It is through his homilies that Monsignor Ghanoum gives his parishioners strength, motivation and insight into the power of prayer and devotion to God.

Throughout his time in Miami, Monsignor Ghanoum has established diverse programs for the needy and homeless, assisted at Miami Children's Hospital, and has served as a Victim's Assistance Coordinator for Child Abuse, among various other programs and services. Currently, he assists the sisters of the Missionaries of Charity of Mother Teresa in the archdiocese of Miami. Along with his work in Miami, he has been a stalwart supporter of the Mexican Association of Aid to Children with Cancer. It is through programs such as these that Monsignor Ghanoum truly shines, and impacts the lives of countless human beings.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Monsignor Gabriel Ghanoum for his continued service to the Miami community. As a true servant of the Lord, he has dedicated himself to his faith and his community. He has gone beyond the call of duty, and has consistently demonstrated the high values of priesthood. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this outstanding individual, and I wish him continued success and happiness in the future.

HONORING THE WORK OF NANCY MERCER AND JILL EGLE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Nancy Mercer and Jill Egle, co-executive directors of The Arc of Northern Virginia, for their tremendous work on behalf of the disabled in our community.

As my colleagues know, The Arc is a leading advocacy and service organization for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities, serving more than 7,000 families in Northern Virginia alone. I am sad to share that after 5 years of collaboration, Nancy and Jill have decided to move on, but they have left The Arc stronger than ever.

Under Nancy and Jill's leadership, the local Arc staff, volunteers and community partners have been successful in promoting and protecting the rights of people of all abilities to live comfortably in the community. One of The Arc's primary missions is to provide full inclusion for intellectually and developmentally disabled individuals in all aspects of the community.

Through their combined efforts, The Arc has been expanded its advocacy efforts to become one of the strongest grassroots organizations in the Commonwealth. They spearheaded the formation of the Virginia Ability Alliance, creating a more unified voice for people with disabilities. Thanks to the compelling public awareness campaign, ''A Life Like Yours . . . Take a Walk in Our Shoes,'' Nancy and Jill helped hammer home the message that community support is essential for The Arc to succeed. With the resulting increase in community and financial support, The Arc has been able to help more people with disabilities live comfortably within our community.

Their voice also is being heard by state and national policy makers. The Arc of Northern Virginia helped lead a statewide campaign to eradicate use of the degrading ''R'' word in Virginia's State Code. They worked with community partners to launch a successful Get Out the Vote campaign that buoyed the participation rate of disabled voters in the 2008 Presidential election, and they recently have used their influence in the international arena to educate representatives from Russia, China, and Korea on the necessity of improving the rights of the disabled globally.

It has been my pleasure to work with both Nancy and Jill, and I have a personal relationship with each of them. As Chairman of the Fairfax Board of Supervisors, I always looked forward to Jill's expert testimony. She successfully raised the level of public discourse on the struggles of the developmentally disabled in Northern Virginia. Nancy's desire to better the lives of those affected by intellectual disability also has been inspiring. She will continue her mission this August as the President and CEO of the PHILLIPS program, an organization dedicated to furthering the lives of the developmentally disabled throughout the National Capital Region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the invaluable work of Nancy Mercer and Jill Egle to improve the lives of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities and wishing them continued success in their future pursuits. While their presence will be missed at The Arc, we are glad to know their influence will continue to be felt in our community.

RECOGNIZING SUZANNE STEWART POHLMAN, FOUNDER OF INTERFAITH COMMUNITY SERVICES

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished tenure of a constituent in my district, Ms. Suzanne Stewart Pohlman, on the occasion of her retirement as the founder and executive director of Interfaith Community Services located in Escondido, California.

As the creator, Ms. Pohlman has transformed Interfaith Community Services from a small food pantry into North San Diego County's most comprehensive social service agency and a nationally recognized model organization. Assisting over 35,000 individuals last year alone, Interfaith Services has been dedicated to serving and empowering the low-income, homeless, and underserved in North San Diego County for nearly 30 years.

Ms. Pohlman has established unique collaborations between faith centers, businesses, government and other not-for-profits to successfully achieve Interfaith's mission of providing resources to help persons in need attain self-sufficiency. Additionally, she has pioneered many housing programs, creating emergency, transitional, permanent supportive and permanent affordable housing stock for the North County community. Under Ms. Polhman's innovative management, Interfaith's programs have received multiple awards and now serves as a not-for-profit incubator to help emerging organizations develop the capacity to grow and succeed.

Time and again, Ms. Polhman has demonstrated her passion for helping people realize their own potential. I commend Ms. Polhman for her commitment to educating the community on ways—big and small—that we all can work to make a difference. Her hard work and dedication is seen through the lives she has touched.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Ms. Pohlman's nearly three decades of service and leadership to the San Diego community as she retires as the Executive Director of Interfaith Community Services.

A TRIBUTE TO ORLA O'HANRAHAN ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in honoring Deputy Chief of Mission at the Embassy of Ireland, Orla O'Hanrahan, for her outstanding service here in Washington, DC.

Building on her years of experience in the Irish Foreign Service, Orla has brought to her position here tremendous skill, knowledge, diplomacy and enthusiasm.

Her past accomplishments include serving as a popular Consul General in Boston and Joint Director General of the International Fund for Ireland. She held the position of Press Officer for the Irish Embassy in Paris, and also was stationed in London during a time of great conflict and violence between Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Having visited Northern Ireland myself during that period, and as a member of the Congressional Friends of Ireland Caucus, I appreciate the important role that diplomats like Orla played during that difficult time which culminated in the successful Good Friday Accord.

Orla is a wonderful public servant and I know my colleagues join me in wishing her continued success and happiness as she returns to Ireland with her family.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the FY 2012 Interior Appropriations. At a time when Congress should be preventing a default crisis and working on job creation, the Majority has chosen to endanger our environment and public health by threatening the air we breathe, the water we drink, the national parks we play in, the wildlife we treasure, and the museums we explore. We cannot ignore the jobs that would be lost as a result of the cuts to the agencies this bill funds.

This bill would overturn 40 years of bipartisan environmental and public health protections. Gutting rules and regulations such as those in the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act would harm our Nation's health just as cities and towns across the country are struck by a record breaking heat wave. Instead of trying to reduce emissions and improve air quality, the House Majority wants to give a carve out to some of the biggest contaminators contributing to global warming.

It is shocking that in the aftermath of several disastrous oil spills, instead of fully funding oversight and enforcement for oil and gas extraction, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have reduced that funding while increasing the budget for the oil and gas extraction programs that benefit big oil. Instead of punishing the flagrant polluters, the Majority chooses to reward them. In addition to reducing oversight capabilities, this legislation cuts important programs that promote clean and efficient energy solutions that would help America reduce its dependence on foreign oil.

If enacted, this bill would result in very steep cuts to programs that are important to keeping New York happy and healthy. These include

across the board cuts to programs such as the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative to combat invasive species and the Long Island Sound Restoration. The bill includes a provision on ballast water rules that is a direct attack on New York's strong rules to protect state waters from aquatic invasive species. Our guidelines are more stringent than federal and some international guidelines, which under this bill would actually prevent New York from receiving any related EPA funds.

Every state in the union depends on the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds to help manage wastewater and protect our drinking water. This bill drastically cuts funding to these programs by 55 percent and 14 percent as compared to last year. The Land and Water Conservation Fund that helps states and communities preserve public parks is cut by 78 percent. With more than three dozen anti-environment policy riders attached to the bill including those to remove the Endangered Species Act protections and to prohibit EPA cross-state air pollution standards, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are using this Appropriations bill to push their own agenda and ideology at the expense of our health and that of our land, water and wildlife. This bill hurts those most vulnerable to contaminants such as our children suffering from asthma, and removes important protections for all creatures great and small.

I urge a "no" vote on this dangerous bill that jeopardizes the health of our country and our future.

HONORING FLORIDA CHIEF JUSTICE, LEANDER J. SHAW, JR.

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize former Florida Chief Justice, Leander J. Shaw Jr. Shaw was born in Salem, Virginia, on September 6, 1930. His parents were Leander J. Shaw, retired Dean of the Florida A&M University Graduate School in Tallahassee, and Margaret Shaw, a retired teacher. He attended public schools in Virginia and received his bachelor's degree in 1952 from West Virginia State College. After serving in the Korean conflict as an artillery officer, he entered law school and earned his juris doctorate degree in 1957 from Howard University.

Shaw came to Tallahassee in 1957 and followed in the footsteps of his father as an assistant professor of law at Florida A&M University. In 1960 he was admitted to the Florida Bar and went into private practice in Jacksonville, where he also served as assistant public defender. Shaw's hiring marked the beginning of an era that revamped the Florida judicial system. Prior to his hiring no African Americans were working for Duval County. Shaw later joined the State Attorney's staff in 1969, where he served as head of the Capital Crimes Division.

In 1974 Governor Reubin Askew appointed him to the Florida Industrial Relations Commission, where he served until Governor Bob Graham appointed him to the First District Court of Appeals. He served there until January 1983 when Governor Graham appointed him to the Supreme Court. Justice Shaw served as Chief Justice from 1990 to 1992. Following a prestigious career serving the public of Florida, Shaw returned to private practice.

Shaw serves on a number of advisory boards and is a member of various professional and community associations, including the American Bar Association, the National Center for State Courts, and Florida's Human Relations Council and Police Advisory Committee. He has been granted honorary degrees from West Virginia State, Florida International University, Nova University, Washington and Lee University and has been the recipient of such prestigious awards as the Florida Humanist of the Year and the Ben Franklin Award.

Justice Shaw is the father of five children and lives on Lake Iamonia in Leon County.

I submit an article by Tom Cornelison, entitled "Profiles in Courage."

[From Jacksonville Magazine, Nov. 2007]

PROFILES IN COURAGE

(By Tom Cornelison)

Historians debate the merits of his presidency and it is certain his private life did not live up to his public image, but there is little argument that John F. Kennedy was an inspirational leader. When his life was cut short by an assassin in Dallas on November 22, 1963, Kennedy left behind the memories of history that he made and a slender volume of history that he wrote.

It was called Profiles in Courage, a collection of stories about political rather than physical courage in which public officials risked their careers by bucking popular opinion. Just such an episode quietly took place in Jacksonville the week before Kennedy died.

In those days of strict racial segregation throughout the South, Duval County Solicitor Edward M. Booth Sr. and Public Defender T. Edward Austin—a future Jacksonville mayor—each appointed an African-American to their staff. On November 15, 1963, Booth announced the hiring of Alfred R. Taylor while Austin did the same for Leander J. Shaw, who would later serve as chief justice of the Florida Supreme Court. The state's court system was revamped in 1967, but in 1963 the county solicitor functioned as a prosecuting district attorney for non-capital cases. The public defender's office was newly created and supplied legal representation for indigent defendants who could not afford attorneys.

On the second floor of the Duval County Courthouse, near Courtroom No. 8, two men's rooms stand side-by-side. What looks like poor planning today also gives silent testimony to the era in which Taylor and Shaw were appointed. In 1963, one of the men's rooms was labeled "white," the other "colored." Taylor and Shaw could only use the latter because that was the way things were. If they couldn't go in the same men's room as the vilest of white defendants, well, those defendants couldn't use theirs either. It all seemed normal.

"Separate but equal" seems comical when applied to bathrooms and water fountains, but it was grimly serious for society, where services and opportunities were clearly unequal. No black people had served in public or appointive office in Duval County since the enforced integration of the post-Civil War Reconstruction era almost a century before.

"Until Nat Glover was elected sheriff in 1995, we didn't even have a black elected to countywide office after Reconstruction," says Edward Booth Jr., a Jacksonville lawyer and historian who is the son of the 1963 county solicitor. "And the appointments by my father and Mr. Austin took place 32 years before. They were in an era of separate conditions, but it was really an era of separate exclusions.

"The thing is, they didn't have to do it. It was just the right thing to do."

Few controversial decisions are implemented with an in-your-face contempt for the conventional. This was not a movie with inspirational background music. Booth Sr. and Austin presented sound, practical arguments for their action. These centered on the landmark 1963 U.S. Supreme Court ruling on the Gideon vs. Wainwright case. Prior to this ruling, accused Florida lawbreakers in non-capital cases were not entitled to an attorney if they could not afford one. Clarence Earl Gideon. a convicted burglar from Panama City, argued this violated his Constitutional rights and won his case with the help of attorney Abe Fortas, later a U.S. Supreme Court Justice. The story was later dramatized in Gideon's Trumpet, a made-for-TV movie starring Henry Fonda and José Ferrer.

"It was an exciting time in the legal profession. Tremendous changes were taking place," recalls Austin, who is 81 and served as Jacksonville's mayor from 1991–95. "It was also a very busy time. The Gideon decision made a public defender's office necessary because it immediately threw 580 convicted inmates from Jacksonville back into the court system to be retried. We had been sending people without lawyers to prison regularly for years. Very many of these were minorities. It was obvious minorities should be involved In the process. It was just true. There was a great mistrust of the legal system in the black community and we earned that mistrust because the system abused them for decades."

In making his 1963 announcement—timed on a Friday, perhaps to give any resulting anger a weekend to simmer down—Booth Sr. also cited the number of cases involving racial minorities as a reason for the appointment, saying Taylor's experience as a lawyer and, earlier, as a school principal, would be "of immeasurable value . . . in dealing with young Negro defendants."

The term "Negro" was not considered a slur at the time. The Florida Times-Union and Jacksonville Journal both used it in headlines about the appointments. So did the Florida Star, an African-American newspaper that heralded the event as a "Florida breakthrough" and added "Duval County set a statewide precedent."

The Times-Union reported that "Booth said the services of a qualified Negro attorney would greatly assist in the prosecution of cases involving Negro defendants, who represent the majority of persons coming before the court." Booth also favorably cited "work done by Negro assistants employed by" the Sheriff's Office and Juvenile Court.

Besides the logic of black lawyers dealing with black criminal cases, the joint announcement meant Booth and Austin had each side covered—prosecution and defense. Austin insists this was a coincidence.

"Eddie and I were friendly but I don't remember that we ever discussed it at all," Austin says. "Of course, you're talking about a half-century ago, but I don't think we ever talked. I'm just real glad he did it. Spread some of the risk around."

That risk turned out to be non-existent.

At Taylor's funeral in June 1988, Booth said the only criticism he received was from an angry woman who called him at home the next day. He said she called him back an hour later and apologized.

Austin said his only opposition came before his decision to hire the young lawyer.

"A group of 20 or 25 public officials met with me who really didn't want me to make

the appointment,'' he recalls. ''They were not the least bit enamored with my decision and tried to talk me out of it. I said it wouldn't hurt them and it wouldn't hurt me and if it did hurt me, then I'd just go on and do something else for a living.''

''Maybe it's because Judge Shaw's credentials were so impressive, but there was never any negative feedback. You pick a winner, you'll be all right. Still, it surprised me, considering the reaction I had gotten before the announcement. It was not the deal-breaker in the community that they thought. Just a sense of calm. I can remember a few members of the Bar Association raised minor objections when Judge Shaw would cross-examine witnesses in rape cases, but that didn't amount to much.''

Booth's son believes Kennedy's assassination in Dallas one week later overshadowed the appointments. There is no doubt it ate up all the news space and air time, as anyone who can remember that day knows.

''I'm not sure I want to go there,'' Austin says. ''I think if there was going to be any serious criticism I'd have gotten it the first or second day.''

Perhaps the explanation is that racial tension in Jacksonville did not seriously heat up until later in the 1960s.

The younger Booth recalls his house was put under police guard and a slur was spray-painted on the family car when his father successfully prosecuted four Ku Klux Klansmen for brutally attacking an elderly black minister. The September 1965 verdict was the second conviction the elder Booth obtained in a white-on-black crime case with an all-white jury. The defense attorney, incidentally, was J.B. Stoner, the flamboyant white supremacist who later ran for governor of Georgia.

''A lot of people have taken a lot of credit for a lot of things in the advancement of civil rights,'' says the junior Booth. ''There's nothing wrong with that. It's fine that they do. But my dad and Mr. Austin took it in stride.''

''All in a day's work,'' says Austin,

Taylor and Shaw took it in stride, too. An example is a meeting of Austin's staff in which one of the lawyers said, ''Look, we can do what we want. We're free, white and 21.'' All eyes turned to Shaw. Looking perplexed, he dead-panned, ''You want to run that by me again?''

Austin later switched to prosecution and, as state attorney, employed both Taylor and Shaw. Taylor retired in 1977 and died 11 years later. Shaw prosecuted 42 cases and lost only one. In 1979, Gov. Bob Graham appointed Shaw to the state supreme court where he was elevated to chief justice in 1990. He is now 77, retired, and lives in Leon County.

Despite admitted political differences, Austin and Shaw remain close friends. It was Shaw who swore in Austin as Jacksonville's mayor in 1991.

Booth Sr. died in 2006, like Taylor, at age 78.

All but lost to history is a quiet act of political courage that occured in Northeast Florida some 45 years ago, but it lives on as the memory of a job well done by a man in his eighties and in the pride of a son for his father.

RECOGNIZING BRENDAN MOORE FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE FIFTH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brendan Moore for his outstanding work on behalf of the people of the Fifth District of Illinois. For the past two years, Brendan has served as my Legislative Counsel, advising my staff and me on legal issues and doing Judiciary Committee work.

A true Chicagoan and graduate of Loyola University Chicago School of Law, Brendan represented my alma mater with aplomb in his work on various legislative initiatives, including bills to close the gun show loophole and to ensure honest services from our elected officials. Furthermore, his great attitude and hearty sense of humor made working with him a true pleasure.

Perhaps most importantly, as a Notre Dame graduate Brendan gave me someone with whom I could talk ND football—even if the news was usually bad.

Whether it was Honest Services, Judiciary Committee briefings, or football under the Golden Dome, Brendan's thoughtful and professional contributions have been a great boon to our office and we thank him.

As he leaves to pursue public service opportunities back in Chicago, I am confident that his expertise, integrity, and good humor will continue to serve the people of Illinois well. I thank Brendan again for his hard work and wish him the best of luck in the future.

CONGRATULATING REAR ADMIRAL MICHAEL McMAHON

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rear Admiral Michael McMahon, United States Navy, a resident of my home state of Washington, on his upcoming retirement August 11 after 4 years as Program Executive Officer for Aircraft Carriers and 32 years service to his country.

Rear Admiral Michael E. McMahon was commissioned in 1979 from the University of Colorado where he earned a Bachelor of Science Degree in Mechanical Engineering. He has also earned a Master of Science Degree in Mechanical Engineering in 1986 from the Naval Postgraduate School and a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Mechanical Engineering/Materials Science from the Naval Postgraduate School in 1996.

Rear Admiral McMahon's sea assignments included engineering tours onboard USS *Richard S. Edwards* (DD 950), USS *John F. Kennedy* (CV 67), USS *Ranger* (CV 61), and USS *Carl Vinson* (CVN 70) as Chief Engineer. Rear Admiral McMahon's shore assignments included Ship Design Manager, Future Aircraft Carriers Program (CITNX), Naval Sea Systems Command, PMS–378, and Program Director, Future Aircraft Carrier Program (CVNX), Naval Sea Systems Command, PMS–378. He has served as Engineering and Planning Officer and Business Officer at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and IMF. Rear Admiral McMahon has also served as Executive Secretary to the Naval Research Advisory Committee and Government Advisor to the Defense Science Board. In August 2004, he reported as Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN, Newport News, Virginia responsible for the U.S. Navy's Aircraft Carrier and Submarine Ship Construction, refueling and repair programs at Northrop Grumman Newport News. On 3 December 2007, Rear Admiral McMahon assumed command as the fifth Program Executive Officer for Aircraft Carriers.

Rear Admiral McMahon distinguished himself in every aspect of his demanding and complex assignment as the Program Executive Officer for Aircraft Carriers. During his tour he led the effort to begin construction of the Navy's first aircraft carrier design in 40 years, the *Gerald R. Ford* Class, and achieved the major milestone of laying the keel of the first ship of the class, CVN 78, in 2009. He also oversaw the beginning of advanced construction of the second aircraft carrier in the class, *John F. Kennedy* (CVN 79), in 2011.

Rear Admiral McMahon provided capable leadership for in-service aircraft carrier programs at PEO Aircraft Carriers. He organized the Naval Sea System Command's support for the time-critical fire restoration of USS *George Washington* (CVN 73). His leadership was key in driving successful delivery of CVN 73 back to the Fleet to support critical Forward Deployed Naval Forces missions. He also oversaw the successful commissioning and delivery of USS *George H.W. Bush* (CVN 77) the last *Nimitz* class aircraft carrier, which transitioned from delivery to deployment in only 24 months. During his tenure the Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) of USS *Carl Vinson* (CVN 70) was completed under budget and the RCOH of USS *Theordore Roosevelt* was begun. He also oversaw the last drydocking of the Nation's oldest aircraft carrier USS *Enterprise* (CVN 65) and worked to begin the planning for the first nuclear powered aircraft carrier inactivation.

Rear Admiral McMahon's decorations include the Legion of Merit, the Meritorious Service Medal (three awards), Navy Commendation Medal (two awards), Navy Achievement Medal, Liberation of Kuwait Medals (Kuwait and Saudi Arabia), Southwest Asia Service Medal, Navy Expeditionary Medal, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, Navy Unit Commendation, Meritorious Unit Commendation, National Defense Medal, and Sea Service Deployment Ribbon.

For his many years of service to our Nation, I join my colleagues in extending our best wishes upon his retirement and wish him ongoing success in all future endeavors.

HONORING PETTY OFFICER AMILCAR RODRIGUEZ

HON. CHRISTOPHER S. MURPHY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary bravery of Petty Officer Amilcar Rodriguez, who was awarded the Silver Star for his valor in combat. The remarkable courage he demonstrated while aiding fellow soldiers at great personal risk represents the highest caliber of service to his country.

A 1998 graduate of Avon High School, Petty Officer Rodriguez was serving as a Navy corpsman, or medic, on November 6, 2009, in Bala Murghab in Afghanistan when a Marine and two Afghan soldiers in his team were shot and wounded by an enemy sniper. Under extreme duress, Rodriguez returned fire, killing

two enemy combatants. He then exposed himself to enemy fire and was shot three times while dragging the wounded Marine to safety. As other Marines rescued Rodriguez and his colleague, he told them how to treat his wounded colleague. Later, while still seriously injured, Rodriguez assisted other medics in treating the wounded.

The Silver Star is the third-highest military decoration members of the armed forces can receive, and is only given to soldiers who perform "with marked distinction" and demonstrate gallantry in the face of considerable military adversity. The bravery Petty Officer Rodriguez displayed shows his exceptional dedication to the armed forces and to his fellow soldiers.

In reflection of the Silver Star he was recently awarded, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and honoring the incredible actions, courage and selflessness of Connecticut native, Petty Officer Amilcar Rodriguez.

CIVIL RIGHTS ABUSES IN CYPRUS

HON. JESSE L. JACKSON, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of the lives lost to date on Cyprus, and in recognition of the continuing conflict and civil rights abuses taking place on the island.

On July 20, 1974, Turkey invaded Cyprus in response to a Greek led coup, bringing to life a conflict that had long remained dormant. On that day, Turkish armed forces took control of the Northern portion of the island, and continue to occupy nearly 37 percent of Cyprus' territory today.

The continuing occupation has resulted in segregation and division of Greek and Turkish Cypriots, preventing the diverse and peaceful communities that once existed from returning, and inhibiting any communication or peaceful solution to the current crisis.

To date, more than 160,000 Turkish mainland settlers have emigrated to Cyrpus, creating an imbalance in the population. In addition to that figure, the continued presence of 43,000 Turkish troops in Cyprus has contributed to tension between either ethnicity.

During the course of this conflict, more than 200,000 Greek Cypriots have been forced from their homes; 520 Greek Orthodox churches have been vandalized; 15,000 ecclesiastical items have been lost or stolen; nearly 60,000 Cypriot artifacts have been illegally transferred to other nations; and the property of displaced Greek-Cypriots, including homes and business, has been commandeered by mainland Turkish immigrants. These human rights violations, historical defacements, and cultural destruction of the Cypriot legacy must be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, this House and the United Nations have consistently passed resolutions calling for protection of the Cypriot people, restoration of property rights, and the return of stolen historic and religious artifacts. It is critical that a peaceful solution to this standoff is reached, so that all Cypriot people can return to their homes, and rebuild the vibrant, diverse and accepting communities that once existed there.

I urge all parties involved to join in negotiating a settlement that will prevent further devastation and restore peace and security to the island of Cyprus.

TRIBUTE TO THE WOUNDED WARRIORS AT WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER

HON. STEVE AUSTRIA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. AUSTRIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a tribute poem to the brave men and women who were wounded while serving our country—our Wounded Warriors at Walter Reed Army Medical Center:

100 Years . . .
Throughout all that heartache . . .
And all those most swollen tears . . .
And all of that most courageous courage, so seen here . . .
From battlefields of honor bright!
From far across those distant shores, those fights . . .
From deep blue oceans of yore . . .
And all of those heroes, up in those air wars . . .
Who on land, air and sea . . .
Army, Navy, The Air Force, Coast Guard and the United States Marine Corps . . .
Have all brought their Brothers and Sisters In Arms, to Walter Reed . . .
To Heal!
To rebuild where none lies left!
With but only their fine hearts to bless . . .
As it was all here, that they so received . . .
But The Very Best, at Walter Reed!
Doctors and Nurses and Therapists, Soldiers and Social Workers on this great list . . .
Who have but faced the worst, who have but passed that test!
Cheating death, with but only their most courageous quests . . .
With years of training and devoting, to complete their most noble of notions!
But to heal only our very best!
With only their skills and most courageous hearts, no less . . .
Against All Odds, they would not rest . . .
This Battle, Their Valiant Quest, to win that night so yes!
Day In and Day Out . . .
As their fine hearts to them, so shout . . .
Not to give up, nor give in . . .
For this is how miracles all begin!
All out here on the cutting edge . . .
As their fine hearts are but all so pledged . . .
So pledged, but to heal!
To an oath so true, so real!
To Men and Women without arms and legs . . .
Who without eyes and faces, as to them so pray . . .
And yet, with the stress of each new day . . .
How stoically, all of them have made their ways . . .
But, a thank you is all they ask . . .
As they've seen all of those Mothers crying . . .
Out in the halls, with all that pain and heartache . . . asking why then?
Surely, there is no denying . . .
Holding a young man's hand, until he lays dying . . .
As their fine hearts and souls, so trying . . .
And yet, they go to work each day . . .
Asking not much more, then to win those battles great . . .
To save our most precious heroes, all in their light!
With the Gift of Life, they ask but for one more night!
As each and all, are but quiet heroes in God's eyes . . .
As it's in private that they now so cry!
As they go out all about their jobs each day . . .
Attention, to themselves, they'll not pay . . .
As it's to save precious life, for which they pray!
And when that light once again begins to shine . . .
They must now draw a new battle line!
To rebuild . . . to somehow instill . . .
With Hope, the very will . . . all in a fine hero's heart to live!
And somehow to start all over again!
To ready them to rejoin that fight, or to try to start a brand new life . . .
As it's clear, that they've done as much to help win all those wars!
At Walter Reed, have come . . .
Such magnificent men and women, our daughters and sons . . .
Who to death will not heed!
All because they so believe!
All those lives, and all those stories . . .
And all of those children who'll now know the glory . . .
That glory of having a Mom and Dad, and who one day may grow up to be . . .
An Angel, saving lives at Walter Reed!

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today our national debt is $14,342,830,116,551.28.

On January 6, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was $10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by $3,704,404,370,257.48 since then.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

HONORING THE BETHEL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church of Madison, located in Morris County, New Jersey as they celebrate their 165th Anniversary.

Bethel was the first African-American Church in the Borough of Madison, New Jersey. Its beginnings date back to 1846 when informal gatherings first took place. After being deeded property in 1850, Bethel emerged 35 years later in 1885. Bethel Madison is a testimony of growth and constancy, thriving throughout the many decades. It has been witness to over a century and a half of American history. The church has seen its fair share of hardships, but it has managed to survive and thrive.

Today, Bethel's unassuming, traditional structure remains, but what takes place inside

reflects the church's modernity. Led by Reverend Teresa Rynn Rushdan, the congregation is alive and vibrant as sermons and music professing God's love echo throughout the church each week. Bethel serves the community through numerous programs aimed at feeding and clothing the needy. The church also hosts a variety of community events that allows their followers to connect with each other and the rest of the Madison community.

Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church is a place where anyone is welcome to find God. It is a church that welcomes new followers with open arms, regardless of race. Though they are distinguished by the name African, they are a multicultural church. Bethel is truly an embracing ministry devoted to its followers and the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church as they celebrate their 165th Anniversary.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF USPS LETTER CARRIER ED PYRZYNSKI

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the long and distinguished career of Ed Pyrzynski. For over 40 years, he has served as a letter carrier for the United States Postal Service (USPS), and has tirelessly worked to represent and protect the interests of his fellow USPS employees.

The son of Ed and Mary Pyrzynski, Mr. Pyrzynski began his career as a letter carrier for the USPS in 1970. His work was driven by his strong belief that the great service offered by the USPS should be brought to every home and business. Mr. Pyrzynski was also dedicated in ensuring that the most important issues faced by USPS employees were well-represented and considered. In the early 1980s, he became involved with the National Association of Letter Carriers, and was elected as a union steward for the Kedzie Grace Station. Through his work, he helped to promote cooperation between local employees and management by forming committees, organizing station and community events, and identifying various issues for joint resolution.

In the 1990s, Mr. Pyrzynski attended Wright College and Northeastern Illinois University, and graduated magna cum laude with a bachelor's degree in training and development. He also began his work with the Illinois Letter Carrier Association, and later became the legislative liaison for the Illinois 5th Congressional District. In this capacity, he worked closely with my district office and traveled to Washington, D.C. in presenting the most salient issues faced by USPS letter carriers and other working Americans.

Today, Mr. Pyrzynski continues his work for the National Association of Letter Carriers by reconciling employee grievances. He was previously involved in the NALC's Dispute Resolution, a joint effort by USPS employees and management to promote accord in reducing the number of cases that go through costly arbitration resolutions. As he retires from his long and illustrious career, I am certain that Ed looks forward to moving to Arizona with his wife Laura, and spending more time with his family including his sons Jason, Seth, Travis, and Jeremy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Ed Pyrzynski and his commitment to the many businesses and residents in the Chicagoland area, and to the interests of its employees. His tireless service and dedication will be missed, and I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO JOE SNEDEKER

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge a local television personality and educator who has parlayed his regional fame and physical endurance into a community-wide fundraising effort for severely mentally and physically handicapped children in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

Joe Snedeker was born at St. Joseph's Hospital in Carbondale, Pennsylvania, on February 19, 1966. At an early age, Joe showed an aptitude for science. After graduating from Millersville University, Joe got a teaching job at Carbondale Area High School. Between teaching; marrying his wife, Dawn; and raising three children, Joseph, Luke, and Aleah, Joe worked at a local television station on weekends. As a sign of his lifelong commitment to education and learning, Joe recently finished his master's degree in Biology/Environmental Science from East Stroudsburg University.

In 1999, Joe was hired full-time at WNEP–TV. Over the last several years, hundreds of thousands of residents in Northeastern and Central Pennsylvania have tuned in to Joe to find out what the daily weather forecast would be. Joe not only provides the weather forecast, but he also seeks to educate viewers about basic scientific principles.

Fourteen years ago, Joe, an avid cyclist, initiated an annual charity bike ride. For several days each summer, Joe pedals from location to location, raising money for severely mentally and physically handicapped children at St. Joseph's Center in Dunmore, Pennsylvania. Over the years, Joe has started his ride as far away from Northeastern Pennsylvania as Atlantic City, New Jersey; Plymouth Rock, Massachusetts; Cleveland, Ohio; and Kitty Hawk, North Carolina.

Thousands of miles pedaled adds up to well over a million dollars raised—money that supports the outstanding work of the dedicated staff, administration, and volunteers at St. Joseph's Center, an independent Catholic agency sponsored by the Congregation of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary that strives to provide individuals and families who have special needs the opportunity to develop their abilities and potential to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Joe Snedeker for his charitable work on behalf of the mentally and physically handicapped children at St. Joseph's Center in Dunmore, Pennsylvania. Thousands of people—from the families of those children, to the staff and administration of the center, to Joe's devoted viewing audience—join me in congratulating him and wishing him many years of happy pedaling.

H.R. 1938, THE NORTH AMERICAN-MADE ENERGY SECURITY ACT

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chair, I submit the following exchange of letters.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 8, 2011.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1938, the North American-Made Energy Security Act. The Committee on Energy and Commerce recognizes that the Committee on Natural Resources has jurisdiction over H.R. 1938, and I appreciate your effort to waive the Committee's right to take action on it.

I concur with you that foregoing action on H.R. 1938 does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Natural Resources with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or related legislation.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I will include our letters on H.R. 1938 in the Congressional Record during House floor consideration of the bill.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2011.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: I write concerning H.R. 1938, the North American-Made Energy Security Act, which is expected to be scheduled for floor consideration the week of July 25, 2011.

As you know, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure was listed as the Committee of primary jurisdiction when H.R. 1938 was introduced on May 23, 2011. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee will forgo action on the bill.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1938 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. Further, I request your support in the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

As you are aware, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is the Committee of primary jurisdiction on any legislation to reauthorize federal pipeline safety programs. As such, our agreement to forego consideration of H.R. 1938 is also conditional on our mutual understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will not take any Full Committee action on legislation related to the reauthorizing of the federal pipeline safety programs until

the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has acted on such legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 18, 2011.

Hon. JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MICA: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1938, the North American-Made Energy Security Act. The Committee on Energy and Commerce recognizes that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has primary jurisdiction over H.R. 1938, and I appreciate your effort to facilitate consideration of this bill.

I concur with you that foregoing action on H.R. 1938 does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I will support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or related legislation.

I also concur with you that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is the Committee of primary jurisdiction on legislation to reauthorize the federal pipeline safety programs and agree to not take action before September 20, 2011 at full committee on such legislation, allowing the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to take action on such legislation.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I will include our letters on H.R. 1938 in the Congressional Record during House floor consideration of the bill.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, July 8, 2011.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: I write concerning H.R. 1938, the North American-Made Energy Security Act.

As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources received an original referral of H.R. 1938 when it was introduced on May 23, 2011. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1938 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. Further, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Natural Resources during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 26, 2011, I inadvertently voted "aye" on rollcall No. 650. I intended to vote "no."

FAA JOBS LOST AND STOP WORK ORDERS

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following information regarding loss of FAA Jobs:

FAA NON-EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES BY CITY

[As of 7-29, 10AM]

APPN Desc					
State	City	AIP	F&E PCB & T	RE&D	Grand Total
ALASKA	ANCHORAGE	17	62		79
ALASKA Total		17	62	79	1
ARIZONA	PHOENIX		1		1
ARIZONA Total			1		1
CALIFORNIA	BURLINGGAME	17			17
	FULLERTON		2		2
	HAWTHORNE	32	136		168
	LOS ANGELES		2		2
	MOFFETT FIELD			1	1
	OAKLAND		4		4
	PALMDALE		3		3
	SACRAMENTO		5		5
	SAN DIEGO		2		2
	SAN FRANCISCO	1			1
	UPLAND		1		1
CALIFORNIA Total		50	155	1	206
COLORADO	COLORADO SPGS		1		1
	DENVER	1	3		4
	LONGMONT		6		6
	WATKINS	13	3		16
COLORADO Total		14	13		27
CONNECTICUT	WINDSOR LOCKS		1		1
CONNECTICUT Total			1		1
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	WASHINGTON	95	860	61	1016
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA Total		95	860	61	1016
FLORIDA	HILLIARD		1		1
	MELBOURNE		4		4
	MIAMI		3		3
	ORLANDO	19			19
FLORIDA Total		19	8		27
GEORGIA	ATLANTA	2	4	1	7
	COLLEGE PARK	27	10		37
	EAST POINT		287		287
	FULTON COUNTY		1		1
	HAMPTON		4		4
GEORGIA Total		29	306	1	336
HAWAII	HONOLULU	5			5

FAA NON-EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES BY CITY—Continued

[As of 7-29, 10AM]

State	City	APPN Desc			
		AIP	F&E PCB & T	RE&D	Grand Total
HAWAII Total		5		5	
IDAHO	BOISE		1		1
	TWIN FALLS		1		1
IDAHO Total			2		2
ILLINOIS	AURORA		5		5
	CHICAGO		3		3
	DES PLAINES	30	103		133
	ELK GROVE VILLAGE		4		4
ILLINOIS Total		30	115		145
INDIANA	FORT WAYNE		1		1
	INDIANAPOLIS		6		6
INDIANA Total			7		7
KANSAS	OLATHE		14		14
	SHAWNEE		1		1
KANSAS Total			15		15
MARYLAND	BALTIMORE		1		1
	GAITHERSBURG		2		2
	HAGERSTOWN		1		1
	ROCKVILLE		2		2
	SALISBURY		1		1
MARYLAND Total			7		7
MASSACHUSETTS	BOSTON		2		2
	BURLINGTON	18	34		52
	CAMBRIDGE		1		1
MASSACHUSETTS Total		18	37		55
MICHIGAN	BATTLE CREEK		4		4
	DETROIT	1			1
	ROMULUS	3	1		4
	SAGINAW		1		1
	WATERFORD		2		2
	WAYNE COUNTY	10			10
MICHIGAN Total		14	8		22
MINNESOTA	FARMINGTON		3		3
	MINNEAPOLIS	13	2		15
MINNESOTA Total		13	5		18
MISSISSIPPI	JACKSON	10			10
MISSISSIPPI Total		10			10
MISSOURI	INDEPENDENCE		11		11
	KANSAS CITY	24	45		69
MISSOURI Total		24	56		80
MONTANA	HELENA	3			3
MONTANA Total		3			3
NEVADA	LAS VEGAS		1		1
NEDAVA Total			1		1
NEW HAMPSHIRE	NASHUA		42		42
NEW HAMPSHIRE Total			42		42
NEW JERSEY	ATLANTIC CITY	24	497	118	639
	MORRISTOWN		1		1
	NEWARK		5		5
	NEWTONVILLE		1		1
	POMONA		1		1
	TRENTON		4		4
NEW JERSEY Total		24	509	118	651
NEW MEXICO	ALBUQUERQUE		4		4
NEW MEXICO Total			4		4
NEW YORK	GARDEN CITY	16			16
	ISLIP		6		6
	ITHACA		1		1
	NEW YORK		1		1
	NEW YORK-QUEENS	13	80		93
	QUEENS COUNTY	2	6		8
	ROME		1		1
	SYRACUSE		1		1
NEW YORK Total		31	96		127
NORTH DAKOTA	BISMARK	6			6
	GRAND FORKS		1		1
NORTH DAKOTA Total		6	1		7
OHIO	COLUMBUS		1		1
	OBERLIN		4		4
OHIO Total			5		5
OKLAHOMA	OKLAHOMA CITY	3	46	84	133

FAA NON-EXCEPTED EMPLOYEES BY CITY—Continued

[As of 7-29, 10AM]

State	City	APPN Desc			
		AIP	F&E PCB & T	RE&D	Grand Total
OKLAHOMA Total		3	46	84	133
PENNSYLVANIA	ALLENTOWN		1		1
	ALTOONA		1		1
	AVOCA		2		2
	CAMP HILL	8			8
	CORAOPOLIS		6		6
	DU BOIS		1		1
	LESTER		1		1
	NEW CUMBERLAND	1			1
	SCRANTON		4		4
PENNSYLVANIA Total		9	16		25
PUERTO RICO	SAN JUAN		3		3
PUERTO RICO Total			3		3
SOUTH DAKOTA	HURON		1		1
	SIOUX FALLS		1		1
SOUTH DAKOTA Total			2		2
TENNESSEE	MEMPHIS	9	4		13
TENNESSEE Total		9	4		13
TEXAS	DALLAS		1		1
	EULESS		1		1
	FORT WORTH	42	216		258
	HOUSTON		7		7
TEXAS Total		42	225		267
UTAH	SALT LAKE CITY		5		5
UTAH Total			5		5
VIRGINIA	CHANTILLY		1		1
	DULLES AIRPORT	9			9
	HAMPTON		1	1	2
	HERNDON		6		6
	LEESBURG		6		6
	LOUDOUN COUNTY		1		1
	NORFOLK		2		2
	VIRGINIA BEACH		2		2
VIRGINIA Total		9	19	1	29
WASHINGTON	AUBURN		3		3
	NEAH BAY		1		1
	RENTON	29	177		206
	SEATTLE		5		5
WASHINGTON Total		29	186		215
WEST VIRGINIA	BEAVER	2			2
	BECKLEY	1			1
WEST VIRGINIA Total		3			3
Grand Total		506	2822	266	3594

HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP JEOPARDIZES MORE THAN 90,000 AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION AND FAA EMPLOYEE JOBS

	Airport Construction Funding Lost	Airport Construction Jobs Lost	FAA Employee Jobs Lost	Total Jobs Lost
Alabama	$32,400,000	1,127		1,127
Alaska	69,700,000	2,424	79	2,503
Arizona	35,100,000	1,221	1	1,221
Arkansas	25,900,000	901		901
California	131,500,000	4,573	206	4,779
Colorado	34,200,000	1,189	27	1,216
Connecticut	4,700,000	163	1	164
Delaware	800,000	28		28
District of Columbia	300,000	10	1,016	1,026
Florida	88,000,000	3,061	27	3,088
Georgia	67,100,000	2,334	336	2,670
Hawaii	21,300,000	741	5	746
Idaho	17,500,000	609	2	611
Illinois	90,300,000	3,141	145	3,286
Indiana	19,400,000	675	7	682
Iowa	41,100,000	1,429		1,429
Kansas	41,900,000	1,457	15	1,472
Kentucky	18,700,000	650		650
Louisiana	33,500,000	1,165		1,165
Maine	12,700,000	442		442
Maryland	9,100,000	316	7	323
Massachusetts	17,900,000	623	55	678
Michigan	36,400,000	1,266	22	1,288
Minnesota	36,200,000	1,259	18	1,277
Mississippi	34,600,000	1,203	10	1,213
Missouri	24,600,000	856	80	936
Montana	18,700,000	650	3	653
Nebraska	21,900,000	762		762
Nevada	36,000,000	1,252	1	1,253
New Hampshire	3,700,000	129	42	171
New Jersey	44,700,000	1,555	651	2,206
New Mexico	25,400,000	883	4	887
New York	62,600,000	2,177	127	2,304
North Carolina	45,600,000	1,586		1,586
North Dakota	22,800,000	793	7	800
Ohio	38,900,000	1,353	5	1,358
Oklahoma	54,800,000	1,906	133	2,039
Oregon	16,500,000	574		574
Pennsylvania	28,300,000	984	25	1,009

HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP JEOPARDIZES MORE THAN 90,000 AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION AND FAA EMPLOYEE JOBS—Continued

	Airport Construction Funding Lost	Airport Construction Jobs Lost	FAA Employee Jobs Lost	Total Jobs Lost
Rhode Island	1,100,000	38		38
South Carolina	30,700,000	1,068		1,068
South Dakota	25,700,000	894	2	896
Tennessee	34,700,000	1,207	13	1,220
Texas	72,100,000	2,508	267	2,775
Utah	10,100,000	351	5	356
Vermont	4,800,000	167		167
Virginia	40,500,000	1,409	29	1,438
Washington	37,900,000	1,318	215	1,533
West Virginia	10,800,000	376	3	379
Wisconsin	25,300,000	880		880
Wyoming	15,900,000	553		553
Puerto Rico	15,900,000	553	3	556
Other Territories	9,900,000	344		344
Discretionary Grants	800,000,000	27,823		27,823
TOTAL	$2,500,200,000	86,954	3,594	90,548

Note: This table was prepared by Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Democratic Staff based on technical assistance from the Federal Aviation Administration. The Airport Construction Jobs Lost column is based on the 2007 Federal-aid Highway Administration model on the correlation between infrastructure investment and employment: $1 billion of Federal-aid Highway investment creates or sustains 34,779 jobs over a seven-year period.

FAA STOP-WORK ORDERS THAT HAVE BEEN ISSUED

Name of the contractor	Project location(s)	Type of work	Value of the contract
Jacobs Engineering	California, Oregon, Texas, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, D.C., Florida, Minnesota, Illinois, Virginia.	Architect & engineering, construction for en route centers and combined en route and approach facilities.	$370,000,000
Reliant Contractors	Greenville, MS	Construction of remote communications air-ground facility	97,500
Flintco, Inc	Gulf Port, MS	Tower construction	11,845,620
Daniel J. Keating Co	Wilkes Barre, PA	Tower construction	14,721,356
Paul J. Scariano Inc	New York	Demolition of LGA tower	6,324,387
Sheckler Contracting, Inc	Leesburg, VA	Roof replacement at en route center	363,000
Nationwide Construction Group	PA, NY	Construction, physical security	718,000
M&M Enterprises	Dulles, VA	Fence construction	56,000
Jones Morgan Inc	Rochester, NY	Construction	346,000
Boykin Contracting Inc	Greenwood, MS	Construction	56,000
KOBO Utility & Electric	Hyannis, MA	Construction of Precision Approach Path Indicator lights	37,000
Flintco, Inc	Memphis, TN	Tower construction	55,953,326
Patriot Electric Inc	Providence, RI	Fire alarm, construction	237,000
Standard Builders Inc	Memphis, TN	Painting	18,000
Corinthian	Warrenton, VA	Construction of new Command Center	24,338,718
6K Systems Inc	Burlington, MA	Computer services	234,000
Chappy Corp	Baltimore, MD	Site preparation for installation of BWI ASDE–X	2,279,576
AKAL Security Inc	Baltimore, MD	BWI ASDE–X	91,500
Limbach Co. Inc	Oakdale, PA	Boiler, construction	205,000
Construction and Service Solutions	Rochester, NY	Roof construction	316,000
Peachtree Mechanical Inc	VA	Construction at Washington en route center	631,000
Sheckler Contracting Inc	NY	Construction at JFK tower	155,000
S&E Services, Inc	Garden City, NY	Construct a catwalk in NY TRACON	1,781,000
Limbach Company LLC	Pittsburgh, PA	Plumbing, construction	175,000
CUSA Consulting Corp	Erie, PA	Fire life safety, construction	112,000
Postier & Jaeckle Inc	Rochester, NY	Construction	27,000
Petersen-Dean Inc	Jacksonville, FL	Construction at Jacksonville en route center	55,000
Marathon Electric Inc	Memphis, TN	Construction at Memphis en route center	88,500
Moulison North Corp	Portland, ME	Electrical project	9,000
Cornerstone Construction Services	Lawrence, MA	Roof construction	47,000
Pine Tree Elevator	Portland, ME	Elevator project	163,000
CGMC Building Corp	Poughkeepsie, NY & Danbury, CT	Seismic upgrade	488,000
ProwaC™ess Construction Corp	Lawrence, MA	Facility modernization Construction	123,700
Atlantic Defense Contractor	Portland, ME	Seismic upgrade	935,000
Synthesis Inc	Ronkonkoma, NY	Drain project	10,000
McKercher Corp	Miami, FL	Electric project, construction	133,900
Synthesis Inc	Ronkonkoma, NY	Construction upgrade	256,700
CMGC Building Corp	Nashua, NH	Mechanical room construction	88,500
LVI Services Security	New York, NY	Construction	1,100,000
Construction Services	Nashua, NH	Construction, attic rehab.	4,670,000
Peachtree Specialty Group	Atlanta, GA	Construction at Atlanta en route center	133,900
Louis Berger & Associates	New York	Asbestos removal, construction	168,500
TJB Air Conditioning and Heating	19 Terminal Doppler Weather Radar facilities	HVAC renovations	1,030,000
Swinterton Builders	Palm Springs, CA	Construction of tower	14,229,775
Devon Construction, Inc	Oakland, CA	Construction of tower	31,000,304
Cobalt Construct	Palmdale, CA	Construction (86% complete), modernization of 2d floor of automation wing and control floor, attic.	12,146,449
Bara Infoware	Sacramento, CA	Replace roof and visitor entrance wall panels at Tracon	759,567
E Corp	Auburn, WA	2d floor automation wing	2,294,220
Ahtna Engineering Services LLC	Bethel, AK	Airport Approach and Runway Entrance Lights installation	843,816
Archer Western Contractors	Las Vegas, NV	Construction of new tower	43,429,116
Archer Western Contractors	Abilene, TX	Construction of new tower	15,722,800
Archer Western Contractors	Traverse City, MI	Construction of new tower	11,062,093
Archer Western Contractors	Kansas City, KS	2nd floor modernization construction, attic at en route center	2,399,970
Archer Western Contractors	Albuquerque, NM	Construction build out at en route center	1,984,002
Imperial Construction Weatherford TX	Houston, TX	Construction of replacement TRACON	25,085,257
Imperial Construction Weatherford TX	Chicago, IL	Parking lot replacement at en route center	1,500,000
Skanska	Kalamazoo, MI	Construct new tower	14,422,975
Skanska	GFK	Install new radio transmitter receiver	848,500
Skanska	Walnut Ridge, AR	Install new Medium-Intensity Approach Lighting for runway	587,000
Concept Solutions, LLC	Reston, VA	Business Management Support for Joint Planning and Development Office	1,447,999
Allied Technology Group	Rockville, MD	Program Management Technical Support Services for ATO Finance	1,174,421
CGH Technologies, Inc	Washington, DC	Various projects per Work Order. Support for Aeronautical Information Management (AIM) Obstruction Evaluation.	129,184,768.00
CGH Technologies, Inc	Washington, DC	Various projects per Work Order. Support for Aeronautical Information Management (AIM) Obstruction Evaluation.	54,075,701.00
CGH Technologies, Inc	Washington, DC	Various projects per Work Order. Current WO for development support for airports Geographic Information System.	54,075,701.00
Network Designs Inc. (NDI)	Vienna, VA	Security Engineering Support for FAA's Alaska Flight Service Modernization (AFSM) Program.	914,961.54
Lockheed Martin	Washington, DC	Program Management Support for ATO Technical Operations	233,000
AST Eng	Multiple locations	ERAM support services will be halted at all locations except Seattle and Salt Lake City	3.5M
Science Applications International	Las Vegas, Minneapolis, Dulles, Charlotte, Chicago, O'Hare, Ft. Lauderdale, Newark, LaGuardia, Phoenix, Houston, Seattle, Los Angeles.	Engineering support for runway status lights	37M
Sensis Corp	Las Vegas, Minneapolis, Dulles, Charlotte, Chicago, O'Hare, Ft. Lauderdale, Newark, LaGuardia, Phoenix, Houston, Seattle, Los Angeles.	Runway Status Lights	214M
JVN	Multiple locations	Flight Information Regions	2.3M
Sensis	Multiple locations	ASDE–X	390M
SAIC	Multiple locations	ASDE–X Program Management Office (PMO) Support	104M
Arcon Corporation	Multiple locations	Terminal Automation IV&V	14.1M
Regulus Corp**	Multiple locations	Terminal Surveillance Special Technical	31.8M
Boeing	Multiple locations	Future Air Navigation System Interoperability Team (FIT) Program	200k
Lockheed Martin**	Multiple locations	En Route Communications Gateway	151M
Lockheed Martin**	Multiple locations	HOST Sustainment	619M

FAA STOP-WORK ORDERS THAT HAVE BEEN ISSUED—Continued

Name of the contractor	Project location(s)	Type of work	Value of the contract
L3 Communications**	Multiple locations	Oceanic Integrated Services (OIS) Contract	57.5M
TASC**	Multiple locations	TAQ_2	384M
Apptis**	Multiple locations	ATO-Terminal Support Services	20.6M
MCR**	Multiple locations	ATO-T Support Services	25M
TASC/NG**	Multiple locations	ATO-T Support Services	21.8M
SAIC**	Multiple locations	ATO-T Support Services	21.1M
ITT**	Multiple locations	ATO-T Support Services	34.3M
Technology Service Corp**	Multiple locations	Radar Support System	1.7M
A3**	Multiple locations	ATO-T Support Services	3.7M
Enterprise**	Multiple locations	ATO-T Support Services	2M
S&K**	Multiple locations	ATO-T Support Services	2.9M
JMA Group	Washington, DC	Support to Aeronautical Information Management (AIM) Office	3M
CSC Corporation	Rockville, MD	Traffic Flow Management Software System	593M
CNA Group	Alexandria, VA	Analysis, Systems Engineering and Operations Research for the AIM Office	6.2M
Jacobs Facilities Group, Inc.	ZOA Modernize	Curtain Wall Replacement and Mod. 4 Renovation	5,838,000
Jacobs Facilities Group, Inc.	ZHU Admin Wing	Administration Wing Renovation	6,960,000
Jacobs Facilities Group, Inc	San Juan CERAP	Seismic Upgrade	11,500,000
Jacobs Facilities Group, Inc	ZJX Curtain Wall	Curtain Wall Replacement	1,770,000
Jacobs Facilities Group, Inc	ZDC Curtain Wall	Curtain Wall Replacement	2,530,000
Jacobs Facilities Group, Inc	ZAU Curtain Wall	Curtain Wall Replacement	2,200,000
Jacobs Facilities Group, Inc	ZMP Major Mechanical	Major Mechanical Upgrade	6,230,000
Jacobs Project Mgmt Co	LiHue ATCT, HI	Seismic Modernization Upgrade	3,700,000
Jacobs Project Mgmt Co	Livermore ATCT, CA	Seismic Modernization	505,000
Jacobs Project Mgmt Co	Palo Alto ATCT, CA	Seismic Modernization	479,000
Jacobs Project Mgmt Co	Santa Maria ATCT, CA	Seismic Modernization	497,000
Jacobs Project Mgmt Co	Anchorage, ATCT, AK	Seismic Modernization	563,000
Jacobs Project Mgmt Co	Salem ATCT, OR	Seismic Modernization	340,000
Jacobs Project Mgmt Co	Hillsboro ATCT, OR	Seismic Modernization	140,000
Jacobs Engineering Group	BACNet Upgrade	BACNet Upgrade	900,000
The Matthews Group	ARTCC Miami	Major Mechanical & Seismic Upgrade	4,200,000
Belfour Beatty Jacobs	ARTCC Jacksonville	Major Mechanical & Seismic Upgrade	8,800,000
Engineering Group	NextGen	NextGen Facilities Design and Prototype	9,800,000
RW Armstrong	San Juan CERAP	Major Mechanical	4,200,000
Burton Construction	ARTCC Denver	Piping Upgrade	250,000
Burton Construction	Guam CERAP	FY12 Consolidated Projects	700,000
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Abilene, TX	Work Release 156—ABI LOC	386,000
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Abilene, TX	Work Release160—NEXCOM Radio Replacement	1,007,032
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Abilene, TX	Work Release 164—ABQ FAA Telecommunications Infrastructure (1,11)/Microwave Links	235,600
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Abilene, TX	Work Release 179—Abilene ATCT	430,000
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Abilene, TX	Work Release 194—NEXCOM Abilene RTR Relocation	210,000
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Dallas Fort Worth	Work Release 167—NEXCOM Radio Replacement	1,096,066
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Hobby Field	Work Release 176?C" Hobby Remote Transmitter/Receiver (RTR)	268,987
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Houston, TX	Work Release 178 I90 TRACON	1,000,000
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Alamogordo, TX	Work Release 185—NEXCOM	325,927
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Alamorgordo, TX	Work Release 187—Fiber Optics Transmission System (FOTS) Engineering	400,018
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	San Antonio, TX	Work Release 188—Relocation of San Antonio (SAT) Backup Emergency Communications Systems to Stinson Field (SSF) RTR.	124,914
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	San Antonio, TX	Work Release 193—NEXCOM	103,127
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Beaumont, TX	Work Release 199—NEXCOM Beaumont RTR	68,664
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Woodford, CT	Work Release CT–11–0128 HVAC Modifications F Mills	1,003,784
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Woodford, CT	Work Release Relese CT–11–0137 Reconfiguration F Merly	78,121
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Palm Springs, CA	Work Release 348, ARRA Palm Springs, ATCT	545,000
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Oakland, CA	Work Release 353, ARRA Oakland ATCT	985,300
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Northern, AZ	Work Release 361, Northern AZ Airspace Project	91,998
Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group	Chicago, IL	Work Release 196, EIT Chicago	38,645
L3 Communications	Atlantic City, NJ	All the ongoing System Engineering (SE) and Information System Security (ISS) technical activities for System Wide Information Management (SWIM), DataComm, Aeronautical Message Handling System (AMHS), Enroute Radar Intelligent Tool (ERIT), and NextGen Network Enabled Weather (NNEW) would cease. All major milestones for these programs will be impacted and may not be met.	19.6M
General Dynamics	Fairfax, VA	2012-2012 —"Nextgen Integration and Evaluation Capability (NIEC); Conflict Probe Assessment Team (CPAT); Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) Simulations, UAS Certificate Of Authorization (COA) Support and support for the JPDO office.	17M
Engility Corp	Atlantic City, NJ	Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast Ground	5.7M
Basic Commerce & Industries, Inc.	Atlantic City, NJ	AWOTES—" Reduce Weather Impact (RWI), NextGen Network Enabled Weather (NNEW), NextGen Weather Processor (NWP), legacy fielded weather systems support, technical support for Program Office and weather technology in the cockpit.	14.5M
Engility Corp	Atlantic City NJ	Local Area Augmentation System—" Technical Support for Ground-Based Augmentation System SIAM and Surface Trajectory Based Operations (STBO).	1.1M
Engility Corp	Atlantic City, NJ	DADSB—" Broadcast Airborne	1.5M
General Dynamics	Fairfax, VA	Nextgen Lab Support	18M
Digital Ibiz	Atlantic City, NJ	Engineering & Maintenance Oceanic Integration and Interoperability Facility lab	1M
Engility Corp	Atlantic City, NJ	Engineering & Programming Support—" Research Development and Human Factors Lab (RDHFL).	7.9M
Four Winds Services, Inc.	Atlantic City, NJ	Aircraft Maintenance	5.4M
HiaSun	Atlantic City, NJ	FASTER pavement test facility/AVGAS	3.6M
JDS Management Services	Atlantic City, NJ	Airway Faci9lities Tower Integration Lab	5.3M
SRA	Atlantic City, NJ	Airport Test Machine	57M
Hi-Tec Systems	Atlantic City, NJ	Safety Assessment of NSA and Unmanned Aircraft Systems	2M
Cherokee, CRC	Atlantic City, NJ	Terminal Area Safety Support	5M
Lumark	Atlantic City, NJ	Safety assessment of National Airspace System	5.1M
Lumark	Atlantic City, NJ	Technical Editing	9.2M
Embry Riddle Aeronautical Univ.	Daytona Beach, FL	General Aviation Research	20M
TAMI	Atlantic City, NJ	Fire Safety Testing	9.4M
A3 Technology, Inc.	Atlantic City, NJ	Laboratory Technical Services	7.9M
C-FAR Services, LLC	Atlantic City, NJ	Laboratory Technical Services	700K
Engility Corp.	Atlantic City, NJ	Navigation Services	600K
JDS Management Services	Atlantic City, NJ	ATC Voice Communications	4.5M
ESG	Atlantic City, NJ	Communications	9.7M
Basic Commerce & Industries, Inc.	Atlantic City, NJ	Surface surveillance	5.4M
Basic Commerce & Industries, Inc.	Atlantic City, NJ	Aeronautical Telecommunication Network (ATN) Software Development and Engineering Support.	7.5M
Honeywell	Conn rapids, MN	Local Area Augmentation System (LAAS)—Modification of Global Navigation Satellite Systems (GNSS) landing system Test Bed.	5.3M
Honeywell	Memphis, TN and Houston, TX	Ground Based Augmentation System relocation from Memphis to Houston	650K
Smithers Quality	Atlantic City, NJ	ISO Certification Services for Technical Center Labs	95K
CSSI	Atlantic City, NJ	Simulation & Modeling	4.9M
Boeing Aerospace Systems**	Washington, DC	Research, concept development, and prototyping of NextGen technologies	1.7B
ITT**	Washington, DC	Research, concept development, and prototyping of NextGen technologies	1.4B
Metron Aviation**	Washington, DC	Research, concept development, and prototyping of NextGen technologies	1.14B
Booz Allen Hamilton	Washington, DC	Task Order Request Package (TORP) 1073—Systems Tool Application Support	250K
Booz Allen Hamilton	Washington, DC	TORP 1184—Enterprise Architecture and Engineering Support	1M
Booz Allen Hamilton	Washington, DC	Systems Engineering for the National Airspace System	650K
General Dynamics**	Washington, DC	Research, concept development, and prototyping of NextGen technologies	1.18B
NCI INC	Washington, DC and remote from FL	Contract Support work for the National Airspace Implementation Support Contract (NISC) office.	6.1M
Topologe, LLC	Washington, DC	Contract Support for Power Services	680K
Oceus Networks, Inc	Multiple Continental US locations	Installation and support contract	11.4M

*Note: This list reflects projects in various stages of construction. The FAA will continue to update the list as more stop work orders are issued and more information becomes available.
NOTE (**)—Partial Stop-Work Order Issued.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today to urge all of my colleagues to support the Bishop amendment to H.R. 2551, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2012. This amendment would restore $1 million in funding to the Capitol Police to provide support for security upgrades to Congressional District offices as recommended by the House Sergeant of Arms earlier this year.

Most members, particularly members from rural districts with more than one district office, will undertake a variety of ''security'' upgrades and improvements to their local offices as a result of the tragic shooting of Rep. GABRIELLE GIFFORDS and related security threats.

Coupled with the costs of these new upgrades are reductions in the Members' Representational Allowance MRA for the second year in a row. This includes the 5 percent reduction in MRA in place for Fiscal Year 2011 and the proposed 6.4 percent reduction in MRA proposed in the Fiscal Year 2012 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, which will be considered on the floor this week. The Fiscal Year 2012 proposed reduction in MRA will result in an average hit of approximately $95,000 per office, which will likely pose a severe strain on Member budgets. Additionally, you should know that security upgrades and improvements to Senate District offices will not be paid through MRA's.

My amendment would simply provide an additional $1 million in funding via the Capitol Police for security improvements for those offices impacted by new House security policy. The proposed offset comes from the ''Transition Activities'' account, which essentially provides funding for furniture and related equipment for Freshman members, which of course, should be minimal in Fiscal Year 2012.

Mr. Chair, it would be our intent, that if this amendment is accepted by this House, that the Sergeant at Arms, Capitol Police, members of our Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee and other pertinent House personnel, would work together to devise an effective plan and strategy for the use, approval and disbursement of these funds for district office security purposes.

The pressure and demands which we already have in managing our MRA's are great, and will be more difficult in the coming year. So it is vitally important that we provide Members of this body some financial relief for the costs of district office security improvements.

While the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee has the smallest budget of the thirteen Appropriations Subcommittees, and some would say that it is the least glamorous, its work is of vital importance to the entire nation.

As most of you know, the Subcommittee is responsible for the protection and preservation of the treasures in the U.S. Capitol and the Library of Congress, the publishing and dissemination of government information by the Government Printing Office, the objective analysis of our budget and economic decisions by the Congressional Budget Office, and the resources with which we provide representation to our constituents.

However, our collective effectiveness in representing our constituents is potentially at risk given the proposed reductions in our MRA's.

And I would like to remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, that after the tragic shootings in Tucson, Members were ''strongly encouraged'' to provide additional security for themselves, their staff and their constituents in the district—to be paid out of Members' accounts, with possibly some help from the Sergeant at Arms.

With this bill's cut of 6.4 percent in Members' Representational Allowance, combined with the 10 percent in the Sergeant at Arms budget, these improvements in security will be difficult.

Finally, if the Capitol Police are going to assess more threats against Members and take a more active role in district security, then their budget should also reflect these increased demands instead of being frozen.

Mr. Chair, I would also like to enter into the RECORD, a copy of an article that ran in Roll Call, highlighting the need for enhanced safety advancements for Members of Congress, their staffs, and constituencies.

I would ask that you support this important amendment. Thank you for your consideration.

[From Roll Call, July 21, 2011]

CUTS TO SERGEANT-AT-ARMS RAISE CONCERNS FOR SOME

(By Daniel Newhauser)

After the shooting of Rep. Gabrielle Giffords (D–Ariz.) in January, Members began looking into ways to secure their district offices. Now, some Democrats are questioning whether House leaders will give them enough money to do so.

Members' Representational Allowances and the House Sergeant-at-Arms office face budget cuts, while House appropriators have proposed flat funding for the Capitol Police.

At a Rules Committee hearing Wednesday to set parameters for this week's floor debate on the legislative branch spending bill, Rep. Jared Polis—who said he received threats as recently as last week—singled out those cuts as his main concern.

''Security is hardly a luxury,'' the Colorado Democrat said. ''How can you justify cutting the Sergeant-at-Arms by 10 percent?''

Although the Sergeant-at-Arms' budget appears larger than it was last Congress, the increase actually comes because it was combined with the Office of Emergency Management, which was created after 9/11 to assist in emergency planning. That office was flat-funded, while the Sergeant-at-Arms received an $890,000 cut.

Rep. Ander Crenshaw, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch, assured Polis that the reduction would not affect security. In an interview before the hearing, the Florida Republican said administrative employees and equipment purchases would most likely take the hit.

''We made sure that none of the cuts to this office were going to affect any kind of safety issues,'' he said.

After the Giffords shooting, the Sergeant-at-Arms offered Members free ADT Security assessments in the district offices. The House Administration Committee also authorized Members to use their MRAs to pay for suggested security enhancements.

But between the 5 percent MRA cut of last fiscal year and the 6.4 percent cut proposed for fiscal 2012—a reduction that would average about $80,000 per office—Members might be put in a situation where they have to choose to fire one employee in order to afford to protect the rest, some Democrats argued.

''We are told that we need to secure our district offices more—for our safety, the safety of our staff and, most importantly, the safety of our constituents,'' said Rep. Mike Honda (D-Calif.), the subcommittee's ranking member, in a statement. ''How are we supposed to pay for that?''

Rep. G.K. Butterfield said he had planned to install bulletproof glass and a digital combination keypad lock at his North Carolina district office, but now he's not so sure.

''That was the plan. Now that we've got this dramatic cut, I don't know what we're going to do,'' the Democrat said.

Rep. Sanford Bishop said he's skeptical Members will be left with enough money in their MRAs to pay for the upgrades. He was advised to improve lighting and create a barrier between his Georgia offices' public and work areas.

''The security assessments that the Sergeant-at-Arms paid for for all of our offices were very, very telling. But to implement the recommendations for the safety of our constituents and Members and staffs, it's going to cost some funds,'' the Democrat said. ''The MRA is not sufficient.''

Bishop has proposed an amendment to the legislative branch bill that would reassign $1 million from a fund used to assist freshmen in procuring furniture to create a fund within the Capitol Police to assist in paying for district security upgrades.

Sergeant-at-Arms spokeswoman Kern Hanley said that no matter where the budget ends up, the agency would ''be able to fully execute our security mission'' and that they will help Members efficiently spend their money.

''We will coordinate the provision of professional security assistance to Members by conducting surveys and reviewing office selection options, security systems and policies to aid them in achieving the best value for their security dollars spent,'' Hanley said in an email.

Republicans said that is the real lesson of the budget cut: Do more with less.

Rep. Michael Grimm, a former FBI agent, said Members can mitigate the security impact of the cuts by raising their awareness when they are at home.

''We have to be a little more efficient but also a little more diligent so the Capitol Police has less work,'' the New York Republican said. ''None of that costs money.''

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF EDWARD LEITNER ON HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great joy and honor that I rise to wish Edward Leitner a very happy birthday as he turns 100 years old today. Edward, a resident of Westbrook, Connecticut, is a veteran of World War II and a shining example of this country's Greatest Generation. I had the opportunity to meet Edward last month at a barbeque culminating Wounded Warriors week—an important,

seven-day event honoring the sacrifice of heroes like Edward—sponsored by the Connecticut and Westbrook Elks.

Edward was born in New York City on July 27, 1911. In 1920, he and his family moved to the Pond Meadow region of Westbrook where Edward's father had bought a farm. After graduating from the Pond Meadow School—a one-room schoolhouse still standing today—Edward left home at a young age. He went on to work at a variety of different jobs. He worked in a candy factory, held a construction job on the Merit Parkway, and worked for the railroad.

An automotive mechanic by occupation, Edward was inducted into the Army on November 30, 1942. He served as a member of the 100th Infantry Division, 398th Regiment, which put him in the thick of operations across Central Europe, including Germany. The 398th led the way at Heilbronn, Vosges Mountains, and the Battle of the Bulge. To this day, his family proudly recalls hearing about Mr. Leitner's central role in some of the war's most historic and epic battles. Edward, who earned several decorations and positive citations in the Army, was honorably discharged in March of 1946.

Edward's family describes him as their hero. They say he is a guy who can fix anything and do anything—and he has. Edward, for his brave and historic service to this great Nation, is my hero too. Mr. Leitner, despite his extraordinary story and experiences is an unassuming, down to earth gentleman who is a pleasure to meet and an example to us all. I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in wishing Edward Leitner a happy 100th birthday and thanking him for his great service.

SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM EXTENSION AND REFORM ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 2011

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for reauthorizing the Small Business Administration, which helps countless entrepreneurs receive the training and access the capital they need to start and expand small businesses and create jobs. While I support the reauthorization of these vital programs, I am concerned with provisions in the underlying bill that would prevent some entrepreneurs from obtaining vital assistance.

Specifically, H.R. 2608 singles out the e200 Emerging Leaders program for elimination, which targets entrepreneurs in underserved communities across the country like metro Detroit that have been severely impacted in these tough economic times. This program targets businesses in inner cities and economically hard-hit areas that show a high potential for growth, providing them with the network, know-how and resources they need to build a sustainable, growing business that promotes economic development within their communities. This program has a proven track record. Small businesses that complete the program increase their revenues and create jobs where they are needed most.

In addition to eliminating this vital program, this bill prevents the Small Business Administration from carrying out any succeeding program with similar goals. While I support the underlying reauthorization of the Small Business Administration, I strongly disagree with the elimination of the e200 Emerging Leaders program, and the prohibition of future initiatives that help small businesses thrive in some of the areas hardest hit by the recession.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2684) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I rise to oppose the underlying bill and the numerous extreme, anti-environmental riders included therein.

I rise to oppose the underlying bill and the numerous extreme, anti-environmental riders included therein.

Mr. Chair, this bill is full of anti-environmental riders. These riders are legislative provisions that were attached to an appropriations bill because they are far too extreme to pass Congress on their own merits. Together, these riders undermine decades of progress protecting our nation's environmental heritage. They threaten the air we breath and the water we drink.

One of the riders in this bill stops the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, from giving Clean Water Act protection to critical headwaters and streams that supply drinking water to about 117 million Americans.

Another rider prevents the EPA from updating its stormwater discharge regulations to manage polluted stormwater runoff, which contaminates water supplies and contributes to beach closures. Last year was the second highest year on record for beach closings and advisories.

Yet another rider changes current law to eliminate requirements for chemical companies to obtain permits for pesticides entering rivers and streams. This will mean even more of these toxic poisons in our lakes, rivers, fishing places, and drinking water supplies.

The Cross-State Air Pollution rider prohibits EPA from implementing a rule to protect communities from pollution caused by power plants upwind of them. EPA estimates that this rule will prevent up to 34,000 premature deaths, 15,000 heart attacks, 400,000 cases of aggravated asthma, and 1.8 million sick days a year beginning in 2014.

The Mercury and Air Toxics rider blocks EPA from finalizing a rule reducing emissions of mercury and other toxics from power plants. EPA estimates that this rule could deliver as much as $140 billion in health benefits and prevent 17,000 premature deaths each year.

The Cement Kilns rider prohibits EPA from enforcing limits on emissions of mercury, particulate matter, and hydrochloric acid from cement kilns. These limits would reduce mercury pollution and fine particulate matter from cement kilns by 92 percent, preventing up to 2,500 premature deaths and avoiding 17,000 cases of aggravated asthma each year.

Finally, the Offshore Drilling rider allows oil companies to pollute more by exempting support vessels involved in offshore oil drilling from regulation. This provision undermines the ability of the EPA to ensure that oil drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf proceeds safely, responsibly, and with opportunities for stakeholder input. We've already seen from the BP oil spill how dangerous offshore oil drilling can be.

On top of all of these dangerous riders, this bill slashes funding for the EPA by 18 percent below the 2011 level, in addition to the 16 percent cut that was inflicted on the agency when compared to the 2010 level. These cuts would leave the Environmental Protection Agency unable to effectively regulate pollution or protect public health, even when it is not prevented from doing so by an anti-environmental rider.

This entire bill is a threat to our public lands and our public health, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES T. MALLOY

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated public servant James T. Malloy who served as the last Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, a man I'm proud to have called a a mentor and friend.

Americans knew him as the bellowing voice we'd be waiting for at the start of the annual State of the Union address; the voice that would yell over the hundreds assembled in the House chamber, "Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States." That first introduction came for President Gerald Ford in 1975 only a few weeks after his appointment.

I was privileged to know the man behind the voice, the man who mentored hundreds of members of Congress and staffers who passed through his doorway and the man who was beloved by everyone in this chamber.

Jimmy was incredibly helpful to me when I first came to Congress 24 years ago. He provided a good listening ear and sage advice. Put simply he was an extraordinary human being and he had no bigger fans than those of us from Western New York.

As the proud son of a South Buffalo firefighter, he put Buffalo on the map on a daily basis.

One of Buffalo's other proud sons, Tim Russert, described Jimmy as "a good man, who knew everybody and was always proud of taking care of his own."

"I'll accept that, I like that," Jimmy responded when he heard the description with the humility that personified his rustbelt roots.

In 1994, Jim's last duty was to introduce the new Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich. Since then, there's been no Doorkeeper of the House. I believe no one could possibly follow him. He has been missed in this House and will certainly be remembered fondly by everyone that knew him. He made Buffalo proud and the lives he touched richer. For that, we are all thankful.

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, July 28, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

AUGUST 2

10 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on national mortgage servicing standards.

SD–538

Environment and Public Works

Clean Air and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings to examine a review of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) near-term task force recommendations for enhancing reactor safety in the 21st century.

SD–406

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine health reform and health insurance premiums, focusing on empowering states to serve consumers.

SD–430

2 p.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To receive a briefing on Russian-United States cooperation in the fight against alcoholism, focusing on prospects for sharing experience, strength, and hope on treating alcoholism.

2360, Rayburn Building

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Francis Joseph Ricciardone, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey, and Norman L. Eisen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Czech Republic, both of the Department of State.

SD–419

Armed Services

Strategic Forces Subcommittee

To receive a closed briefing on cyber issues.

SVC–217

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

AUGUST 3

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Securities, Insurance and Investment Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the housing finance system, focusing on the to-be-announced market.

SD–538

10 a.m.

Finance

To hold hearings to examine dually-eligible beneficiaries, focusing on improving care while lowering costs.

SD–215

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Wendy Ruth Sherman, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Political Affairs, and Robert Stephen Ford, of Vermont, to be Ambassador to the Syrian Arab Republic, both of the Department of State.

SD–419

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 958, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs, S. 1094, to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–416), and any pending nominations.

SD–106

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–342

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine cybercrime, focusing on updating the ''Computer Fraud and Abuse Act'' to protect cyberspace and combat emerging threats.

SD–226

2 p.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine debt financing in the domestic financial sector.

SD–538

2:30 p.m.

Environment and Public Works

Children's Health and Environmental Responsibility Subcommittee

To hold an oversight hearing to examine Federal actions to clean up contamination from uranium mining and milling operations.

SD–406

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine S. 1024, to designate the Organ Mountains and other public land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System and the National Landscape Conservation System in the State of New Mexico, S. 1090, to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, S. 1144, to amend the Soda Ash Royalty Reduction Act of 2006 to extend the reduced royalty rate for soda ash, S. 1149, to expand geothermal production, and S. 1344, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to take immediate action to recover ecologically and economically from a catastrophic wildfire in the State of Arizona.

SD–366

AUGUST 4

2:30 p.m.

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4917–S4971

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1422–1433, S. Res. 240–241, and S. Con. Res. 26. **Page S4960**

Measures Reported:

S. Res. 175, expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to ongoing violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Georgia and the importance of a peaceful and just resolution to the conflict within Georgia's internationally recognized borders.

S. Res. 216, encouraging women's political participation in Saudi Arabia, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble.

S. Con. Res. 17, expressing the sense of Congress that Taiwan should be accorded observer status in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). **Page S4960**

Measures Passed:

All-American Flag Act: Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 1188, to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S4968–70**

Brown (OH) Amendment No. 587, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4969–70**

Condemning the Attacks in Norway: Senate agreed to S. Res. 240, condemning the horrific attacks on government buildings in Oslo, Norway, and a youth camp on Utoya Island, Norway, on July 22, 2011. **Page S4970**

International Year for People of African Descent: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 26, supporting the goals and ideals of the designation of the year of 2011 as the International Year for People of African Descent. **Pages S4970–71**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Gary Locke, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of China. **Pages S4924, S4971**

By a unanimous vote of 100 yeas (Vote No. EX. 118), Robert S. Mueller, III, of California, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a term expiring September 4, 2013. **Pages S4937–48, S4971**

William J. Burns, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State. **Pages S4958, S4971**

Messages from the House: **Page S4959**

Measures Referred: **Page S4959**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S4917, S4959**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S4959–60, S4971**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4960–61**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4961–63**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4958–59**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4963–68**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S4968**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S4968**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4968**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—118) **Page S4948**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:55 p.m., until 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, July 28, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4971.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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 Department of Education, after receiving testimony from Arne Duncan, Secretary of Education.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support concluded a hearing to examine financial management and business transformation at the Department of Defense, focusing on the numerous challenges that must be addressed to improve reliability of financial information, after receiving testimony from Robert F. Hale, Under Secretary, Comptroller, Elizabeth A. McGrath, Deputy Chief Management Officer, Mary Sally Matiella, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management and Comptroller, Gladys J. Commons, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Financial Management and Comptroller, and Jamie M. Morin, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management and Comptroller, all of the Department of Defense; and Asif A. Khan, Director, Financial Management and Assurance, Government Accountability Office.

ECONOMIC INTERESTS IN THE CHANGING ARCTIC

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard concluded a hearing to examine defending United States economic interests in the changing arctic, focusing on if there is a strategy, after receiving testimony from Admiral Robert Papp, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security; Rear Admiral David Titley, Oceanographer of the Navy, Director, Task Force Climate Change, Department of Defense; David A. Balton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Fisheries; Peter E. Slaiby, Shell Alaska, Anchorage; Scott Borgerson, Institute for Global Maritime Studies, Gloucester, Massachusetts; and Andrew T. Metzger, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance concluded a hearing to examine improving highway and vehicle safety, focusing on reauthorization of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, after receiving testimony from David L. Strickland, Administrator, and Nicole R. Nason, former Administrator, both of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation; Susan Fleming, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, Government Accountability Office; and Jacqueline S. Gillan, Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety, Robert Strassburger, Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, and Vernon Betkey, Governors Highway Safety Association, all of Washington, DC.

TAX CODE

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine chief executive officer (CEO) perspectives on how the tax code affects hiring, businesses and economic growth, after receiving testimony from Mike Duke, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Bentonville, Arkansas; Thomas J. Falk, Kimberly-Clark Corporation, Irving, Texas; Gregory S. Lang, PMC–Sierra, Sunnyvale, California; and Larry Merlo, CVS Caremark Corporation, Woonsocket, Rhode Island.

TEN YEARS AFTER 9/11

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine ten years after 9/11, focusing on emergency communications, after receiving testimony from Greg Schaffer, Acting Deputy Under Secretary of Homeland Security for National Protection and Programs Directorate; Michael D. Varney, Connecticut Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection Interoperability Coordinator, Middletown; Robert McAleer, Maine Emergency Management Agency Director, Augusta; and Charles H. Ramsey, Philadelphia Police Department Commissioner, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on behalf of the Major Cities Chiefs Association and Police Executive Research Forum.

FULFILLING TREATY OBLIGATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine fulfilling our treaty obligations and protecting Americans abroad, including S. 1194, to facilitate compliance with Article 36 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, after receiving testimony from Patrick F. Kennedy, Under Secretary of State; Bruce C. Swartz, Deputy Assistant Attorney General and Counselor for International Affairs, Department of Justice; John B. Bellinger III, Arnold and Porter LLP, on behalf of the Council on Foreign Relations, and David B. Rivkin, Jr., Baker Hostetler LLP, both of Washington, DC; and Clare Gillis, New Haven, Connecticut.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Edgardo Ramos, of Connecticut, Andrew L. Carter, Jr., and Jesse M. Furman, all to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, all introduced by Senator Schumer, James Rodney Gilstrap, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, who was introduced by

Senators Cornyn and Hutchison, and Jennifer Guerin Zipps, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, who was introduced by Senators McCain and Kyl, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

LIFETIME COSTS OF SUPPORTING THE NEWEST GENERATION OF VETERANS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the lifetime costs of supporting the newest generation of veterans, focusing on issues related to real property realignment and future health care costs, after receiving testimony from Heidi L. W. Golding, Principal Analyst for Military and Veterans' Compensation, Congressional Budget Office; Lorelei St. James, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, Government Accountability Office; Paul Rieckhoff, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America (IAVA), Washington, DC; James Hosek, The RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, California; and Crystal Nicely, Silver Spring, Maryland.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 14 public bills, H.R. 2663–2676; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 376 was introduced. **Pages H5660–61**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H5661**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows: H. Res. 375, providing for consideration of the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–184). **Page H5660**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Marchant to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5583**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:08 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5590**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Rick Postell, Christian Renewal Church, Brunswick, Georgia. **Pages H5590–91**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

Providing for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom: H.R. 440, amended, to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia. **Pages H5595–H5600**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:12 p.m. and reconvened at 1:15 p.m. **Page H5600**

Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012: The House resumed consideration of H.R. 2584, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012. Consideration of the measure began on July 25th. **Pages H5600–59**

Agreed to:

Dicks amendment that was debated on July 26th that strikes the proviso relating to funding limitations for carrying out certain subsections of the Endangered Species Act (by a recorded vote of 224 ayes to 202 noes, Roll No. 652); **Page H5601**

Reed amendment (No. 44 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2011) that was debated on July 26th that increases funding, by offset, for State and Private Forestry by $8,291,000 (by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 189 noes, Roll No. 656); **Pages H5603–04**

Scalise amendment, as modified, that was debated on July 26th that reduces funding for the Office of the Secretary, Departmental Operations by $420,000 (by a recorded vote of 215 ayes to 213 noes, Roll No. 657); **Pages H5604–05**

LaTourette en bloc amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Environmental Programs and Management by $13 million and increases funding for the Great Lakes Initiative by $50 million (by a recorded vote of 220 ayes to 206 noes, Roll No. 660); and **Pages H5622–25, H5633–34**

Pompeo amendment (No. 39 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2011) that reduces funding for Environmental Programs and Management by $6,246,000 and applies the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 191 noes, Roll No. 661). **Pages H5629–31, H5634**

Rejected:

Clarke (MI) amendment that was debated on July 26th that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Environmental Programs and Management by $10 million (by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 251 noes, Roll No. 651); **Pages H5600–01**

Tonko amendment that was debated on July 26th that sought to increase funding, by offset, for National Recreation and Preservation by $8,408,000 (by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 653); **Pages H5601–02**

Amash amendment (No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2011) that was debated on July 26th that sought to strike funding for the National Capital Performing Arts/Capital Concerts and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 131 ayes to 294 noes with 1 voting ''present'', Roll No. 654); **Pages H5602–03**

Dold amendment that was debated on July 26th that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Environmental Programs and Management by $24,700,000 (by a recorded vote of 137 ayes to 291 noes, Roll No. 655); **Page H5603**

Dicks amendment that sought to strike section 118; **Pages H5610–11**

Dicks amendment that sought to strike section 120; **Pages H5613–14**

Dicks amendment that sought to strike section 121; **Pages H5614–18**

Moran amendment that sought to strike section 124; **Pages H5618–22**

Fleming amendment that sought to reduce funding for Environmental Programs and Management by $48,206,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; **Pages H5628–29**

Dicks amendment that sought to strike section 116 (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 237 noes, Roll No. 658); **Pages H5605–10, H5632**

Dicks amendment that sought to strike section 119 (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 659); **Pages H5611–13, H5633**

Richardson amendment (No. 23 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2011) that sought to increase funding for State and Tribal Assistance Grants by $5 million (by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 662); **Pages H5631–32, H5634–36**

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 18 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2011) that sought to reduce funding for State and Private Forestry by $20,860,800 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; and **Page H5643**

Hanabusa amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for State and Private Forestry by $50 million. **Pages H5643–44**

Point of Order sustained against:

Eddie Bernice Johnson (TX) amendment that sought to insert ''and fellowships'' after ''development'' under Title II—Environmental Protection Agency, Science and Technology and **Pages H5625–28**

Bishop (NY) amendment that sought to increase funding for State and Tribal Assistance Grants by $1,411,000,000. **Page H5641**

Proceedings Postponed:

Blackburn amendment that seeks to reduce funding for State and Tribal Assistance Grants by $30 million and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; **Pages H5636–37**

Richardson amendment that seeks to increase funding, by offset, for State and Tribal Assistance Grants by $5 million; **Pages H5637–41**

Lankford amendment that seeks to amend language relating to Clean Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants; **Pages H5641–43**

Gosar amendment that seeks to increase funding, by offset, for the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund by $10 million; **Pages H5644–47**

Lankford amendment that seeks to eliminate funding for the Council on Environmental Quality and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; **Pages H5647–50**

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 14 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for Smithsonian Institution, Salaries and Expenses by $55,624,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; and **Pages H5650–51**

Walberg amendment that seeks to reduce funding for the National Endowment for the Arts by $10,600,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account. **Pages H5652–53**

Pending:

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 13 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2011) that seeks to reduce funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities by $13,500,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account. **Pages H5658–59**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H5591.

Senate Referrals: S. 1406 and S. 846 were referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. **Page H5659**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Twelve recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5600–01, H5601, H5601–02, H5602–03, H5603, H5603–04, H5604–05, H5632, H5633, H5633–34, H5634, H5635. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Committee Meetings

EXAMINATION OF TITLE I AND THE SURE PROGRAM

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing on Agricultural Program Audit: Examination of Title I and the SURE Program. Testimony was heard from Bruce Nelson, Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a markup of the FY 2012 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill. The bill was forwarded without amendment.

THE WAY AHEAD IN AFGHANISTAN

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing on The Way Ahead in Afghanistan. Testimony was heard from Francis J. ''Bing'' West, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Department of Defense; and public witnesses.

RESERVE COMPONENTS AS AN OPERATIONAL FORCE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on The Reserve Components as an Operational Force: Potential Legislative and Policy Changes. Testimony was heard from Gen. Craig R. McKinley, USAF, Chief, National Guard Bureau; LTG Jack Stultz, USA, Chief, Army Reserve; VADM Dirk J. Debbink, USN, Chief of Naval Reserve; Lt. Gen. Charles Stenner, USAF, Chief, Air Force Reserve; Lt. Gen. Harry Wyatt, USAF, Director, Air National Guard; MG Raymond Carpenter, USA, Acting Director, Army National Guard; Maj. Gen. Darrell L. Moore, USMC, Director, Reserve Affairs Division, U.S. Marine Corps Reserves; and Rear Admiral David Callahan, USCG, Acting Director of Reserve and Leadership, U.S. Coast Guard Reserves.

SUSTAINING NUCLEAR DETERRENCE AFTER NEW START

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Force held a hearing on sustaining nuclear deterrence after New START. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXPLORING TEACHER QUALITY INITIATIVES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Education Reforms: Exploring Teacher Quality Initiatives.'' Testimony was heard from Kevin S. Huffman, Commissioner, Tennessee Department of Education; Tom Boasberg, Superintendent; Denver Public Schools; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a markup of the following: discussion draft of the ''Pipeline Infrastructure and Community Protection Act of 2011''; and H.R. 2054, the ''Energy and Revenue Enrichment Act of 2011''. Both bills were forwarded, as amended.

OVERSIGHT OF THE CREDIT RATING AGENCIES POST DODD-FRANK

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Credit Rating Agencies Post Dodd-Frank.'' Testimony was heard from John Ramsay, Deputy Director, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities Exchange Commission; Mark Van Der Weide, Senior Associate Director, Division of Banking Supervision and Regulation, Federal Reserve Board; David Wilson, Senior Deputy Comptroller and Chief National Bank Examiner, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; and public witnesses.

IMPACT OF THE WORLD BANK AND MULTI–LATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND U.S. JOB CREATION

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled ''The Impact of the World Bank and Multi-Lateral Development Banks on National Security and U.S. Job Creation.'' Testimony was heard from James T. Kolbe, former Member of Congress, Senior Transatlantic Fellow, German Marshall Fund of the United States; James A. Harmon, Chairman, Caravel Management, LLC, Past-President and CEO, Export-Import Bank of the United States; Benjamin Leo, Research Fellow, Center for Global Development, former Treasury Department and National Security Council Official; and public witnesses.

U.S. HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY TOWARD IRAN AND SYRIA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia held a hearing on Axis of Abuse: U.S. Human Rights Policy toward Iran and Syria, Part 1. Testimony was heard from Jeffrey D. Feltman, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State; and Michael H. Posner, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Department of State.

AL SHABAAB: RECRUITMENT AND RADICALIZATION WITHIN THE MUSLIM AMERICAN COMMUNITY AND THE THREAT TO THE HOMELAND

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Al Shabaab: Recruitment and Radicalization within the Muslim American Community and the Threat to the Homeland.'' Testimony was heard from William Anders Folk, former Assistant United States Attorney, District of Minnesota; Tom Smith, Chief of Police, Saint Paul, Minnesota; and public witnesses.

CHAPTER 7 BANKRUPTCY TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITIES AND REMUNERATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law held a hearing entitled ''Chapter 7 Bankruptcy Trustee Responsibilities and Remuneration.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee began to mark up the following: H.R. 1981, the ''Protecting Children From Internet Pornographers Act of 2011''; H.R. 1433, the ''Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2011''; H.R. 2633, the ''Appeal Time Clarification Act of 2011''; H.R. 83, the ''Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2011''; and H.R. 2189, the ''Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2011''. H.R. 2633 was ordered reported without amendment. This markup is scheduled to continue July 28, 11 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

STATE PERSPECTIVES ON OFFSHORE REVENUE SHARING

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''State Perspectives on Offshore Revenue Sharing.'' Testimony was heard from Doug Domenech, Secretary of Natural Resources, Virginia; Garret Graves, Chairman, Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority, Office of the Governor State of Louisiana; and public witnesses.

DISPOSAL OF FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Disposal of Federal Real Property: Legislative Proposals.'' Testimony was heard from Rep. Chaffetz; Rep. Quigley; Rep. Denham; Daniel I. Werfel, Controller, Office of Management and Budget; David E. Foley, Deputy Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration; Theresa Gullo, Deputy Assistant Director, Budget Analysis Division, Congressional Budget Office; F. Joseph Moravec, former Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration; and public witnesses.

THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and Labor Policy held a hearing entitled ''The Thrift Savings Plan: Helping Federal Employees Achieve Retirement Security.'' Testimony was heard from Gregory T. Long, Executive Director, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board; and public witnesses.

FASTER FOIA ACT OF 2011 (BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011)

Committee on Rules: Granted, by record vote of 8 to 4, a closed rule providing two hours of debate with one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in Part A of the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution, modified by the amendment printed in Part B of the report, shall be considered as adopted. The rule provides that the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The rule authorizes the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules at any time through Sunday, July 31, 2011 if the measure was made available on the previous legislative day, except measures proposing an amendment to the Constitution, which must be available for three legislative days. The rule provides two hours of debate on a motion to suspend the rules relating to a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The rule sets the dates for the convening of the House for the anticipated pro forma sessions during the period from August 1, 2011 through September 6, 2011, and provides that the Speaker may dispense with legislative business for those pro forma sessions and authorizes the Speaker to declare the House adjourned to a time on the next pro forma session day. The rule provides for the approval of the Journal during pro forma sessions from August 1, 2011 through September 6, 2011. The rule provides that days during the period from August 1, 2011 through September 6, 2011 shall not constitute calendar days for purposes of the War Powers Resolution. Finally, the rule provides that the Speaker may delay the referral of introduced measures from August 1, 2011 through September 6, 2011.

BUREAUCRATIC OBSTACLES FOR SMALL EXPORTERS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Bureaucratic Obstacles for Small Exporters: Is our National Export Strategy Working?'' Testimony was heard from Suresh Kumar, Assistant Secretary and Director General, Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration, U.S. Commercial Service; Christian Foster, Deputy Administrator, Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agriculture Service; and public witnesses.

EUROPEAN UNION'S EMISSIONS TRADING SCHEME

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing entitled ''The European Union's Emissions Trading Scheme: A Violation of International Law.'' Testimony was heard from Susan Kurland, Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs, Department of Transportation; Kl'islma R. Urs, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Transportation Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled ''The Economic Development Administration: How to Improve Effectiveness through Reforms and Consolidations.'' Testimony was heard from John R. Fernandez, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, Department of Commerce; William Shear, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, GAO; and public witnesses.

PREVENTING VIOLENT RADICALIZATION IN AMERICA

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Terrorism, HUMINT, Analysis, and Counterintelligence held a hearing on Preventing Violent Radicalization in America. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

MAXIMIZING AMERICA'S PROSPERITY

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine maximizing America's prosperity, focusing on how fiscal rules can restrain Federal overspending, after receiving testimony from James C. Miller III, former Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, Daniel J. Mitchell, Cato Institute, and Robert D. Reischauer, Urban Institute, all of Washington, DC.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D719)*

S. 1103, to extend the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Signed on July 26, 2011. (Public Law 112–24)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 28, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Brian T. Baenig, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine opportunities for specialty crops and organics in the farm bill, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Service and General Government, to hold hearings to examine Federal disaster assistance budgeting, focusing on the role of the Federal government in mitigating the economic impact of severe weather events through long-term budgetary planning, 2 p.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Admiral Jonathan W. Greenert, USN for reappointment to the grade of admiral and to be Chief of Naval Operations, and Lieutenant General Charles H. Jacoby, Jr., USA to be general and to be Commander, United States Northern Command, and Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command, both of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security, to hold hearings to examine aviation fuels, focusing on needs, challenges, and alternatives, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Charles DeWitt McConnell, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Fossil Energy, and Rebecca R. Wodder, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 264, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, S. 265, to authorize the acquisition of core battlefield land at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park, S. 324, to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, S. 764, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to make technical corrections to the segment designations for the Chetco River, Oregon, S. 864, to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, S. 883, to authorize National Mall Liberty Fund D.C. to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor free persons and slaves who fought for independence, liberty, and justice

for all during the American Revolution, S. 888, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 925, to designate Mt. Andrea Lawrence, S. 970, to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1063, to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska, and S. 1134, to authorize the St. Croix River Crossing Project with appropriate mitigation measures to promote river values, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Juan F. Vasquez, of Texas, and Maurice B. Foley, of Maryland, both to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court, and Janice Eberly, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine Food and Drug Administration (FDA) user fees, focusing on advancing public health, 9:45 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Mark D. Acton, of Kentucky, and Robert G. Taub, of New York, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 546, to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, S. 379, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, S. 1218, to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, S. 703, to amend the Long-Term Leasing Act, and S. 636, to provide the Quileute Indian Tribe Tsunami and Flood Protection; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine enforcing the ''Indian Gaming Regulatory Act'', focusing on the role of the National Indian Gaming Commission and tribes as regulators, 2:15 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 401, to help Federal prosecutors and investigators combat public corruption by strengthening and clarifying the law, S. 657, to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, S. 409, to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs, S. 605, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to place synthetic drugs in Schedule I, S. 839, to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs, and the nominations of Steve Six, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Morgan Christen, of Alaska, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Scott Wesley Skavdahl, to be United States District Judge for the District of Wyoming, Sharon L. Gleason, to be United States District Judge for the District of Alaska, Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and Richard G. Andrews, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Rural Development, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture, hearing on Agricultural Program Audit: Examination of USDA Research Programs, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, Panel on Defense Financial Management and Auditability Reform, meeting to receive testimony on DOD's plans for financial management improvement and achieving audit readiness, 8 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup of the following: H.R. 2405, the ''Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act''; H.R. 1254, the ''Synthetic Drug Control Act''; and H.R. 1852, the ''Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act''. 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity hearing entitled ''Insurance Oversight: Policy Implications for U.S. Consumers, Businesses and Jobs.'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights, hearing on Improving Implementation of the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies, markup of H.R. 2658, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance the ability of the Federal Protective Service to provide adequate security for the prevention of terrorist activities and for the promotion of homeland security, and for other purposes. 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, continue markup of the following: H.R. 1981, the ''Protecting Children From Internet Pornographers Act of 2011''; H.R. 1433, the ''Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2011''; H.R. 83, the ''Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2011''; and H.R. 2189, the ''Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2011''. 11 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs, hearing on the following: H.R. 50, the ''Multinational Species Conservation Funds Reauthorization Act''; H.R. 1760, the ''Great Ape Conservation Reauthorization Amendments Act''; and H.R. 1761, the ''Marine Turtle Conservation Reauthorization Act.'' 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Organization, Efficiency and Financial Management, hearing entitled ''Improper Medicare Payments: $48 Billion in Waste?'' 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health Care, District of Columbia, Census, and the National Archives hearing entitled ''Impact of Obamacare on Job Creators and Their Decision to Offer Health Insurance.'' 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, markup of H.R. 2484, the ''Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2011.'' 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Healthcare and Technology, hearing entitled ''Small Businesses and PPACA: If They Like Their Coverage, Can They Keep It?'' 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight and Regulations, hearing entitled ''Open for Business: The Impact of the CFPB on Small Business.'' 1:30 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, markup of the following: H.R 2243, the ''Veterans Employment Promotion Act''; H.R. 2388, the ''Access to Timely Information Act''; and H.R. 2383, the ''Modernizing Notice to Claimants Act''. 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Evaluating VA's SDVOSB Certification Process, hearing will begin after the Subcommittee's markup has finished, 334 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Health, markup of the following: H.R. 1154, the ''Veterans Equal Treatment for Service Dogs Act''; H.R. 1855, the ''Veterans' 'Traumatic Brain Injury Rehabilitative Services' Improvements Act of 2011''; H.R. 2074, the ''Veterans Sexual Assault Prevention Act''; H.R. 2530, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for increased flexibility in establishing rates for reimbursement of State homes by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for nursing home care provided to veterans; and H.R. 2646, to authorize certain Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility projects and leases, to extend certain expiring provisions of law, and to modify certain authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes. 9:30 a.m., 340 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on the new IRS paid tax return preparer program, 9:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing on Ongoing Intelligence Activities, 10:15 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine United States policy and the Organization for Co-oporation in Europe, focusing on making good on commitments and challenges, including unresolved conflicts, ethnic tension, corruption and lack of governance, racism and intolerance, and trafficking in persons, 1:30 p.m., 210 Cannon Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, July 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will be in a period of morning business for one hour. Following morning business, the Majority Leader will be recognized.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, July 28

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of S. 627—Budget Control Act of 2011 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E1421
Austria, Steve, Ohio, E1419
Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1420
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1426
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1417, E1421
Capps, Lois, Calif., E1415
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1419
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E1416
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E1426
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E1415
Dicks, Norman D., Wash., E1418
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1415
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1419
Issa, Darrell E., Calif., E1416
Jackson, Jesse L., Jr., Ill., E1419
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1416
Murphy, Christopher S., Conn., E1418
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E1416
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E1427
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E1418, E1420
Scott, David, Ga., E1415
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E1427
Upton, Fred, Mich., E1420
Waters, Maxine, Calif., E1427

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.