United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 2012 No. 52

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 29, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES F. BASS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

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

We ask today that You bless the Members of the people's House to be the best and most faithful servants of the people they serve.

May they be filled with gratitude at the opportunity they have to serve in this place. We thank You for the abilities they have been given to do their work and to contribute to the common good. May they use their talents as good stewards of Your many gifts and thereby be true servants of justice and partners in peace.

Give each Member clarity of thought and purity of motive so that they may render their service as their best selves.

May all that is done this day in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mrs. HARTZLER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

VOICE OF TEXAS, KARINA GARDUNO

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, I visited Hargrave High School in Huffman, Texas. Students at this school come from hardworking, rural, lower-middle class families. I met with 400 seniors, and almost every one of them had a job. I was impressed by their intelligent questions about government and the state of this country.

One student, Karina Garduno, asked me this:

Why should those of us that work hard have to sacrifice our tax dollars for free handouts to potheads and others that are too lazy to work? This has nothing to do with being black, brown or white, because I'm Hispanic. They should be made to try harder to find work and submit to drug testing to qualify for this money.

Mr. Speaker, Karina and several other students remember the concept many people have forgotten—personal responsibility. The American Dream means that if you work hard, you can do anything in this country. And it's the individual, not the Federal Government, who controls our future. Young people must know that hard work still pays off because it is the American way.

And that's just the way it is.

A BALANCED DEFICIT-REDUCING BUDGET

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a 10-year, $4 trillion deficit-reduction plan that is both balanced and comprehensive. In the Congress today, there is now broad support in both parties from both Chambers to reduce the deficit by $4 trillion over 10 years. That's the goal set by the President's deficit reduction commission.

Today, we will consider a number of budget proposals for fiscal year 2013. None of them is perfect, but it is critical that we come together behind a reasonable 10-year, $4 trillion framework and start working on the details. Time is running out to fix this critical problem.

I believe the Van Hollen and the Cooper-LaTourette proposals are both frameworks that deserve support and consideration. Both of them are balanced and fair. They include revenue increases and spending cuts, and they don't undermine the fragile economic recovery in the short term.

Progress is difficult, and today's budget votes are only the first step. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on this difficult task.

Printed on recycled paper.

ENERGY PRICES

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when President Obama was inaugurated in January 2009, the average nationwide price for a gallon of gasoline was $1.84. The 2012 March nationwide average has been $3.89 or higher, reflecting a 110 percent increase. Keep in mind that every penny increase in the price of gasoline costs the U.S. economy $1 billion and American consumers $4 million per day.

Now, last week, Secretary of Energy Steven Chu, while testifying in front of a House committee, was asked to grade his performance on American gasoline prices. He graded himself an ''A''—an ''A,'' America—when the price at the pump for American families has gone up over 110 percent.

I'm sorry, Secretary Chu, America doesn't grade on a curve. We give your performance and the performance of the administration's handling of energy in America the grade of ''F.''

FISCAL YEAR 2013 BUDGET

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, we all have our own ideas on how we should balance the budget, but missing in today's debate is a bipartisan approach to solve our Nation's fiscal problems. No one party has the answers. We can do this not through a Republican- nor a Democratic-proposed budget, unless we are willing to demonstrate bipartisanship.

That's why I'm opposing both the Republican and the Democratic proposals. These are not an answer to our Nation's fiscal problems. Instead, the Simpson-Bowles approach reflected in the Cooper-LaTourette substitute is the preferred approach that we need to follow.

Last night's votes and today's votes will once again demonstrate that the Congress is tone deaf. It's time to put our economy back on a path to fiscal sustainability and pass the Simpson-Bowles measure that last night fell far short. I suggest we cut $4 trillion from the deficit over 10 years with spending cuts and tax reform to ensure solvency of entitlements such as Medicare and Social Security. It's time that we act in a bipartisan fashion.

OBAMACARE DESERVES AN ''F'' GRADE

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 2-year anniversary of the President's health care law's going into effect, and as a former teacher, I think it's important that we look at and see how it makes the grade. I believe that if you compare it to the matrix of its failed promises that it deserves an ''F.''

They said that it would create jobs. It didn't. In fact, CBO says 800,000 people will lose their jobs because of it.

They said it would lower costs. It hasn't. Premiums have increased by over $2,000 per individual.

They said that Americans would be able to keep their own plan and their own doctor. The administration's own estimates say that over 20 million Americans could lose employer-sponsored health care as a result of it.

Is it constitutional? I believe it's not. It's time to have grade A health insurance here in America, one that increases accessibility and affordability. That's what House Republicans are advancing, and that's what Americans deserve.

□ 0910

HAPPY 100TH ANNIVERSARY TO THE JUNIOR LEAGUE OF CHICAGO

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, for 100 years, women in the Chicago area have been improving the world around them through the Junior League of Chicago. This summer, the Junior League will mark its centennial anniversary, and I join the current and past volunteers of this wonderful organization in celebrating its many contributions. In fact, from 1976 to 1978, I served as president of the Junior League and am eternally grateful for the opportunity this great organization gave me to work with the Head Start program in Chicago. It was the beginning of many wonderful and fulfilling years of public service.

Mr. Speaker, since Lucy McCormick Blair Linn founded the organization in 1912, the Junior League of Chicago has contributed more than 10 million hours of volunteer service. They have treated scarlet fever, funded epilepsy research, and launched what later became the Chicago Children's Museum. These are just a few of the examples over 100 years of service.

Today, I applaud the Junior League and wish its volunteers another 100 years of success.

A BUDGET FULL OF ENERGY

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today, House Republicans will stand up to business as usual in Washington and vote for a budget that will help our economy grow, guarantee the promise of Medicare for everyone, and put forth a true all-of-the-above energy strategy in America.

Now, compare this to President Obama's budget, one filled with more of his failed tax-and-spend policies, one in which he called for over $45 billion in new taxes on energy production. With prices surging at the pump—more than doubling since President Obama took office—it's unconscionable that he would want to further burden America's small businesses and families who are already struggling.

America sits on top of the largest amount of total recoverable energy resources in the world, including oil, natural gas, and coal. That's 1.3 trillion barrels of oil equivalent. Just imagine if we developed them as part of a real all-of-the-above strategy. Job creation would surge, gas prices would fall, and America would be one step closer to energy independence.

HOMES FOR HEROES ACT

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say thank you to the many persons who supported the Homes for Heroes Act that passed the day before yesterday. This is an important piece of legislation that will place a person in HUD whose sole responsibility it is to monitor homelessness among our veterans. We believe that in solving the homelessness problem, we can also solve a lot of other problems that they have.

I would like to thank all of the persons on the committee, especially my chairman of the committee, Mr. BACHUS; my ranking member, Mr. FRANK; Ms. WATERS, who has helped me for years with this legislation. I would like to thank Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. GUTIERREZ, the chair and ranking member of the subcommittee. I would also thank Mr. CANTOR, because I did have a chance to visit with him about this, and he helped to promote this legislation. Ms. PELOSI, of course, is a big supporter of our veterans, as is the case with Mr. HOYER.

Also, one additional person that was very helpful, Mr. HENSARLING. He and I had a great conversation about this, and he was very supportive and mentioned it in open mic at one of our hearings. So I thank everyone. Our veterans are better served.

God bless the United States of America and thank God for our veterans.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 600 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 600

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4281) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and

other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of March 29, 2012, providing for consideration or disposition of a measure extending expiring surface transportation authority.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the potential it holds for a bipartisan, bicameral agreement for a long-term transportation reauthorization bill.

House Resolution 600 provides for a closed rule for prompt consideration of H.R. 4281, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012.

H.R. 4281 simply calls for a 90-day extension of current transportation legislation at existing funding levels. Without the extension, critical transportation programs around the country will begin to shut down Saturday night at midnight. The Federal Government will no longer be able to collect the user fees necessary to maintain the highway trust fund, and eventually it would be unable to pay obligations that have already been incurred for construction projects. Most importantly, according to recent reports, a shutdown Saturday would immediately furlough 3,500 Federal employees and put up to 130,000 highway projects at risk.

A 90-day extension is no one's ideal scenario; but at this juncture it appears necessary, necessary not only to avoid the calamity that comes from current legislation's expiration, but also necessary for the continued potential for a long-term reauthorization. With passage of this extension, a long-term reauthorization remains within reach.

The transportation bill passed out of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has many laudable provisions. It streamlines and consolidates Federal transportation programs, cuts red tape and Washington bureaucracy, and increases funding flexibility to States and local governments, better leverages existing infrastructures resources, and encourages more private sector participation in rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure. It provides 5 years of certainty and stability with flat funding that is paid for without raising taxes.

I'm sure that the authors and proponents of the Senate bill can point to a menu of laudable policy provisions within their bill as well.

With this extension, we don't give up on the likelihood of the best of both bills being reconciled, and long-term certainty and stability can be provided to those tasked with rebuilding our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

To be sure, however, the task at hand remains avoiding expiration of the existing authorization this Saturday night. I don't have to reiterate the consequences that loom if we do not act. As the Chamber of Commerce wrote in a letter to the Members earlier this week: ''An extension is not the best course of action, but it must be done.''

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the potential this short-term extension holds for coming together in a bipartisan, bicameral way for a long-term authorization of our Nation's transportation programs.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, where do I begin? This is one more opportunity lost, one more opportunity squandered by this Republican-controlled House.

We are just days away from the expiration of the laws that authorize our surface transportation programs, and yet here we are debating a politically charged, unnecessary, and partisan bill that just kicks the can down the road a few months.

Last month, this House began, but could not finish, consideration of the most partisan drafted—possibly the only partisan drafted—highway reauthorization bill in history. Let me repeat that. The House could not complete consideration of the Republican bill, a Republican bill that would have been considered a joke if it weren't such a serious breach of responsibility.

This is like a bad soap opera. Just when the twists and turns can't get more fantastical and crazy, someone comes up with an even zanier idea just to keep the plot lines moving along. I'm waiting for the mysterious twin brother to show up.

□ 0920

The plotline here is that the Republican leadership keeps manufacturing ways not to do the simple thing, the right thing, and that is to pass the Senate bill, the 2-year bill that passed the Senate 74–22, clearly and overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion.

It's refreshing and a bit strange when the Senate can put their ideological differences aside and actually pass a decent bill. It's not every day that Senator BARBARA BOXER and Senator JAMES INHOFE agree on a bill, but that's what happened with the Senate bill.

Now, I'm not going to stand here and say that the Senate bill is the bill I would have drafted. To the contrary, I want a 5-year reauthorization that is fully funded, a bill that results in real jobs and a bill that invests in important areas like public transit.

While the Senate bill lasts for only 2 years, it is a good start and it is much better than the Republican proposal we have here today. For my colleagues who have a short memory, let me recap where we were last month.

The Republican leadership took a 1,000-page bill, undoubtedly the most partisan transportation bill in Congressional history, and made it worse. They took a bill that was written in secret and jammed through the Transportation Committee and inserted unrelated and controversial provisions like the Keystone pipeline, ANWR, offshore drilling, and cuts in Federal pensions. Even worse, they changed the rules in the middle of the game. Specifically, after everyone had submitted their amendments to the original single bill, Speaker BOEHNER decided to split it into three separate measures, which meant that many of the amendments could not be considered in the way that they were originally drafted.

Now, of course the Republicans quickly realized that they didn't have the votes for that bill and yanked it from the floor. It must have been pretty embarrassing because it's been over a month since they gave up on that bill.

And what has the Republican leadership been doing over the last month? Negotiating with House Democrats to reach a bipartisan compromise? Talking with the Senate on ways to properly reauthorize these programs and bring jobs back to the economy? Of course not. Over the past month, the Republican leadership has been sitting around pointing fingers and complaining that they can't move the transportation bill, even though Republicans are in control of this House.

It's the end of March, and Republicans can't get their act together to get a real transportation bill passed. You call that leadership? Give me a break.

Leadership is about governing. Leadership is about doing what's right. Honestly, Mr. Speaker, there's no leadership here.

Shame on this leadership for bringing us here today. Shame on this leadership for putting the American jobs on the line just because they cannot manage their own internal politics. That's right. By refusing to pass the Senate bill today, Republicans are putting American jobs on the line.

With the economy slowly recovering and with more than 2.7 million construction and manufacturing workers still out of work, why do Republicans want to play Russian roulette with this important jobs bill?

We should not be in this position today. This is a manufactured crisis, a crisis that is a product of a lack of leadership, a crisis that is a product of a lack of bipartisan cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, we had an opportunity to consider the Senate bill today, but the Rules Committee, mislabeled by some as the most open Rules Committee in decades, blocked that bill from consideration.

That's right. This new majority put this bill on the floor, sight unseen, and without any markup or hearing. They waived their own 3-day layover rule, and this is a closed rule. In fact, I can't even seem to find a CBO score for this bill. And this is the open process my colleagues on the Rules Committee are so proud of.

This is a completely closed rule. I offered the Senate bill as an amendment to this rule last night so that Members could have an opportunity to vote on it today, not in place of the Republican bill, but as a stand-alone amendment.

Speaker BOEHNER is fond of saying, let the House work its will, but apparently the Republicans on the Rules Committee do not believe in that philosophy because they blocked my amendment on a party-line vote. Why did they block my amendment? As the chairman of the Rules Committee is fond of usually saying, because they could.

Now, I will try one more time to offer the Senate amendment. Congressman TIM BISHOP introduced H.R. 14, the exact same language as the Senate-passed bill. If this House defeats the previous question, Congressman BISHOP will be able to offer his amendment to the Republican bill, not in place of, just alongside the Republican bill. The House, like Speaker BOEHNER promised, would then be able to work its will.

Now, it's clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Republican leadership is more concerned with political victories than with legislating. It is clear that the Republican leadership would rather score cheap political points with their right-wing base than promote and create jobs in America.

President Clinton was fond of saying, The perfect can't be the enemy of the good. There's a perfectly good bipartisan Senate bill that would pass this House overwhelmingly if the Republican leadership decided to bring it up. But no, the Republican leadership would rather play chicken with people's jobs on the line instead of actually legislating, let alone legislating in a bipartisan way.

It is clear that when the far right wing of the far right wing opposes something, the Republican leadership crumbles like cheap asphalt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in 2005, the Congress passed SAFETEA–LU, which is the last transportation reauthorization bill that was long term. There was, under the Democratic-controlled House, a bill proposed by the chairman that never made it to the floor, and because it didn't make it to the floor—my, my, my, how we've forgotten. It was only a couple of years ago. But it didn't make it. It expired. SAFETEA-LU expired in 2009, September 30, and there was a bill, never got marked up, never happened.

So what happens instead? Well, let's see. Number 1, Democrats did a 1-month extension. Number 2, there was a 1.5-month extension. Number 3, there was a 2.5-month extension. Number 4, there was a 1-month extension. Number 5, there was a 9-month extension. Number 6, there was a 2-month extension.

So, I'm not sure what you're talking about, but as far as lack of leadership, we are a long way from having that many extensions. We're a long way from having done what was done in the previous Congress.

I would suspect that we have an opportunity here, and that opportunity, the way to avoid a shutdown of the Nation's transportation programs this Saturday night, is to pass this extension. The only way we can get to that is pass this rule which allows for us to consider that extension.

The only way we can keep ourselves from having 3,500 Federal employees furloughed is to pass this extension. The only way we can keep 130,000 projects that are highway projects from being at risk is to pass this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me respond to my friend.

The difference is that we have an overwhelmingly bipartisan compromise that has passed one of the Chambers here, the Senate. This is the choice we have: Do we do these short-term extensions so that cities and towns and States can't plan, or do we take this bipartisan compromise that the Senate has put together so that there's some certainty for our cities and towns and for our States?

I mean, that's the difference. What's happening here is that there is an internal fight within the Republican Party. The right wing is battling with the extreme right wing, and they can't agree with each other because you have people in the Republican Party who don't believe in the public sector.

So, as this economy is struggling to get back on its feet and we see some recovery, more and more every month, we could actually help that recovery. We could move things along. We could create more jobs if we were to act in a different way today.

But, instead, the right wing and the extreme right wing are having a fight within the Republican Party, so the Republican House leadership is paralyzed. That's not leadership. That's just irresponsible.

At this point, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and he is absolutely right. The passage of this rule and it's approach is not the only way to avert a shutdown. And, in fact, the bill moving forward here is precisely the wrong approach because, sadly, what's going to happen is it's going to bifurcate the construction cycle.

There is work going on around the country that people want to move forward, and the approval of a 90-day extension means that people cannot plan for the entire construction cycle. If they take the gentleman's suggestion and approve the bipartisan Senate bill, there will be certainty, not just for this construction cycle, but the next year's construction cycle.

It's frustrating to watch our friends on the other side of the aisle play chicken. Remember the FAA shutdown where the Republicans in the House refused to accept a bill that passed the Senate overwhelmingly, 89 votes for the FAA? Instead they choose to leave town, putting out of work 70,000 construction workers and laid off 4,000 others in the FAA.

□ 0930

We don't have to play this sort of infrastructure chicken.

Later today, we are going to consider the worst budget for transportation in anybody's memory. The Republican budget that will be decided later today calls for a 46 percent reduction in transportation funding. There isn't enough money in the Republican budget to even pay for the areas that are already obligated.

I developed this, in a friendly way, in the Budget Committee, and they had to agree. There are $6.5 billion more in actual outlay, contracts, roads, bridges, and transit projects that we're committed to than they would pay for.

It's sad that we've reached this point. I hope the House rejects this rule which will allow Mr. BISHOP to present the Senate bill for an up-or-down vote. The Republicans are afraid that actually there will be dozens of their Members that will join us in a bipartisan vote.

It's a pipe dream that somehow we're better off cutting the construction cycle in half, not allowing people to plan, that somehow we'll come together and merge the worst transportation bill in history that would overturn 21 years of transportation reform

and the agreement of President Reagan that we would dedicate money for transit, that we throw this out to the House bill that was so bad they wouldn't even have a hearing on it.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I served for a dozen years on the Transportation Committee. I've worked with the Transportation Committee with Republican and Democratic chairs. This is an embarrassment that the process is not working. It doesn't have to be partisan and limited. We have two high-level commissions that call for more investment and reform.

The best approach is to vote on the Senate bill today, which I'm confident will pass, which is why they don't want to bring it to a vote, and then come together to work as we get past this election ''Gong Show'' process and be able to strike what truly is a grand bargain when we have all the moving pieces at the end of the year, when we're not staring down the barrel of goofy election politics, and people will actually be able to work on what's in the best interest of America.

What's in the best interest of America is rejecting this assault on transportation and dealing with rebuilding and renewing the country.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the other side at least letting me know what they did over the last 2 years. They bifurcated the construction projects. They did it six times. At least now we know that they have knowledge of what they did during those times when they only gave, in some cases, 1-month extensions.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT), my colleague.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Florida and fellow Rules Committee member to allow me to speak today on behalf of this.

It's interesting to stand up here and listen to what comes across from the other side. They talk about the FAA bill. That's a bill that while they were in control of this area, since 2007, there was not a reauthorization of that bill until this year, until the 112th Congress came into power. We now have a 4-year reauthorization of the FAA bill that sat over on the other side while they had control of this House since 2007. There's been no action other than just temporary fixes. The same goes now with this bill today in regards to transportation.

They want you to believe that the Senate passed this great bill out of the Senate, a 2-year fix. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, a 2-year fix in this industry is like nothing at all.

In speaking with developers and road construction folks in my State, they said a 6-month extension is as good as a 2-year extension, and basically all it does is keep their doors open. They don't hire new folks; they don't go out and purchase new equipment; they don't go to Caterpillar up in Peoria, Illinois, and buy more equipment. What they told me was that when the Senate came back out with an 18-month and 2-year extension, they canceled major equipment orders in Peoria, Illinois. They canceled those orders because there's no reason for them to invest millions of dollars in equipment on a 6-month, an 18-month, or a 2-year extension.

We should be standing here talking today about a 5- to 7-year extension of the highway bill. That's what we should be talking about. That gives those builders some certainty.

We talk about certainty. The other side talks about it at great length, but what certainty did they show when they had control of both houses, the Senate and the House, and the President? What did they show for an accomplishment, other than short-term fixes that have nothing to do with certainty? The construction industry hires based upon certainty, how far they can look out.

A major road builder that I talked to said: ''Listen, RICH, it's just not going to work that way.''

Mr. Speaker, what they're saying to us is that for them to spend money to hire new workers, they need to have some certainty that they're going to have a 5- to 7-year window to start building upon, not a 6-month fix, not an 18-month fix, not a 2-year fix.

Once again, the builders I'm talking to are saying that on these short-term fixes, all it does is keep the status quo alive. It allows them to keep the employees that they have, but they will not invest in new equipment, and they're not going to invest in hiring new employees because it's a short-term fix for them, not a long-term fix.

We had the opportunity to do a pay-for, and I agree with my friend from Worcester when we talk about we should have a pay-for 5- to 7-year transportation bill, not a short-term fix. But if we don't do a short-term fix today—you heard my colleague from Florida talk about what's going to happen on Sunday—all projects stop as we know it. That's not what this House should do. We need to pass the 90-day extension. We need to support this rule and pass the bill so we can eliminate uncertainty, not what we have today.

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

I want to thank my colleague on the Rules Committee for making, I think, a very strong case why we should reject the 90-day extension and pass a 2-year extension for this reason: because 90 days means nothing.

He diminishes the impact of 2 years. Most people I talk to would have preferred 2 years to 90 days. Here's the difference. We have a democratically controlled Senate that worked out a deal with Republicans. BARBARA BOXER and JIM INHOFE came together. They are very opposite individuals when it comes to politics, but they came together.

Here, the Republicans are fighting Republicans. Democrats have been locked out of this entire process.

Let's get real here. Let's be honest with the American people. The budget that you all are going to vote for later this afternoon decimates highway and road and bridge funding, which basically destroys, I think, the basis for a strong infrastructure program in this country. You're not here trying to argue about a better bill. You're trying to figure out a way to give States less, to give cities and towns less. That would undercut a lot of the projects that are being contemplated all across this country that will not only put people back to work but make us more economically secure. That's what this is all about. It's about trying to come up with an even lousier transportation bill than the one that you brought to the House floor.

At this point, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, and I oppose the motion to move the previous question.

I am growing more and more deeply concerned that our Republican colleagues simply don't get it. They do not understand that their ideological crusade to ''starve the beast'' has only resulted in starving the American worker.

Here we are today taking up the third version of the Republican kick-the-can infrastructure plan down the road in a single week, the third version in a week.

□ 0940

If that's not a complete failure of leadership, I don't know what is.

We are a mere 2 days away from the expiration of our highway programs, and they have their hands over their ears, desperate not to hear commonsense solutions like the bipartisan Senate highway bill.

Since the beginning of the 112th Congress, we have witnessed time and time again their ''my way or the highway'' approach to governing. As a result, job creation is suffering; working families across the Nation are suffering; the construction industry is in the middle of the construction season, and it's suffering because House Republicans want to score political points with their ideological base rather than solve real-world problems with real-world solutions.

This week, the House Republicans were forced to remove two short-term highway extension bills from floor consideration because they would rather dig deeper into the conservative ranks of their caucus than reach across the aisle to discuss solutions for the American worker. Sadly, this is nothing new. They have been doing this for the past 15 months. We have lurched from self-created crisis to self-created crisis. I've counted at least five over the last 15 months. Yet they wonder why the

American public's perception of Congress is at an all-time low.

Meanwhile, I've sponsored H.R. 14, the Senate highway bill, which is a bipartisan path forward that makes meaningful reforms and provides certainty to States. I am proud to be offering this bipartisan legislation in order to refocus the discussion on jobs and economic opportunities rather than that of the Republican message this week of tearing down Medicare and protecting the 1 percent at the expense of middle class families.

As of today, House Republicans have yet to put forward a credible highway reauthorization that puts Americans back to work. Their only attempt, H.R. 7, the Boehner-Mica authorization, was called the worst highway bill ever by Secretary of Transportation LaHood, a former distinguished Member of this body, a Republican. It was drafted in the dark of night without any Democratic input. It removed transit from the highway trust fund. It broke a 30-year bipartisan cooperation to fund transit, and it couldn't attract a single Democratic vote nor even a majority of Republican votes.

Over in the Senate, MAP–21 passed overwhelmingly with a bipartisan majority and is fully paid for, something House Republicans seem unable to come close to achieving. The MAP–21 pay-fors are less controversial than those contained in the House Republican bill. The Senate has estimated that MAP–21 will save 1.8 million jobs and will create up to 1 million more jobs. That's almost 3 million jobs wrapped up in this legislation. During a weak economic recovery that is looking for a jump-start, this is the kind of legislation we need to be passing.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. House Republicans had their chance to address our infrastructure needs with H.R. 7. Instead, they chose to pander to their base and chase ideological extremes. I am sorry to say their effort was an utter failure. MAP–21 has the support of Senate Democrats, Senate Republicans, House Democrats, and the administration.

It is time that the House Republicans got on board with job creation instead of fighting it. Americans want jobs and safe roads and bridges. The Senate passed the biggest jobs-creating bill in this Congress by an overwhelming bipartisan majority. We have the chance to do the same thing. Let's move H.R. 14, and let's put this country back to work.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, let's just set the record straight. The other side says that this wasn't a bipartisan process.

First of all, the first hearing was held in the ranking Democrat member's hometown and district in West Virginia. We went from sea to shining sea, all the way to Los Angeles, in order to accommodate a bicameral, unprecedented bipartisan hearing in Los Angeles. Again, the comments that are made here do not reflect the reality. In the committee, we took 100 Democrat amendments, and we accepted about 20 of them. In addition to when we drafted the legislation, 60 percent of the recommendations of the Democrats were in the draft that came before the committee. Yet there is this stuff about it not being bipartisan.

Then the Republicans can't get it done. These are the people who cannot get it done. They controlled the House; they controlled the Senate; they controlled the White House during this entire process. They couldn't even get it to committee. They could not get the bill to committee. It passed a subcommittee.

So we have passed it. They've made bipartisanship in this committee a one-way street, and it wasn't that way before. They will close down major projects across this country if we don't pass this extension. Why are we here for this extension for 90 days? Because we offered 90 days to begin with, and they said, No, we won't do 90 days because we want to keep things stirred up. So we said, Well, what do you want? They said 60 days. Okay. In the spirit of bipartisanship, we'll go 60 days. So then they rejected that. Some of the Democrats threw each other under the bus, so to speak; and here we are at 90 days again.

So, folks, let's get the facts straight and the reality straight. Republicans want America to work and our infrastructure to be built.

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

Let's get the facts straight. Let's talk about this great bipartisan process.

All we're asking for today is to have an alternative to be voted on—one substitute. That's it. That's all we've been asking for; and we've been told, no, you can't. It's your way or the highway. That's not bipartisanship.

As for all of these great bipartisan amendments, let's everybody be clear on one thing: that not one single amendment has been considered to the transportation bill on this House floor. Not one single amendment has been allowed. You yanked the bill when, I guess, some of the extreme right wing of the extreme right wing got upset on your side for whatever reason, also because there were a lot of moderates who realized that the bill that you brought to the floor would bankrupt the highway trust fund, that it was bad policy for this country, and that it was not going to help rebuild our infrastructure.

So the only bipartisan proposal we have before us right now, which is not perfect but which is the only bipartisan product, is the Senate bill, which passed 74–22.

At this time, I would be happy to yield 1 minute to the ranking member of the Transportation Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I asked for this time only because the chairman referred to opening these hearings in my hometown of Beckley, West Virginia, which he did, and I appreciate that very much and the many other hearings he held across the country. Yet the question is, you have to learn from these hearings, and you have to incorporate that which you learn from these hearings into the bill that you end up finally writing, and I'm not sure that was done from what the gentleman heard from my home State.

In addition, which the gentleman from Massachusetts referred to, as to the bipartisanship of the other body, we all know in this town and across the country how hard it is to get that other body to agree on anything. Even if it were a resolution saying, ''I love Mother,'' it's hard to get 60 votes over there for anything. Yet they got 72 votes for a bipartisan transportation bill. They got half of the Republican Members of that other body to support a bipartisan transportation bill. We have tried, as the gentleman from Massachusetts knows, to bring that up in the Rules Committee, to make it in order.

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

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

Mr. RAHALL. I and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) have tried and tried and tried to bring that up and on the floor of the House. Yet we get turned down at every turn in the road. At every corner in the road, we get turned down in our efforts to bring up the bipartisan Senate transportation bill. It is not very often that you will find such a measure produced by that other body. Yet they've done it this time, and we cannot get it brought up to the floor of this body.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, pass the extension.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to refrain from trafficking the well while a Member is under recognition.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), I just want to point out something for my colleagues here.

One of the reasons many of us prefer the Senate bill to even the House bill that you brought to the floor and then split up and then yanked from the floor is that the Senate bill sustains approximately 1.9 million jobs on an annual basis. The House Republican bill destroys 550,000 jobs compared to the current funding level. So what you had brought to the floor and then you yanked was a job killer.

At this point, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, the ranking member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee, Mr. DEFAZIO.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This is really a discussion about the future of transportation in America, and there is a very basic difference.

The Republicans are being hung up because there is a substantial portion of their caucus that believes—truly believes—there is no Federal interest, that we should not have a national transportation policy and that it should be devolved to the States.

□ 0950

Well, that's what this looks like when you devolve to the States. Kansas Turnpike, 1956, Oklahoma said they'd build their section. They didn't. They were launching cars into Amos Switzer's cornfield for the next 8 years. This was about the failure of a 50-State transportation policy. They are being hung up by enough people on their side to hold up this bill by those who believe that this is the way the country should look in the future.

Now, we want jobs. Even if they could move their H.R. 7—which they can't because of this faction—they would cut funding by 20 percent. We've got 150,000 bridges on the Federal system, the National Highway System, that need repair or replacement. Forty percent of the pavement needs substantial redoing, not just resurfacing. There is a $70 billion backlog on our legacy transit systems—that's our 20th century system—and there's no money in this for a 21st century system.

And this is their vision. Their vision, it's one of two visions. Cut 20 percent. The Ryan budget actually would cut transportation by 35 percent from current levels. Or the Flat Earthers who say there's no Federal interest in a national transportation system. One of those three things is going to come out from their side; a 20 percent cut, a 35 percent cut, or no program.

We have an alternative. Let's vote on the Senate bill. When you can get 22 Republican Senators to vote to extend the program for 2 years—and we had one gentleman say, Oh, 2 years is nothing, no equipment orders. Well, guess what. I have a list here—and it's just the beginnings of a list—of seven State DOTs who have contacted the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials saying a 90-day delay will cost jobs; 40,000 jobs in North Carolina, and on down the list. Nevada, Maryland, Michigan, Rhode Island, West Virginia, and New Hampshire have all reported in about projects they're going to delay or cancel if we do another 90-day extension and we don't do the 2-year bill. The 2-year bill is enough certainty for these projects to move forward. No, it's not optimal. We need a real 5-year bill, but we don't need a 5-year bill that guts or destroys the program. But those are the alternatives you are offering us here.

Just give us one vote, just one vote. Let us vote on the Senate bill, which passed as a true bipartisan bill. This is not a bipartisan bill. The gentleman from Florida is a good friend. But look, we did not sit down and look at this bill and review it. It was presented to us.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, again, I will go back over this list because we must have forgotten it since I presented it a few minutes ago.

The Democrats, when they were in control, passed a 1-month extension back on October 1, 2009; 1 month, no amendments; 1.5 months a little bit later, no amendments; 2.5 months, no amendments; 1 month, no amendments; 9 months, no amendments; 2 months, no amendments.

I'm not sure what they're talking about, Mr. Speaker. Pass the extension.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that, I would yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment is going down, but there are people still unemployed. Right now we have a Senate bill on transportation, and many don't understand what that means. There is a wide gamut of highways and mass transit and infrastructure ready to be signed by the President of the United States so that millions of Americans can go to work, and this body won't allow us to vote for a bill that has already passed the Senate.

Higher funding levels to be able to build, build, build. More jobs, 1.9 million annualized. Buy America, do I love it. Buy America, making sure that we buy the products right here in America so that not only are we building with American workers but are also supplied by them. Providing guaranteed transit funding for all of America. The crumbling transit infrastructure, we're providing for it. And in Houston, Texas, we need those moneys, and we need the operational moneys.

So here's my point: Unemployment is going down. The President is moving forward on employing and empowering Americans. And they won't put the Senate bill, the bipartisan bill, on the floor.

Today we need to vote for the jobs here in America. I ask for a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Mr. WEBSTER. Could I inquire of Mr. MCGOVERN how many more requests for time he has?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I have the ranking member of the committee and myself.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it's my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member of the Transportation Committee.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that the extension the majority is bringing to the floor this morning is too long, and it will do nothing but continue the uncertainty that States and businesses—small businesses, I might add—have faced since the expiration in the last long-term bill in August '09, 2½ years and eight extensions ago.

Uncertainty is what we are continuing by the passage of this extension today, uncertainty among the small business community in this country. They need the certainty with which to plan contracts.

This happens to be the springtime of the year, the time when contracts are let and when jobs are planned and when people need to know if they're going to be working or not—not 90 days from now. This is the contracting season with the work usually done during the summer and then concluded by the fall, and the bottom lines are added up.

We have already heard stories of small businesses that have had to cut back from 80 percent of their budget to 40 percent or less because they don't know what the Congress is going to do in terms of a long-term transportation bill. To elaborate on what my colleague from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) had said, the impacts on our State DOTs of endless extensions and the inability to plan for current and future transportation needs are very real, very real. And here are just a few of the examples:

North Carolina has delayed projects totaling $1.2 billion, affecting 41,000 jobs;

Nevada and Maryland each report 4,000 jobs are at risk due to projects being delayed;

Michigan has only let 35 percent of its projects, or $180 million below its normal activity level, and it's delayed several large construction projects;

Rhode Island has delayed $80 million worth of projects and planning for needed safety and structural improvements of a major interchange;

My home State of West Virginia reports that an extension would result in a 10 percent cut in programs, affecting over 1,200 jobs, and the State of West Virginia may be forced to shut projects down or delay payments to contractors to manage cash flow;

New Hampshire, Mr. Speaker, will not award contracts on $60 million in projects that were recently bid, affecting 1,800 job years, and will delay $115 million in bond issuance for the construction of two exits; and

Illinois estimates that the uncertainty posed by stopgap funding measures means that 4,500 jobs could be lost and that ongoing uncertainty will increase contractor risk and cause higher bids for construction projects.

Without congressional action on the Senate bill, many States in the Northeast and Midwest stand to lose an entire construction season. That would be a devastating blow to many States as they slowly recover from the worst construction downturn since the Great Depression.

While millions of construction jobs and much-needed infrastructure projects hang in the balance, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have spent weeks driving in circles. They have at least been consistent and embraced this theme of uncertainty in their own internal deliberations.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close and will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up H.R. 14, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act. This is the House companion to the bipartisan Senate transportation bill that passed in the other body 74–22.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives is not working for the American people. At a time when jobs should be the most important priority of this Congress, we have a leadership that talks about everything but jobs. And when it comes to jobs, nothing could be more important than passing a transportation bill.

□ 1000

The Republicans brought a terrible bill to the floor—so terrible, they couldn't even force their own Members to vote for it. They had to pull it. And now we're in this period of delay, delay, delay; kick the can down the road, kick the can down the road.

And what makes this situation unique, I would say to my friend from Florida, as compared to previous years, is that we actually have a bipartisan bill that has passed one of the Chambers—a bipartisan bill in the Senate that passed overwhelmingly, 74–22—authored by BARBARA BOXER and JIM INHOFE, two polar opposites of the political spectrum. They could come together.

They came together and put the American people first. They put jobs first. It wasn't about ideology. It wasn't about getting it perfect for either of them. And yet here we are, still fighting over the most ridiculous things and bringing the most inconsequential piece of legislation to the House floor when we should be focused on passing bills like this.

I'm told we need to do this because we're going on another recess. God forbid we stay here and actually work on something that will be meaningful for the American people. This bill is so important to our economy that, quite frankly, it's worth us staying here a few extra days and getting this thing done. Instead, we're going to kick the can down the road for 90 days. Next week nothing will be done. We'll come back, and then what? Then what will happen?

Essentially, what we're doing here is we're telling the American people that we're not putting them first. We're not putting jobs first. For the life of me, I can't understand why this Congress, this leadership, which claims to be open, won't even give us a vote. We can't even get a vote on the Senate bill. If you want to vote against the Senate 2-year extension and vote instead for your 90-day extension, fine. But let us have an opportunity to vote on something that will mean something to our communities, that will put people back to work. Why are you denying us this vote? I have yet to hear anybody say why we can't have a vote on this. We had no amendments debated on this House floor on the transportation bill. We ought to have this debated.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so a little democracy can happen here in the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. WEBSTER. The situation we find ourselves in is certainly not ideal. I've been a strong proponent of a long-term reauthorization of Federal transportation programs. Recently, reauthorizations haven't been that long-term. But that's more often than not, also. The goal everyone is seeking is a long-term reauthorization. I hear that, the necessity of it, from all transportation officials all over the country, including my own State and in my own district.

Without the ability to plan over the course of several years—not 3 months, not 17 months—that lack of certainty has increased the operating costs. It increases cost uncertainty, and that is the death knell for critical infrastructure projects in this economy.

As my colleagues have noted, transportation reauthorization bills are typically bipartisan affairs. Unfortunately, we don't have a bipartisan, bicameral agreement on a viable long-term reauthorization yet. But the passage of this brief extension gives us the opportunity to once again bring both sides to the table to try to work out a collaborative effort and a collaborative solution to this problem. I think that's what the American people want. It's our responsibility to make sure that happens, and this is the last chance to do it before the current legislation expires at midnight on Saturday.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 600 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 14) to reauthorize Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 3 of this resolution.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 178, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—237

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

NAYS—178

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

NOT VOTING—16

Black
Costello
Engel
Filner
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Mack
Meeks
Moore
Paul
Rangel
Sanchez, Loretta
Speier
Towns
Woodall
Young (AK)

□ 1029

Mr. PASCRELL changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. PEARCE and ROKITA changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 146 I was inadvertently detained in a meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 146 for H.R. 4281, I was detained because of meeting with constituents to allow the Senate Transportation bill to come to the Floor to save jobs and support new construction for transportation and infrastructure. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 146, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1030

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4281.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 600, I call up the bill (H.R. 4281) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 600, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4281

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012''.

(b) RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the amount apportioned or allocated for a program, project, or activity under this Act in fiscal year 2012 by amounts apportioned or allocated pursuant to the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (title I of Public Law 112–30) for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; reconciliation of funds; table of contents.

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

Sec. 101. Extension of Federal-aid highway programs.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

Sec. 201. Extension of National Highway Traffic Safety Administration highway safety programs.

Sec. 202. Extension of Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration programs.

Sec. 203. Additional programs.

TITLE III—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 301. Allocation of funds for planning programs.

Sec. 302. Special rule for urbanized area formula grants.

Sec. 303. Allocating amounts for capital investment grants.

Sec. 304. Apportionment of formula grants for other than urbanized areas.

Sec. 305. Apportionment based on fixed guideway factors.

Sec. 306. Authorizations for public transportation.

Sec. 307. Amendments to SAFETEA–LU.

TITLE IV—HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXTENSION

Sec. 401. Extension of trust fund expenditure authority.

Sec. 402. Extension of highway-related taxes.

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (Public Law 112–30; 125 Stat. 343) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' each place it appears and inserting ''the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(2) by striking ''½'' each place it appears and inserting ''¾''; and

(3) in subsection (a) by striking ''March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''June 30, 2012''.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 111(c)(3)(B)(ii) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (125 Stat. 343) is amended by striking ''$319,500,000'' and inserting ''$479,250,000''.

(c) EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS UNDER TITLE V OF SAFETEA–LU.—Section 111(e)(2) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (125 Stat. 343) is amended by striking ''the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 112(a) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (125 Stat. 346) is amended by striking ''$196,427,625 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''$294,641,438 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) CHAPTER 4 HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 2001(a)(1) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''$235,000,000 for fiscal year 2009'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''$235,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $176,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(b) HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 2001(a)(2) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''and $54,122,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''and $81,183,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(c) OCCUPANT PROTECTION INCENTIVE GRANTS.—Section 2001(a)(3) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2006'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011, and $18,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(d) SAFETY BELT PERFORMANCE GRANTS.—Section 2001(a)(4) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''and $24,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''and $36,375,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(e) STATE TRAFFIC SAFETY INFORMATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 2001(a)(5) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''for fiscal year 2006'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $25,875,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(f) ALCOHOL-IMPAIRED DRIVING COUNTERMEASURES INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 2001(a)(6) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''$139,000,000 for fiscal year 2009'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''$139,000,000 for each of fiscal years fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $104,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(g) NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.—Section 2001(a)(7) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''and $2,058,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''and $3,087,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(h) HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—Section 2001(a)(8) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''for fiscal year 2006'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $21,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(i) MOTORCYCLIST SAFETY.—Section 2001(a)(9) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2009'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $5,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(j) CHILD SAFETY AND CHILD BOOSTER SEAT SAFETY INCENTIVE GRANTS.—Section 2001(a)(10) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2009'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $5,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(k) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 2001(a)(11) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''and $12,664,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''and $18,996,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS.—Section 31104(a)(8) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(8) $159,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31104(i)(1)(H) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(H) $183,108,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(c) GRANT PROGRAMS.—Section 4101(c) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''2011 and $15,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $22,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'';

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking ''2011 and $16,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $24,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'';

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking ''2011 and $2,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $3,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'';

(4) in paragraph (4) by striking ''2011 and $12,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $18,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''; and

(5) in paragraph (5) by striking ''2011 and $1,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $2,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(d) HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(k)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2011 and $7,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $11,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''.

(e) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—Section 31144(g)(5)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and up to $14,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''and up to $21,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''.

(f) OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—Section 4127(e) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1741) is amended by striking ''2011 (and $500,000 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and $1,500,000 to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012)'' and inserting ''2011

(and $750,000 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and $2,250,000 to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012)''.

(g) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—Section 4134(c) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1744) is amended by striking ''2011 and $500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''.

(h) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 4144(d) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1748) is amended by striking ''March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''June 30, 2012''.

(i) WORKING GROUP FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES TO ENHANCE FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS.—Section 4213(d) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 14710 note; 119 Stat. 1759) is amended by striking ''March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''June 30, 2012''.

SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS.

(a) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS RESEARCH PROJECTS.—Section 7131(c) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1910) is amended by striking ''2011 and $580,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $870,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''.

(b) DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.—Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''; and

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''.

TITLE III—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR PLANNING PROGRAMS.

Section 5305(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012''.

SEC. 302. SPECIAL RULE FOR URBANIZED AREA FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5307(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting ''SPECIAL RULE FOR FISCAL YEARS 2005 THROUGH 2011 AND THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 1, 2011, AND ENDING ON JUNE 30, 2012.—'';

(2) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''; and

(3) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting ''MAXIMUM AMOUNTS IN FISCAL YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2011 AND THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 1, 2011, AND ENDING ON JUNE 30, 2012.—''; and

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking ''2011 and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''2011 and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012''.

SEC. 303. ALLOCATING AMOUNTS FOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.

Section 5309(m) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2006 THROUGH 2011 AND THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 1, 2011, AND ENDING ON JUNE 30, 2012.—'';

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''; and

(C) in subparagraph (A)(i) by striking ''2011 and $100,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $150,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''2011 and $7,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $11,250,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''2011 and $2,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $3,750,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''; and

(3) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking ''2011 and $5,000,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $7,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(ii) in clause (i) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $1,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $1,875,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(iii) in clause (ii) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $1,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $1,875,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(iv) in clause (iii) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(v) in clause (iv) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(vi) in clause (v) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(vii) in clause (vi) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(viii) in clause (vii) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $325,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $487,500 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''; and

(ix) in clause (viii) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $175,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $262,500 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking clause (vii) and inserting the following:

''(vii) $10,125,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.'';

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''and not less than $17,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''and not less than $26,250,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''; and

(E) in subparagraph (E) by striking ''and $1,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''and $2,250,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''.

SEC. 304. APPORTIONMENT OF FORMULA GRANTS FOR OTHER THAN URBANIZED AREAS.

Section 5311(c)(1)(G) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(G) $11,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

SEC. 305. APPORTIONMENT BASED ON FIXED GUIDEWAY FACTORS.

Section 5337(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(g) SPECIAL RULE FOR OCTOBER 1, 2011, THROUGH JUNE 30, 2012.—The Secretary shall apportion amounts made available for fixed guideway modernization under section 5309 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012, in accordance with subsection (a), except that the Secretary shall apportion 75 percent of each dollar amount specified in subsection (a).''.

SEC. 306. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FORMULA AND BUS GRANTS.—Section 5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking subparagraph (G) and inserting the following:

''(G) $6,270,423,750 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''$113,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $113,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $56,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$113,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $85,125,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''$4,160,365,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $4,160,365,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $2,080,182,500 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$4,160,365,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $3,120,273,750 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''$51,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $51,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $25,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$51,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $38,625,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''$1,666,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $1,666,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $833,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,''

and inserting ''$1,666,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $1,249,875,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(E) in subparagraph (E) by striking ''$984,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $984,000,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $492,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$984,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $738,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(F) in subparagraph (F) by striking ''$133,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $133,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $66,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$133,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $100,125,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(G) in subparagraph (G) by striking ''$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $465,000,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $232,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $348,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(H) in subparagraph (H) by striking ''$164,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $164,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $82,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$164,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $123,375,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(I) in subparagraph (I) by striking ''$92,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $92,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $46,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$92,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $69,375,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(J) in subparagraph (J) by striking ''$26,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $26,900,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $13,450,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$26,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $20,175,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(K) in subparagraph (K) by striking ''in fiscal year 2006'' and all that follows through ''March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $2,625,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(L) in subparagraph (L) by striking ''in fiscal year 2006'' and all that follows through ''March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $18,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,'';

(M) in subparagraph (M) by striking ''$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $465,000,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $232,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $348,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''; and

(N) in subparagraph (N) by striking ''$8,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $8,800,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $4,400,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$8,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $6,600,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''.

(b) CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.—Section 5338(c)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(7) $1,466,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

(c) RESEARCH AND UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTERS.—Section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''and 2010, $69,750,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $29,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''through 2011, and $33,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''; and

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

''(3) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—

''(A) RESEARCH.—Of amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012, the Secretary shall allocate for each of the activities and projects described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (1) an amount equal to 47 percent of the amount allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each such subparagraph.

''(B) UNIVERSITY CENTERS PROGRAM.—

''(i) OCTOBER 1, 2011, THROUGH JUNE 30, 2012.—Of the amounts allocated under subparagraph (A)(i) for the university centers program under section 5506 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012, the Secretary shall allocate for each program described in clauses (i) through (iii) and (v) through (viii) of paragraph (2)(A) an amount equal to 47 percent of the amount allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each such clause.

''(ii) FUNDING.—If the Secretary determines that a project or activity described in paragraph (2) received sufficient funds in fiscal year 2011, or a previous fiscal year, to carry out the purpose for which the project or activity was authorized, the Secretary may not allocate any amounts under clause (i) for the project or activity for fiscal year 2012 or any subsequent fiscal year.''.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 5338(e)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(7) $74,034,750 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012.''.

SEC. 307. AMENDMENTS TO SAFETEA–LU.

(a) CONTRACTED PARATRANSIT PILOT.—Section 3009(i)(1) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1572) is amended by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''.

(b) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 3011 of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 5309 note; 119 Stat. 1588) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(5) by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012''; and

(2) in the second sentence of subsection (d) by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''.

(c) ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 3012(b)(8) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 5310 note; 119 Stat. 1593) is amended by striking ''March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''June 30, 2012''.

(d) OBLIGATION CEILING.—Section 3040(8) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1639) is amended to read as follows:

''(8) $7,843,708,500 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012, of which not more than $6,270,423,750 shall be from the Mass Transit Account.''.

(e) PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS FOR NEW FIXED GUIDEWAY CAPITAL PROJECTS.—Section 3043 of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1640) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''; and

(2) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012,''.

(f) ALLOCATIONS FOR NATIONAL RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.—Section 3046(c)(2) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 5338 note; 119 Stat. 1706) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2012, in amounts equal to 47 percent of the amounts allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each of paragraphs (2), (3), (5), and (8) through (25) of subsection (a).''.

TITLE IV—HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXTENSION

SEC. 401. EXTENSION OF TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''April 1, 2012'' in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting ''July 1, 2012''; and

(2) by striking ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II'' in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012''.

(b) SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.—Section 9504 of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II'' each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012''; and

(2) by striking ''April 1, 2012'' in subsection (d)(2) and inserting ''July 1, 2012''.

(c) LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—Paragraph (2) of section 9508(e) of such Code is amended by striking ''April 1, 2012'' and inserting ''July 1, 2012''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on April 1, 2012.

SEC. 402. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY-RELATED TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Each of the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''June 30, 2012'':

(A) Section 4041(a)(1)(C)(iii)(I).

(B) Section 4041(m)(1)(B).

(C) Section 4081(d)(1).

(2) Each of the following provisions of such Code is amended by striking ''April 1, 2012'' and inserting ''July 1, 2012'':

(A) Section 4041(m)(1)(A).

(B) Section 4051(c).

(C) Section 4071(d).

(D) Section 4081(d)(3).

(b) EXTENSION OF TAX, ETC., ON USE OF CERTAIN HEAVY VEHICLES.—Each of the following provisions of such Code is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2013'':

(1) Section 4481(f).

(2) Subsections (c)(4) and (d) of section 4482.

(c) FLOOR STOCKS REFUNDS.—Section 6412(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''April 1, 2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''July 1, 2012'';

(2) by striking ''September 30, 2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''December 31, 2012''; and

(3) by striking ''July 1, 2012'' and inserting ''October 1, 2012''.

(d) EXTENSION OF CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS.—Sections 4221(a) and 4483(i) of such Code are each amended by striking ''April 1, 2012'' and inserting ''July 1, 2012''.

(e) EXTENSION OF TRANSFERS OF CERTAIN TAXES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9503 of such Code is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''April 1, 2012'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting ''July 1, 2012'';

(ii) by striking ''APRIL 1, 2012'' in the heading of paragraph (2) and inserting ''JULY 1, 2012'';

(iii) by striking ''March 31, 2012'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''June 30, 2012''; and

(iv) by striking ''January 1, 2013'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''April 1, 2013''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''January 1, 2013'' and inserting ''April 1, 2013''.

(2) MOTORBOAT AND SMALL-ENGINE FUEL TAX TRANSFERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (3)(A)(i) and (4)(A) of section 9503(c) of such Code are each amended by striking ''April 1, 2012'' and inserting ''July 1, 2012''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—Section 201(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–11(b)) is amended—

(i) by striking ''April 1, 2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''July 1, 2013''; and

(ii) by striking ''April 1, 2012'' and inserting ''July 1, 2012''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on April 1, 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, we know why we're here. We are here to pass a responsible extension so that people across America can go to work, that we can finish a long-term transportation bill, and that we can be responsible stewards of the trust which the taxpayers and the citizens of America sent us here for.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, March 29, 2012.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MICA: I am writing concerning H.R. 4281, the ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012,'' which is scheduled for floor consideration this week.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code. Title IV of this bill amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by extending the current Highway Trust Fund expenditure authority and the associated Federal excise taxes to June 30, 2012. However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4281, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, March 29, 2012.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4281, the ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012.'' The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure recognizes the Committee on Ways and Means has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 4281, and I appreciate your effort to facilitate consideration of this bill.

I also concur with you that forgoing action on this bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means 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 legislation.

I will include our letters on H.R. 4281 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Again, I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I look forward to working with the Committee on Ways and Means as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, the pending legislation before this body today, at the eleventh hour, as a result of a tortuous process—excuse me, it's not been a process at all, but rather a series of stalled starts, retreats, and the failure by the Republican leadership to seize upon a reasonable solution to reauthorizing our Nation's transportation surface programs.

At first, the Speaker stated this was a jobs bill. Almost as soon as the words were out of his mouth, he countered himself by saying that investing in America's infrastructure has nothing to do with jobs at all. Nothing to do with jobs at all.

What came about then was a scheme to produce a 5-year reauthorization bill coupled with that universal House Republican answer to all ills, which is to open up ANWR to drilling, drill, baby, drill, and then attempt to pay for some of the proposal on the backs of working-class Americans.

The surface transportation portion, H.R. 7, proposed to slash $15.8 billion in highway funding to the States, destroying 550,000 American family-wage jobs over the coming years. Investment in roads, highways, and bridges would retrench in all but five States.

The Republican leadership also proposed to shift public transit revenue to highways and then bail out transit with a one-time transfer of $40 billion from the general fund, while robbing middle class Americans to pay for the shuffle.

This is an idea that would make even the most hardened con artist green with envy. It is a shell game. It's a shell game, but it has no place in the hallowed Halls of Congress. It is a shell game, and it is a sham.

But it was not Democrats who took this ill-advised proposal down; it was Republicans. Over the course of 6 weeks, they caucused, they corralled, and they contorted themselves in trying to obtain 218 votes to pass H.R. 7. And they could not, which brings us to this week, when the Republican leadership decided to bring up a 90-day extension bill under suspension of the rules in the form of H.R. 4239.

But when this legislation was called up on Tuesday, it was done so as a 60-day extension. The House debated this measure. I asked for a vote, and the vote was postponed. As far as I know, that request for a vote is still pending, even as we debate a different bill now.

Then another curious thing happened. According to the publication Transportation Weekly yesterday, and I quote:

> After more discussion among themselves, Republican leaders order Mica to reintroduce the 60-day version of his extension as a stand-alone bill, which can then be considered by the Rules Committee.

That bill is H.R. 4276.

The Transportation Weekly article yesterday then noted, and I quote again:

> After still more discussion among themselves, Republican leaders order Mica to reintroduce the 90-day version of the extension as a stand-alone bill, which can then be considered by the Rules Committee as well.

Confused? Anybody confused?

That bill is now H.R. 4281, which we are currently debating. Who knows what we'll be debating the next hour.

And yet, during the course of last and this week, the Republican leadership could have scheduled the bipartisan, non-controversial, Senate-passed bill for consideration by this body. It could have been brought up any time by the Speaker, passed by this body in a bipartisan fashion, signed into law.

I make these points to illustrate the fast and loose means by which the Republican leadership has been dealing with an extremely serious matter. Instead they're spinning their wheels in pursuit of the ill-conceived H.R. 7, which slashes investments in Federal aid to highways by $15.8 billion from current levels at a time when more spending is needed to address structurally deficient bridges and maintain our highway system.

H.R. 7 reduces highway funding to all but five States.

H.R. 7 guts America's commitment to transit by a sleight-of-hand move that siphons away a portion of gas taxes which are dedicated to transit funding and instead proposes to fund

transit with general revenue funds which is offset on the backs of workers.

H.R. 7 contains a bogus pay-for by linking opening up ANWR and changes in OCS oil and gas leasing, which only produce $4.3 billion over a 10-year period.

H.R. 7 continues to send American dollars and jobs overseas through the inclusion of a ''Buy America Light'' requirement that does not fully cover transit rolling stock, Amtrak, and the Federal railroad loan program, while failing to crack down on DOT's waiver authority.

H.R. 7 places a roadblock on public participation in reviewing transportation projects by limiting and, in certain cases, outright waiving NEPA.

And H.R. 7 eliminates OSHA protections for hazmat workers and allows bad actors to continue to receive hazmat compliance exemptions.

So this body could have considered and passed the other body's bipartisan bill, which passed that body by a vote of 74–22. That's half of the Republican Members in the other body, and we know how difficult it is to get that other body to get 60 votes to cut off debate on any resolution or any bill. Even one saying ''I love Mother'' would be hard to pass in that other body. Yet, for a transportation bill, they came up with 72 votes.

That bill continues current funding levels, sustaining approximately 1.9 million jobs. The States will receive $3.8 billion more in highway construction funding than H.R. 7 over the course of 2 years.

The Senate bipartisan bill eliminates many of the gaping loopholes in current law by American requirements, loopholes that are being exploited by foreign competitors like China, who are stealing American jobs.

The Senate bipartisan bill does not contain poison pills like H.R. 7, such as provisions to strip OSHA requirements for hazmat workers and efforts to finance highway construction on the backs of middle class workers.

I would note, Mr. Speaker, that we have tried, we have tried by every means available to us on this side of the aisle, to have this Senate-passed bill brought up for consideration in the House, and not just through procedural motions. Yesterday, Representatives DEFAZIO, CORRINE BROWN, TIM BISHOP, and myself submitted that measure to the Rules Committee, asking them to make it in order as an amendment to the pending measure so we could vote on it today. We were denied.

Instead, we are on the floor today with the Republican leadership proposal to kick the can down the road for another 90 days so they can try to convince their conference to support something they have not been able to do over the last 6 weeks.

□ 1040

The fact of the matter is we need to be investing more, not less, if we are to keep pace with China, India, and our other international competitors. Today China spends 9 percent of its GDP per year on infrastructure. India spends 5 percent. The U.S. only invests 1.9 percent.

While our competitors are moving forward, the inability of the Republican leadership to reach out across party lines to House Democrats to address this bill is leaving America stuck in a ditch and putting American businesses at a disadvantage with companies around the world.

In 2008, a blue ribbon commission established as a result of the last multiyear surface transportation bill reported that the Federal Government must invest a minimum of $62 billion a year just to maintain the Nation's roads and bridges in their present inadequate condition.

This bill comes nowhere close to that. Instead, it leads America down the opposite path. President Lyndon B. Johnson once said: ''In large measure, America's history is a history of her transportation.''

I say let us seize the moment and move forward without procedural gimmicks, without partisan brinksmanship, and do what is right for America, for the American worker, for American families, and for American values.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, and then I would like to yield 2 minutes to the chair of the Highway Subcommittee, Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, let's just deal with the facts. The fact is that the Democrats had six amendments—1 month, 1.5 months, 2.5 months, 1 month, 9 months, and 2 months—when they controlled the House of Representatives and the Senate by huge majorities, and the White House. They couldn't even get it through committee. They could not get it through committee. These are the facts.

LIST OF TRANSPORTATION EXTENSIONS

Extension #1: A Democratic controlled House passed extension with a duration of 1-month from 10/01/2009 to 10/31/2009.

Extension #2: A Democratic controlled House passed extension with a duration of 1.5-months from 11/01/2009 to 12/18/2009.

Extension #3: A Democratic controlled House passed extension with a duration of 2.5-months from 12/19/2009 to 2/28/2010.

Extension #4: A Democratic controlled House passed extension with a duration of 1-month from 3/01/2010 to 3/28/2010.

Extension #5: A Democratic controlled House passed extension with a duration of 9-months from 3/29/2010 to 12/31/2010.

Extension #6: A Democratic controlled House passed extension with a duration of 2-months from 1/01/2011 to 3/04/2011.

Extension #7: A Republican controlled House passed extension with a duration of 7-months from 3/05/2011 to 9/30/2011.

Extension #8: A Republican controlled House passed extension with a duration of 6-months from 10/01/2011 to 3/31/2012.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that Chairman MICA has performed great leadership of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and he has tried in every way possible to work with everybody he possibly could. His task has been made much more difficult by the rule prohibiting earmarks. And as he just mentioned, the other side couldn't bring a bill out of committee and to this floor, a highway bill, in the last Congress when they controlled the House, the Senate, the White House, and still allowed earmarks. So we're in a very difficult situation at this point, and that's why we're here today asking for this 90-day extension.

H.R. 4281 extends the surface transportation programs through June 30 at funding levels consistent with fiscal year 2012. The transportation appropriations bill passed in November. This extension is clean and does not add any policy provisions. Without this extension, the transit and highway safety programs are set to expire this Saturday. This legislation will allow these programs to continue to operate as the spring construction season kicks off.

If Congress fails to pass this extension by Saturday, it will cost the highway trust fund about $1 billion a week in lost revenue and put the brakes on 134,000 highway projects and 5,700 transit projects across the Nation. States that seek to be reimbursed for their Federal aid for highway and transit projects would be unable to receive Federal funds for the work they have completed. The Federal Highway Administration would furlough 3,500 of their employees, and work on environmental permits and project approvals for new construction projects would come to a screeching halt. Over 280,000 construction workers, Mr. Speaker, working on highway and bridge projects today could lose their jobs if Congress cannot pass this extension.

This country simply cannot afford a loss of such a magnitude during our tenuous road to economic recovery. Time magazine has a cover article this week describing our recovery as the wimpy recovery, and it's based primarily on pent-up demand.

We need to pass this extension so that we can work toward completing and finalizing H.R. 7, our long-term authorization reform bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the distinguished ranking member on our Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This could or should be the most important jobs-creating bill in America, investing in our Nation's infrastructure, making our Nation more competitive in the international economy, more efficiently moving goods and people. The current system, a legacy of the 1950s, is falling apart.

The Republicans are telling us that this 90-day extension will be good for America. It will not be good for America because we have a better option before us. A bill passed by the United

States Senate, a bipartisan bill, with 22 Republican Senators, half the Republican Senators supporting that bill, which would give us more funding without creating deficit and create more jobs than their pie-in-the-sky bill, H.R. 7, which they can't even get out of their own caucus here, because their own caucus is split.

There are a number of Republicans who do not believe we should have a national transportation system. They want to devolve it back to the States, go back to the pre-1950s.

The Speaker was forced to say to his caucus:

> We are not making the claim that spending taxpayer money on transportation projects creates jobs. We don't make that claim, and we won't make that claim. What makes this a jobs bill is that it removes government barriers that are getting in the way of economic growth.

That's not what all the people engaged in rebuilding the Nation's infrastructure think. They think investment equals jobs. If we do this 90-day extension, the Association of General Contractors says that States will cut back from 50 percent to 40 percent of their planned projects because of the uncertainty created by this 90-day extension. We're going to lose half of the proposed projects this construction season around America, tens of thousands of jobs, needed investment because they've got a bunch of bozos in their caucus that don't believe we should have a national transportation system. They're fighting among themselves.

Give us a vote. Let us vote on the Senate bill.

It doesn't create deficit. It does create jobs. It does give us the investment we need.

The gentleman who spoke just before me, the gentleman from Tennessee, who is a good friend, under the bill they're trying to pry out of their caucus, which the Secretary of Transportation called the worst transportation bill in history—and by the way, the Secretary is a Republican and served in this House for more than a decade. He says it's the worst bill ever in terms of policy and lack of investment. In the case of the gentleman from Tennessee, their H.R. 7, if they could get it out of caucus—and they can't—it would cost his State $444 million over 5 years. That's lost investment. That's more than 10,000 jobs lost.

We have an opportunity today to take up a 2-year bill and provide certainty not only for construction jobs and for engineering jobs, but for people who manufacture construction equipment, for people with Made in America requirements who construct transportation equipment, our buses, our light rail, our streetcars, all the things that need building and replacing just for the existing system, let alone beginning to have a vision of building out a 21st century system. Our competitor nations around the world are doing it.

They are so dyspeptic on their side, they're arguing over whether or not the Federal Government should be involved in transportation. That's nuts. We settled that debate 60 years ago when Dwight David Eisenhower said this doesn't work. We have States building turnpikes that end in farmers' fields because the adjoining State couldn't afford to build their section of the turnpike. He said we need a coordinated national transportation policy.

We have an opportunity to improve on the one we have today by passing the Senate bill that does do some streamlining, it does do things that will help us spend the money more efficiently, and it maintains current levels of spending instead of reductions, and it does not have the uncertainty of a 90-day bill that is going to cost us half of the proposed projects this construction season.

Give us that chance. Let us have that vote. What are you afraid of? Are you afraid it might pass?

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is appropriate that Members of my conference be referred to as bozos. I think that we have dedicated Americans, ladies and gentlemen, who serve this country and the Congress well.

The gentleman who just spoke on September 23, 2009, said:

> Don't play politics with investments in our infrastructure, don't play politics with the economy, don't play politics with people's jobs, don't bring America to a screeching halt on October 1 and walk away from your obligation to extend this program.

Mr. Speaker, when they controlled the House in huge numbers, they could not pass that extension, nor could they pass, I'm told, any extension freestanding.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1050

Mr. RAHALL. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I still agree with that quote. We shouldn't play politics. It has never been a partisan issue. You've made it into a partisan issue, and that quote was when you were opposing a 90-day extension and when I was saying don't play politics by opposing a 90-day extension at that point in time. But we're too far down the road. We didn't have an alternative then. We have an alternative now. Pass the Senate bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member on the House Education and the Workforce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Americans all over the country know that our economy is improving, that the unemployment number is coming down, that people are finding jobs, that small businesses are doing better; but it's a very fragile recovery. That infrastructure bill that is waiting in the Senate, which was passed 74–22, is key to continuing the economic growth in this country for businesses, for families, and for people seeking jobs who have been laid off for a very long time.

But now what we see here today is a conscious decision. Rather than give the Obama administration and President Obama any help with the continuing growth in the economy, which these jobs would mean if we had a long-term extension of the highway bill for all across America, they've decided that they'll do a short-term extension. This is a party that has complained about uncertainty in the economy, about uncertainty in the business community—with a 90-day extension. Cities, counties, and State governments are going to have to rethink what they contract for—with a 90-day extension. There are those in the leadership who have already said, And then we'll need another 90 days. This construction season will be gone for equipment manufacturers, for engineers, for construction workers, all across the country in our local communities, who are in desperate need of infrastructure improvement.

But they've made a decision that they're going to fight President Obama with the jobs that belong to middle class Americans all across the country—jobs that people need today to feed their families. They've made a decision: inject uncertainty. Those contracts and those jobs won't be met, and that will somehow be a victory for the Republicans in the House, but it will be a disaster for American families, for American workers, and for American businesses.

This kind of cold-blooded, political calculation to use the jobs of the American working people as political cannon fodder for your agenda in order to defeat the Obama administration is outrageous.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. It should be rejected by your party, and it should be rejected by my party because, when you put American people's lives and their well-being and their family incomes and the economic growth in our communities on the line for this kind of partisanship, you should stop it. You should stop it.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, you should stop banging the gavel, because this is a critical issue for the American people, for their families, for their livelihoods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is no longer recognized.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield, at this time, 2 minutes to the

chair of the Railroads Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. I wish the gentleman from California would have shown that kind of passion when the stimulus bill was passed 2 years ago and had come to the floor and said that the stimulus bill should be an infrastructure bill. There was only a very, very small portion—I think about $68 billion of that $800 billion stimulus package—that went to the infrastructure of this country. Where was the gentleman when that outrage was happening?

If you want real stimulation—and we believe this stimulates the economy in that this helps put concrete on our roads and repairs our bridges and puts people to work—this bill will do that, a 5-year bill. An 18-month bill is not going to put any kind of certainty out there. I correct myself. It will create certainty. The certainty is that it will bankrupt the trust fund in less than 2 years. Our bill that we've been trying to pass here, a 5-year bill, that's what the people back in the States want.

To the gentleman from Oregon, I'm surprised. He has been a long-time member of the T&I Committee and knows that a long-term transportation bill is better for the States, that it's better for the folks who build roads and employ people, and that that's what we need here. That's what we're trying to get at.

Mr. RAHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I will not yield to the gentleman from West Virginia. I know the gentleman has plenty of time, and he can respond on his time.

This 90-day extension is a clean extension. It gives us the time to work on a 5-year bill. As I said, members on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee know that a 5-year bill is something that would put certainty out there to the folks in the States—to the folks who are going to buy trucks, who are going to hire people, who are going to expand their businesses to build and rebuild these bridges and roads throughout the country. It doesn't make any sense to do an 18-month extension, which is basically what the Senate's bill does, and along the way bankrupt the trust fund.

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

Mr. MICA. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SHUSTER. Our 5-year bill has significant reforms in it that will shorten the timeframe to build a highway. We all sit around here and we talk about streamlining government. That's what this bill does. It eliminates departments and consolidates departments in transportation, and it shortens the timeline of 14 to 15 years down to 7 to 8 years.

Now, it's tough to quantify the savings, but we all know that time is money. All of us have seen these projects that go on year, after year, after year. They balloon and they have cost overruns. This bill is going to solve a lot of those problems, so we need to pass this 90-day extension in order to be able to continue to work on a real solution to our infrastructure.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the bill he is promoting, H.R. 7, means to his home State of Pennsylvania a cut of $948 million, and it destroys some 32,983 good-paying jobs. For fiscal year 2016, in the State of Pennsylvania, the level of funding will be less than that for fiscal year 2004. That's what H.R. 7 would mean to the gentleman's home State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. You would not yield to me. I will not yield to you.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes now to the gentleman from Missouri, a valued member of our committee, Mr. CARNAHAN.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I rise today in strong opposition to yet another lame, shortsighted extension of our surface transportation system.

I thank NICK RAHALL and PETER DEFAZIO for their staunch support of a real transportation-jobs bill.

This kick-the-can-down-the-road extension fails—it fails—to make progress in rebuilding America just at the time when our construction season is starting off this year. Our States and our local governments need certainty to invest, to plan, to build America's infrastructure; and this ninth—yes, ninth—short-term extension only extends the uncertainty this Congress has repeatedly created.

In a bipartisan fashion, by a vote of 74–22—rare in the Senate these days—they passed a responsible 2-year, 2 million jobs bill that is a better path for the American people and the economy. This includes an estimated 36,500 jobs in my home State of Missouri. The construction sector and especially our building trades have been particularly hard-hit by this recession, with 1.9 million jobs lost at the depth of the recession. Currently, there are 1.4 million unemployed construction workers. Let's put them back to work.

I sit on the Transportation Committee where, 6 weeks ago, the Republican majority passed out a completely partisan transportation bill for the first time in history. Their bill would kill over a half a million jobs and cut investments in 45 States and in the District of Columbia, and it was dead on arrival in this House. So it is no surprise that here, 6 weeks later, we have not seen any action on the floor, because there is no support for their job-killing proposal. Now we're delaying again with yet another extension instead of taking up a true compromise passed by our colleagues in the Senate.

□ 1100

I was proud to be an original cosponsor when the Senate bill was introduced in the House as H.R. 14, and it's time the House take up that bipartisan bill. Let's pass it. Let's send it to the President.

Infrastructure is a national and urgent priority, and this body needs to start treating it that way. Infrastructure is one of the few areas where virtually everyone except the isolated, out-of-touch Republican majority agrees on what we need to do.

From the Chamber of Commerce to the AFL–CIO to everyone's transportation leaders back home, let's pass this bipartisan bill. Let's send it to the President's desk before the current transportation programs expire. It will bring the certainty that State and local governments need, that our construction industry, that our building trades are yearning for, are hungry for. They are hungry to go back to work.

I call on my colleagues to reject yet another short-term extension and pass H.R. 14, a 2-year, 2 million jobs bill to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and put Americans back to work.

Mr. MICA. I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

I dispute the gentleman from West Virginia's figures. Are we going to spend less? Yes, quite possibly. But we have to live within our means. And by streamlining, I believe we'll spend that money out, and we'll create more jobs by streamlining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) at this time, a valued member of our committee and the sponsor of H.R. 14, the other body's bipartisan transportation bill, which is twice as good as H.R. 7.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me see if I have this right. Our Republican colleagues are telling us that we should forget about the 15 months that have passed since they started crafting the highway bill. They're telling us we should forget about the last 6 weeks during which time their bill, H.R. 7, imploded and the bipartisan MAP–21 bill passed the Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support. Now they're telling the American people that they simply need 3 additional months to find the money and shape a policy—an effort that thus far has eluded them—that can garner a majority of votes in the House and overcome the 60-vote threshold in the Senate and be signed by the President of the United States.

It gets better. On the very same day that they make this outrageous argument, they will vote for a Republican budget that slashes investment in transportation infrastructure by 46 percent, a 46 percent reduction in investment in infrastructure.

Now, if they're serious about this vote, if they're serious about seeing this destructive level of funding enacted into law, how can we take them seriously when they talk about a 5-

year bill? They talk about certainty. How can we give the American people or the construction industry or construction workers certainty when they say, Just give us 90 more days and we'll craft a 5-year bill, but in the meantime, we want to cut highway funding by 46 percent? These don't line up. No reasonable person can take that seriously.

To make it even worse, at the end of today, we're going to adjourn the House for 2 weeks. Asking for a 90-day extension, but in the first 2 weeks of that 90-day extension, they're going to adjourn the House and go home. And they're going to do that while construction workers are wondering where their next paycheck is coming from. They're wondering how they're going to be able to provide for their families. This is unconscionable.

If Republicans want 90 more days, we should stay here and work through the issues with the bipartisan Senate bill MAP–21, H.R. 14, here in the House as the basis for these discussions. We know we can get it through the Senate; and I am confident that if Republicans are released by their leadership to vote for it, they'll vote for it here in the House.

Let's pass H.R. 14.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from West Virginia has 9 minutes. The gentleman from Florida has 23 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes at this time to the distinguished gentlelady from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the ranking member on our Economic Development and Public Buildings Subcommittee.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The American people will be puzzled by why we can't get out what has traditionally been the most popular bill, the transportation bill. And they will hope that we're not on a road to the 20-plus extensions that we had with the FAA bill. It won't do to say, like two kids: You did it, too; therefore, we can do it.

None of us should have done it.

But in any case, we know we don't have to do it this time because the Senate has passed a bill that we could pass as well. So we know the compromise can happen because they've passed a bill with more than two-thirds of their own house, including many Republicans, signing on.

Compromise is possible if you believe in compromise, and I'm afraid that this bill shows that we have a majority that does not. They are on record saying that they must have 218 votes from their caucus alone. That says to the American people, we need to pass a bill that will have only people from our party voting for it. But, the Senate has passed a bill with both parties compromising. Which is the party that does not believe in compromise? You always have to compromise.

There is not a whole lot of difference in the amount of money in these bills; $52 billion per year for the House, $54 billion per year for the Senate.

The problem is poison pills. The problem is not treating the transportation bill as it has always been treated, as a bipartisan bill. The problem is not caring that you are effecting the recovery if you pass a series of 90-day bills.

We should be speeding the recovery instead of hanging, clinging to a bill that would kill half a million jobs.

It's time to compromise. This side is holding out its hand for a compromise. We need colleagues on the other side to hold out theirs.

Mr. MICA. I am going to continue to reserve the balance of my time and will close at the appropriate time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I just want to reiterate the point I made earlier. Outside of a minority of their caucus, I believe a majority of the United States House of Representatives believes that Federal investment—using taxpayer dollars without creating deficit—that Federal investment and rebuilding our national infrastructure, the 150,000 bridges on the National Highway System that need substantial repair or replacement—the steel that goes into those bridges is made in America. The workers are American workers. The engineers are American engineers. The $60 billion backlog in our existing transit systems, let alone giving Americans more fuel-efficient transit options, $60 billion. Buses made in America, light railcars made in America, these are manufacturing jobs, engineering jobs, high-tech jobs. These are not just construction jobs.

The construction industry, itself, is devastated with double-digit unemployment. Passing this 90-day extension, according to the Association of General Contractors, a very Republican-leaning organization—80 percent of their political contributions go to the Republicans, so they are not partisan to our side of the aisle—they say that it is going to mean the States will go to a 40 or 50 percent reduction in their projects this summer because they are not assured beyond that 90 days that they're going to get their Federal reimbursements. Many States, unlike this body and unlike the Federal Government, have constitutional balanced budget requirements, something we should have nationally. But that's a debate for another day.

The point is that this temporary extension does cost us jobs, and the bill we'll vote on later today, the Ryan budget, would actually reduce transportation investments by 56 percent from current levels, which isn't even dealing with the already deteriorated infrastructure and is not putting people back to work.

□ 1110

So there's this kind of a mixed message on their side. They say, Well, just do the 90 days and then we'll do H.R. 7. Well, H.R. 7 will reduce spending and cost half a million jobs.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. The budget they're going to vote on later today would reduce spending by 56 percent on transportation. That is mind-boggling in the face of what confronts our Nation, the challenges around the world, and the need for jobs.

There are people on their side of the aisle that just say, The government can't create jobs. They're hung up on this semantic thing. No, the government isn't creating the jobs. The government is investing taxpayer dollars without borrowing to let out private contracts to the lowest and best bidders to build these projects with all products made in America—the strongest Made in America requirement.

So you can't tell me those things don't create jobs. Those are investments. They create jobs. Consumption and tax cuts don't create jobs. They want more tax cuts instead of investment in America. That is so wrong.

Let us vote on the bipartisan Senate bill. If 22 Republican Senators can support that bill, which would give us 2 years of stability, we ought to have a chance to vote on it in this House.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. GERRY CONNOLLY.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my friend from West Virginia.

Madam Speaker, America's commuters and businesses want us to speed up transportation improvements. However, the House Republicans have offered only a speed bump. We face a transportation crisis, with bridges and roadways crumbling, millions of Americans stuck in gridlock, and transit improvements languishing.

We've known that the transportation authorization lapses on March 31, severely jeopardizing projects and jobs in every one of our States. The transportation vote today is nothing more than a 3-month Band-Aid. The Republican plan was rejected on a bipartisan basis because it disinvests in America, cutting $361 million in my home State of Virginia alone.

America needs a real transportation plan: a plan that ensures that States and localities don't shut up projects this Sunday; a plan that creates jobs, putting the hard-hit construction industry back to work. Thankfully, there is such a plan. It's bipartisan. This month, the Senate passed a 2-year transportation plan by a vote of 74–22, including half of the Republicans present.

I urge Republican leadership to bring forward the bipartisan Senate bill. It's time to get America moving again.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield the customary 1

minute to the Democratic leader in the House of Representatives, the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his tireless efforts on behalf of America's workers and for his attempts to bring to the floor a bipartisan transportation bill, as has been the custom in our House and as we do have the opportunity to do by taking up the Senate bill.

The bill in the Senate has bipartisan support—74, plus one who was absent but voting for the bill. Seventy-five Members of the Senate support that legislation. It is bipartisan. It creates jobs. It is worthy of our support.

It has the cosponsorship of the chair and the ranking member of the committee, from Chairwoman BARBARA BOXER to Ranking Member INHOFE, a wide array of philosophical thinking, and all of it coming together around a bipartisan initiative.

The American people have a right to know why the Republicans in the Senate, the Democrats in the Senate, the President of the United States, and the House Democrats all support this bipartisan bill while the Republicans in the House are odd man out. It calls to mind when there was an odd man out on the payroll tax cut in December, when all the parties had come together in a bipartisan way.

But what is dangerous about what is happening here today is that this initiative, this kick-the-can-down-the-road, this my-way-or-no-highway-bill attitude is costing jobs. I'm sure that they have been reviewed—41,000 in North Carolina; 4,500 in Illinois; 4,000 in Maryland; and the list goes on and on—just because of the delay and the uncertainty that is injected into the system. This costs the taxpayers more, and small businesses suffer because they cannot proceed with contracts and the rest to go forward. And it is a job-loser, as I mentioned.

So this has nothing to recommend it except to be explained by the fact that the Republicans can't even bring their own transportation bill to the floor and pass it. Their own transportation bill is not a good bill, but at least it would take us to conference. They can't vote for their own bill. I don't know how it happens that they have a bill that they can't support.

But in addition to not being able to support their own bill—and it's interesting that the budget and transportation are on the floor at the same time—they have this bill, and yet in the budget that they are going to be voting on today, they have cut transportation funding in half: from $90 billion to $46 billion. That's $44 billion worth of jobs, promotion of commerce, improving the quality of life of the American people, building the infrastructure of America, and that means mass transit and all the rest of that. Cut that in half. Oh, and by the way, give a tax break of over $300,000 to the wealthiest people in America. Wealthy people get off fine. Middle class people pay. Small businesses pay. The taxpayer pays. Job-seekers and workers pay the price.

So I think it's really important to understand what the bipartisan National Governors Association has said:

> A string of short-term extensions will only increase uncertainty for State and local governments and the private sector.

So, again, I call the House back to its bipartisanship on this legislation. The distinguished chairman, Mr. MICA, has been part of that bipartisanship in the past, and now they come up with a bill that the Republican Secretary of Transportation says is a job-loser and is dangerous to public safety. It's the worst bill he's seen in his 35 years of public service, and his public service has been in this field. Again, it departs from bipartisanship.

So I urge my colleagues to not aid and abet the Republicans in going down this path that is not a good one, but to urge them to bring up the Senate bill. It can go to the President's desk today, putting people back to work immediately.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 23 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. I guess it's not very popular on his side of the aisle. He doesn't seem to have many speakers coming over. I haven't noticed many members of his committee to speak in favor of this extension today.

I am prepared to close. I would take some time from the distinguished chairman, if he'd be willing to yield me some of his time.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. That's about all we're getting out of H.R. 7, too.

Madam Speaker, if the other side were serious about creating jobs, they would have worked in a bipartisan fashion in this body, as the other body did, to build a bill that could pass both bodies of the Congress and be signed into law. As the distinguished Democratic leader has just said, everybody is on board except the leadership of the House of Representatives on the Republican side.

Just as this Congress has done so many times before—and I have been in this body over three decades, involved in every transportation bill we've done over that time—every transportation bill we've done has been in a bipartisan fashion, passing this body by overwhelming margins.

□ 1120

Instead, today's leadership in this House has plowed full speed ahead writing a partisan proposal that is aimed at appealing to ideological spectrums of their party. Last month, Teamsters general president James Hoffa wrote in a letter:

> How do eliminating OSHA protections for hazmat workers improve this Nation's crumbling roads and bridges? How do loopholes in ''Buy America'' protections put hundreds of thousands of construction workers back on the job?

Last month in a letter addressed to the Speaker of this body, the general president of the Laborers International Union, Terry O'Sullivan, wrote:

> The House must return to the principles of sound governance and bipartisanship that has historically characterized consideration of the Surface Transportation Act.

He further noted:

> The offsets used to pay for this bill are also irresponsible. Slashing the pay and retirement security of the hardworking Federal and postal employees is neither honest nor fair. It is an unacceptable attack on the hardworking people who provide essential services for veterans and Native Americans, process our mail, keep our skies safe, our parks clean, and help protect us from threats, both foreign and domestic.

As has already been noted, one of our key business groups in this country, the Associated General Contractors, has stated the following:

> The majority of the work is supposed to go out in spring and get done by the fall. Instead of spending 60 or 70 percent of their budgets, our small businesses are going to cut back to 50 to 40 percent to make sure they have some cash in the fall.

That comes from one of the major business groups in this country responsible for putting people to work and responsible for getting our economy moving again. I urge that we take up the bipartisan Senate-passed bill and reject this extension.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time to close.

Madam Speaker and my colleagues, I think it might be time right now, Madam Speaker, that we call the Capitol Physician to come to the House floor. I think we should call the Capitol Physician because there appears to be on the other side a mass case of loss of memory, and I think that we need to clear up just a few facts in what has been said here.

Now, we have the gentlelady from California who happened to be the Speaker of the House. As I recall, the other side controlled the House by a huge margin, the Senate by a significant margin—most of the time I think it was 60 votes where you could do anything—and they controlled the White House for those 2 years. They could have done anything they wanted to do. President Obama, in fact, sent Secretary LaHood to Mr. Oberstar and me—I was the ranking Republican, he was the chair—and cut the knees right out from the Democrats and said he wasn't doing a long-term bill, he was doing an 18-month bill, which really sent a death signal to transportation and infrastructure projects.

In fact, the other side would be in the majority probably and I would be the ranking member if they had just done what they could have done. Then they tell you that we can't pass a bill. Well, let's deal with the facts. They six times

had to do extensions. Not one extension was freestanding. In fact, one time they could not even pass the extension with the House, the Senate, and the White House. In March of 2010, they actually closed down programs.

Madam Speaker, we may need the House Physician because there are multiple cases of amnesia, and we need to remind folks about the facts and what they have forgotten.

Even in the extensions, I offered first a 90-day extension, and I know Speaker BOEHNER talked to the Senate and the other leaders and said we'll do a 90. No, we want to do a 60-day extension, they said. Then some of the Democrats felt like they were thrown under the bus, and the 60-day extension that they asked us to do, they couldn't get the votes for, they came down and spoke against yesterday.

Madam Speaker, there's something wrong here. I think we really need to get the Capitol Physician involved because the amnesia is very, very serious on the other side. They had earmarks. The last bill was passed with 6,300 earmarks. They had earmarks. They had control. They couldn't even pass a freestanding bill and get it to the full committee. So, again, I think the amnesia is pretty rampant on the other side.

I don't want this to be delayed any further because I want Americans to go back to work.

We offer here today a long-term bill that will put people who want jobs in this country back to work without earmarks and without tax increases. The end of the era of the biggest gorilla walking off with the most bananas is over, and we will pass responsible legislation, and we will get it done.

As the Cable Guy said, Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to ''Git-R-Done.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, today I voted against H.R. 4281, the Surface Transportation Extension Act. I oppose this legislation not because I oppose transportation funding—on the contrary—but because we can and should pass a better-funded and longer-term bill.

The unemployment rate in the construction industry is nearly double the national average. Over the past year, I have met with many of my constituents who work in the construction industry, including construction workers, designers, managers, engineers, contractors, and developers. The one thing they have all shared is that another short-term extension will not bring enough certainty to the industry to encourage the types of project development and job creation that our country needs.

I object to H.R. 4281 because there is a better bill we can pass right now. I am a cosponsor of H.R. 14, or MAP–21, which is identical to the bill that passed the Senate with an overwhelming bipartisan majority, 74–22. MAP–21 would fund our transportation and infrastructure needs for two years. If the Republican leadership would allow that bill to come to the floor, we could pass it today. Instead, they have elected to play political games and pass a bill that promotes an unpredictable transportation future.

I can't support a 90-day extension that will bring another funding battle at the end of June, during the heart of our construction season in Illinois. This attempt to ''kick the can down the road'' will delay projects and risk 4,500 jobs in our state alone. We need to move forward with legislation that will provide our state, local communities, and small businesses the stability and predictability they need. A short-term extension will do nothing to alleviate concerns about future funding and will not reduce unemployment.

Businesses and employees need the increased certainty that MAP–21 will provide. We owe it to our constituents to oppose a short-term extension in favor of that bipartisan, commonsense legislation that will protect and promote our economic and transportation needs.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 4281, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012. I am opposing this measure because it is merely a 3-month extension, as opposed to a long-term reauthorization. States and municipalities need time to adequately plan their transportation projects, and these piecemeal extensions will not offer the certainty needed to see these projects through.

It has been more than a month since House Republicans reported their seriously flawed bill, and they do not have the votes to pass it. I have served on the Transportation Committee for 20 years, and up until now, the committee has worked in a bipartisan fashion to produce a sound and commonsense transportation policy.

Instead of voting on another extension, we should be considering the bipartisan Senate transportation bill. While I would prefer a longer reauthorization, the 2-year bipartisan Senate bill will provide the kind of investment in infrastructure and job creation that is desperately needed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 600, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 266, nays 158, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—266

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

NAYS—158

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Flake
Fleming
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich

Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Filner
Jackson (IL)
Mack
Meeks
Paul
Rangel
Towns

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1155

Ms. WILSON of Florida changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay''.

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, SHULER, and ISRAEL changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 147, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). Pursuant to House Resolution 597 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 concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 112.

Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) kindly take the chair.

□ 1155

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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, with Mrs. BIGGERT (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 28, 2012, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112–423 by the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. HONDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) 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 78, noes 346, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

AYES—78

Andrews
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Deutch
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Markey
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Scott, David
Serrano
Slaughter
Stark
Tonko
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey

NOES—346

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Filner
Jackson (IL)
Mack
Meeks
Paul
Rangel
Towns

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1214

Messrs. BUTTERFIELD and JOHNSON of Illinois changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 148, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 5 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112–423.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2012 and for fiscal years 2014 through 2022 are set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION SUBMISSIONS

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.
Sec. 202. Submission of reports on mandatory savings.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 302. Restrictions on advance appropriations.
Sec. 303. Emergency spending.
Sec. 304. Changes in allocations and aggregates resulting from realistic scoring of measures affecting revenues.
Sec. 305. Allocation of new budget authority for fiscal year 2013.
Sec. 306. Prohibition on using revenue increases to comply with budget allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 307. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 308. Budget Protection Mandatory Account.
Sec. 309. Budget discretionary accounts.
Sec. 310. Treatment of rescission bills in the House.
Sec. 311. Sense of the House regarding baseline revenue projections.
Sec. 312. Sense of the House regarding long-term budget projections.
Sec. 313. Make it easier to amend appropriation bills.

TITLE IV—EARMARK MORATORIUM

Sec. 401. Earmark moratorium.
Sec. 402. Limitation of authority of the House Committee on Rules.

TITLE V—POLICY

Sec. 501. Policy statement on health care law repeal.
Sec. 502. Policy statement on bailouts of State and local governments.
Sec. 503. Policy statement on means-tested welfare programs.
Sec. 504. Policy statement on reforming the Federal budget process.
Sec. 505. Policy statement on reforming Federal regulation.
Sec. 506. Policy statement on medicare.
Sec. 507. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.
Sec. 508. Policy statement on block granting Medicaid.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2022:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $1,887,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,059,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,249,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,459,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,627,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,770,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,892,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,021,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,173,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,332,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,499,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: –$12,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: –$234,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: –$303,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: –$357,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: –$389,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: –$424,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: –$461,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: –$498,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: –$535,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: –$574,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: –$617,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $3,069,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,663,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,512,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,561,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,632,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,698,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,788,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,923,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,035,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,141,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,289,000,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $3,120,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,818,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,653,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,654,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,713,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,764,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,834,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,970,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,081,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,186,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,340,000,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: –$1,233,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: –$759,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: –$405,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: –$195,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: –$86,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $6,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $58,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $51,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $92,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $146,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $159,000,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $16,076,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $17,003,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $17,586,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $17,967,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,266,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $18,520,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $18,737,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $18,954,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $19,129,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $19,252,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $19,352,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $11,359,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $12,191,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,677,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $12,950,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,110,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,178,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,186,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $13,202,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,189,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $13,135,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $13,088,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2012 through 2022 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $687,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $679,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $659,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $673,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $619,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $659,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $633,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $640,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $647,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $647,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $619,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $608,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $635,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $618,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $653,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $639,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $672,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $657,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $690,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $675,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $709,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $699,000,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $224,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $224,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $234,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $234,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $249,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $249,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $287,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $340,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $340,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $391,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $391,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $435,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $435,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $471,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $471,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $499,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $499,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $514,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $514,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $528,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $528,000,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $2,109,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,120,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $1,770,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,911,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $1,644,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,745,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,641,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,727,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,645,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,726,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,688,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,765,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,718,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,781,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,799,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,860,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $1,864,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,925,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $1,937,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,997,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $2,052,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,113,000,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(21) Global War on Terrorism and related activities (970):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION SUBMISSIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS TO SLOW THE GROWTH IN MANDATORY SPENDING AND TO ACHIEVE DEFICIT REDUCTION.—(1) Not later than September 15, 2012, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $54,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $24,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2013 and by $204,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $32,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2013 and by $2,872,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $3,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2013 and by $45,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(E) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $10,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(F) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $8,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2013 and by$172,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(b) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IN REVENUE TO PREVENT TAX INCREASES AND ENACT H.R. 3400.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report a reconciliation bill not later than September 15, 2012, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than $234,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by not more than $4,392,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(c) REVISION OF ALLOCATIONS.—(1) Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) Upon the submission to the House of a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of this section, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

SEC. 202. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS ON MANDATORY SAVINGS.

In the House, not later than September 15, 2012, all House committees shall identify savings amounting to one percent of total mandatory spending under its jurisdiction from activities that are determined to be wasteful, unnecessary, or lower-priority. For purposes of this section, the reports by each committee shall be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget not later than September 15, 2012.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—Spending limits for total discretionary Federal spending are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $931,000,000,000 in new budget authority.

Fiscal year 2014: $931,000,000,000 in new budget authority.

Fiscal year 2015: $931,000,000,000 in new budget authority.

Fiscal year 2016: $931,000,000,000 in new budget authority.

Fiscal year 2017: $931,000,000,000 in new budget authority.

Fiscal year 2018: $950,000,000,000 in new budget authority.

Fiscal year 2019: $969,000,000,000 in new budget authority.

Fiscal year 2020: $988,000,000,000 in new budget authority.

Fiscal year 2021: $1,008,000,000,000 in new budget authority.

Fiscal year 2022: $1,028,000,000,000 in new budget authority.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that causes discretionary budget authority to exceed any level set forth in subsection (a).

SEC. 302. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2013 and fiscal years 2014 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $23,565,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2013.

SEC. 303. EMERGENCY SPENDING.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In the House, if a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in paragraph (2). If such legislation is to be considered by the House without being reported, then the committee shall cause the explanation to be published in the Congressional Record in advance of floor consideration.

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any such provision is an emergency requirement if the underlying situation poses a threat to life, property, or national security and is—

(i) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(ii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iii) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(iv) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report that contains an emergency designation unless that designation meets the criteria set out in subsection (a)(2).

(c) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (b).

(d) DISPOSITION OF POINTS OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.—As disposition of a point of order under subsection (b) or subsection (c), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the point of order. A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent of the point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

SEC. 304. CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES RESULTING FROM REALISTIC SCORING OF MEASURES AFFECTING REVENUES.

(a) Whenever the House considers a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report, including measures filed in compliance with section 201(b), that propose to change Federal revenues, the impact of such measure on Federal revenues shall be calculated by the Joint Committee on Taxation in a manner that takes into account—

(1) the impact of the proposed revenue changes on—

(A) Gross Domestic Product, including the growth rate for the Gross Domestic Product;

(B) total domestic employment;

(C) gross private domestic investment;

(D) general price index;

(E) interest rates; and

(F) other economic variables; and

(2) the impact on Federal Revenue of the changes in economic variables analyzed under paragraph (1).

(b) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make any necessary changes to allocations and aggregates in order to conform this concurrent resolution with the determinations made by the Joint Committee on Taxation pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 305. ALLOCATION OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.

For the purposes of budget enforcement, the allocation of new budget authority to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for fiscal year 2013 is $931,000,000,000. Such allocation shall be the allocation made pursuant to section 302(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and shall be enforceable under section 302(f)(1) of that Act.

SEC. 306. PROHIBITION ON USING REVENUE INCREASES TO COMPLY WITH BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution in the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall not take into account the provisions of any piece of legislation which propose to increase revenue or offsetting collections if the net effect of the bill is to increase the level of revenue or offsetting collections beyond the level assumed in this concurrent resolution.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to any provision of a piece of legislation that proposes a new or increased fee for the receipt of a defined benefit or service (including insurance coverage) by the person or entity paying the fee.

SEC. 307. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the appropriate Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 308. BUDGET PROTECTION MANDATORY ACCOUNT.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the ''Budget Protection Mandatory Account''. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget, except that it shall not include the Committee on Appropriations.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution or a House amendment to a Senate bill or joint resolution (other than an appropriation bill), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Mandatory Account by the amounts specified in paragraph (2); and

(B) reduce the applicable section 302(a) allocations by the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in paragraph (1)(A) shall be the net reduction in mandatory budget authority (either under current law or proposed by the bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment that was adopted in the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution or a House amendment to a Senate bill or joint resolution, other than an appropriation bill, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the net reduction in mandatory authority (either under current law or proposed by a bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in paragraph (1) is as follows: ''The amount of mandatory budget authority reduced by this amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.''

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

(d) As used in this rule, the term—

(1) ''appropriation bill'' means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of fiscal year 2008 or any subsequent fiscal year, as the case may be.

(2) ''mandatory budget authority'' means any entitlement authority as defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) During the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain a running tally, which shall be available to all Members, of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 309. BUDGET DISCRETIONARY ACCOUNTS.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the ''Budget Protection Discretionary Account''. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee's suballocations, under section 302(a) and 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House appropriations bill, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Discretionary Account by the amounts specified in paragraph (2).

(B) reduce the applicable 302(a) and (b) allocations by the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in subparagraph (A) shall be the net reduction in discretionary budget authority provided by each amendment adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House appropriations bill, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the net reduction in discretionary budget authority provided by each amendment that was adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in paragraph (1) is as follows: ''The amount of discretionary budget authority reduced by this amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.''

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

(d) As used in this rule, the term ''appropriation bill'' means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of fiscal year 2013 or any subsequent fiscal year, as the case may be.

(e) During the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain a running tally, which shall be available to all Members, of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 310. TREATMENT OF RESCISSION BILLS IN THE HOUSE.

(a)(1) By February 1, May 1, July 30, and November 11 of each session of Congress, the majority leader shall introduce a rescission bill. If such bill is not introduced by that date, then whenever a rescission bill is introduced during a session on or after that date, a motion to discharge the committee from its consideration shall be privileged after the 10-legislative day period beginning on that date for the first 5 such bills.

(2) It shall not be in order to offer any amendment to a rescission bill except an amendment that increases the amount of budget authority that such bill rescinds.

(b) Whenever a rescission bill passes the House, the Committee on the Budget shall immediately reduce the applicable allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 by the total amount of reductions in budget authority and in outlays resulting from such rescission bill.

(c)(1) It shall not be in order to consider any rescission bill, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, unless—

(A) in the case of such bill or conference report thereon, it is made available to Members and the general public on the Internet for at least 48 hours before its consideration; or

(B)(i) in the case of an amendment to such rescission bill made in order by a rule, it is made available to Members and the general public on the Internet within one hour after the rule is filed; or

(ii) in the case of an amendment under an open rule, it is made available to Members

and the general public on the Internet immediately after being offered; in a format that is searchable and sortable.

(2) No amendment to an amendment to a rescission bill shall be in order unless germane to the amendment to which it is offered.

(d) As used in this section, the term ''rescission bill'' means a bill or joint resolution which only rescinds, in whole or in part, budget authority and which includes only titles corresponding to the most recently enacted appropriation bills that continue to include unobligated balances.

SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING BASELINE REVENUE PROJECTIONS.

For purposes of constructing its baseline revenue projections, the Congressional Budget Office should assume that any tax provision which is scheduled to expire under current law will be extended through the duration of any budget forecast by Congressional Budget Office so as to ensure that expiring tax provisions and expiring spending programs (other than direct appropriations) are treated in like fashion.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING LONG-TERM BUDGET PROJECTIONS.

For purposes of constructing its ten-year and long-term budget projection reports, the Congressional Budget Office should include an alternative scenario that assumes that mandatory spending programs grow at the same rate as average, projected nominal gross domestic product (GDP).

SEC. 313. MAKE IT EASIER TO AMEND APPROPRIATION BILLS.

The first sentence of clause 2(c) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by inserting '', except to the extent that it is a germane amendment to an authorizing provision or a line item appropriation of the bill under consideration'' after ''changing existing law''.

TITLE IV—EARMARK MORATORIUM

SEC. 401. EARMARK MORATORIUM.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order to consider—

(1) a bill or joint resolution reported by any committee, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes a congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit; or

(2) a bill or joint resolution not reported by any committee, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes a congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this resolution, the terms ''congressional earmark'', ''limited tax benefit'', and ''limited tariff benefit'' have the meaning given those terms in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—The point of order under subsection (a) shall only apply to legislation providing or authorizing discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority, providing a Federal tax deduction, credit, or exclusion, or modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule in fiscal year 2012 or fiscal year 2013.

(d) INAPPLICABILITY.—This resolution shall not apply to any authorization of appropriations to a Federal entity if such authorization is not specifically targeted to a State, locality, or congressional district.

SEC. 402. LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The House Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order that would waive the point of order set forth in the first section of this resolution.

TITLE V—POLICY

SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE LAW REPEAL.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152) should be repealed.

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON BAILOUTS OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Federal Government should not bailout State and local governments, including State and local government employee pension plans and other post-employment benefit plans.

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that:

(1) In 1996, President Bill Clinton and congressional Republicans enacted reforms that have moved families off of Federal programs and enabled them to provide for themselves.

(2) According to the most recent projections, over the next 10 years we will spend approximately $10 trillion on means-tested welfare programs.

(3) Today, there are approximately 70 Federal programs that provide benefits specifically to poor and low-income Americans.

(4) Taxpayers deserve clear and transparent information on how well these programs are working, and how much the Federal Government is spending on means-tested welfare.

(b) POLICY ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's budget should disclose, in a clear and transparent manner, the aggregate amount of Federal welfare expenditures, as well as an estimate of State and local spending for this purpose, over the next ten years.

SEC. 504. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING THE FEDERAL BUDGET PROCESS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Federal budget process should be reformed so that it is easier to reduce Federal spending than it is to increase it by enacting reforms included in the Spending, Deficit, and Debt Control Act of 2009 (H.R. 3964, 111th Congress).

SEC. 505. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING FEDERAL REGULATION.

It is the policy of this resolution that the cost of regulations on job creators should be reduced by enacting title II of the Jobs Through Growth Act (H.R. 3400), as introduced on November 10, 2011.

SEC. 506. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in and near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Congressional Budget Office—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2022 and unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.3 percent per year, and under the Congressional Budget Office's alternative fiscal scenario, direct spending on Medicare is projected to reach 7 percent of GDP by 2035 and 14 percent of GDP by 2085.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution to protect those in and near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits and offer future beneficiaries the same health care options available to Members of Congress.

(c) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that:

(1) Current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in and near retirement, without changes.

(2) For future generations, when they reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs.

(3) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks.

(4) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

SEC. 507. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies will hold $698 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2013.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending made available by Congress that remain available for expenditure beyond the fiscal year for which they are provided.

(3) In some cases, agencies are granted funding and it remains available for obligation indefinitely.

(4) The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the Administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an act of Congress.

(5) Greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from unneeded balances of funds.

(b) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.—Congressional committees shall through their oversight activities identify and achieve savings through the cancellation or rescission of unobligated balances that neither abrogate contractual obligations of the Federal Government nor reduce or disrupt Federal commitments under programs such as Social Security, veterans' affairs, national security, and Treasury authority to finance the national debt.

(c) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Congress, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and other appropriate agencies should make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

SEC. 508. POLICY STATEMENT ON BLOCK GRANTING MEDICAID.

It is the policy of this resolution that Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) should be block granted to the states by enacting the State Health Flexibility Act of 2012 (H.R. 4160) as introduced on March 7, 2012.

Amend the title so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2012 and fiscal years 2014 through 2022.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Last week, the House Republicans introduced a budget that takes the first step towards reversing the path to debt and decline that the President and his fellow Democrats have laid out for the American people. Today the Republican Study Committee, the RSC, builds off of that work and offers a plan to further cut spending and balance the budget in just 5 years.

With real spending cuts today, enforceable spending cuts for tomorrow, and commonsense changes to strengthen our Nation's safety net programs and pro-growth tax reform, we can finally restore much-needed certainty to the economy and reopen America for business.

To say that President Obama and Senate Democrats have failed to lead on the most predictable economic crisis in our history would be an understatement. Senate Democrats have not been in the debate at all, failing to pass a budget for over 1,000 days. The President's most recent attempt at a budget—well, it came a week late, and it adds literally trillions of dollars to our Nation's debt.

Every American family understands the necessity of a balanced budget. Families also understand that setting a budget sometimes is difficult. It requires difficult choices. But even with accounting gimmicks and the massive tax increases, our President's budget never, ever balances. This is a void in leadership, and it has substantial consequences on real Americans all across this country.

So, today, the RSC budget represents a clear, practical way for our economy to—what?—begin to grow again. How do we do that? First, we repeal ObamaCare once and for all. Next, we cut discretionary spending, and we eliminate programs that are unconstitutional, duplicative, or harmful. Perhaps most importantly, we don't kick this can down the road and punt these tough decisions. We actually save our national safety net programs that are currently going bankrupt today.

So with these commonsense solutions and by harnessing the power of competition between private insurance plans and improving at the same time the quality of care, we put Medicare on the path to long-term solvency. This offers a real plan for the future. Today I urge all to support the Republican Study Committee substitute.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Yesterday we debated the Republican budget plan. Today, we have a plan that's more of the same, except on steroids.

As we debated yesterday, the question is not whether we should reduce the deficit or whether we should reduce the debt. Of course we should. The question is how we do it. And we should do it in a way that doesn't damage the ongoing economic recovery, which this proposal does. We should do it in a way that is balanced, meaning we have shared responsibility. The Democratic alternative that we'll debate shortly has that balance.

We make difficult spending cuts but we also cut a lot of the loopholes and special breaks in the Tax Code because if you don't do any of that to reduce the deficit, it means you've got to reduce the deficit at the expense of everyone and everything else. And that, unfortunately, is what this budget does as well.

It ends the Medicare guarantee for seniors. It slashes Medicaid very deeply, cutting the program by more than a third by the year 2022, where two-thirds of the funding for that program goes to seniors in nursing homes and disabled individuals. It cuts deeply into education funding, both for prekindergarten/preschool as well as college. It cuts deeply into those important investments, including transportation, which we were debating earlier today. In fact, their transportation proposal would cut transportation spending next year by 46 percent, even though we have 17 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

So this budget, like the one yesterday, makes the wrong choices for America. We can reduce our deficits and debt. Let's just do it in a balanced way with shared responsibility.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to both the Garrett substitute and the Ryan budget.

Today's debate is about one thing: priorities. Should Nevada seniors be the priority for the United States Congress? Or should Wall Street and Big Oil companies be the priority? The Republican budget proposal answers that question very clearly.

Instead of tackling Nevada's record unemployment and foreclosure rates, Washington Republicans are, instead, advocating to kill Medicare by turning it over to profit-hungry insurance companies. This proposal would raise the premiums for Nevada's seniors by up to $6,000 a year.

□ 1220

Why would Republicans do this? In order to pay for more tax breaks for corporations that ship good-paying American jobs overseas or to continue taxpayer giveaways to Big Oil companies that made a record $137 billion in profits last year alone?

Madam Chair, these are the wrong priorities. Wall Street millionaires and Big Oil companies don't need our help. They're doing just fine. But Nevada seniors are struggling to make ends meet. Putting private insurance companies in between patients and their doctors would just make things worse.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in rejecting this plan and any plan that has the wrong priorities and tries to kill Medicare by turning it over to private insurance companies whose only interest is profits and not the health and well-being of our seniors.

Mr. GARRETT. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the RSC, Mr. JORDAN.

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to respond to two arguments my friend from Maryland has made in his remarks and, frankly, made the last 2 days in this debate.

First, he says we need a balanced approach. Everyone understands when Democrats talk about a balanced approach, what they mean is raising taxes now and, oh, we promise—and you can count on this promise because it's coming from politicians—we promise we will cut spending later.

I would like to point out: If it's so important to raise taxes on the American people and on certain businesses, why in the world didn't the Democrats do this just 24 months ago when they controlled all of government? In fact, they had a filibuster-proof majority in the Senate just 24 months ago. If it was so critical, why didn't you do it then? So this balanced approach is not going to fly.

The other argument they make is somehow our proposal that Mr. GARRETT and his team put together, which I strongly support, that somehow it's going to hurt economic growth. Someone's got to explain to me how getting to balance in 5 years and then beginning to pay off a $16 trillion debt, a debt that is now bigger than our entire economy, bigger than our entire GDP, someone's got to explain to me how that will hurt economic growth. I actually think it will probably prevent a downgrade, unlike last summer. If we'd have adopted this budget last summer, my guess is we wouldn't have gotten a downgrade from S&P.

So I just want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey and his team for his hard work and make this final point.

One of the things that makes our country special is this simple phenomena: parents make sacrifices for their kids so that when they grow up they have life better than they did. They, in turn, do it for their children. And each generation in this country has done it for the next—until today.

Today, for the first time in American history, we have a political class who's living for the moment, spending for the moment, and sending the bill to the next generation. It is wrong; it is unfair; it is immoral. The only budget that's going to get us to balance in a reasonable period of time, in a commonsense period of time that the American people understand, is the budget that Mr. GARRETT and his team have put together.

So I strongly support it and urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend for yielding to me.

I rise in opposition to this budget and in opposition to the extreme Republican budget. Budgets are about priorities. And what are the priorities of my Republican friends? Protect the wealthiest in this country, protect big corporations, kill the seniors, and hurt middle class people. This is just nothing that makes sense.

Their budget slashes services for the elderly, slashes Pell Grants, slashes education services, slashes services of those with disabilities, and increases tax cuts for the wealthiest people and the wealthiest corporations. That's the Republican priority. They go after Medicare, go after Medicaid, and give increased tax breaks to wealthy people.

I don't think those are the priorities of the American people. I think the priorities of the American people are in the Democrat programs.

Let me remind my friend on the other side of the aisle, for 6 years, under Mr. Bush, they controlled the Senate and the House and the Presidency and did none of this—none of getting back to basics with the budget and red ink as far as the eye can see. So the newfound religion we see on the other side, please spare me.

What we do see from the other side, again, is to protect the wealthiest, Big Oil, big corporations, hurt Medicare and Medicaid, hurt the middle class, and tax breaks for the rich. Those are the Republican priorities.

On the Democratic side, we care about the average person who's struggling to make ends meet. We want to help the average person go to school. These are our priorities.

Which are the priorities of the American people? I think it's the Democratic priorities.

Mr. GARRETT. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, a man who understands that our President has failed to lead by not presenting us a balanced budget, so he has presented one through the RSC, Mr. SCALISE.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this amendment forward, this budget that implements what we would consider a balanced approach, and that's what we call cut, cap, and balance.

That's what's so important about this amendment, this budget that we bring forward with the RSC, is that, number one, the most important thing is we finally control the wasteful Washington spending that has added mountains and mountains of debt on the backs of our children and grandchildren, which is just immoral. It's wrong and surely not fair to send the bill for all this spending to our children and grandchildren and continue it on autopilot, as President Obama's budget did—President Obama's budget, by the way, which got no votes. Not even one Democrat voted for the President's budget.

The contrast we bring here today is that in 5 years we will have a balanced budget under this amendment that's being brought forward. So we cut spending in areas where we've been needing to finally control spending like families are controlling spending back home.

When families deal with tough economic times, they've already done this. They tighten their belts and they make do with what they've got and they live within their means. And Washington has refused to do it. We finally put those fiscal constraints in Washington. But then we also put caps in place so that until we get to a balanced budget, there's a freeze on discretionary spending so that we're able to finally get to what is ultimately a balanced Federal budget in 5 years.

And we go further. Of course, we repeal ObamaCare, which is something that's been so devastating already to so many families that have lost the health care that they like, and so many other things like the tax increases that go with it—tax increases, by the way, which in many areas hit middle class families real hard. We abolish that.

We even go further. We save Medicare. President Obama's budget actually escalates Medicare's bankruptcy. In 12 years—and this, by the way, is from President Obama's own Medicare actuaries—Medicare goes bankrupt. They're willing to sit by and let that happen. We're not willing to do that. We're going to save Medicare. This budget does that, too. It has those reforms that Chairman RYAN brought forward that actually put Medicare back on a sustainable growth path.

And then we have commonsense tax reform that actually lowers overall rates.

This is a great budget that's been brought forward that's finally responsible to address our problems.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, the reason the Republican budget and this budget do things like end the Medicare guarantee, do things like cut deeply into education for our kids' future, do things like cut Medicaid by over $800 billion over 10 years, is because they're not asking the very wealthy to share more responsibility in reducing the deficit. In fact, they double down on tax cuts.

If you see from this chart from the Nonpartisan Tax Policy Institute, simply by locking in the portion of the Bush tax cuts that benefit the wealthy, millionaires, on average—people making over a million dollars a years—will get $129,000. Then you heard talk about how they're going to drop the top rate from 35 percent to 25 percent. That would give people earning a million dollars over $265,000.

On top of that, they say they're going to do that in a deficit-neutral manner. Well, to do that, you've got to make up $4.6 trillion in revenue loss. They're going to do it by getting rid of all those deductions. One of the biggest ones is the mortgage interest deduction that helps middle-income people.

So the net result of what they're saying is more tax cuts for the folks at the very top financed by increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans and financed by cutting important investments that help grow our economy.

With that, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, this budget proposal is a stunningly radical document because at its core is a massive redistribution of income from the economically disadvantaged to the wealthiest members of our society.

In order to fund historic, unnecessary, and unsustainable tax cuts for the rich, this Republican budget would require us to nearly eliminate our ability as a government to invest in our physical and human infrastructure.

□ 1230

In other words, it shows no faith in our Nation's future. It puts our future in the hands of those who can afford to live in gated communities and invest in foreign economies. In fact, more than two-thirds of the non-defense cuts in this Republican plan come from programs that directly benefit low-income Americans. The path laid out by this resolution is one where, in my children's lifetime, most of the Federal Government, with the exception of defense, Social Security, and health care, would no longer have the money to function.

Now, what does it mean to virtually eliminate non-defense discretionary spending? That's a budgetary term. But that includes research at NIH; roads and public transportation; transit funding; Head Start; education support; FBI; drug enforcement; food, meat, and drug inspections; no national park maintenance or environmental protection. That's what it means to virtually eliminate these functions of the government.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman from Virginia an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, this is not a budget for the America that we know today. It's a budget for Grover Norquist's America—a radical, conservative fantasy land where government is no longer fiscally able to play a role protecting those who need it most, protecting our most precious natural resources and investing in the job creation initiatives that will enable us to move forward as a people. That is not a vision that we should want to see passed into law, let alone into reality.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas

who understands that this administration has failed our children by continuing to take from them so this administration can spend today.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I appreciate the hard work of my colleague from New Jersey.

Today I rise in proud support of the RSC budget that we're discussing here today. This budget offers a clear vision for fiscal responsibility and limited government as well as a path toward accomplishing that vision.

In just 3 days, the United States will have the highest corporate business tax rate in the world. In a matter of months, every American, every business owner and every investor will be subject to higher taxes as a result of the expiration of the Bush-Obama tax cuts. That's right, the Bush-Obama tax cuts will expire.

This budget addresses these looming challenges not only by proposing to lower tax rates, but it also includes the ticket to make them a reality with reconciliation instructions that require Congress to vote before September 15 on comprehensive tax reform that will actually create jobs in America.

On another note, this budget vastly improves Medicare and helps our most needy. The costs of this program are consuming our already cash-strapped Federal and State coffers. In many States, it's not uncommon to spend more on Medicaid than on K–12 education. In converting Medicaid to a block grant program, we will enhance State-level accountability, respect the 10th Amendment, and give States the freedom, flexibility and, yes, accountability they need in order to serve their citizens better at the local and State level.

I urge all my colleagues to support this budget as the answer to accomplishing America's priorities of cutting spending, keeping taxes low, creating jobs, and balancing our budget in a matter of years, not decades.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Make no mistake, this budget is actually the heart of the budget philosophy of our friends from the other side of the aisle. This is where they want to take America. Do you remember last time it almost passed until the leadership was horrified, seeing that it was winning. Then they started twisting arms to have people change their votes so it would go down? It is disconnected from the real life consequences of average Americans and what America needs.

There's a certain irony. We just approved a short-term extension of the transportation bill which makes it impossible to use the full construction cycle this summer because the Republicans would not allow a vote on the bipartisan bill that passed the Senate. They were afraid it would pass and we would have stability for 2 years.

The Ryan Budget Committee budget will cut transportation 46 percent at a time when America's infrastructure desperately needs additional investment. And this budget doesn't even identify the depths of the cut. They shove it all into function 920, so it's disguised, but it's likely 10 percent or more below the already intolerable levels of the Ryan budget.

This is not what people are hearing from folks at home in terms of what America needs to put people back to work, to strengthen our communities, to deal with problems of water, sewer, transportation, failing bridges and transit. It fails a fundamental test of the partnership we've had for the last 66 years of a national priority to rebuild, renew, and focus on transportation and infrastructure.

This is just one more reason why we should reject both of these alternatives and support the program that has been offered by my friend from the Budget Committee.

Mr. GARRETT. At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, who has been a stalwart leader in the legislation before us in trying to have the U.S. live within a balanced budget.

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chairman, I thank my colleague from New Jersey for the opportunity. We can and will, obviously, over the course of this day, say a lot about this budget—a lot of bad things about this budget. I prefer to focus on one positive thing above all others—one thing. This budget actually balances. The budget actually balances. Five years it takes to do that. It's not easy. In fact, it's very, very hard to do that.

It's easier to borrow money. In fact, the reason that we borrow so much money is because it's easier to do that than it is to go home and tell people that we have to make hard decisions in order to balance the budget, and we're afraid that if we go home and tell people that we have to make difficult decisions, that they won't send us back the next term. And make no mistake about it, the most important thing in many people's minds in this Chamber is to make sure they come back next term.

This budget challenges that. This budget balances.

The President's does not. We took it up last night, and it failed overwhelmingly. No one supported it. It never balances. Later today, we'll take up the Democratic budget, which also never balances. Budgets that never balance raise a legitimate moral question, a moral issue. If you borrow money with the intention of paying it back, that is debt. There's no question. If you borrow money intending to pay it back, it's debt. If you borrow money never intending to pay it back, that is theft. That is theft, and that is what the President's budget represents. That is what the Democrat budget represents. That's what so many budgets over the course of the last generations in this town have represented. We have borrowed money with no plan and no intention ever to pay it back. And too many budgets in here today will simply continue that cycle.

It's wrong. It's wrong to do to our children and our grandchildren, and it's wrong to do for ourselves. You should never take something and not even have a plan to pay it back. Say what you want to about the Republican Study Committee budget, say what you want to later on about the Republican budget that Mr. RYAN and the committee are offering, but at least at the very end of the day, they offer some way to pay back the money that we borrowed, and for those reasons alone, they merit our support.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, we'll talk more later about the Democratic alternative and how we address the deficit in a serious and credible way without doing it in a manner that provides a windfall tax break to folks at the top at the expense of everybody else.

For now, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. PASCRELL.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Chair, just when you thought it couldn't get any worse, it does. I've listened to these words. ''Empty'' and ''pyrrhic'' come to my mind. How in God's name can you speak across the floor to the people on this side and imply that the President is guilty of thievery or theft when, from 2001 to now, here's the record—and I'll wait if you want to interject. Please stand and say ''you're wrong'': 2001, tax cuts, not paid for; 2003, tax cuts, not paid for.

Mr. MULVANEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASCRELL. No, not yet. I'm not finished. Then you can interject your thoughts. Don't look so startled, because what you've said is startling. You didn't pay for those two tax cuts, you didn't pay for two wars, and you didn't pay for the prescription drug plan that you put into effect. In fact, you didn't even vote for it, Mr. Chairman, yourself.

The point of the matter is, you pay for nothing, then you're accusing us—you're accusing those on this side of the aisle of not being responsible? Do you know what you've done? By 2020, the portion of the debt gets bigger because of those things you folks did a few years ago, and you have amnesia about it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair must remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair, not to others in the second person.

□ 1240

Mr. MULVANEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank my friend from New Jersey, for whom I have a great deal of respect, Madam Chairwoman. And what he says is correct. What he says is absolutely and without reservation correct. What this government did during the first half of this

decade was wrong. Borrowing the money as we did was wrong. To continue it, Madam Chairwoman, is just as wrong.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Chairman, I take back my time. I think I've been generous about that.

The only difference is, the President who was the President in 2001—I'm glad you agree with me—came into circumstances very different from the President who raised his hand in January of 2009, wasn't it? In 2000, we had a surplus of $5 trillion.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. When this President raised his hand, we were losing 750,000 jobs a year, number one; and, number two, we had a deficit beyond belief, Madam Chairman. And for us to compare, you must believe in fairy tales.

Now, if you want to talk about a budget that's in balance, we can do that; but if we continue on this path and not recognize history, we will never come to balance. Let's be honest.

Mr. GARRETT. At this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who understands, first and foremost, that Washington must do what every family in the United States does, and that is to balance its budget.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, this Nation is on a collision course with a sovereign debt crisis, the magnitude of which we have never experienced. This is not some moonless night on the Atlantic. We are spending full speed ahead toward that iceberg of debt in the full light of day, and we can all see that plainly.

The House budget turns the ship just barely enough to avoid hitting that same hazard which has already wrecked Greece. The RSC budget turns us promptly and safely. It builds on the House Budget Committee's work, but within the budget passed by the House last year as adjusted by the sequester.

I've heard the descriptions—it's draconian, it's radical, it's extreme. It returns us to the spending levels before the Obama-Pelosi spending binge began in 2008. That might sound extreme to my friends across the aisle, but I assure them many families have been working within flat or even diminished family budgets since then and they have every right to expect that their government, over the next 5 years, does what they have already been doing over the past 5—work hard, waste not, and live within your means. If we were to do so, this Nation could see a balanced budget again within 5 years and redeem its rightful place as the respected financial leader of the world.

We know the challenge. We see the American Dream at risk. And we know that we have but a fleeting moment in history to avoid the hardest times our Nation has ever known.

We still have a chance to place our retirement systems on a sound financial footing, arrest the debilitating spiral of debt that threatens the very survival of our Nation, and return our economy to the prosperity it has known when it has enjoyed what Jefferson called a ''wise and frugal government.''

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 1¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. At this time, I'd like to yield 3 minutes then to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), who also has been a leader on this in order to make sure that this House does what the American public asks for, to live within our means and to bring this country to prosperity.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Chair, these are serious times. We're hearing a lot of rhetoric here today. We've got some revisionist history. There's a lack of recollection that in 2006 and 2007 this body was in control by the Democrats, the Senate was controlled by the Democrats, and then the President inherited a mess from the Democrats that were in control of these bodies, of which he was a part. A little bit of revisionist history going on here today.

But the fact that the Members on the other side can stand here and look into these cameras, into the faces of the children all across this Nation and not provide them a solution is appalling. Every time it is: let's push it off, let's push it off further. We have no plan to balance the budget, we have no plan to pay off the debt, but we have a balanced approach to continue down the same path. Now, a balanced approach, that's like straddling the fence: it gets you nowhere, and at some point you're going to fall off this fence, and it's going to hurt.

Today, we have the opportunity to reverse this trend of trillion-dollar deficits and balance the budget in 5 years. Today, we will decide whether to stop borrowing from the future to pay for the present. This budget presents a path to the balanced budget without raising taxes. It eliminates the death tax; it unlocks America's energy sources. This budget unleashes the power and ingenuity of America's job creators and addresses the entitlement elephant that is this impending path of insolvency that lays before us. In 6 years, Madam Chair, we will begin paying down the debt with this budget that's before us.

So we should no longer accept the Democrats' and President Obama's decision to take us down this road to ruin, because we have a choice. It's a choice between two destinies: it's a destiny of debt and dependency—the wrong path—or it's the choice of a different path. Maybe it's one of opportunity and prosperity, Madam Chair. I say we choose the path of opportunity and prosperity. This budget—the budget I refer to not as the RSC budget, but as America's budget—will put us on that path to prosperity and opportunity.

Madam Chair, I encourage every Member of this body, regardless of party, to support this budget because it is the children who are looking out on us today, looking for that solution, looking for a positive answer, and looking for us to work together. This is that opportunity.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. If there are no other speakers, then I will close with the remaining time.

Madam Chairman, as we come to the floor today, it is agreed on both sides that there is plenty of blame to go around as to how we got into this mess. Republican and Democrat on both sides of the aisle, this administration and past administrations as well are to blame. We can point fingers all day at blame, but what we should come here today to do is point the finger at the solution to this problem.

The solution is the budget that we see on the floor today. The solution is the RSC budget that we have here today on the floor. The solution is to make sure that we do on the floor today what every single family in this country and what every single business in this country has always had to do, and that is to make the tough choices, and that is to make the hard choices, and that is to live within our means, and that is to have a balanced budget.

This is the only budget that will come to the floor today that will actually do all that. This is the only budget that will come that will make sure that we actually balance—not within 50 years, 40 years, 30 years, 20 years, 10 years. We will actually balance within 5 years, and we will do so at the same time that we protect the safety net for our seniors today and in the future. We will do so at the same time that we protect our children in the future. We will do so at the same time that we make sure that we do not borrow from the future to pay the bills today.

I ask you to support the only budget that does all those things. Support the RSC budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, one thing I hope we can all agree on is that we need to protect our children and grandchildren and future generations. The question is not whether we need to do that. Of course we do. The issue is how. I keep hearing my colleagues come forward and passionately talk about that, but they're absolutely unwilling to take the balanced approach that has been recommended by bipartisan groups. Everyone that's looked at this challenge says we've got to take a combination of tough spending cuts, but we also need some revenue from closing tax loopholes and asking folks at the very top to go back to what they were paying during the

Clinton administration—by the way, the last time that we had a balanced budget.

□ 1250

And yet, despite all that talk, they don't want us to close one loophole. In fact, almost every Republican in this House has signed this pledge to Grover Norquist saying they won't cut one tax loophole for the purpose of deficit reduction; that they won't ask folks making $1 million to contribute any more to deficit reduction. In fact, they propose to give them another windfall tax cut.

That's the choice they make, and because of that choice, they cut our investment in education for our kids. They cut investments that will strengthen our economy, help build our infrastructure so we can outcompete and outbuild and outeducate the rest of the world. That's what we need to do for the future of our children.

I urge everybody to vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, in light of the fact that this House just weeks ago voted * * *

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GARRETT. I ask for a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been requested. Those in favor of taking this vote by a recorded vote will rise. A sufficient number having risen, a recorded vote is ordered. Members will record their vote by electronic device.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 136, noes 285, answered ''present'' 3, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

AYES—136

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lummis
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder

NOES—285

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Webster
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—3

Fattah
Polis
Waxman

NOT VOTING—7

Filner
Jackson (IL)
Mack
Maloney
Meeks
Rangel
Towns

□ 1327

Messrs. DREIER, WALZ, BILIRAKIS, and YOUNG of Florida changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. RIVERA, HARPER, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ELLMERS, Messrs. SHIMKUS, HUNTER, HULTGREN, MICA, FINCHER, COFFMAN of Colorado, TIPTON, Ms. FOXX, Messrs. OLSON, MURPHY of Pennsylvania, SHUSTER, and BUCSHON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Messrs. ROSS of Arkansas, BISHOP of Georgia, CLAY, THOMPSON of Mississippi, and MILLER of North Carolina changed their vote from ''present'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 149, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. 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. LATHAM) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, had come to no resolution thereon.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the ordering of the yeas and nays on the motion that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4239) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and

other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, as amended, be vacated, to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HOYER. Reserving the right to object, and I have no intention of objecting, Mr. Speaker, but simply to say that we continue to believe on this side of the aisle that we could resolve this issue, as we have had this debate, over a longer term and give confidence to the markets, give confidence to the States and localities by simply bringing the Senate bill to the floor and passing that bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the ordering of the yeas and nays on the motion that the House suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4239 is vacated, and the Chair will put the question de novo.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4239, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 112.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 597 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. Con. Res. 112.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1330

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. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, with Mr. THORNBERRY (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112–423 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112–423.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. 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:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2012 and for fiscal years 2014 through 2022.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 201. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for job creation through investments and incentives.
Sec. 202. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing energy independence and market stability.
Sec. 203. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and servicemembers.
Sec. 204. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicare improvement.
Sec. 205. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Transitional Medical Assistance.
Sec. 206. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for initiatives that benefit children.
Sec. 208. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
Sec. 209. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for college affordability.
Sec. 210. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for additional tax relief for individuals and families.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 302. Adjustments to discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 303. Costs of emergency needs, Overseas Contingency Operations and disaster relief.
Sec. 304. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 305. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 306. Reinstatement of pay-as-you-go.
Sec. 307. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—POLICY

Sec. 401. Policy of the House on jobs: Make it in America.
Sec. 402. Policy of the House on sequestration.
Sec. 403. Policy of the House on taking a balanced approach to deficit reduction.
Sec. 404. Policy of the House on Social Security reform that protects workers and retirees.
Sec. 405. Policy of the House on protecting the Medicare guarantee for seniors.
Sec. 406. Policy of the House on affordable health care coverage for working families.
Sec. 407. Policy of the House on Medicaid.
Sec. 408. Policy of the House on overseas contingency operations.
Sec. 409. Policy of the House on national security.
Sec. 410. Policy of the House on tax reform and deficit reduction.
Sec. 411. Policy of the House on agriculture spending.
Sec. 412. Policy of the House on the use of taxpayer funds.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2022:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $1,836,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,064,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,336,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,604,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,800,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,962,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,092,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,234,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,411,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,586,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,766,705,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: –$62,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: –$228,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: –$214,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: –$211,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: –$215,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: –$232,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: –$259,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: –$284,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: –$296,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: –$320,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: –$348,776,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $3,239,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,966,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,984,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,098,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,308,049,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,470,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,637,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,824,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,037,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,220,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,431,285,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $3,138,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,064,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,048,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,130,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,308,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,435,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,580,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,799,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,993,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,187,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,401,684,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: –$1,301,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: –$1,000,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: –$711,644,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015: –$525,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: –$508,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: –$473,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: –$488,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: –$564,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: –$582,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: –$601,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: –$634,979,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 2012: $16,140,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $17,309,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $18,199,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,911,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,632,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $20,366,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $21,129,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,961,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,812,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $23,682,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $24,575,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2012: $11,424,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $12,498,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $13,290,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,894,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,477,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $15,023,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,578,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $16,210,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,871,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $17,565,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $18,311,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2012 through 2022 for each major functional category are:
(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $560,847,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $620,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $553,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $582,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $564,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $568,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $574,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $565,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $585,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $578,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $598,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $585,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $612,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $592,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $625,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $610,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $639,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $625,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $653,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $638,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $671,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $659,506,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $47,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $50,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $49,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,664,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $47,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,118,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $50,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $52,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $53,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $54,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $56,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $57,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,154,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $30,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $34,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $35,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,996,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $7,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $13,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $5,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $4,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $4,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $4,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $4,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $4,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,174,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $35,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $36,632,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $37,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,453,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $37,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $38,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $41,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $42,539,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,958,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $43,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,598,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,278,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $23,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $23,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,355,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $45,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $9,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$1,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $9,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$2,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $10,253,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -$4,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $16,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $24,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,043,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $138,613,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $88,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $102,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $109,043,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $116,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $122,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $129,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $94,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $96,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $98,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $100,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,984,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $46,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $11,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,152,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $12,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $12,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $12,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,101,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $13,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $14,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,758,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $160,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $84,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $77,217,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $81,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $89,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $99,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $103,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $107,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $108,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $109,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $111,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $110,714,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $355,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $356,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $370,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $373,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $470,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $460,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $543,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $538,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $592,964,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $596,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $638,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $640,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $676,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $674,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $719,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $718,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $773,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $761,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $813,307,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $812,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $869,217,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $867,542,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $492,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $491,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $515,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $514,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $543,057,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $542,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $567,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $616,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $616,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $633,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $633,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $655,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $655,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $716,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $716,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $768,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $767,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $819,327,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $818,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $898,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $898,790,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $556,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $555,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $537,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $502,630,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $499,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $500,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $498,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $507,526,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $509,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $505,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $502,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $507,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $500,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $522,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $520,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $534,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $547,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $545,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $564,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $568,249,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $145,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $43,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $52,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $57,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $62,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $68,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,079,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $128,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, $135,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $137,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $139,862,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,999,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $148,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $148,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $147,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $146,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $156,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $155,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $160,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $165,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $175,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,607,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $58,849,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $55,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $55,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $58,542,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $57,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $58,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $60,204,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $61,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $62,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $67,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,496,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $23,973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $25,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $29,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $33,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $35,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $38,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $40,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $45,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,794,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $337,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $345,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $345,961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $360,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $360,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $399,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $399,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $464,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $464,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $535,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $535,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $608,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $608,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $678,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $678,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $740,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $740,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $790,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $790,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $841,746,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $841,746,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, –$3,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$3,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $8,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, –$18,415,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$10,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, –$17,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$14,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, –$23,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$21,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, –$25,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$24,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, –$26,716,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$25,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, –$28,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$27,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, –$37,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$33,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, –$31,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$33,094,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, –$74,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$75,270,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, –$76,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$76,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, –$75,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$75,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, –$77,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$77,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, –$83,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$83,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, –$85,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$85,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, –$93,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$93,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, –$97,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$97,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, –$103,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$103,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, –$102,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$102,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, –$107,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$107,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, –$109,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$109,655,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $126,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $96,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $28,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $9,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $2,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $52,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $38,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $24,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR JOB CREATION THROUGH INVESTMENTS AND INCENTIVES.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for robust Federal investments in America's infrastructure, incentives for businesses, and support for communities or other measures that create jobs for Americans and boost the economy. The revisions may be made for measures that—

(1) provide for additional investments in rail, aviation, harbors (including harbor maintenance dredging), seaports, inland waterway systems, public housing, broadband, energy, water, and other infrastructure;

(2) provide for additional investments in other areas that would help businesses and other employers create new jobs; and

(3) provide additional incentives, including tax incentives, to help small businesses, nonprofits, States, and communities expand investment, train, hire, and retain private-sector workers and public service employees;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit

for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND MARKET STABILITY.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) provides tax incentives for or otherwise encourages the production of renewable energy or increased energy efficiency;

(2) encourages investment in emerging clean energy or vehicle technologies or carbon capture and sequestration;

(3) provides additional resources for oversight and expanded enforcement activities to crack down on speculation in and manipulation of oil and gas markets, including derivatives markets;

(4) limits and provides for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions;

(5) assists businesses, industries, States, communities, the environment, workers, or households as the United States moves toward reducing and offsetting the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions; or

(6) facilitates the training of workers for these industries (''clean energy jobs'');

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND SERVICEMEMBERS.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) improves disability benefits or evaluations for wounded or disabled military personnel or veterans, including measures to expedite the claims process;

(2) expands eligibility to permit additional disabled military retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay (concurrent receipt); or

(3) eliminates the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017, or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 204. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes improvements to Medicare, including making reforms to the Medicare payment system for physicians that build on delivery reforms underway, such as advancement of new care models, and—

(1) changes incentives to encourage efficiency and higher quality care in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability;

(2) improves payment accuracy to encourage efficient use of resources and ensure that patient-centered primary care receives appropriate compensation;

(3) supports innovative programs to improve coordination of care among all providers serving a patient in all appropriate settings;

(4) holds providers accountable for their utilization patterns and quality of care; and

(5) makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare;

by the amounts provided, together with any savings from ending Overseas Contingency Operations, in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSITIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends the Transitional Medical Assistance program in title XIX of the Social Security Act through fiscal year 2014, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 206. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INITIATIVES THAT BENEFIT CHILDREN.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the lives of children by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022. Improvements may include:

(1) Extension and expansion of child care assistance.

(2) Changes to foster care to prevent child abuse and neglect and keep more children safely in their homes.

(3) Changes to child support enforcement to encourage increased parental support for children, particularly from non-custodial parents, including legislation that results in a greater share of collected child support reaching the child or encourages States to provide access and visitation services to improve fathers' relationships with their children. Such changes could reflect efforts to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty. When 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that capitalizes the existing Affordable Housing Trust Fund by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 209. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes college more affordable, including efforts to keep the interest rate on subsidized student loans from doubling in July 2013 at the end of the one-year extension of the current 3.4 percent interest rate assumed in the resolution, or efforts to ensure continued full Pell grant funding, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 210. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX RELIEF FOR INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides additional tax relief to individuals and families, such as expanding tax relief provided by the refundable child credit, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal year 2014 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2015, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

(2) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2013.

SEC. 302. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES UNDER THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(2) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration

of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates $9,487,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to $691,000,000, to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(2) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates $60,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to $15,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(c) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in this subsection for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 303. COSTS OF EMERGENCY NEEDS, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AND DISASTER RELIEF.

(a) EMERGENCY NEEDS.—If any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to this subsection, then new budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority shall not count for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or this resolution.

(b) OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2012 or fiscal year 2013 for overseas contingency operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to the amounts of budget authority specified in section 102(21) for fiscal year 2012 or fiscal year 2013 and the new outlays resulting from that budget authority.

(c) DISASTER RELIEF.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated for disaster relief pursuant to this subsection, then the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and as necessary, the aggregates in this resolution, shall be adjusted by the amount of new budget authority and outlays up to the amounts provided under section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subsections (b) and (c) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 304. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the House Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

SEC. 305. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—In the House, any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this resolution.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for legislation which has received final congressional approval in the same form by the House of Representatives and the Senate, but has yet to be presented to or signed by the President at the time of final consideration of this resolution.

SEC. 306. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

In the House, and pursuant to section 301(b)(8) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the remainder of the 112th Congress, the following shall apply in lieu of ''CUTGO'' rules and principles:

(1)(A) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the on-budget deficit or reducing the on-budget surplus for the period comprising either—

(i) the current year, the budget year, and the four years following that budget year; or

(ii) the current year, the budget year, and the nine years following that budget year.

(B) The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(C) For the purpose of this section, the terms ''budget year'', ''current year'', and ''direct spending'' have the meanings specified in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that the term ''direct spending'' shall also include provisions in appropriation Acts that make outyear modifications to substantive law as described in section 3(4) (C) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(2) If a bill, joint resolution, or amendment is considered pursuant to a special order of the House directing the Clerk to add as new matter at the end of such measure the provisions of a separate measure as passed by the House, the provisions of such separate measure as passed by the House shall be included in the evaluation under paragraph (1) of the bill, joint resolution, or amendment.

(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall exclude a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles in the case of a point of order under this clause against consideration of—

(i) a bill or joint resolution;

(ii) an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business;

(iii) a conference report; or

(iv) an amendment between the Houses.

(B) In the case of an amendment (other than one specified in subparagraph (A)) to a bill or joint resolution, the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall give no cognizance to any designation of emergency.

(C) If a bill, a joint resolution, an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business, a conference report, or an amendment between the Houses includes a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect thereto.

SEC. 307. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE IV—POLICY

SEC. 401. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON JOBS: MAKE IT IN AMERICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the economy entered a deep recession in December 2007;

(2) a financial crisis in 2008 worsened the situation and by January 2009, the private sector was shedding 840,000 jobs per month;

(3) actions by the President, Congress, and the Federal Reserve helped stem the crisis, and job creation resumed in 2010;

(4) the economy has created 3.9 million private jobs over the past 24 consecutive months;

(5) as part of a ''Make it in America'' agenda, U.S. manufacturing has been leading the Nation's economic recovery as domestic manufacturers regain their economic and competitive edge and a wave of insourcing jobs from abroad begins;

(6) despite the job gains already made, job growth needs to accelerate and continue for an extended period of time in order for the economy to fully recover from the recession; and

(7) job creation is vital to nation-building at home and to deficit reduction—CBO has noted that if the country were at full employment, the deficit would be about one-third lower than it is today.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pursue a ''Make it in America'' agenda with a priority to consider and enact legislation to help create jobs, remove incentives to out-source jobs

overseas, and instead support incentives that bring jobs back to the U.S.

(2) JOBS.—This resolution—

(A) assumes enactment of—

(i) the President's $50 billion immediate transportation jobs package;

(ii) other measures proposed in the American Jobs Act and reflected in the President's budget; and

(iii) the President's proposed surface transportation legislation;

(B) assumes $1 billion for the President's proposal to establish a Veterans Job Corps;

(C) assumes $80 billion in education jobs funding for the President's initiatives to promote jobs now while also creating an infrastructure that will help students learn and create a better future workforce, including $30 billion for rebuilding at least 35,000 public schools, $25 billion to prevent hundreds of thousands of educator layoffs, and $8 billion to help community colleges train 2 million workers in high-growth industries with skills that will lead directly to jobs; and

(D) establishes a reserve fund that would allow for passage of additional job creation measures, including further infrastructure improvements or other spending or revenue proposals.

SEC. 402. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SEQUESTRATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the Budget Control Act of 2011 called upon the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction and the Congress to enact legislation to achieve $1.2 trillion in savings;

(2) the Joint Select Committee could not reach agreement and did not report savings legislation to the Congress;

(3) failure to enact the required savings triggered sequestration procedures as required under the Budget Control Act; and

(4) this resolution assumes the enactment of savings in excess of $1.2 trillion, negating the need for sequestration to achieve the savings.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that paragraphs (3) through (11) of section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, as amended by the Budget Control Act of 2011, shall be repealed.

SEC. 403. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAKING A BALANCED APPROACH TO DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the President's budget request and every bipartisan analysis of the Nation's future fiscal path have recommended deficit reduction through a balanced approach that includes both spending and revenue; and

(2) The President's choices represent the right general balance of changes to spending and revenue.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution to reduce the deficit through a similar balance of spending and revenue changes. The resolution does not endorse any specific spending cuts or revenue proposals unless they are expressly stated in this resolution.

SEC. 404. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND RETIREES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Social Security is America's most important retirement resource, especially for seniors, because it provides an income floor to keep them, their spouses and their survivors out of poverty during retirement – benefits earned based on their past payroll contributions;

(2) in 2011, 55 million people relied on Social Security;

(3) Social Security benefits are modest, with an average annual benefit for retirees of less than $15,000, while the average total retirement income is less than $26,000 per year;

(4) diverting workers' payroll contributions toward private accounts undermines retirement security and the social safety net by subjecting the workers' retirement decisions and income to the whims of the stock market;

(5) diverting trust fund payroll contributions toward private accounts jeopardizes Social Security because the program will not have the resources to pay full benefits to current retirees; and

(6) privatization increases Federal debt because the Treasury will have to borrow additional funds from the public to pay full benefits to current retirees.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that Social Security should be strengthened for its own sake and not to achieve deficit reduction. Because privatization proposals are fiscally irresponsible and would put the retirement security of seniors at risk, any Social Security reform legislation shall reject partial or complete privatization of the program.

SEC. 405. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON PROTECTING THE MEDICARE GUARANTEE FOR SENIORS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) senior citizens and persons with disabilities highly value the Medicare program and rely on Medicare to guarantee their health and financial security;

(2) in 2011, nearly 50 million people relied on Medicare for coverage of hospital stays, physician visits, prescription drugs, and other necessary medical goods and services;

(3) the Medicare program has lower administrative and program costs than private insurance for a given level of benefits;

(4) excess health care cost growth is not unique to Medicare or other Federal health programs, it is endemic to the entire health care system;

(5) destroying the Medicare program and replacing it with a voucher or premium support for the purchase of private insurance that fails to keep pace with growth in health costs will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks;

(6) shifting excess health care cost growth onto Medicare beneficiaries would not reduce overall health care costs, instead it would mean beneficiaries would face higher premiums, eroding coverage, or both; and

(7) versions of voucher or premium-support policies that do not immediately end the traditional Medicare program will merely cause traditional Medicare to weaken and wither away.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the Medicare guarantee for seniors and persons with disabilities should be preserved and strengthened, and that any legislation to end the Medicare guarantee and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance should be rejected.

SEC. 406. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) making health care coverage affordable and accessible for all American families will improve families' health and economic security, which will make the economy stronger;

(2) the Affordable Care Act signed into law in 2010 will expand coverage to more than 30,000,000 Americans and bring costs down for families and small businesses;

(3) consumers are already benefitting from the Affordable Care Act's provisions to hold insurance companies accountable for their actions and to end long-standing practices such as denying coverage to children based on pre-existing conditions, imposing lifetime limits on coverage that put families at risk of bankruptcy in the event of serious illness, and dropping an enrollee's coverage once the enrollee becomes ill based on a simple mistake in the enrollee's application;

(4) the Affordable Care Act reforms Federal health entitlements by using nearly every health cost-containment provision experts recommend, including new incentives to reward quality and coordination of care rather than simply quantity of services provided, new tools to crack down on fraud, and the elimination of excessive taxpayer subsidies to private insurance plans, and as a result will slow the projected annual growth rate of national health expenditures by 0.3 percentage points after 2016, the essence of ''bending the cost curve''; and

(5) the Affordable Care Act will reduce the Federal deficit by more than $1,000,000,000,000 over the next 20 years.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the law of the land should support making affordable health care coverage available to every American family, and therefore the Affordable Care Act should not be repealed.

SEC. 407. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICAID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Medicaid is a central component of the Nation's health care safety net, providing health coverage to 28 million low-income children, 5 million senior citizens, 10 million people with disabilities, and 14 million other low-income people who would otherwise be unable to obtain health insurance;

(2) senior citizens and people with disabilities account for two-thirds of Medicaid program spending and consequently would be at particular risk of losing access to important health care assistance under any policy to sever the link between Medicaid funding and the actual costs of providing services to the currently eligible Medicaid population;

(3) Medicaid pays for 43 percent of long-term care services in the United States, providing a critical health care safety net for senior citizens and people with disabilities facing significant costs for long-term care; and

(4) at least 70 percent of people over age 65 will likely need long-term care services at some point in their lives.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the important health care safety net for children, senior citizens, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable Americans provided by Medicaid should be preserved and should not be dismantled by converting Medicaid into a block grant that is incapable of responding to increased need that may result from trends in health care costs or economic conditions.

SEC. 408. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that it is the stated position of the Administration that Afghan troops will take the full lead for security operations in Afghanistan by the end of 2014.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that consistent with the Administration's stated position, no funding shall be provided for operations in Afghanistan through the Overseas Contingency Operations budget beyond 2014.

SEC. 409. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) we must continue to support a strong military that is second to none and the size and the structure of our military and defense budgets have to be driven by a strategy;

(2) a growing economy is the foundation of our security and enables the country to provide the resources for a strong military, sound homeland security agencies, and effective diplomacy and international development;

(3) because it puts our economy at risk, the Nation's debt is an immense security threat

to our country, just as former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen has stated, and we must have a deficit reduction plan that is serious and realistic;

(4) the bipartisan National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform and the bipartisan Rivlin-Domenici Debt Reduction Task Force concluded that a serious and balanced deficit reduction plan must put national security programs on the table;

(5) from 2001 to 2010, the ''base'' Pentagon budget nearly doubled and, in 2010, the U.S. spent more on defense than the next 17 countries combined (and more than half of the amount spent by those 17 countries was from seven NATO countries and four other close allies);

(6) last year, Admiral Mullen argued that the permissive budget environment had allowed the Pentagon to avoid prioritizing;

(7) more can be done to rein in wasteful spending at the Nation's security agencies, including the Department of Defense—the last department still unable to pass an audit—such as the elimination of duplicative programs that were identified in a report issued last year by the Government Accountability Office;

(8) effective implementation of weapons acquisition reforms at the Department of Defense can help control excessive cost growth in the development of new weapons systems and help ensure that weapons systems are delivered on time and in adequate quantities to equip our servicemen and servicewomen;

(9) the Department of Defense should continue to review defense plans to ensure that weapons developed to counter Cold War-era threats are not redundant and are applicable to 21st century threats, which should include, with the participation of the National Nuclear Security Administration, examination of requirements for the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization;

(10) more than 94 percent of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce since 2001 is due to increases at security-related agencies—Department of Defense (31 percent), Department of Homeland Security (32 percent), Department of Veterans Affairs (26 percent), and Department of Justice (6 percent)—and the increase, in part, represents a transition to ensure civil servants, as opposed to private contractors, are performing inherently governmental work and an increase to a long-depleted acquisition and auditing workforce at the Pentagon to ensure effective management of weapons systems programs, to eliminate the use of contractors to oversee other contractors, and to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse;

(11) proposals to implement an indiscriminate 10 percent across-the-board cut to the Federal civilian workforce would adversely affect security agencies, leaving them unable to manage their total workforce, which includes contractors, and their operations in a cost-effective manner;

(12) ballistic missile defense technologies that are not proven to work through adequate testing and that are not operationally viable should not be deployed, and that no funding should be provided for the research or development of space-based interceptors;

(13) cooperative threat reduction and other nonproliferation programs (securing ''loose nukes'' and other materials used in weapons of mass destruction), which were highlighted as high priorities by the 9/11 Commission, need to be funded at a level that is commensurate with the evolving threat; and

(14) the Department of Defense should make every effort to investigate the national security benefits of energy independence, including those that may be associated with alternative energy sources and energy efficiency conversions.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 should be rescinded and replaced by a deficit reduction plan that is balanced, that makes smart spending cuts, that requires everyone to pay their fair share, and that takes into account a comprehensive national security strategy that includes careful consideration of international, defense, homeland security, and law enforcement programs; and

(2) the Administration shall provide an additional bonus to members of the Armed Forces who serve in harm's way. This bonus shall be provided from savings that are achieved by increasing efficiencies, eliminating duplicative programs, and reining in waste, fraud, and abuse at the Nation's security agencies.

SEC. 410. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM AND DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the House must pursue deficit reduction through reform of the tax code, which contains numerous tax breaks for special interests;

(2) these special tax breaks can greatly complicate the effort to administer the code and the taxpayer's ability to fully comply with its terms, while also undermining our basic sense of fairness;

(3) the corporate income tax does include a number of incentives that help spur economic growth and innovation, such as extending the research and development credit and clean energy incentives;

(4) but tax breaks for special interests can also distort economic incentives for businesses and consumers and encourage businesses to ship American jobs and capital overseas for tax purposes; and

(5) the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform observed that the corporate income tax is riddled with special interest tax breaks and subsidies, is badly in need of reform, and it proposed to streamline the code, capturing some of the savings in the process, to achieve deficit reduction in a more balanced way.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) POLICY ON INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES.—

(A) The President and this resolution extend the middle class tax cuts, provide long-term relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax for tens of millions of middle class American families, and discontinue the additional estate tax relief resulting from the increased estate tax exemption and reduced maximum tax rate enacted in 2010.

(B) The President and this resolution assume the revenue from returning to the top two tax rates that were in effect when President Clinton left office. The National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform plan also assumes the revenue from returning to those top two tax rates for top earners.

(C) The President and this resolution extend policies that re-invest in domestic manufacturing; build up the renewable energy production capacity of the United States in order to limit our reliance on foreign oil; expand access to higher education; and support saving and capital formation.

(D) This resolution encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider the various proposals made by the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform to limit tax expenditures and raise revenue for deficit reduction; and expressly rejects the approach in the Republican resolution that provides millionaires with even larger tax cuts at the expense of middle-income taxpayers. This resolution protects middle-income taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes below $200,000 ($250,000 for married couples) and encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to raise the revenue necessary in this resolution through tax expenditure reform proposals that would apply to households with over $1 million in adjusted gross income, consistent with the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform's proposals to limit tax expenditures.

(E) In particular, this resolution encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider various proposals for implementing a ''Buffett Rule''—reflecting billionaire investor Warren Buffett's realization that he faces a lower effective tax rate than his secretary—to ensure that middle class families do not face higher effective tax rates than the wealthiest members of society.

(2) POLICY ON CORPORATE INCOME TAXES.—

(A) The President and this resolution propose elimination of subsidies for the major integrated oil and gas companies, and pernicious tax breaks that reward U.S. corporations that ship American jobs—rather than products—overseas for tax purposes.

(B) This resolution adopts those and other pro-growth corporate tax incentives in the President's proposals, such as: enhancing incentives for domestic manufacturing to support a ''Make it in America'' agenda, including providing a tax credit for companies that return operations and jobs to the U.S. while eliminating tax breaks for companies that move operations and jobs overseas; closing loopholes that allow businesses to avoid taxes, by subjecting more of their foreign earnings sheltered in tax havens to U.S. taxation; extending the research and development credit; and extending and enhancing clean energy incentives.

(C) This resolution therefore urges the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider the President's framework for business tax reform in determining how to best overhaul our corporate tax code so that it promotes economic growth and domestic job creation without increasing the deficit and the debt.

SEC. 411. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AGRICULTURE SPENDING.

It is the policy of this resolution that the House Committee on Agriculture should reduce spending in farm programs that provide direct payments to producers even in robust markets and in times of bumper yields. The committee should also find ways to focus assistance away from wealthy agribusinesses and toward struggling family farmers in a manner that protects jobs and economic growth while preserving the farm and nutrition safety net. Finally, it is the policy of this resolution that no Member of Congress should personally receive agriculture commodity payments, in any calendar year, the total of which exceeds 15 percent of the annual rate of basic pay for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, as of January 1 of such calendar year.

SEC. 412. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE USE OF TAXPAYER FUNDS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the House of Representatives should lead by example and identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration shall review the policies pertaining to the services provided to

Members of Congress and House Committees, and shall identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, Barber shop, Salon, and the House dining room. Further, it is the policy of this resolution that no taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

Amend the title so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2012 and fiscal years 2014 through 2022.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 423, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We're here at a very important time for our country. As a result of extraordinary actions that have been taken over the last 4 years, and thanks to the tenacity of the American people and small businesses, we have begun to climb out of a big economic hole.

If you look at this chart right here, you'll see where we were back in January 2009, the first month President Obama was sworn in and took office. At that time, the economy was in total free fall. As a result of actions that were taken, we've begun to climb out of that hole and now we've had 24 months—consecutive months—of positive private sector job growth, creating about 4 million jobs in the economy.

We need to keep that job growth going, and that's what the Democratic alternative does. It builds on the President's proposals.

In here, we have the President's jobs plan—a plan which has been sitting in front of this body since he introduced it back in September. We took some action on the payroll tax cut. That was good. But the President has also called for a major infrastructure investment to modernize our roads and our bridges. We fund that plan, as opposed to the Republican budget which, as we've heard, slashes transportation—in fact, next year by 46 percent in spending—and which independent analysts have said will cost the economy 1.3 million jobs in 2013 and 2.8 million jobs in 2014. That is not the direction we should be going.

We need to nurture the fragile economy. We need to deal with our budget deficits in a credible way, which this does. It takes us from deficits over 8½ percent of GDP down to under 3 percent of GDP by 2015, and sustains them. And we do it in a balanced way by asking for shared responsibility.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the distinguished gentleman and my friend from Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic substitute because the House Republican budget harms middle class families throughout our country.

Mr. Chairman, under the House Republican budget, Medicare is turned from a guaranteed benefit program into a bait-and-switch scheme where millionaires get more and seniors have to pay more.

Under the House Republican budget, if you're a millionaire, you get an additional $394,000 tax cut. If you're an oil company, you get a bigger tax break. If you're a company that outsources jobs, you get a deeper tax break. But if you're a senior, you get as much as a $6,000 increase in your medical costs. You get a bill from the Federal Government for your additional Medicare costs. If you're the child of a middle class family trying to go to college, you get an additional $2,800 tuition increase.

The middle class has always been the backbone of the American economy, Mr. Chairman, and the House Republican budget kicks the middle class in the stomach.

The Democratic budget invests in education; the House Republican budget divests from education. The Democratic budget invests in our children; the Republican budget divests from our children. The Democratic budget invests in America's future; the House Republican budget divests from America's future.

And that is why we should pass this Democratic substitute, which invests and grows and strengthens the middle class, and quit investing in and growing and strengthening tax cuts for Big Oil companies and corporations that offshore our jobs.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding and let me say thanks to Chairman RYAN and members of the Budget Committee for a job well done.

This is a tough process, making real decisions about our path for the future. The interesting thing I've found about this debate that's gone on the last 2 days is that our team actually went and made the tough choices—made the tough choices to preserve freedom in America and to deal with our fiscal nightmare.

If you look at all the proposals we've seen in this debate, it's all more of the same. There are two things that are prevalent: let's raise taxes on the American people once again; and, secondly, let's kick the can down the road as if no one knows that Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are going broke. Oh, yes, all these proposals we've seen continue to kick the can down the road.

I think that the Path to Prosperity that Chairman RYAN and his committee have put together is a blueprint for America's future. We all know that we've got some $16 trillion worth of debt already—$1.3 trillion in a budget deficit this year alone. The American people know that they have got to live within their means; they have got to do a budget. They also know that you can't continue to spend money that you don't have.

And so I applaud my colleagues for the tough decisions they've made to try to do the right thing for the country and to lay out a real vision of what we were to do if we get more control here in this town. This is still a Democrat-run town.

The saddest thing I've seen, though, when it comes to a budget, is that while we did a budget last year—we're doing another budget this year, we're making tough decisions to help preserve Social Security and preserve Medicare—it has been 1,065 since the United States Senate has passed a budget. That's 1,065 days. Almost 3 years since they've had the courage to show the American people what their solutions are.

I think it's high time that we're serious about solving America's fiscal problems. The first step is actually doing a budget.

So, on behalf of my Republican colleagues, I would suggest that we support the Ryan budget. It's a real pathway to prosperity. It makes the tough decisions and puts us on a course that's sustainable, not just for our generation, but for our kids and grandkids.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I have great respect for the Speaker. I would just suggest that he may call it a tough choice to provide and lock in another round of tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans while cutting Medicaid by $800 billion, a full one-third, by the year 2022. Two-thirds of that money goes to seniors in nursing homes and disabled individuals. I don't know if it's a tough choice. It's certainly the wrong choice. And that's what this debate is all about. It's not about whether we reduce our deficits, but how.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Democratic Caucus, Mr. LARSON.

□ 1340

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, let me rise and commend the efforts of CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and the Budget Committee and rise in full support of their balanced and fair document that emphasizes shared sacrifice. Let me say to my Republican colleagues that this appears to us much like that great philosopher Lawrence Berra said, ''deja vu all over again.''

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in another difficult period of our history, said that we need to prevail upon this country to come together and find the warm courage of national unity that comes from shared sacrifice that would again demonstrate to the American people, especially the most frail amongst us and those in the middle class who are impacted the most, that

we have national unity because we have guaranteed that no longer will they be in a position where they have to suffer while others would use government in a way to prosper and grow at the expense of the middle class.

There isn't a Member of this Chamber who doesn't have friends or family who aren't affected by the altering of Medicare, Social Security, or Medicaid. These are the tough decisions that are made every single day across the dinner table.

This fragile recovery impacts the most fragile amongst us and also is tearing asunder the very middle class that we seek to provide with the guarantee—the guarantee of a social safety net that provides them with Social Security, Medicare and, yes, health care, as well. That is why the Democrats have offered an alternative plan that underscores our convictions and our belief in Social Security, Medicare, and affordable health care.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee. He's done a fantastic job.

And to the gentleman from Maryland, I know it's been difficult this week, you've stood in a difficult position, and now you're presenting your budget, and you've been in opposition to many of the budgets put forward, including the President's last night, and I know it's tough.

What we're addressing here right now, Mr. Chairman, I think, is a lot of numbers, a lot of charts and a lot of rhetoric. We hear that. But what we know is that Washington has not been forthright with the American people. For far too long, the top has been getting the bailout, the bottom has been getting a handout, and now who's going to get stuck with the bill? It's our kids. That's who's going to get stuck with the bill.

So why can't we, for once, instead of looking at the charts and numbers and throwing it all out there, just look through the lens of how will this budget impact our children and their future, their opportunity and their prosperity? Is this a budget that presents equal outcomes? Or is it going to be one that presents equal opportunities? Can we not look through that lens, for once, Mr. Chairman?

I would say that the budget that the gentleman has put forward is one more about equal outcomes. It's more taxes, it's more government, and it's more government solutions. Do you know what? Why don't we provide more opportunities and more prosperity for the children of the next generation? That's the lens that I believe we should be looking through.

And this is why: because whether we believe it or not, whether we're willing to recognize it, we are scribes of time right now. History is being written based on the discussions, the outcome and the debate that we have. We are the ones who are determining what history will reflect back on and say we did at this time and what the future exists like later. What will we choose? What will we write? Will this be the chapter that concludes with the words ''the end,'' or will we write a chapter that we can turn the page and hand the pens off to the next generation?

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that we take our pen and that we pass it to the next generation, that we can turn the page, that we can move forward, and that we can provide a new chapter and a new beginning, one that is a beginning that leads to another future of opportunity and prosperity. I believe that only happens if we pass the Republican budget that we have before us today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I do think the focus should be on our children and on the future, and that's why our budget does not do some of the things the Republican budget does do, which is, for example, say that kids who have preexisting conditions, whether it's diabetes or asthma, get insurance. We make sure that those kids can't be excluded because of preexisting conditions. They don't. We make sure that the interest rates on student loans don't double this July, as their budget would allow, because we think it's important that those students have an opportunity to get the education to get ahead and succeed.

So I hope we will continue to focus on that question as we debate the choices that are being made in this budget.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. YARMUTH.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friend from Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, a recent analysis of American tax returns showed that in 2010, the top 1 percent of earners in the United States earned $288 billion more than they had in 2009—$288 billion more, the top 1 percent. In fact, that was 93 percent of all the additional income earned in the entire United States from year to year, 2009 to 2010.

Now, apparently, my friends on the Republican side were outraged that 7 percent of the additional income could slip away to the other 99 percent of American families because they came up with a budget that tried to rectify that immediately. I call it the ''Republican 1 percent budget.'' It's a gift basket for billionaires and millionaires. It contains a permanent extension of the Bush tax cuts, which have created an income gap in this country on par with Cameroon and Rwanda.

But the ''Republican 1 percent budget'' doesn't stop there. It gives an additional tax break of $150,000 a year for everyone making more than $1 million a year. And it does that by dismantling Medicare, slashing education funding, transportation, and things like the SNAP program which help so many needy families in this country.

Mr. Chairman, income inequality has become the central tenet of Republican ideology. The budget we will probably vote on later makes their commitment to widening the income gap abundantly clear. That's why I call the Republican budget, in addition to the ''1 percent budget,'' this is the ''all for 1 budget.'' It's a budget that's all for the 1 percent.

By contrast, the Democratic budget, the resolution we are offering now, is really the ''one for all budget,'' one budget that provides benefits for all Americans. It makes the critical investments that we need to make sure all Americans have equal opportunity and equal tools to realize the American Dream, and it makes sure that all contribute to the deficit reduction that we all are committed to. Everybody plays a part; everybody does their share.

I support the Democratic budget and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. GUINTA.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I find what's going on in this country with the level of spending in America outrageous. People in this country have sent us here to do a job, to be leaders, and to solve problems. We have a current deficit of roughly $1.3 trillion, something that is so high that so many people can't even comprehend that number. We have a long-term debt approaching $16 trillion.

This substitute today continues that path of spending money that we simply don't have. I do thank the gentleman for at least offering a proposal—something that has not been done in the Senate—so we can debate in, I think, a reasonable way what the path is that his budget would propose versus the Path to Prosperity.

This proposal, the substitute proposal, does three things. Number one, it spends $3.7 trillion of roughly $1 trillion-ongoing deficits. Secondly, over the 10-year window, it spends $44.7 trillion, continuing the long-term debt that we have found ourselves in currently. Finally, it doesn't solve the significant drivers of our debt, and it doesn't allow for an opportunity to preserve and protect Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

The country wants us to be honest, the country wants leadership, and we continue to provide that in the House Budget Committee with the Path to Prosperity. I remind people that budget proposes stability and predictability by cutting $5.3 trillion in spending, by reducing the tax on both individual and corporate to give us a fair, level playing field and predictability for the long term. And it reduces our short-term deficit about $700 billion next year and continues to ensure we get on a path to balance. A balanced budget is the

dream of every American, and we offer that opportunity in the Path to Prosperity.

With that, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

□ 1350

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. At this point I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I will yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, in light of this week's Supreme Court arguments on the health care law, I'd like to take a moment to talk about the contrast between our Path to Prosperity budget and the broken promises of that law.

As we've heard from so many of my colleagues in the last couple of days, we are on the verge of a debt crisis. I don't think any of us can argue that. And this health care law, with a total price tag of $1.76 trillion, would surely drive us over that cliff faster. Now, that is why, in the Path to Prosperity budget, we repeal the entire health care law, including the very dangerous IPAB, which would slash physician payment rates, forcing doctors to stop seeing Medicare patients. This 15-member, unelected board makes senior care even harder to access and puts bureaucrats between patients and their doctors.

Our plan for Medicare offers a choice for seniors, and they deserve a choice. We increase the competition between a guaranteed coverage option—and I want to repeat that, that this is a guaranteed coverage option—and traditional Medicare, and it allows seniors to choose. All of this would lower costs of the program while increasing the quality of care. This is the choice of two futures, both for our health care system and also the prosperity of our Nation.

Now, we can continue to go down the path of ObamaCare, where we see $1.76 trillion in spending over 10 years. We also see $525 billion in new taxes, fees, and penalties on families and small businesses. Or, we can repeal this law and put in place policies that increase competition, decrease costs, and ensure that our health care system is patient-focused.

We can continue to explode the size and scope of the Federal Government, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like. If Democrats had their way, their budget would tax more, borrow more, spend more, and waste more of the hardworking taxpayer dollars.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BLACK. I find it interesting that last night this Chamber unanimously rejected the President's 2013 budget that would be an absolute fiscal disaster. And yet this budget before us today again doubles down on those failed policies of the past. The American people are sick and tired of Washington's culture of spend, spend, spend because they know there are consequences of living without a budget and spending more than what we take in.

What we're doing here today is being honest with the American people. We are here to cut spending, reform programs in order to save them, and we make government smaller and less intrusive.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm glad the gentlelady brought up the issue of health care and how these budgets impact health care.

She described their proposal as giving seniors a choice. It's interesting that they would give seniors on Medicare a choice that they don't want themselves to have, that they give Members of Congress a much better deal in health care than they would give to seniors on Medicare.

Here's what their budget would do in ending the Medicare guarantee. This blue line shows the current level of support Medicare beneficiaries get from the Medicare program, up around 90 percent. That green line right there, that's the level of support Members of Congress get from the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan. You can see it's steady; as costs go up, the support goes up proportionally. The Republican plan, that red line, is the one for seniors. That takes support steadily down relative to rising health care costs so that seniors would have to eat those rising health care costs. They bear the risk. That is a bad plan for American seniors. It's a bad plan for America.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has focused a lot on these issues as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. NEAL.

Mr. NEAL. Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

What's striking about the debate that we're having today and this discussion is that essentially our Republican friends and colleagues are asking us to go back to the policies that got us here in the first place, the folly of those 6 years when they controlled the Presidency, when they controlled the Senate, and when they controlled the House of Representatives. So let me reacquaint all with their number forecast.

They offered $1.3 trillion worth of tax cuts in 2001, and then came back in 2003 and said that wasn't enough; let's cut taxes by another trillion dollars. The underlying argument that they offered at the time was that this would jump-start growth, despite the fact that as we came off the Clinton years with the greatest spurt of economic growth in the history of the world—a budget that was balanced for 4 successive years and 22 million jobs—their argument was: We can outdo that growth if we simply cut taxes by $2.3 trillion—and, incidentally, not for the middle class. These tax cuts overwhelmingly went to people in the 1 percentile. Remember the theory that tax cuts pay for themselves?

So, let's contrast January 19, 2001 with the end of the Bush years—$15 trillion worth of debt, deficits as far as the eye could see, all under the guise of economic growth. So, let me give you a number—not an opinion, but a fact. Those 8 years offered the most anemic economic growth at any time since Herbert Hoover was President of the United States. And what they ask for today in this budget is to have bigger tax cuts for wealthy people and eviscerate the guarantee of Medicare.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NEAL. This is the party, on the Republican side, that tried to privatize Social Security during those years, and all they want to do is shoehorn these legislative proposals into tax cuts for wealthy people. Their argument today, despite these record deficits, is, with revenue at 14.7 percent of GDP—headed toward the Eisenhower years—when the town has argued for years about revenue being between 19 and 21 percent, they're going to cut Medicare to give tax cuts for wealthy people.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, before we had a chance to vote on the President's budget, I received a copy of a press release from the White House. It encouraged the House Democratic leadership to vote for this amendment. It encouraged the Democrats in the House to vote for the Van Hollen amendment, which I just thought was worthy of getting up and talking about, very briefly.

It makes me wonder why the President didn't send a press release asking his Democrat colleagues to vote for his budget. It makes me wonder what the President is thinking. Does he like the Van Hollen budget better than his own budget? I mean, I guess there are some things to like. The President's budget raised taxes by $1.9 trillion; the Van Hollen budget only raises taxes by $1.7 trillion. The President's budget raised spending by $1.5 trillion; the Van Hollen amendment only raises it by $900 billion.

But it makes me wonder where the President is. Does the President think that his budget that he offered just a month ago raises taxes too much, raises spending too much? Is it too big of a tax-and-spend document, now he wants a little bit less of a tax-and-spend document? I guess the reason he

likes the Van Hollen budget is that it raises taxes, it raises spending, and it never balances. I guess those are the consistencies between the Van Hollen budget and the President's budget that we unanimously defeated last night 414–0. So I guess the President likes budgets that raises taxes, raise spending, and never balance.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, as I have through this entire debate, that any balanced approach that does not end up in a balanced budget is no balance and is no budget. For that reason, I encourage us to defeat this amendment.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thought we were back to reality today instead of in the land of make-believe. Mr. MULVANEY offered an amendment yesterday that was not the President's budget. We debated that last night. I don't know why we're continuing that charade.

□ 1400

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There's been a lot of talk about kick the can down the road and kick the can down the road. I want to know what road that is?

The road I know, the road that gave me the American Dream, was the road to an education that's being undercut by this budget. It's a road to medical security that my grandparents worked hard and struggled for to give me. So that's the road we're talking about.

The other question I have is, What can are we talking about? The budget offered by the Republicans kicks the can down the road all right, but that can is the middle class American.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I thank the chairman for yielding.

We have a lot of folks in the gallery today that have worked hard and saved money that they've earned to make their trip and to come here and listen to this debate. They understand that Santa Claus and a fairy tale is not going to pay for their transportation back. They get that. And they know that when they get back home, they're going to have to earn and work and find earned success if they want to bring their family back again. They get it. They get it. The American people get it.

At no point in time have the American people had to do more with less and the Federal Government has done less with more.

We hear a lot about fairness. True fairness does not come from wealth distribution. True fairness means rewarding merit, creating opportunity, and letting people rise. That has been a bedrock of the American system, the free enterprise system; and it is that free enterprise system that has given opportunity and rewarded people. And America has been benevolent with the gifts of being rewarded by hard work and honest dealings.

The Democratic budget does not support that; yet the Ryan budget or the Path to Prosperity, the Republican budget, does.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair reminds all Members not to refer to occupants of the gallery.

The gentleman from Maryland has 1¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR).

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the other side speak about their budget, it takes me back to growing up in Puerto Rico as a young man. And I'm very privileged to represent the people of Idaho right now, but I grew up in a very poor neighborhood. I grew up in a very poor environment in Puerto Rico.

I remember my mother taking me to the wealthier neighborhoods. And I remember her taking me to different places to the nicer stores, the nicer places in Puerto Rico and telling me that I had a choice, that I could work hard, I could play by the rules, I could do all the things I needed to do, and one day I could live in one of those homes, one day I could actually have those opportunities.

But if my mother would have had the same mentality that the other side has, I would have never been able to amount to anything in my life because what they believe is that the only way you can actually amount to something is if you take from the ones who have, if you're a ''have-not.''

My mother never believed in that. She never said some day she will own a beautiful home, you will own a beautiful car, you will own a beautiful house if you take away from the rich. She always said that was up to you to become somebody in your life. And that's the mentality that the other side has.

I have this chart here to show what really happened under the Democrats and the Republicans. If you see this, when the Democrats took control of Congress, we were at just under 5 percent unemployment. As soon as they took over Congress, and Barack Obama was elected, the unemployment rate went higher. And as soon as the Republicans were elected, the unemployment rate started going down. That's the path that we can have between the two parties.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in opposition to the budget offered by my colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Then-Senator Obama, when campaigning for President, called President Bush unpatriotic for raising our national debt by $4 trillion in 8 years, a figure he has surpassed in less than 4 years.

When then-Senator Obama voted against a debt limit increase he said, Leadership means the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today on to the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

I agree with Senator Obama. If he believes this type of leadership was a failure and unpatriotic, then certainly so too should he think that about his budget and this budget here, for this budget would leave the U.S. with nearly $25 trillion of debt by the end of 2022, despite a massive tax increase of $1.7 trillion.

And despite the increase, this budget does not balance within the next 10 years, the next 20 years, and not even in 75 years. We can't wait. We can't wait, Mr. Chairman. We can't wait to balance the budget for 75 years.

Now more than ever, America needs leadership. As Senator Obama said, we cannot put the failures of today on the backs of the next generation. I agree, Senator Obama. So I reject this budget for the sake of our children and grandchildren.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just remind my colleagues that at the end of the 8 years of the Bush administration, after the tax cuts, which helped create the deficits, we ended up losing over 600,000 private sector jobs. That's the result of trickle-down economics.

The last thing we want to do is go back to those policies. The Republican budget takes us back to our policies. We invest in jobs.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader, who's been focused on jobs, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I want to rise to sing the praises of our Democratic members on the House Budget Committee, led by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). Thank you for bringing us a balanced budget to the floor, a balanced option on how we go forward to the floor.

Yes, we know we have to make cuts, and we have to increase revenue, but most of all, we have to increase jobs. Growth is what is important.

And the difference between these two budgets, the budget that Mr. VAN HOLLEN is proposing and the Ryan Republican budget, is that the Ryan Republican budget loses jobs. The Van Hollen budget, the Democratic budget, is a job-creator. It's a job-creator.

It also invests in education. Think of it, if you're a student and you have a student loan, on July 1 your interest rate will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. The Ryan Republican budget says that's just fine. The House Democratic budget prevents that from happening.

And if you're a senior, the Ryan budget takes you down a path where the Medicare guarantee is cut. You may have to spend $6,000 or more for less in terms of benefits.

All the while, while not protecting our students, while not creating jobs, while not protecting our seniors and their Medicare, the Ryan budget gives an over-$300,000 tax break to people making over $1 million a year.

How can that be? How can that be?

The more people know about that budget, the more they know that it hurts them and their lives. The budget that is put forth by the House Democrats is a positive one for economic growth, for investing in our small businesses, for honoring the entrepreneurial spirit of America, for strengthening the middle class, for building ladders of opportunity for people who want to work hard, play by the rules, take responsibility for themselves to succeed as we re-ignite the American Dream.

So I thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for your leadership in putting a budget forth that is responsible, that honors our commitment to future generations, that reduces the deficit in a positive way, as opposed to Mr. RYAN's Republican budget. It doesn't even get to deficit reduction, ending that until close to 2040. I mean, the contrast could not be greater. The impact on America's families could not be greater.

Just think, seniors pay $6,000 more for fewer benefits in Medicare, while they give a $300,000 tax cut to the wealthiest people in our country.

□ 1410

You be the judge. Is that a budget that is a statement of your values?

Vote ''yes'' on the Van Hollen budget. Vote ''no'' on the Ryan Republican budget.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 15 seconds remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Maryland wish to use his remaining 15 seconds?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Yes, I would. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, our Democratic alternative invests in the President's jobs proposal, a proposal that has been sitting here in the House of Representatives since September.

We reduced the deficit in a balanced and fair way. We make choices not to provide another tax break to the wealthiest but to say we need the combination of cuts and revenue, just like bipartisan commissions have done.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me just try to give, in a nutshell, the economic vision the minority leader just gave us. It kind of works like this:

Take more money from communities, from families, from small businesses and send it to Washington; swish it around the bureaucracy; make the decisions here; then, through trickle-down government, try to create jobs from government; borrow more money if that's not enough; then print more money if that's not enough over at the Federal Reserve; and we can make jobs in government.

It doesn't work. We've been trying this. Look at where we are today. Our debt is bigger than our economy. Look at the common theme we've seen before us. This budget, the House Democratic budget, has a $1.7 trillion tax increase; the President's budget, a $2 trillion tax increase; the CBC budget, a $6 trillion tax increase; and least, but not last, the Progressive budget has a $6.7 trillion tax increase. Is that for deficit reduction? No. It's for more spending.

The House Democratic budget has a $4.6 trillion spending increase; the CBC budget, a $5.2 trillion spending increase; the President's budget, a $5.2 trillion spending increase; and the Progressive Caucus Budget, a $6.6 trillion spending increase.

It is clear, they want you taxed more so they can spend more, and they never, ever balance the budget and they send us off a debt cliff.

This debt crisis is the most predictable crisis we've ever had in the history of this country, and we've got to stop this notion that we can just keep taking more and more and more from families and businesses to spend us deeper into debt. It doesn't work.

With that, I urge a ''no'' vote on the House Democratic substitute.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 262, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

AYES—163

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
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
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—262

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul

Paulsen	Ros-Lehtinen	Stutzman
Pearce	Roskam	Sullivan
Pence	Ross (AR)	Terry
Peterson	Ross (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Petri	Royce	Thornberry
Pitts	Runyan	Tiberi
Platts	Ryan (WI)	Tipton
Poe (TX)	Scalise	Turner (NY)
Pompeo	Schilling	Turner (OH)
Posey	Schmidt	Upton
Price (GA)	Schock	Visclosky
Quayle	Schrader	Walberg
Reed	Schweikert	Walden
Rehberg	Scott (SC)	Walsh (IL)
Reichert	Scott, Austin	Webster
Renacci	Sensenbrenner	West
Ribble	Sessions	Westmoreland
Rigell	Shimkus	Whitfield
Rivera	Shuler	Wilson (SC)
Roby	Shuster	Wittman
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Wolf
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Womack
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Woodall
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Yoder
Rohrabacher	Southerland	Young (AK)
Rokita	Stearns	Young (FL)
Rooney	Stivers	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Filner	Mack	Rangel
Jackson (IL)	Meeks	Towns

□ 1437

Mr. FARR and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 150, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let me just start off by thanking all of the staff and the minority and their staff for the hard work.

I want to congratulate Mr. VAN HOLLEN for bringing his substitute to the floor. The minority does not need to do that, and I think that it is good for the process and the system that they do that.

In particular, I want to thank our Budget Committee staff: Alex Stoddard, Andy Morton, Austin Smythe, Charlotte Ivancic, Conor Sweeney, Courtney Reinhard, David Logan, Dennis Teti, Dick Magee, Eric Davis, Gerrit Lansing, Jane Lee, Jenna Spealman, Jim Herz, Jon Burks, Jon Romito, Jose Guillen, Justin Bogie, Marsha Douglas, Matt Hoffmann, Nicole Foltz, Paul Restuccia, Stephanie Parks, Steve Spruiell, Ted McCann, Tim Flynn, and Vanessa Day.

I also want to thank our personal office staff and the people who are over there at the Ford Building that not everybody sees but who work for the Congressional Budget Office. I had the privilege to meet with them last December while they were busy putting the payroll tax numbers together.

This year, the President's budget came late. Easter came early. Everyone was crunched. We worked them overtime, very hard. Now, we don't always like the estimates they necessarily give us, but I want to thank them for their dedication and their professionalism in making this process work.

With that, I will reserve the balance of my time.

PAUL RYAN PERSONAL OFFICE STAFF

Allison Steil, Andy Speth, Chad Herbert, Danyell Tremmel, Joyce Meyer, Kevin Seifert, Megan Wagner, Nathan Schacht, Sarah Peer, Smythe Anderson, Susie Liston, Teresa Mora, Tricia Stoneking, Lauren Schroeder, Casey Higgins, Aubrey Yanzito, Rick Jacobson.

CBO STAFF

Adam Talaber, Adam Wilson, Adebayo Adedeji, Alan van der Hilst, Alexandra L. Minicozzi, Allison Percy, Amber G. Marcellino, Amy E. Petz, Andrea K. Noda, Andrew Stocking, Ann Futrell, Anna E. Cook, Annette W. Kalicki, Athiphat Muthitacharoen, Aurora K. Swanson, Avi Lerner, Barbara Edwards, Barry Blom, Benjamin R. Page, Bernard C. Kempinski.

Brianne B. Hutchinson, Bruce G. Arnold, Carla Tighe Murray, Caryn Rotheim, Chad M. Chirico, Chad Shirley, Charles Pineles-Mark, Charles Whalen, Chayim Rosito, Christi Hawley Anthony, Christian K. Howlett, Christina Vu, Christine M. Bogusz, Christopher Murphy, Christopher Williams, Christopher Zogby, Courtney Griffith, Cynthia R. Cleveland, Damien Moore, DaMischa Phillip.

Daniel Frisk, Daniel S. Hoople, Darren Young, Dave Hull, David A. Brauer, David Arthur, David Austin, David B. Newman, David C. Gaffney, David D. Jackson, David E. Mosher, David Rafferty, David Torregrosa, David Weiner, Dawn Sauter Regan, Deborah A. Kalcevic, Deborah Kilroe, Deborah Lucas, Denise Jordan-Williams, Doug Elmendorf, Dwayne Wright.

Ed Harris, Edward (Sandy) Davis, Edward C. Blau, Elias Leight, Elizabeth Bass, Elizabeth Cove Delisle, Ellen C. Werble, Emily Holcombe, Eric J. Labs, Ernestine McNeil, Ernestine McNeil, Esther Steinbock, Felix Reichling, Frances M. Lussier, Francesca Castelli, Frank J. Sammartino, Frank S. Russek, Gregory Acs, Gregory H. Hitz, Heidi Golding, Holly Harvey, Jamease Miles.

James A. Langley, James Baumgardner, James Johnson, Janet F. Airis, Janet Holtzblatt, Janice M. Johnson, Jared Brewster, Jason Wheelock, Jean P. Hearne, Jeanine Rees, Jeff LaFave, Jeffrey Kling, Jeffrey M. Holland, Jennifer C. Gravelle, Jennifer Smith, Jessica Deegan, Jessica S. Banthin, Jimmy Jin, J'nell L. Blanco, Joanna (Jodi) Capps.

Joe Miller, John H. Skeen III, Jonathan A. Huntley, Jonathan A. Schwabish, Jonathan P. Morancy, Joseph Evans Jr., Joseph Kile, Joshua Shakin, Joyce M. Manchester, Juan M. Contreras, Juann H. Hung, Judith Cromwell, Julia M. Christensen, Julia Mitchell, Julie H. Topoleski, Julie Somers, Justin Humphrey, Justin R. Falk.

Kalyani Parthasarathy, Kate Kelly, Kathleen FitzGerald, Kathleen Gramp, Kent R. Christensen, Kevin Perese, Kim J. Kowalewski, Kim P. Cawley, Kirstin B. Nelson, Kurt Seibert, Lara E. Robillard, Larry Ozanne, Leah C. Mazade, Leigh S. Angres, Leo K. Lex, Linda Bilheimer, Linda Schimmel, Lisa Ramirez-Branum, Loretta Lettner, Lori B. Housman, Lyle Nelson.

Majid Moghaddam, Marika Santoro, Marin A. Randall, Marion C. Curry, Mark Booth, Mark E. Sanford, Mark J. Lasky, Mark P. Hadley, Mark T. Grabowicz, Martin von Gnechten, Mary M. Froehlich, Matthew Goldberg, Matthew Pickford, Matthew Schmit, Maureen Costantino, Megan E. Carroll, Melinda B. Buntin, Melissa Merrell, Michael Bennett, Michael Levine, Michael S. Simpson, Mitchell A. Remy, Molly W. Dahl, Monte Ruffin.

Nabeel A. Alsalam, Nancy A. Fahey, Natalie J. Tawil, Nathan T. Musick, Noah P. Meyerson, Noelia J. Duchovny, Paige Piper/Bach, Pamela Greene, Patrice L. Gordon, Patrice L. Watson, Paul Burnham, Paul Jacobs, Paul Masi, Paula D. Brown, Perry C. Beider, Peter H. Fontaine, Philip C. Webre, Priscila Hammett.

R. Derek Trunkey, Rae Wiseman, Raymond J. Hall, Rebecca Rockey, Rebecca V. Yip, Robert A. Sunshine, Robert G. Shackleton Jr., Robert McClelland, Robert W. Arnold, Robert W. Stewart, Rod Goodwin, Romain Parsad, Ron Gecan, Ronald L. Moore, Ryan G. Miller.

Sam Papenfuss, Santiago Vallinas, Sarah Ammar, Sarah Anders, Sarah Jennings, Sarah Puro, Shane Beaulieu, Shannon Mok, Sharon Broderick, Sharon Corbin-Jallow, Sheila Campbell, Sheila M. Dacey, Sherry Snyder, Simone Thomas, Stephanie Burns, Stephanie Cameron, Stephanie M. Ruiz, Stephen P. Rentner, Steven A. Weinberg, Stuart A. Hagen, Sunita C. D'Monte, Susan Willie, Susanne S. Mehlman.

T.J. McGrath, Tamara Hayford, Terry M. Dinan, Theresa A. Gullo, Thomas B. Bradley, Tiara P. MizeIle, Valentina Michelangeli, Vi Nguyen, Virginia Myers, Wendy Edelberg, Wendy Kiska, William J. Carrington, William Ma, William Randolph.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by thanking all the members of the Budget Committee, Republicans and Democrats alike. We had a very good debate in the Budget Committee. We had a good debate here on the floor. And I want to thank all our colleagues. We obviously have deep differences, but I think everybody conducted this debate in a civil manner.

I also want to thank the chairman for the way he conducted the proceedings in the committee. And to all the staff, Republican and Democratic staff, I want to thank our team, headed by Tom Kahn. Many of them are here on the floor. As I think everybody knows, they've spent many, many, many late nights working on this budget. So I salute all of them as well as the folks over at the Congressional Budget Office.

□ 1440

We obviously think that this budget proposed by our Republican colleagues is the wrong choice for America.

I now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, my friend, our colleague from the State of Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RYAN, who is an outstanding Member of this body and my friend, and who is one of the most able among us, as well as Mr. VAN HOLLEN, who has been my close friend for many years and one of the most able among us,

have just spent time thanking our staffs for the work that they have done. I share their view that our staffs have worked mightily. And, indeed, there has been much debate.

Tragically, the product we will produce today is far less than the sum of our parts in this body. It is, I would suggest to you, a product unworthy of the intellect that has been applied to it. It is a product, indeed, that I think will hurt America, not help America. It is a product that is too much politics and too little policy. It is a product of which I think this House can not be proud.

It is a product that relies on substantially undermining the security of seniors. I say that as one who has said repeatedly that in reaching a fiscally sustainable path we must deal with entitlements. We need to do so together, and we need to do so in a balanced way.

But there is no balance in this proposal. Seniors, middle class, the vulnerable, and working Americans are asked to pay the price of this agreement. And, indeed, not only are they asked to pay the price, but the best off among us is asked to do the least.

That's not the America of which we're all proud—that has worked together and sacrificed together at times, to come together to make a joint contribution to the welfare of this country.

This product is less than the sum of its parts. This product would undermine the guarantee of Medicare.

Again, we need to deal with entitlements, but not in a way, I tell my friends in this House, that undermines the guarantee of senior security as well as family security, so their children will know their parents are secure.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, we had an agreement. I think that the gentleman from Wisconsin is an honorable man. He is my friend. I like PAUL RYAN. But I am sorely disappointed, I tell my friend.

We came to having a difference of opinion on what the number ought to be for this year's budget. You had a lower number. We had a higher number. We almost took the Nation to the brink—as a matter of fact, we took it to the brink—of default.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. We came to the brink of default in this great Nation, the most creditworthy Nation on the face of the Earth, and were downgraded as a result of failing to get to an agreement. But when we got to an agreement, it was an agreement. And if we are able to rely on one another's words, we ought to keep our agreements.

It simply said that 302(a), which simply means, for the public, that the dollars we were going to spend on discretionary spending this fiscal year coming would be $1.47 trillion. That's a lot of money, no doubt about it. Your side didn't like it, my side didn't like it, but we agreed on it.

That agreement is not carried out in this budget. How can we rely in the future on such an agreement? It asks seniors to pay the bill, the vulnerable to pay the bill, but not the wealthiest in America. It puts Medicare at risk and does not get us to where we want.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. In fact, it adds $10 trillion, and then some magical formula that's somewhere out there, like waste, fraud, and abuse, we're going to find the money to pay for the $10 trillion in tax cuts. That's by the extension of the Bush tax cuts and the 35 to 25. Some magical way, we're going to eliminate preference items. It doesn't say which ones. It doesn't say who's going to pay the bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, we can do better. The parts in this body are very good on both sides of the aisle—good intellect, good instincts, and a love for this country. We can do better.

Let's reject this budget. Let's do some real work. Let's come together and put this country on a fiscally sustainable path without harming our people.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished majority whip, Mr. MCCARTHY.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for the work that he's done, both sides.

We've watched a lot of debate. This floor is supposed to be devised to have the power of the idea to win.

Mr. Chairman, we watched the President's budget come here and, unfortunately, unite us when nobody thought that was the direction to go.

We watched history be made on this floor for many years. It's always said that history repeats itself. In my short lifespan, if I'm really looking at where America stands, it stands much where we stood in 1980—a choice between two futures.

Have you ever thought for a moment the similarities of 1980 to today?

In 1980, America was afraid that Japan was going to surpass us in our economy. Today, we have fear of China and India being larger.

In 1980, Iran was holding Americans hostage. Today, they want to close the Strait of Hormuz. They want to develop missiles that hold the world hostage.

We had an energy crisis. Today, the price of gasoline is the highest it's ever been.

Every generation in America has been able to improve on the generation before it, but do you realize 1980 was the first time a majority of Americans believed the best days were behind us? 50.4 percent. Today, it's at 74. We had a challenge in our foreign policy. We literally had a President put a sweater on and tell us to turn the heater down.

Our biggest challenge is our debt that faces us.

Well, today we have a choice, a choice of two futures, just as we did in 1980. So the choice today is: Do you want that European model; or do you want something that faces our challenge, honest to the American people, and rises to the occasion?

When Ronald Reagan was sworn in at his inaugural, he said:

> Our willingness to believe in ourselves and our capacity to perform great deeds; to believe that together, with God's help, we can and will resolve the problems which now confront us. And after all, why shouldn't we believe that? We are Americans.

Winston Churchill once said of America:

> You can always count on them to do what's right after they've exhausted every other option.

We have exhausted every other option. This is an opportunity for a new path, for a new future.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House Republican budget resolution offered by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Chairman PAUL RYAN.

Mr. Chairman, people in this country are looking. They are desperate to see a strong signal from Washington that we are prepared to make the tough decisions necessary to address our Nation's fiscal crisis. Today, we will pass our budget that proposes real, honest solutions to create a stronger economy and a more certain future for our country.

□ 1450

Our budget takes bold steps that will get the fiscal house in order and will manage down the debt and deficit. It also strengthens the entitlement programs which are the biggest drivers of our debt. It reforms the Tax Code and prevents devastating defense cuts from taking place—all without raising taxes.

Mr. Chairman, we are seizing the opportunity to address what even the minority has admitted is the most predictable economic crisis in our Nation's history. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, those on the other side of the aisle seem to refuse to be able to deal with this crisis and actually propose a solution.

The Democratic-controlled Senate has failed to pass a budget in over 1,000 days, shirking its responsibility to the American people. And the President has refused to put forth any serious solution to pay down the historic debt and deficit that he helped create. In fact, the President's budget will actually aggravate the Nation's problems. President Obama's budget saddles the American people with massive tax increases, puts more burden on job creators, weakens our military and fails

to provide a plan to save our entitlement programs. I believe these policies will fundamentally change our Nation for the worse.

In contrast, Mr. Chairman, our budget restores the system of free enterprise that has made America the greatest nation in the world. We propose a simpler, fairer, and more competitive Tax Code that will actually foster economic growth and job creation. Instead of picking winners and losers, our plan levels the playing field. Our budget lowers tax rates for taxpayers, broadens the base, and gets rid of loopholes and preferences so we can grow the economy and see more jobs created.

Mr. Chairman, our budget seeks to save our entitlement programs because we actually produce a plan to solve the disproportionate cause of our deficits in health care entitlements.

This commitment to lead, this commitment to find solutions and to actually put a plan in place is what has been missing from the debate in this town. And we ask our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us in that commitment to actually adopt a plan so that we can begin to make progress and send a signal to the American people that we get it and that we are here to help solve the problem.

Mr. Chairman, House Republicans are offering the American people a choice in terms of the direction this country will take. And I thank Chairman RYAN and the members of his Budget Committee for their hard work to produce this pro-growth, solutions-oriented budget. This document does begin to address the serious fiscal challenges we face and grow the economy so that our children have the same hope, opportunity, and ability to achieve success that our parents gave to us and their parents to them.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. If I could ask how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank our colleagues for a vigorous debate, and I would remind everybody that just a few years ago when the President was sworn in, our economy was in a total free fall. The bottom was falling out, we had negative 8 percent GDP, and over 800,000 jobs were being lost every month. And as a result of extraordinary actions that were taken, along with the tenacity of the American people, we have climbed out of that hole that we inherited. We have now had 24 months of consecutive private-sector job growth. Let's keep that growth going.

The budget that the President proposed, the budget that the Democrats proposed, did that. It expanded investments in jobs. The Republican budget will cut our investment in transportation next year by 46 percent when we have 17 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

Independent analysts have said that their budget will cost us 1 million jobs this year and cost us 2 million jobs next year. That's not what we need. The Congressional Budget Office has said that over one-third of our current deficit is because of underemployment. Why would we want to add to underemployment, as the Republican budget does?

Now, in the long term, we've got to get our deficits under control. The issue is not whether we need to do that, the issue is how. As the previous speaker said, the question is the choice. Our Republican colleagues overwhelmingly have signed this pledge saying they are not willing to close one tax loophole—not one penny—for the purpose of reducing the deficit. And when you say to folks making over $1 million a year, you don't have to share any more responsibility of reducing the deficit, when you say to big oil companies we're going to keep going with the taxpayer subsidies, do you know what? You've got to take out the budget on everybody else, at the expense of seniors, at the expense of middle-income taxpayers, and at the expense of important investments in our economy. And that's what their budget does. That's why it ends the Medicare guarantee.

They're proposing to give seniors a deal that's a lot worse than we have for Members of Congress—worse than the one for Members of Congress, seniors on Medicare. They cut Medicaid by $800 billion, more than one-third of the program, by 2022, putting seniors and disabled individuals at risk. They cut education investments and would allow interest rates on student loans to double this July. Those are not decisions that we make if we want a strong economy and a robust future for our children and grandchildren.

So this is all about choices, and we don't think that it's bold to provide tax breaks to millionaires while you're ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors. We don't think it's courageous to protect big taxpayer giveaways to companies that ship American jobs overseas while we're cutting investments in education, science, research, and infrastructure right here at home. We don't think it's fair to provide another round of tax cuts to folks at the very top. The Tax Policy Center says it's going to be close to $400,000 on average for people making over $1 million. We don't think it's fair to do that, financing those tax cuts by increasing taxes on middle-income Americans.

I would challenge our colleagues: show us how you make up for $4.6 trillion in lost revenue from dropping that tax rate without socking it to middle-income taxpayers? So far, Republican colleagues have been absolutely incapable of showing us that they're not shifting the burden to middle-income taxpayers.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is all about choices. Unfortunately, we didn't pass the alternative Democratic budget. Let's not make the mistake of passing this Republican budget plan. We can do better. We can do what bipartisan groups have done, take a balanced approach, cut spending and also cut the loopholes for special interests. Let's do it in a way that the American people would say brings us together, rather than apart.

So I would urge rejection of this budget. It makes the wrong choice for America. I thank the chairman, and I thank my colleagues.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, we are bearing witness to history this week. Across the street, we are witnessing what could be the end of bureaucratic-controlled health care. What we are on the verge of witnessing is a powerful reaffirmation of the American idea, and we are finally having the debate we need to have.

Our rights come to us naturally, they come from God and nature, and not from government. This health care law is the latest and perfect example of the notion that government is now needed to grant us new rights. And if that is the case, then government has authority to ration, to regulate and to redistribute exactly how we exercise these new rights, such as health care. And if these new government-granted rights conflict with our constitutional rights and liberties, well, then, such is the sacrifice needed in the name of progress, or so the thinking goes.

Across the street, we are witnessing what could be a rejection of this line of thinking. The new health care law, which asserts unlimited power to the Federal Government to decide for Americans how they should go about getting their health care, simply is not compatible with the Constitution.

□ 1500

But the Justices who are considering this case, they've raised a very good point: If this is, at the end, a bureaucrat control of health care, what comes next? And if you listen to them, you may hear a pretty dim view of Congress' ability to solve this problem.

With respect, I would suggest that they take a look at what we are accomplishing here in this body today. Here, in this Chamber, we are witnessing the growing momentum of a new approach, one that maintains a critical role for government, but ultimately puts the American people in charge where they belong.

For the second year in a row, we are passing a budget that outlines a new approach to Medicare. We keep the protections that made Medicare a guaranteed promise for seniors throughout the years, but this is what we say to the bureaucrats who have mismanaged this program into bankruptcy: Enough. Your approach doesn't work. Government has never come up with the magic formula to micromanage America, let alone lower costs and improve quality. It's time to put 50 million seniors, not 15 bureaucrats, in charge of their own health care decisions.

Forcing insurance companies to compete, that's the only way to guarantee quality affordable health care for seniors that lasts for generations. That's the answer to what comes next. Let's keep building on the growing bipartisan consensus on how to improve patient-centered health care reform.

But putting our trust in Americans, it goes beyond health care. It is what this entire budget is all about. We get government bureaucrats out of the business of picking winners and losers in the economy because Americans should make their own decisions about what kind of car they drive or what kind of light bulb they use. We give power over the safety net programs to the States because we believe that governments that are closest to the people are in the best position to design programs for their unique communities, to get people on to lives of self-sufficiency and upward mobility.

When we lower tax rates by closing special interest loopholes, we're saying we in Washington don't need to micromanage people's decisions through the Tax Code. Let people keep more of their own hard-earned dollars; let them decide how to spend it. Economic growth, jobs, upward mobility, opportunity, these are what we're striving for, just like our parents did the same for us.

Mr. Chairman, it is so rare in American politics to arrive at a moment in which the debate revolves around the fundamental nature of American democracy and the social contract, but that is exactly where we are today. One approach gives more power to unelected bureaucrats, takes more from hardworking taxpayers to fuel the expansion of government, and commits our Nation to a future of debt and decline. This approach is proving unworkable in Congress, in our courts, and in our communities.

This contrast with our budget could not become clearer: We put our trust in citizens, not in the government. Our budget returns power to individuals, to families, to communities.

As these choices become clear, today's budget is a vote of confidence for the American experiment. We think that putting our trust in the American people will renew their trust in us. We think Americans should control their destinies, and we trust them to make the right choices about the future of our country.

Mr. Chairman, we think America is on the wrong track. We believe the President is bringing us toward a debt crisis and a welfare state in decline. We are offering the Nation a choice. We are offering the Nation a better way forward. And we are offering the Nation a plan to renew America and the American idea.

Mr. Chairman, let's have that vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chair, I rise today to voice my opposition to the House Republican budget which ends Medicare guarantees while giving huge tax cuts to millionaires and billionaires. As they have done countless times over the past three decades, the House Republicans are siding with millionaires and billionaires, while making life more difficult for seniors, students, and working people and families. To fund an average tax cut of $400,000 per year for people making more than $1 million annually, they would take away the Medicare guarantee and the Affordable Care Act's provisions to close the donut hole and for free preventive care; destroy more than 4 million jobs through 2014; and cut funding for Pell Grants, K–12 education and Head Start. Instead of continuing with 30 years of failed trickle-down economic policy, we should be investing in our infrastructure, education and research—we need to pass the President's budget for our country's long-term economic health and to renew the American Dream for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I will vote today for H. Con. Res. 112, authored by Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN, because we have a duty to address our nation's looming fiscal obligations. Simply put, we cannot continue to kick the proverbial can down the road.

When I came to the floor to vote for last year's budget, we were $14 trillion in debt. Today, we are $15.5 trillion in debt. It is projected we could be $17 trillion in debt by the end of the year and $21 trillion in debt by 2021.

This will be our fourth straight year of trillion dollar deficits. Four straight years.

We are currently spending 10 cents of every dollar on interest to finance the debt, even though we're borrowing money at historically low rates. If we realistically assume that rates will rise, we could be spending close to 1 out of every 6 dollars to finance the debt by the end of the decade. And that is under the best case scenario.

That is money that could be going to our national defense, repairing our roads and bridges or life-saving cancer research.

In 1970, 5 percent of debt held by the public was in foreign hands. In 1990, it was 19 percent. Today, more than 40 percent of our publically held debt is in foreign hands.

Who are our bankers? Nations such as China, which is spying on us, where human rights are an afterthought, and Catholic bishops, Protestant ministers and Tibetan monks are jailed for practicing their faith, and oil-exporting countries such as Saudi Arabia, which funded the radical madrasahs on the Afghan-Pakistan border resulting in the rise of the Taliban and al Qaeda.

Quite frankly this borrowing is unsustainable, dangerous and irresponsible.

That is why I have been willing to make the hard choices to ensure a better future for our children and grandchildren. Every two years I take an oath to support and defend the Constitution. I do not sign pledges to lobbyists or special interest groups.

That is why I have been working with my colleagues, through my assignment as chairman of the House appropriations subcommittee that funds the departments of Commerce and Justice, to cut $95 billion in federal spending since the start of this Congress, including $11 billion from my subcommittee alone.

That is why I have repeatedly voted against the payroll tax holiday, which steals from the Social Security Trust Fund. The most recent extension alone took $93 billion and brought us nearly a month closer to the statutory debt limit. With just one vote in February, we practically wiped out all the $95 billion savings from the cuts enacted since Republican took back control of the House.

I have speaking out about the need to get our nation's fiscal house in order since George W. Bush was in office.

In 2006 I introduced legislation to create an independent, bipartisan commission to address our debt and deficit. I called it the SAFE Commission, short for Securing America's Future Economy. It said everything should be on the table for discussion: all entitlement spending, all domestic discretionary spending, including defense spending, and tax reform, particularly changes to make the tax code more simple and fair and to end the practice of tax earmarks that costs hundreds of billions of dollars. Congress would be required to vote up or down on the commission's recommendations, just as was done in the base closing process.

I was glad to have been joined in this effort by my good friend and colleague JIM COOPER of Tennessee. Our legislation served as the blueprint for the president's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, commonly referred to as the Simpson-Bowles Commission. I am pleased Mr. COOPER and Mr. LATOURETTE produced a full substitute amendment that I believe is the right way forward. I commend them for their work.

The Simpson-Bowles Commission produced a credible plan that gained the support of a bipartisan majority of the commission's 18 members. Called ''The Moment of Truth,'' the commission's report made clear that eliminating the debt and deficit will not be easy and that any reform must begin with entitlements. Mandatory and discretionary spending also has to be addressed as well other ''sacred cows,'' including tax reform and defense spending.

Had just three more members of the Simpson-Bowles Commission supported the recommendations, this plan likely would have passed the Congress and be law today. I was disappointed that the president, and his administration, walked away from the commission. The president failed the country. And the Congress has also failed. This town is dysfunctional. If the plan had advanced, we would already be on our way in getting our nation's fiscal house in order.

We have to find a solution to this debt crisis. Failure is not an option.

Congress and the president must be willing to support a plan that breaks loose from the special interests holding Washington by the throat and return confidence to the country.

Congress and the president also need to be honest with the American people and explain that we cannot solve our nation's financial crisis by just cutting waste, fraud and abuse within discretionary accounts. The real runaway spending is occurring in our out-of-control entitlement costs and the hundreds of billions in annual tax earmarks. Until we reach an agreement that addresses these two drivers of our deficit and debts, we cannot right our fiscal ship of state.

I regret that the bipartisan Cooper amendment failed. But since it did, today I'm voting for the Ryan budget.

Like last year's proposal, this budget blueprint calls for significant reductions in discretionary spending, for reduced tax rates and for the repeal of the costly health care reform law.

The plan also points out that we can no longer ignore the trillions of dollars in unfunded liabilities that consume our budget. There may be disagreement on the significant changes in Medicare and Medicaid entitlement programs that he proposes, and while his plan is again silent on changes needed to reform Social Security entitlements, it does recognize that need. Mr. RYAN continues to pull back the curtain on the mandatory spending ''elephant in the room,'' which we can no longer ignore.

I want to be clear: I would prefer for this House to pass the bipartisan Cooper-LaTourette budget, which is modeled on the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles plan. Even though there were some parts that I would have liked to change, I spoke in strong support of that budget proposal and continue to believe that it is the only plan that can pass the Senate. That proposal put everything on the table, and, more importantly, sought to achieve enough deficit reductions to turn off the need for the sequester that could be so harmful to our defense capabilities. But, again, as that bipartisan proposal failed to pass, I will support the Ryan plan.

I do not agree with everything in this proposal, and will work to improve future legislation. For example, I regret that this proposal does not offer more on ways to address Social Security and tax reform efforts.

This resolution also unfairly targets the federal workforce. While there are many federal employees in the Capital region, it is worth noting that more than 85 percent of the workforce is outside of Washington.

It is also worth noting that more than 65 percent of all federal employees work in agencies that support our national defense capabilities as we continue to fight the War on Terror. The first American killed in Afghanistan, Mike Spann, was a CIA agent and a constituent from my congressional district. CIA, FBI, DEA agents, and State Department employees are serving side-by-side with our military in the fight against the Taliban.

Let's also not forget the Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents who are working to stop the flow of illegal immigrants and drugs across our borders.

Or the medical researchers at NIH working to develop cures for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's and autism.

Or the VA doctors and nurses treating veterans from World War II to today.

Or the FDA inspectors working to stop a salmonella outbreak. These are all federal employees.

Mr. Chair, enough is enough. It is simply wrong to claim, as the Ryan budget does, that these public servants ''have been immune from the effects of the recession.''

This budget also could be improved by providing for the needs of the most vulnerable in our society. As the Congress deals with the budget, we must always do it in a way that does not neglect the needs of the poor. Scripture (Proverbs 19:17) tells us, ''He who is kind to the poor lends to the Lord.'' And in the New Testament Jesus talks a lot about the poor. Matthew 25 says that if we ignore the poor and hungry it is the same as ignoring him. But this budget resolution is an outline for future action, not an enacting piece of legislation that carries the weight of law.

The budget also seeks to shore up our defense capabilities for the next year by finding alternative savings to prevent the across-the-board cuts that are coming in January as a result of the Joint Committee on Deficit Reduction's bipartisan failure of leadership, which, regretfully, represents the larger failure of the President and both political parties.

Another example of this failure of leadership is the decision by the Senate not to even offer a budget proposal. While the Budget Control Act, BCA, does not require a new budget to establish FY 2013 spending levels, the BCA was passed with the assumption that the so-called supercommittee on deficit reduction would be successful. We need to have a robust debate in the public arena as everyone works to mitigate the harmful cuts that will result from the coming sequester. It is an abdication of responsibility for the Senate to refuse to put forth a budget.

This budget recognizes that our fiscal challenges are too great to wait until the next election. We, as elected representatives, have a duty to lead. We have a duty to put forth ideas within the public sphere and engage in debate. I'm ready to make the tough choices today. I vote for the Ryan budget so that the House can get to work.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chair, listening to the claims of the opponents of this budget, one would think it represented a full-frontal assault on the welfare state and the entitlements system. However, in fact—with all respect to Shakespeare—the sound and fury over this budget ultimately signifies nothing. Under this budget, the federal government will spend $3.5 trillion next year, while under President Obama's budget the federal government will spend $3.8 trillion. The small difference between the congressional budget and the President's hardly seem to justify the overheated rhetoric we hear emanating from both sides of the aisle.

Even under the most optimistic scenario, this supposedly radical plan does not balance the federal budget until my one-year old great-granddaughter will be in college. Under less optimistic assumption, my great granddaughter will be almost 30 before she sees a balanced federal budget. This assumes that Congress will adhere to this year's budget in future years, a dubious assumption since we cannot bind future Congresses to abide by our spending plans. The only budget this Congress cannot legally bind any future Congress to follow a budget we passed today.

The only budget this Congress controls is this year's budget. So why aren't we making substantial spending cuts this year, instead of putting off the hard choices?

Critics of this budget do have a point when they criticize this budget for misplaced priorities, since this plan calls for the federal government to continue to waste trillions of dollars in a future attempt to police the world. Mr. Speaker, through my years in public life I have explained the folly of our hyper-interventionist foreign policy; I will not rehash those arguments here. Instead, I will simply point out to my colleagues that we can no longer afford to spend trillions overseas.

Also, many of those who share my goal of unwinding the federal welfare and entitlement system understand the need to do without harming Americans currently reliant on the system. That task will be much easier if we began by eliminating overseas militarism, foreign aid, and corporate welfare. Yet this so called radical budget treats the Pentagon as a sacred cow, as if closing one overseas base or canceling one contract for Lockheed-Martin will render America defenselessness.

This budget bill not only fails to reduce spending by changing our foreign policy, it also fails to make any meaningful changes in domestic spending. While the bill does repel the President's misguided national health care plan, and repeal a few other federal programs, it leaves the vast majority of the federal welfare-regulatory leviathan intact. Despite the claims of both proponents and opponents that this budget dramatically downsizes the federal government, it does not repeal one unconstitutional cabinet department, not even the Department of Education, which has no constitutional authority and if anything has diminished the quality of American education.

Mr. Chair, the problem facing the federal government is at root not a fiscal problem but a philosophical problem. Too many people in both parties have bought into the idea that the federal government should run the economy, run our lives, and run the world. Until that idea is repudiated and we once again embrace the principles of liberty and constitutional government we will not be able to address our fiscal problems. This budget does little to advance the goal of moving us toward a free society; therefore I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chair, I rise today to strongly oppose the Republicans' budget proposal. I remain committed to creating jobs, expanding health care coverage, and promoting education, but this budget signals that the Republicans do not. In fact, this budget seems designed to have devastating effects on American families and businesses, and would dramatically damage our nation's improving economy. This legislation makes significant cuts to social programs and investments in education, destroys American jobs, and represents the latest in a series of Republican attacks on Medicare.

Although our economy is recovering from years of misguided policies, many Americans are still struggling to make ends meet. Gas prices have skyrocketed in recent months. Quality health care and education are becoming more expensive for the average American. Families are fighting to save their homes from foreclosure and escape from under mountains of debt.

Instead of focusing on these important issues, Mr. RYAN and the Tea Party have developed a budget that dramatically undermines the social safety net that so many Americans depend on. I believe that budgets are reflections of our values—and it is clear from this proposal that Mr. RYAN and the Tea Party do not possess the same values as ordinary Americans.

By turning Medicare into a voucher program, this budget would effectively end Medicare as we know it, and shift thousands of dollars of health costs onto seniors. But gutting Medicare is not enough for the Republicans. The Ryan budget would also cut more than $1 trillion from Medicaid, and endanger health care coverage for over 60 million Americans, including low-income children, pregnant women, nursing home patients, and persons with disabilities.

This budget also demonstrates the Republicans' lack of commitment to investing in America's youth. By proposing to cut funding for education by 45 percent, it is clear that the Republicans do not understand the importance of investing in education, and in science, technology, engineering, and math in particular, to ensure our nation's competitiveness in the

global economy. At a time when states are drastically reducing their education budgets—including my home state, which recently cut funding for education by $5 billion—the Republicans' budget attacks critical initiatives ranging from extra reading and math help for low-income students to much-needed financial aid for college. If Mr. RYAN and the Tea Party get their way, in 2014 nearly 10 million students would see their Pell Grants fall by more than $1,000 dollars, and 200,000 children and their families would no longer be able to participate in Head Start.

In my 16 years proudly representing the people of my district, this is by far the worst piece of legislation that I have seen. Mr. RYAN and the Tea Party have once again put forward a budget to benefit the wealthy and special interests groups at the expense of middle-class Americans, seniors, veterans, and children. While this budget provides huge tax cuts for the richest one percent of Americans, it does nothing to stimulate the economy nor create jobs, and would adversely impact the Hispanic community and the residents of my district.

This budget yet again shows how out of touch the Republican Party is with the lives of ordinary Americans. Instead of focusing on creating jobs and putting Americans back to work, it extends the Bush tax cuts—which I voted against and continue to oppose—for the wealthiest Americans, and provides millionaires and billionaires with an average tax cut of $150,000. To put this amount into perspective, $150,000 would pay for: one years' worth of savings for a senior in the Medicare prescription drug "donut hole" ($600); one school computer lab ($40,000); one year of medical care for a veteran returning home ($8,945); one grant for medical research on chronic diseases ($50,000); one tax credit to make a year of college more affordable ($2,500); one firefighter, police officer, or first responder kept on the job ($42,000); and one college student receiving the maximum Pell Grant ($5,550).

In today's economic climate, we don't need more subsidies for big oil and bigger tax loopholes for hedge fund managers on Wall Street. Yet, the Republicans have put forward a budget that provides huge tax cuts and subsidies for the mega-rich and corporations, while utterly failing to support vital investments in education, job training, research and development, and our nation's crumbling infrastructure.

For these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this ideological, radical budget, and stand firm in support of job creation, health care, and education for all Americans.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the shortsighted foreign assistance cuts in Chairman RYAN's FY13 Budget. The Ryan Budget slashes our foreign aid by 10%, dangerously undermining some of the most low-cost, high-return tools in our national security toolbox. And why? Because the Chairman claims it will help to reduce the deficit. But the numbers tell a very different story. These foreign aid cuts amount to 0.2% reduction in our deficit. Two-tenths of one percent! Dr. Mike Tierney of The College of William & Mary put it best when he said, "Cutting foreign aid to address the budget crisis is like getting your hair cut in an effort to lose weight."

In our present fiscal environment, every dollar we spend must yield the highest possible return on our investment. And that means doing everything possible to efficiently reduce the threat of costly conflict and build stable, peaceful American allies. And who is on the frontlines of building peace? Our State Department diplomats, our USAID development professionals, our Peace Corps Volunteers, our US Institute of Peace civilian power, our Inter-American Foundation grassroots development capacity, to name a few. And the budget that supports this smart power amounts to less than 2% of our total budget. Talk about big return on small investment!

But the Ryan Budget cuts will also have real reverberations for US workers. Foreign aid creates strong markets for US goods; 11 of our top 15 trading partners are graduates of US foreign assistance programs. And one out of every five American jobs is tied to trade. So, not only does this ill-conceived budget jeopardize our national security efforts, it takes an unnecessary swipe at American workers in the midst of a fragile economic recovery.

Mr. Chair, make no mistake about it: I firmly believe we need to get our fiscal house in order. So for this reason, we must support foreign assistance because foreign assistance supports peace. And peace is the least costly, most important tool in our national security toolbox.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, and, pursuant to House Resolution 597, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

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

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 191, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

YEAS—228

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

NAYS—191

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern

McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Broun (GA)
Dicks
Filner
Hinchey
Jackson (IL)
Mack
Meeks
Paul
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Rangel
Watt

□ 1527

Mrs. LOWEY changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 151, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, April 3, 2012; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Friday, April 6, 2012; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, April 10, 2012; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, April 13, 2012; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, April 16, 2012.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4281. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 29, 2012.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to section 703(c) of the Public Interest Declassification Act of 2000 (50 U.S.C.) 435 note), I hereby re-appoint Mr. David E. Skaggs of Longmont, Colorado to the Public Interest Declassification Board.

Thank you for your consideration of this re-appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
House Democratic Leader.

CAMDEN PROPERTY TRUST

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a distinguished company from the Houston area, Camden Property Trust.

Camden was recently recognized by Fortune Magazine as one of the 100 best companies to work for.

This is not the first time they've been named to such an esteemed list, as Camden consistently ranks among the most desirable places to work in America.

Camden is the only multifamily real estate company to be named to this prestigious list. They employ nearly 1,800 people in 13 States.

Camden provides conservative financial policies and a positive, dynamic work environment.

Camden is also committed to helping employees improve their personal and professional lives through outstanding training programs, mentoring, networking, and community service.

This commitment has helped Camden become a leader in their industry and a valued asset to the Houston area.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud their high standards and wish them continued success.

□ 1530

A PROMISE TO TRAYVON

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I made a promise to Trayvon. I made a promise to his mother. I promised to stand up for Trayvon. I promised that I would rise every day and let the world know how long it has been since he was murdered. Today marks 33 days since Trayvon's death—33 days without justice.

I want to let Trayvon know that I'm going home this evening. I'm going home because votes have finished for the week, but I will be back. This vigil will not stop. It will continue every day. Every day the House is in recess, I will tweet the world and update on how many days have passed without justice; and this Sunday, I will personally host a rally back home—Trayvon's home—in Miami, Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I want Trayvon to know that he is not forgotten. He is missed. He is loved. We will continue to stand up for justice for Trayvon.

STAFF SERGEANT JOSEPH D'AUGUSTINE

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. As cochairman of the House Explosive Ordnance Disposal Caucus and as a former Army EOD tech, I address you today with a heavy heart. On Tuesday of this week, Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine was killed in Afghanistan by an IED. He was 29 years old.

Staff Sergeant D'Augustine was an EOD tech in the United States Marine Corps, and he had four tours of duty in Afghanistan and Iraq to his credit. He enlisted in the Marine Corps the day after he graduated from Waldwick High School in New Jersey in 2001. As an EOD tech, Staff Sergeant D'Augustine displayed the full extent of his bravery by clearing explosive threats in defending the lives of his fellow marines, soldiers, airmen, and sailors.

EOD techs, like Staff Sergeant D'Augustine, play an invaluable role in securing our freedom and in combating terrorism, but too often their heroic deeds go unreported.

Staff Sergeant D'Augustine is survived by his parents and three sisters. I am eternally grateful for Staff Sergeant D'Augustine's service to our country and for all the brave men and women who defend our freedoms at home and abroad as members of the armed services. On behalf of the Congressional EOD Caucus and the interservice EOD family, our thoughts and prayers are with the family of Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT LET STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES GO UP

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a matter of great urgency for America's students and their families.

In just 3 months, if Congress does not act, millions of Americans will be thrown deeper into debt. That's because on July 1 the interest rates on need-based student loans will double, from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. This interest-rate hike will hit 7 million Americans who are already in financial need.

With rates at historic lows, for the Congress to let these interest rates double is highway robbery. Congress should not require students and families who can least afford it to pay twice as much in interest on the same loans they got a year before at lower rates. Congress should help make college more affordable, not more expensive. Congress should help families to get out from under the crushing debt, not pile on more.

Tens of thousands of students have asked Congress to act, but their pleas to help have been met with silence from the Republicans in Congress. Silence. Silence is not what they need. Action is what they need. Only Congress can set the rates for these student loans. The clock is ticking. Applications are being made to college, and the time to act is now. Congress should not let the interest student rate loans go up. Congress should not let the interest rates double on these families and these students.

CHARLOTTE LUCAS

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

Mr. ROKITA. I rise today to recognize an Indiana-born and bred entrepreneur who exemplifies innovation and dedication.

Charlotte Lucas, along with her husband, Forrest, founded Lucas Oil Products in 1989. Under her leadership, Lucas Oil quickly established itself as a top-selling additive line in the trucking and automotive retail industry.

To Indiana, Charlotte is still the good-natured Hoosier who always enjoys meeting new people and who knows the importance of being there for people in need. Marked by common sense and a commitment to philanthropic interests, her leadership embodies the qualities emblazoned in the Hoosier spirit itself.

There is a slogan at Lucas Oil, Mr. Speaker, that reads: ''It works.'' Well, I think the same can be said of Charlotte. Working on behalf of children, the elderly, race car drivers and their families, and many more other causes, she has provided so many with a better place to live, work, and raise a family. Whatever Charlotte does, it works.

As a man of faith, I believe we were put on this Earth to love one another and to make the best of the gifts the Lord has provided. When I look at Charlotte, her husband, Forrest, and how she shared her good fortune with our world, all I can say is, Amen. Charlotte Lucas exemplifies the American Dream in every way, and I am proud to honor her on her birthday in recognition of her devotion to her family, friends, employees, and our whole Hoosier community.

HATE CRIMES

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just last week, I had the privilege of coordinating and working with other Members of Congress to hold a briefing with Judiciary Committee members to discuss the jurisdiction of the hate crimes. We were privileged at that time, in the midst of their mourning, to have there the parents of Trayvon Martin. I had the further privilege, though not wanted, to be in Sanford, Florida, before their city commission in order to discuss the absolute dereliction of duty that occurred in this terrible tragedy.

Now, many have raised the question of race. Let me be very clear: the race question comes into factor only because of jurisdictional Federal laws with which they are now investigating this case; but this is a case for every American and every parent. As our Speaker did, it is a case to which everyone can ask the simple question. The State and Federal jurisdictions are looking at this, and they should review it. For those of us who believe that the perpetrator should be arrested, we maintain that. He should have been arrested and should be arrested; but this is a question for every parent:

When you send your children out to get Skittles and a tea, whether they should come back alive or whether you should have to find them in a morgue.

I remain persistent on finding justice for Trayvon but also justice for all of the other young people and others who have been victims of crimes like this, with guns, where people have used their language of suspiciousness and where all they were doing is walking on the streets of America.

AN EASTER PRAYER

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

Mr. GOHMERT. As this will be the last session before we go into the Easter district work period, I thought it was appropriate to look back at something historically, and I have a prayer that was given in the United States Senate in the 1940s by Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall. He said:

> We pray to Thee, O Christ, to keep us under the spell of immortality.
>
> May we never again think and act as if Thou wert dead. Let us more and more come to know Thee as a living Lord who hath promised to them that believe: Because I live, ye shall live also.
>
> Help us to remember that we are praying to the Conquerer of Death, that we may no longer be afraid nor be dismayed by the world's problems and threats, since Thou hast overcome the world.
>
> In Thy strong name, we ask for Thy living presence and Thy victorious power. Amen.

That was Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall. It is a good prayer, Mr. Speaker, to pray as we head for the Easter recess.

DETROIT GROWTH AND STABILITY ACT

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce the Detroit Growth and Stability Act, which will provide up to $500 million in loans to the city of Detroit.

I am asking this House, this Congress, and this administration to give Detroit, the arsenal of democracy, a second chance—a second chance to build the best products, a second chance to create the best technologies that could be sold worldwide which will create jobs, jobs not only for southeastern Michigan—because our city and our suburbs are linked together—but also jobs throughout this country.

You see, the best way that we can renew America's economy, the most effective way, is to help rebuild Detroit. I urge your support for this important legislation.

□ 1540

REMEMBERING DR. CRAWFORD LONG

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I rise today to commemorate a very important medical breakthrough that happened hundreds of years ago in Jefferson, Georgia. And that's the invention of general anesthesia. Tomorrow is Doctors Day, and I am pleased to take this time to honor Dr. Crawford Long, who gave the first general anesthetic for a surgical procedure in 1842. If it weren't for Dr. Long's discovery of ether as a general anesthetic, the world of medicine would not be as profound or innovative as it is today.

This is a proud claim for the city of Jefferson, Georgia, for the 10th Congressional District, and for the State of Georgia as a whole. It is a little known fact that Dr. Long's statue is in the U.S. Capitol as part of the National Statuary Hall Collection, but this tribute is well deserved, given his significant contribution to both science and to medicine.

I hope that all Georgians passing through Washington will take the time to stop by Dr. Long's statue to reflect upon this great Georgian's wonderful achievement to science and to humanity.

CLEARING THE NAMES OF JOHN BROW AND BROOKS GRUBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

I, again, come to the floor to talk about a 10-year journey that I have been on with two wives whose husbands were tragically killed on April 8, 2000. The pilot was John Brow, lieutenant colonel, and the copilot was Brooks Gruber. They were flying what's known as an Osprey. I will hold this up, Mr. Speaker. The Osprey has been one of the planes that the Marine Corps for so long has needed to replace the aged helicopters from the Vietnam era.

The sadness and the problem was that the MV–22 at the time that it was being flown by Colonel Brow and Major Gruber was not ready for the mission it had been assigned to. Sadly, that night there were 17 young marines in the back of that V–22 that crashed on April 8 in Arizona. So a total of 19 marines were killed when the V–22 flipped and crashed and burned.

December of 2002, the wife of Major Brooks Gruber, Connie Gruber, who lives in my district, Jacksonville, North Carolina, the home of Camp LeJeune Marine Base, she sent me an email. And I want to read one paragraph:

> I contacted you in hopes that leaders of integrity, free of bias, would have both the intelligence and the courage it takes to decide the facts for him/herself. If you do that, you will agree the ''human factor/pilot error'' findings should not stand as it is in military history. Again, I respectfully ask for your support. Please do not simply pass this matter along to General Jones without offering the support my husband and his comrades deserve. Please remember, these 19 marines can no longer speak for themselves. I certainly am not afraid to speak for them, and I believe somebody has to. Even though it is easier put to rest and forgotten, please join me in doing the right thing by taking the time to address this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, along the way, there have been so many people joining me in asking the Marine Corps to correct the press release that came out in July of 2000. And I will read from the press release:

> Marine Corps Officials Say Combination of Factors Caused Osprey Accident: Confirms that a combination of ''human factors'' caused the April 8 crash of an MV–22 Osprey tilt-rotor aircraft that killed 19 marines.

It further stated, Mr. Speaker:

> Although the report stops short of specifying pilot error as a cause, it notes that the pilot of the ill-fated aircraft significantly exceeded the rate of descent established by regulations for safe flight.

Commandant General Jones, who is now retired, stated:

> The tragedy is that these were all good marines joined in a challenging mission. Unfortunately, the pilots' drive to accomplish that mission appears to have been the fatal factor.

Mr. Speaker, that is so erroneous, it is painful for me to even repeat it on the floor of the House.

I have spent 10 years trying to clear the names of Pilot Colonel John Brow and his copilot Major Brooks Gruber. If you look at the JAGMAN report, this is the report that was completed by three marine officers who were sent the day after the accident to Marana, Arizona, to investigate. And they published what was called a JAGMAN report. I would like to read the major section that I think says clearly that John Brow and Brooks Gruber were not at fault:

> During this investigation, we found nothing that we would characterize as negligence, deliberate pilot error, or maintenance/material failure.

During this investigation, we found nothing that we would characterize as negligence, deliberate pilot error.

Mr. Speaker, I want to further read because this plane was not ready for the mission that it was assigned to by General Fred McCorkle, who was the general that oversaw aviation for the Marine Corps at the time. In fact, I will read from an expert, Philip Coyle, who understands the issue involved with this plane. He wrote me a page and a half in his support of clearing the names of John Brow and Brooks Gruber. And I will read one paragraph:

> Considering that it was ignorance on the part of the Marine Corps that caused the April 2000 accident, the Marine Corps should make it clear to Major Gruber's family—with no ifs, ands, or buts—that Major Gruber was not responsible for the accident. I don't suppose the Marine Corps ever apologizes, but considering that the accident was their fault and not Major Gruber's, an apology to the family would be in order also.

Another one of those individuals who has joined us in this effort to clear the names is Rex Rivolo, well known in the aerospace industry as an expert:

> The failure of the manufacturer, Bell-Boeing, and the Navy to characterize slow speed, high rate of descent handling qualities of the V–22 through flight testing, the failure to describe them for the aircrew in the NATOPS, and the failure to provide an adequate warning system in the aircraft were the causes of the mishap, not aircrew error.

Mr. Speaker, I reached out to the two attorneys who prosecuted, who filed suit against Bell-Boeing on behalf of the families. Jim Furman, himself a Vietnam helicopter pilot, was the attorney for the wives of John Brow and Brooks Gruber. Brian Alexander in New York and his associate Francis Young, they represented the 17 families whose sons were burned to death.

□ 1550

I'm not an attorney, Mr. Speaker, but I must say, knowing that Bell-Boeing settled for no one knows how much money because it is closed, but they settled with the families of the 19 marines who were burned to death. And Jim Furman has joined me in saying these two pilots had not been trained, there was no warning system. And, Mr. Speaker, the NATOPS manual is what pilots have between them that explains if you get into this kind of situation, you can read and see how to react. The NATOPS manual they had was written by an Army helicopter pilot, and nothing in there about vortex ring state, which is a phenomenon that can cause the plane, particularly a V–22, to flip. And Major Gruber and Colonel Brow had no idea.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read comments from the attorney, Jim Furman:

> If there was no human error, it was error for the program manager to certify the aircraft as airworthy when clearly it was not. Brow and Gruber found themselves in a position of having to do what they were not trained or qualified to do.

Jim Furman further stated:

> It was not the mission of the operations evaluation crew to discover the new boundaries and limitations associated with the V–22. Engineering test pilots, under appropriate test conditions, should have done this. It is simply wrong and improper to place this burden upon Gruber and Brow. They did the best job they could have done under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the wives, Connie Gruber and Trish Brow, are asking that the United States Marine Corps, on the letterhead of the Commandant of the Marine Corps, write one paragraph that says Colonel John Brow and Major Brooks Gruber, pilot and copilot, were not responsible for the accident on April 8, 2000.

I am very disappointed in the Marine Corps, quite frankly. I have Camp Lejeune Marine Base, New River Air Station, and Cherry Point Marine Air Station in my district. I'm not disappointed in the Marines and their magnificent fighting force for this country, but I never thought that I would be fighting for one paragraph with the United States Marine Corps.

These two pilots deserve better than having this blemish against their names.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many people that have joined in this. The three investigators, Colonel Mike Morgan, Colonel Ron Radich, and Major Phil Stackhouse, have given me letters independent of the JAGMAN report that have clearly stated that nothing in their investigation should indicate that this was pilot error. I have given this to the attorneys for the Commandant.

In addition, Jim Schafer, at the time a lieutenant colonel, was in the air in the third V–22. John Brow and Brooks Gruber were his friends. He's joined in this effort to clear their names.

It does not make any sense, Mr. Speaker, that the Marine Corps cannot do what has been asked by the wives. The wives have just asked for one paragraph that clearly states—and Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, the Marine Corps owes this to the families because they came out with this press release that I just read a moment ago, in 2000, and indicated that this was pilot error. They have seen all the information that I have accumulated in 10 years.

All the families are asking for their children. Connie Gruber has a little girl named Brooke. Trish has two boys, named Michael and Matthew. All they're asking is an official letter from

the United States Marine Corps that the children can have for years to come, and whenever it comes up that the crash on April 8, 2000, in Arizona, was pilot error, Mr. Speaker, they can say, No, that's not true. I have a letter from the United States Marine Corps Commandant that clearly states that my father was not at fault.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank The Hill magazine today. I'm sorry that I had to be featured in it, because the most important thing about the article—and I want to thank Jeremy Herb, who spent so much time on this article. He interviewed the Commandant; interviewed General McCorkle, who was the aviation chief at the time of this crash; and he interviewed the wives. Again, they clearly understand that if you want to bring rest to two outstanding marines who have been blamed for this crash, Mr. Commandant, all you have got to do is write a letter with one paragraph in it. The wives have given you what they request.

I'm calling on the United States Marine Corps today, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, to please do what is right. You have the evidence. The attorneys that sued Bell-Boeing over this accident know more than anyone, including the Commandant, about what happened and who was at fault.

Again, Jim Furman and Brian Alexander have joined in this effort. I hope that the Marine Corps will give the wives what they're asking for.

Mr. Speaker, if we can ever bring this journey to an end, I intend to go to the cemetery in Jacksonville, North Carolina, with Connie Gruber and her daughter Brooke, and I want to walk to the grave of the husband and the father and say, Major Brooks Gruber, Rest in peace. The blame game is over. You're not to blame for the accident.

And then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go with Trish Brow and her sons, Matthew and Michael, to Arlington and say the same thing to Colonel Brow. Colonel, you have earned the rest. You did nothing wrong to cause that accident.

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense that these wives and their children have had to carry this burden because, Mr. Speaker, too many times articles are written, books are written, that say one accident in the history of the Osprey was caused by pilot error. And they're talking about John Brow and Brooks Gruber, and they're talking about the accident in Arizona.

I give you one quick example, Mr. Speaker. A book called ''Leathernecks'' was published about 4 years ago. The father of Colonel Brooks Gruber is living. His name is Bill Gruber. He lives in Naples, Florida. He fought for this country as a marine in the Korean War. He's carried the pain of this blemish on his son's name.

He called me a couple of years ago. He knew what I was trying to do for the families. He called me here in Washington, D.C., about 2 years ago, and said, Congressman, they've done it again. I said, What's that, Mr. Gruber?

On page 113 of the new edition of ''Leathernecks'' they've got a section on the Osprey. They say one accident was due to pilot error.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I'm a strong man of faith, and I prayed every night that God would touch the hearts of those who could make the decision to clear the names of Colonel John Brow and Major Brooks Gruber. And as long as I serve in the Congress, as long as I have the energy to fight for these two men, I will continue to fight until the Marine Corps does what is right. And what is right is to give Connie Gruber and Trish Brow an official letter with one paragraph on it. And we will ask that the Marine Corps issue a national press release that the commandant has done this so that the press in years to come will always be able to look at that press release by the Marine Corps and see that Colonel John Brow and Major Brooks Gruber, young men who died too early in their life, through no fault of their own, they were 17 young marines, the oldest being 23, in the back of the V–22 that crashed, that they are not at fault for this accident.

Mr. Speaker, as I do before I close, I ask God to please bless our young men and women in uniform and their families. I ask God to bless the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to please bless the families of John Brow and Brooks Gruber, and I ask God to touch the heart of the Marine Corps and the commandant to bring these two men's image to respect and not an image that is blemished by the accident. I ask God to bless my good friend sitting here and his family.

I ask God to bless everyone in America. I ask God to bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people. And I ask God to please bless the President, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people. And three times I will ask, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE PROGRESSIVE MESSAGE

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

Mr. ELLISON. Well, Mr. Speaker, my name is KEITH ELLISON. I'm cochair of the Progressive Caucus, and I say, God, please bless WALTER JONES.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today with the Progressive Caucus message today. Our Web site is listed on the bottom, cpc.grijalva.house.gov. We come every week with the progressive message. The Progressive Caucus is a caucus in the Congress. There are several. Of course, the two big caucuses are the Democratic Caucus and the Republican caucus; but within both, there are different groups that have points of agreement that they come together around. On the Republican side, there's the Republican Study Group. On the Democratic side, there are several caucuses. There's the Black Caucus, the Hispanic Caucus, and there is the Blue Dog caucus. There are different groups.

The Progressive Caucus is a caucus within the Democratic Caucus. We'd be happy to have Republican Members if they ever wanted to join, but all of our members are Democrats, and we believe that America should be a place where there's liberty and justice for all. That means whether you're Hispanic or Latino or African American, one America. We believe that the working men and women of America should get a fair, decent wage, and that the people who are most privileged in our society, God bless them, but they should pay adequate taxes so that we can afford the basic necessities of a society—schools, roads, take care of our environment and things like that. We believe we should stay out of these wars unless they're necessary to defend the American people, so we are promoting diplomacy, and we are very proud to say that we are the liberal caucus.

We're the Progressive Caucus. We're the ones who believe fairness, inclusion, and that, yes, the government has a responsibility, because it is our collective—the way we all come together as Americans to the poor, and we should stand by that and stick by that. That is who the Progressive Caucus is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we've been dealing with the budget this week. It's been ''budget week,'' you could say. We started out the week, we were talking about the Republican budget drafted by Mr. PAUL RYAN. We went from there, and we talked about the Democratic budget drafted by Mr. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN. And then, of course, the Progressive Caucus budget came up, the Black Caucus budget came up. I think Mr. MULVANEY came up with a budget proposal. They put the President's—a very, very watered down and inaccurate version of the President's budget up there, and we've been talking budget.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the budget, what we're talking about is the values and priorities of America. It's important to keep this in mind. What shows up in your budget is what you care about. What does not show up in your budget is what you don't care about. Now, Mr. Speaker, I always caution people not to just take their family budget and the United States budget and assume they're basically the same thing, one just is bigger than the other. That's not exactly accurate. There are important differences, and we shouldn't mix up the two. But in this way they are similar in that they reflect what it is that people value.

If you have a family and their budget, you can look at their budget; they

spend a lot of money on entertainment, you can pretty much figure they value that. If they put a lot of money into food, you can figure they definitely think that is a priority for them. You can go through the family budget and see what people spend their money on, see what people don't have in their budget, and then you can pretty much figure, well, maybe that's not a priority for them. Of course, they may not be able to afford it at this time. But if you talk about reasonably middle class people, their budget reflects what they care about, what matters and what doesn't.

And for our Nation, that certainly is true. If our Nation puts more money into warfare than it does into social uplift, jobs and the economy and infrastructure, that says something about who we are. If our national budget puts more money into infrastructure and jobs and putting people back to work, then that says something about who we are. The various budgets that have come up, Mr. Speaker, reflect what the various caucuses think is important and project a vision for our country. I want to talk about that today.

I want to start by talking about PAUL RYAN's budget. PAUL RYAN is the Republican Budget Committee chair. He's a nice guy. I don't have anything bad to say about him personally because he is actually a nice person. But the fact is we disagree in a significant way about what the priorities of America should be. For example, the Republican budget, 20 children will lose access to Head Start to pay for one millionaire's tax cut. That's their budget. Just if you want to understand what their tax cuts represent, it means 20 kids don't get to go to Head Start so that a millionaire can get a tax cut—150,000 equals 20 times 7,500. So, if you look at this tax cut, a millionaire's tax cut, which will amount to about $150,000, these little guys don't get to go to Head Start.

Now, what is Head Start? Head Start is a great program for low-income kids to make sure that they have a chance at getting a quality education and don't fall behind in school. And so this is a great program. It has great results. These Head Start kids, 20 of them going to Head Start, versus what a millionaire's tax cut would be, which is $150,000. Now, this is the choice we're making.

Mr. Speaker, we should not act like we're not making choices. We are making choices. We are deciding. My friends on the Republican side of the aisle like to say, oh, we shouldn't pick winners and losers. We're always doing it. They just pick the rich people, and we—I—pick the kids in Head Start.

Also, Mr. Speaker, if you just want to get a sense of what the Republican budget, what it does and what the tax cuts that it's calling for mean, Republican budget, 150 college students will have their Pell Grants cut by $1,000 to pay for one millionaire's tax cut. So one millionaire's tax cut, $150,000, but 150 times 1,000, all these kids, these college kids trying to make something of themselves, their Pell Grant is going to get whacked by 1,000 bucks.

So again, choices. Do we want to make sure the country club set is doing even better, or do we want to make sure that these aspiring engineers, these aspiring doctors and teachers, these aspiring police officers, these aspiring workers of tomorrow, will have a shot at an affordable college education?

□ 1610

This is what we're talking about. These are the choices that we're making, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's very important that Americans know it. It's critical that we know it.

Now, let's just not stop there. Let's talk about other critical choices being made, Mr. Speaker. Because I think it is so critical that as we're talking budget week and all the budget decisions that we are making, that we make it real clear to the American people what it is we're choosing.

Republican budget: 216 pregnant or postpartum women, infants, and children would lose access to WIC—that's the Women, Infants and Children program, and it provides food for poor women and their kids—to pay for one millionaire's tax cut. So, $150,000 tax cut for a millionaire—again, this is the country club set—equals about 216 pregnant women or postpartum women and the amount of money that Americans give them so that they can have good nutrition for their kids. These are poor women. These are women who are struggling economically. But just because they're struggling economically, we don't want their kids to go without good, nutritious food. So as Americans, we have the WIC program. Well, they're going to get slashed out of the program because a millionaire needs a tax cut. That's the choice that we're making.

I want to talk about why we're making that choice in a minute, but I want to give one more example. Republican budget: 25 seniors paying $6,000 or more for Medicare to pay for one millionaire's tax cut. So, if you're a millionaire and you get a tax cut under what the Republicans want to give you—you're already doing good, but they want you to even do better—that will mean that you've got about 25 seniors who have to pay $6,000 a piece more for their Medicare. So, Mom, Dad—if you're my age, Mom and Dad are senior citizens. If you're younger, they're not. But if your parents or grandparents are on Medicare and they're doing all they can on their fixed income to make it, they're going to need a little extra help because we've got to make sure that that millionaire gets his $150,000 tax cut. These are the choices that we're making.

Now, my friends in the Republican caucus—God bless them—it's not like they don't like poor people. Many of them are very charitable. They give in their different walks of life, maybe their faith community, or whatever, they just don't think government should do it. This is what they say. They think that government needs to get out of that and let churches, mosques, synagogues, and other folks do it. Of course, that would mean that it wouldn't get done, because even though churches, mosques, and synagogues do great work, they can never possibly come up to meet the need that's out there.

What they're really believing is—this is what they really believe: They believe in something called trickle-down economics. They believe that if you give this millionaire 150,000 more dollars than he already has, he will maybe, hopefully, perhaps invest it in plant and equipment and maybe somebody will get a job because of it. Or maybe not. Or maybe he will invest in China. He'll improve jobs, but just not in America.

Nobody knows what they will do with this tax cut, but this is what the Republicans believe. They think that if you give rich people more money, they will invest in plant and equipment, create more economic activity, and it will trickle down to the rest of us. The only problem is that it has never worked. It doesn't stop them from saying it, but it's never worked.

In fact, the GOP budget will destroy more than 4 million American jobs in the next 2 years, according to the Economic Policy Institute. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that:

> The shock to aggregate demand from near-term spending cuts would result in roughly 1.3 million jobs lost in 2013, and 2.8 million jobs lost in 2014, or 4.1 million jobs through 2014.

So, a little bit more than 4 million jobs over the next 2 years.

Now, people might think, well, KEITH, is that right? Well, yeah, it's right. And I'll tell you why it's right. It's right because when Republicans say we need to cut government waste, we need to cut government, cut government, cut government, they act as if there's just some Big Government thing over there, like it's a big giant piece of Styrofoam and they can just cut it and it doesn't change anything. What they're talking about cutting are Federal workers. They're talking about laying off Federal workers. And they're very derisive about government jobs and act like people who work for the government don't do anything of value—of course this is not true at all. But if you look on this chart right here, Mr. Speaker, it says:

> I earn less than $45,000 a year. Explain to me, GOP, how cutting my pay creates jobs.

This particular person is named Paul, and he is an Army depot worker. I think we need Army depot workers.

Teresa is a nurse—and this is her right here. She lives in my district. And she says:

> Twelve percent of the salary I earn caring for veterans goes to my retirement. Explain to me, GOP, how cutting my retirement puts people to work.

Well, one of the things that they do in the Ryan budget is cut into Federal workers' retirement. They act like, oh, the government. No, the government is people. The government is nurses. The government is Army depot workers. And what about Federal prisons that keep dangerous criminals behind bars:

I pay more than $9,000 a year for my family's health insurance. Explain to me, GOP, how cutting my take-home pay lowers unemployment.

This guy is a corrections officer. And thank goodness for correction officers or the streets that we live on wouldn't be so nice.

The bottom line is, when Republicans say, oh, we're going to shrink the size of government, what they mean is they're going to lay off and cut the pay and cut the employment benefits of Federal workers, people who work in prisons at risk to themselves, nurses who care for our veterans, people who are Army depot workers, and people who work in our parks and people who fix our roads and a whole lot of other people.

Here's a chart for you, Mr. Speaker. If you look at the Ryan budget, if you look at the GOP proposal, if you look at it and it could do what they want it to do, it could cause a loss of up to 7 million jobs by 2016. Because it would cut Federal workers, and then they wouldn't be able to have the money to spend in the neighborhoods they live in anymore. That would then have a ripple effect in their neighborhoods because they're buying less. For example, if that young nurse at the VA in Minnesota, if she doesn't have the same pay as she had before, then she can't buy as much as she bought before, then the company she shops at doesn't sell her as much as they have before. You do that enough, multiply it times enough people, and that company then needs to start laying off people. So it's a ripple effect, what the Republicans are asking for.

But if you look at what they wanted—and I'm talking about going all the way back to H.R. 1, which is their proposal—you would see repealing health care reform, that would cut about $2 million; the GOP budget, that would cut about $3 million; cuts to the Federal workforce, that would cut about 285,000; the so-called JOBS Act, that would cut a lot; the Fair Tax, that would cut; and they would just cut on down the line. What they're basically proposing is by shrinking government and by doing all that stuff, they're getting rid of people.

Now, I just want to be on the record because your words do get twisted. If there is a Federal program that is not justifiable, and it's so poorly run that it's of no value to anyone, I'm okay with cutting it. I just want to say that on the record on the House floor, Mr. Speaker. I'm all right with cutting programs that don't work. But when you're talking about VA nurses and you're talking about corrections workers in Federal prisons, we need these people. They do good stuff. And I believe that we should stand by them as they stand by us.

The GOP budget—now going back to the budget we addressed today—will shift costs to seniors for the Medicare guarantee, according to the AARP. And what's AARP? That's the leading organization representing retired persons. And the CBO—what's the CBO? That is the Congressional Budget Office. And for folks who like to watch C–SPAN, I'd just say, Mr. Speaker, you need to know what CBO is because this is very important, Congressional Budget Office. They're the nonpartisan group that says what's really going on with the numbers.

□ 1620

At the same time, it is raising the seniors' cost. This GOP budget gives those making more than a million a year an average tax cut of about $394,000. So I put 150 up there a moment ago. That was the generic millionaire. The actual number is about 394 for the average millionaire, per year, on the average tax cut.

And also, the tax breaks for Big Oil companies. You know, they get about $4 billion a year. I'm talking about if you look at Conoco, ExxonMobil, and all the Big Oil companies, they get about $4 billion a year.

Now how much did you pay for gasoline?

I'm not saying that they're not good people. I'm not saying that they don't run a good business and supply an important product. I'm just asking you this: Does ExxonMobil really need your money through a tax subsidy? Do they?

I think that they don't need your money. I think their $4 a gallon is taking care of them just fine. And I think it's outrageous that the Republican budget that we dealt with does not eliminate that tax break.

In short, the Big Oil companies who are gouging Americans at the pump and the wealthiest Americans win, while middle class and working class families get the short end of the stick.

Last year, oil profits—and this is an exact number or close to it. Last year, Big Oil profits totaled about $137 billion. But you don't need to remember $137 billion. All you need to remember is Big Oil profits were the biggest ever that the oil industry ever had. And yet we're forking it over to them through our tax money, not through the pumps.

Some people might think, well, of course we're paying them, KEITH, through the pump. They give us gas. We've got to get to work, so we need to buy the gas.

I'm not talking about that. I'm saying they get—they can apply for grants and subsidies, and it all adds up to about $4 billion a year. With soaring gasoline prices, Big Oil's 2012 profits will even be bigger. Yet Republicans want to give Big Oil more money in our tax dollars, and it just doesn't make any sense.

Now, of course you shouldn't expect the Big Oil companies like ExxonMobil to say we don't want the money. Of course they want the money. Who doesn't want money? Everybody does, including them. But the people who have a public responsibility to look out for the American people should be willing to say ''no'' to public subsidies for the ExxonMobils of this world.

And again, if you work for ExxonMobil, I'm not running you down. I'm just saying that you're doing well enough and you don't need the help of the American people. You can do fine on your own.

Now, those kids on Head Start need help. They need help. Those college kids need help, but not ExxonMobil executives.

The major consequence for Medicare and Medicaid, the Ryan budget, the Republican budget, has big consequences for Medicaid and Medicare. Many seniors will be forced to pay sharply higher premiums to stay in traditional Medicare and keep their current choice of doctors. New Medicare beneficiaries would pay more than $1,200 more by 2030 and more than 6,000 by 2050.

Before, more seniors would gradually shift to private health insurance plans over time, increasing privatization of Medicare. More than 47 million Americans would lose health care insurance over 10 years because they would get rid of ObamaCare.

Now, my friends in the Republican aisle, when they say ''ObamaCare,'' they don't mean it in a nice way. It's an insult. But you know what? Obama does care, so I don't mind them saying ''ObamaCare.'' I hope they keep saying it, because they're just reminding Americans that Obama cares about them and that the people the Republicans want to look out for apparently do not.

States, under the Republican plan, would be forced to slash Medicaid eligibility benefits and payments to health care providers. Their budget shreds the Medicaid safety net and shifts health care costs to States and beneficiaries, blocking Medicaid. This shifts all risks, including future recessions, health care cost increases, and disasters to States and beneficiaries.

So, here's the thing. This Ryan budget, this Republican Ryan budget, it helps and takes care of the rich. It ignores everyone else, and it hurts the middle class.

The Republican budget would weaken the middle class in important ways. First and foremost, their plan ends the Medicare guarantee of decent health insurance in retirement. It also slashes critical middle class investments such as education and infrastructure by 45 percent and 24 percent, respectively—education by 45 percent, infrastructure by 24 percent.

Now, look. The American Society of Civil Engineers, Mr. Speaker, has told us that we have crumbling infrastructure in this country to the tune of about $2.2 to $3 trillion, a lot of money. And if you are living in any city across this country, you can drive over 75-

year-old bridges. You can drive over potholes. Our sewage systems need upgrade.

I am from Minneapolis, Minnesota, a city I love so much; but back a few years ago, we had a bridge fall into the Mississippi River because the gusset plates, which are those plates that hold up the bridge, gave way because the adequate maintenance just wasn't maintained over time.

Now, it happened to us, but it could happen anywhere. There are many structurally deficient bridges across this Nation, literally thousands. We could put people back to work if we put the money into taking care of them. And not only would we have people working, we'd have to save bridges to go over. But the Republican majority, to use their phrase, kicks the can down the road and doesn't deal with this looming infrastructure crisis.

So let me just say this. I've talked a little bit about the so-called Ryan Republican budget. I don't want to spend all my time talking about it, but I do think it's important for Americans to know that this is a budget for the 1 percent. This is a budget for people who've got it well, who are doing fine.

Now, let me just tell you. I swear, I am a big fan of well-to-do people. I wish I were one of them. But my point is that you don't need to help people who already have a lot of help on their own, but you do need to help schoolkids, Head Start kids, pregnant moms, pregnant low-income moms, seniors. These people we should help. People who are doing fine, they don't need our help. They should do the helping, in my opinion. And yet the Ryan budget says we're just going to help the country club set, and I think that's not any way to have a budget.

I'm going to talk about the Progressive Caucus budget, but I just want you to know, first, that the Ryan Republican budget is no good budget for America. In fact, it's premised on the theory that rich people don't have enough money and poor people have too much. Really. That's the animating, organizing feature of their budget, that if we gave rich people more money, then they might invest it in plant and equipment, and then it'll trickle down to the rest of us. And poor people have too much stuff; we can't afford it. We can't afford Head Start, can't afford WIC, can't afford home heating oil for seniors, can't afford Medicare, can't afford Medicaid. The poor folks are just, they're getting treated too well.

And that's basically what the theory is of the Republican budget, and so that's fine. And I respect them for being real honest about what they believe in, because a budget is a reflection of our values.

So now that we've talked about what they're talking about, let's talk about a real budget, not for the 1 percent, but a budget for all.

The Progressive Caucus budget has a name. The name of the Progressive Caucus budget is the Budget for All. That's the name of the Progressive Caucus budget because, unlike the Republicans' budget, which is a budget for the 1 percent, this is a budget for all.

Let me tell you what it does, Mr. Speaker. It creates 3.3 million jobs in the first 2 years. It cuts the deficit by nearly 7 trillion, $6.8 trillion; no benefit cuts to Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security.

The Budget for All makes the American Dream a reality again for the vast majority of Americans. By putting Americans back to work, the Budget for All enhances our economic competitiveness by rebuilding the middle class and investing in innovation and education.

Our budget protects Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security, invests in America's future, and asks those who have benefited the most from our economy to pay their fair share.

Now, as I said, you can't have a budget—you can have a budget that cuts taxes for rich people if you then cut services for poor people. And you can have a budget that pays for infrastructure and education, but the money has to come from somewhere. And we ask people who already have lots of it to do a little more for their fellow Americans.

□ 1630

We're not hiding that fact. Yes, we would raise taxes on the wealthiest Americans. Not to punish them, because we don't think taxes are punishment, but because it's necessary to meet the needs of the Nation and any self-respecting patriot would do so if they could.

In fact, there is a group out there—and I would urge you to check them out, Mr. Speaker—called Patriotic Millionaires who understand that they may need to pay higher taxes.

If you already are making a million dollars a year, would you pay a little extra just to make sure that low-income pregnant women got some food for their kids? If you are already making a million or more a year, would you pay a little extra to make sure that little kids had Head Start to go to? If you're already making a million dollars a year, Mr. Speaker, would you pay a little extra just to make sure that the Federal workers don't have their pensions cut to pay for your tax cut? That's just my thinking.

I don't want anybody to think the Republicans are mean. They do charitable work in their individual lives, and that's a fact and I think people ought to know that. But they don't think government has any role in helping people. I disagree with that and call on Americans, Mr. Speaker, to look carefully at the choices that they offer.

The Budget for All is not a budget for the 1 percent, it's not a budget for the 99 percent, but a budget for all because we care about the 1 percent too. We want even the 1 percent to live in a good Nation with fairness, with economic opportunity, with economic mobility, with good roads, good bridges, good education, clean water, clean air. We want this for everyone.

The Budget for All attacks America's persistently high unemployment levels with more than $2.4 trillion over 10 years in job-creating investment. This plan utilizes every tool at the government's disposal to get our economy moving again, including direct-hire programs that create School Improvement Corps, Park Improvement Corps, Student Jobs Corps, and others; targeted tax incentives that spur clean energy, manufacturing, cutting-edge technological investment in the private sector; widespread domestic investment, including an infrastructure bank; a $556 billion surface transportation, unlike this thing that they tried to pass today, which is a 3-month extension.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, can you believe it, the Republican caucus is always going on and on about uncertainty. What did they do? They created uncertainty by passing some 3-month transportation bill. My goodness, it boggles the mind actually.

Back to the Budget for All. There is approximately $1.7 trillion in widespread domestic investment.

Unlike the Republican budget, the Budget for All substantially reduces the deficit and does so in a way that does not devastate what Americans value. We achieve these notable benchmarks by focusing on the true drivers of our deficit: unsustainable tax policy, wars overseas, and the policies that helped cause the recent recession, rather than putting the middle class and the social safety net on the chopping block.

The budget creates a fairer America; it ends tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans on schedule at the year's end; extends tax relief for middle class households and the vast majority of Americans; creates new tax brackets for millionaires and billionaires in line with the Buffett Rule principle; eliminates Tax Code preferential treatment for capital gains and dividends; abolishes corporate welfare for oil, gas, and coal companies; eliminates loopholes that allow businesses to dodge their true tax liability; creates a publicly funded Federal election system that gets corporate money out of politics for good.

It responsibly and expeditiously ends our military presence in Afghanistan, leaving America more secure at home and abroad. It also adapts our military to address 21st century threats through modernization. The Department of Defense will spend less and stop contributing to the deficit, but they will have what they need to keep America strong, which is very important to all of us.

It provides a making-work-pay tax credit for families struggling with high gas and food costs; extends an earned income tax credit and child dependent

care credit; invests in programs to stave off further foreclosure; invests in children's education by increasing education, training, and social services.

The Budget for All is a budget for all. I know that sounds repetitive, but it's important to note that the name of our budget reflects the reality of our budget; and the reality of our budget is that we want to see rich, poor, and everybody in the middle do well in America. That means a budget for all.

As I begin to wind down, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that it is an honor to come before you to talk about the Budget for All, but it's also an honor to talk about the Ryan Republican budget because the Ryan Republican budget offers a very different vision of America than the Budget for All. The Ryan vision says that if we just could get rich people more money, they might create some plants and equipment that will hire the rest of us.

The Budget for All says: No, we're in this together, and we're going to ask the wealthiest to pay more to invest in health, education, transportation, and infrastructure so that we can have a stronger, better, greater America.

Two visions of a Nation. One says austerity for the middle and working class and the poor, and one says investment. One says if you are out of luck, you're on your own; and one says as Americans, we're all in this together.

I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to be here and offer these contrasts, these choices for Americans as we close out what I call Budget Week.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 30, 2012, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5472. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Colonels Jon S. Lehr and Burdett K. Thompson, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5473. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Commercial Determination Approval (DFARS Case 2011-D041) (RIN: 0750-AH61) received March 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5474. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting Buy American Act report for Fiscal Year 2011; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5475. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report required by the Omnibus Appropriation, Public Law 105-277, Section 2215 on ''Overseas Surplus Property''; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5476. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on the status of Data Mining Activities, pursuant to Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act, Section 804; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5477. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the Distirct of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-333, ''Targeted Retirement Distribution Withholding Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5478. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-321, ''Car Wash Employee Overtime Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5479. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-322, ''Lottery Amendment Repeal Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5480. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-323, ''Moratorium on Establishments Which Permit Nude Dancing Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5481. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-327, ''Workforce Job Development Grant-Making Authority Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5482. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-328, ''Board of Elections and Ethics Electoral Process Improvement Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5483. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-329, ''Unemployment Anti-Discrimination Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5484. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-330, ''Civil Marriage Dissolution Equality Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5485. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-332, ''Unemployment Compensation Funds Appropriation Authorization Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5486. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-331, ''DDOT Omnibus Conforming Temporary Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5487. A letter from the Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-57; Introduction [Docket: FAR 2012-0080, Sequence 2] received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5488. A letter from the Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement [FAC 2005-57; FAR Case 2012-004; Docket 2012-0004, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM18) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5489. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting seventh annual report on crime victims' rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5490. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone and Regulated Navigation Area, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Romeoville, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1108] (RIN: 1625-AA11, 1624-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5491. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Temporary Change for Recurring Fireworks Display within the Fifth Coast Guard District, Wrightsville Beach, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0978] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5492. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Key West World Championship, Atlantic Ocean; Key West, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0942] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5493. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fourth Annual Chillounge Night St. Petersburg Fireworks Display; Tampa Bay, St. Petersburg, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0615] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5494. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Art Gallery Party St. Pete 2011 Fireworks Display, Tampa Bay, St. Petersburg, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0774] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5495. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Seminole Hard Rock Winterfest Boat Parade, New River and Intracoastal Waterway, Fort Lauderdale, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1011] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5496. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Potomac River, National Harbor Access Channel, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0976] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5497. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Department of Defense Exercise, Hood Canal, Washington [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1017] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5498. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Seagoing Barges [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0363] (RIN: 1625-AB71) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5499. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Container Crane Relocation, Cooper and Wando Rivers, Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1045] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5500. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Orange Bowl International Youth Regatta, Biscayne Bay, Miami, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0994] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5501. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Truman-Hobbs alteration of the Elgin Joliet & Eastern Railroad Drawbridge; Illinois River, Morris, Illinois [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1058] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. H.R. 2309. A bill to restore the financial solvency of the United States Postal Service and to ensure the efficient and affordable nationwide delivery of mail; with an amendment (Rept. 112–363 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H.R. 4295. A bill to establish the Department of Energy and the Environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Appropriations, Science, Space, and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. CRAVAACK):

H.R. 4296. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act to repeal a duplicative program relating to inspection and grading of catfish; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 4297. A bill to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st Century; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4298. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to conduct a review of the forms related to obtaining workers' compensation benefits under the Federal Black Lung Benefits Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. RUNYAN):

H.R. 4299. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide specially adapted housing assistance to individuals residing temporarily in housing owned by a family member; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. RUNYAN):

H.R. 4300. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the authority to provide work-study allowance for certain activities by individuals receiving educational assistance by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. LANDRY):

H.R. 4301. A bill to contribute to the growth of the American economy and the strength of American national security by streamlining regulatory permitting procedures and increasing domestic production from all energy sources; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, Rules, Ways and Means, Agriculture, Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 4302. A bill to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 4303. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to designate as foreign terrorist organizations certain Mexican drug cartels and submit a report on the activities the Department of State is taking to assist Mexico with drug cartel violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H.R. 4304. A bill to clarify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 4305. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to provide a grant to assist Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies in the rapid recovery of missing individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4306. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit the importation, exportation, transportation, and sale, receipt, acquisition, or purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4307. A bill to prohibit the Ambassador's Fund for Cultural Preservation from making grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4308. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide growth and stability funding for the city of Detroit; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 4309. A bill to permit Federal officers to remove cases involving crimes of violence to Federal court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington) (both by request):

H.R. 4310. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 4311. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit L06, Topsail, North Carolina; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 4312. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BOSWELL (for himself and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 4313. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to require an evaluation of county workload assessments for purposes of the closure or relocation of a county office for the Farm Service Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. FARR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 4314. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish a coastal climate change adaptation planning and response program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr.

COURTNEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. CHU, Ms. HAHN, and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 4315. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for unlimited eligibility for health care for mental illnesses for veterans of combat service during certain periods of hostilities and war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 4316. A bill to amend chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 to include Guam, the Virgin Islands of the United States, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in the definition of State for the purposes of the trade adjustment assistance for workers program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. DOLD):

H.R. 4317. A bill to expand sanctions with respect to the energy sector of Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 4318. A bill to prohibit the use, production, sale, importation, or exportation of any pesticide containing atrazine; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 4319. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations to provide for accurate disclosures of the terms and conditions of prepaid telephone calling cards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 4320. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require long-term cost benefit analyses of introduced bills; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4321. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on heavy trucks and trailers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BERG, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HALL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 4322. A bill to clarify that a State has the sole authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing on Federal land within the boundaries of the State; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 4323. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 4324. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the credit for employee health insurance expenses of small employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Mr. OWENS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4325. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior may accept bids on any new oil and gas leases of Federal lands (including submerged lands) only from bidders certifying that all oil produced pursuant to such leases, and all refined petroleum products produced from such oil, shall be offered for sale only in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. COBLE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 4326. A bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to require residential carbon monoxide detectors to meet the applicable ANSI/UL standard by treating that standard as a consumer product safety rule, to encourage States to require the installation of such detectors in homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. JONES, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 4327. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recognize tinnitus as a mandatory condition for research and treatment by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 4328. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a Great Lakes basin initiative for agricultural nonpoint source pollution prevention; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey):

H.R. 4329. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the payment of monthly annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan to a supplemental or special needs trust established for the sole benefit of a disabled dependent child of a participant in the Survivor Benefit Plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 4330. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to clarify the maximum distance between Farm Service Agency county offices for purposes of the closure or relocation of a county office for the Farm Service Agency; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4331. A bill to respond to the extreme fire hazard and unsafe conditions resulting from pine beetle infestation, drought, disease, or storm damage by declaring a state of emergency and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately implement hazardous fuels reduction projects in the manner provided in title I of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 4332. A bill to amend section 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to extend the period for a first applicant, with respect to a generic drug, to obtain tentative approval without forfeiting the 180-day exclusivity period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 4333. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to permit providers of eligible food purchasing and delivery services to be approved as retail food stores that accept and redeem supplemental nutrition assistance benefits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4334. A bill to establish a monument in Dona Ana County, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 4335. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to allow the Postal Regulatory Commission to set aside determinations by the United States Postal Service to close or consolidate postal facilities that would deny essential postal services to rural areas, communities, or small towns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BERG, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 4336. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion from gross income of discharges of qualified principal residence indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. HOCHUL):

H.R. 4337. A bill to limit the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to implement certain actions related to Chesapeake Bay watershed total maximum daily loads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 4338. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand certain restrictions relating to the overhaul and repair of vessels in foreign shipyards to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4339. A bill to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act to include the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in the employment services provided under that Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 4340. A bill to restrict assistance to Egypt unless the Government of Egypt holds free and fair elections; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. SCHILLING, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 4341. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a working group to review TRICARE policy with respect to providing health care to children and determine how to improve such policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 4342. A bill to provide for funding for construction and major rehabilitation for projects located on inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. WOLF:

H.R. 4343. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the President, the Vice President, Members of Congress, and other officers of the executive branch from lobbying on behalf of foreign governments or instrumentalities for 10 years after leaving office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. FLORES):

H.J. Res. 107. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to parental rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BUERKLE (for herself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. YODER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WEST, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. KELLY, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. MACK, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia):

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 64th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BIGGERT:

H. Res. 602. A resolution encouraging people in the United States to recognize March 2, 2012, as Read Across America Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 603. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 2, 2012, as World MRSA Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ISSA:

H. Res. 604. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President exercised the recess appointment power despite the fact that neither the House of Representatives nor the Senate have been adjourned for a period in excess of three days during the Second Session of the 112th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. BACA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. DELAURO):

H. Res. 605. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Health Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AUSTRIA (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H. Res. 606. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the notice signed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency Lisa Jackson on March 27, 2012, entitled 'Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions for New Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H. Res. 607. A resolution congratulating Western Washington University on winning its first Division II NCAA National Basketball Title in the school's 110-year history; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H. Res. 608. A resolution honoring the life and work of Arab-American writer Ameen Rihani and celebrating the 100th anniversary of the publication of the first Arab-American novel, 'The Book of Khalid', by Ameen Rihani; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H. Res. 609. A resolution Expressing support for the people of Tibet; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. TURNER of New York):

H. Res. 610. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President and the Secretary of State should continue to press Russian authorities for a full and complete accounting regarding the fate of Raoul Wallenberg; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. BOREN):

H. Res. 611. A resolution promoting global energy supply security through increased cooperation among the United States, Turkey, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Iraq, and Georgia; 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 Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 4295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 4296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I: Section 8: Clause 3 The United States Congress shall have power

''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 4297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 4299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 4300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 4301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact legislation pertaining to the rules and regulations for property owned by the United States pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

Authority for additional functions of this legislation having to do with tax credits are found within Article I, Section 7; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Authority to stay misapplied regulations from the executive Branch stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 4302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.''

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 4303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 4304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and within the Indian Tribes.''

Additionally, this legislation enforces Amendments IV, V, VII, IX, and X of the Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, 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;

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and 3 and implied powers to not act in these areas.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 4309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).''

By Mr. McKEON:

H.R. 4310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress ''to provide for the common Defence'', ''to raise and support Armies'', ''to provide and maintain a Navy'' and ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces'' as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 4311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 4312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 4313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 4314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1. ''All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.''

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 4316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.''

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 4317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, clause 3, Congress has the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 4318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 4319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution. Congress has the power to enact this legislation, as well, under Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3 and 18.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 4320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which states the Congress shall have the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 4321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 4322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment stating that ''[t]he powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 providing that ''Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . . .''

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 4323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 4324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I: ''Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes.''

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 4325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 4326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 4327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 4328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Claus 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 4329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12, 13, and 14.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 4332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 4335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution, known as the Postal Clause or the Postal Power, empowers Congress ''To establish Post Offices and post Roads''. The Clause has been construed to give Congress the enumerated power to designate mail routes and construct or designate post offices, with the implied authority to carry, deliver, and regulate the mails of the United States as a whole.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution which states that the

Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 4336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 4337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States. This clause allows Congress to regulate interstate commerce. In this case, this legislation is necessary to reduce burdens on interstate commerce.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 4338.

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 (clauses 13 and 14), which grants Congress the power to provide and maintain a Navy and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 4339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 4340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, §8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States'' & Art. 1, §9, Clause 7 ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 4341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 11–14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 4342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 4343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is found in the power of Congress ''provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States,'' as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.J. Res. 107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Parental Rights Amendment is introduced pursuant to Article V: ''The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution . . .''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 9: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 14: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 32: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 59: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 157: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 174: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 192: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 300: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 476: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 498: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky and Mr. MACK.

H.R. 531: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 605: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 664: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 733: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 750: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 797: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 860: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.

H.R. 870: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 891: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 893: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 904: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 931: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 941: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 942: Mr. NUNES and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 948: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 972: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 997: Mr. QUAYLE.

H.R. 1004: Mr. SCHILLING.

H.R. 1005: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 1066: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. REYES, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1161: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

H.R. 1169: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 1172: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1175: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1182: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1244: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1259: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 1321: Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1335: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1340: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1351: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1370: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1375: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1385: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 1448: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1449: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1465: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 1474: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1545: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1558: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 1612: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 1653: Mr. REED and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1675: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1700: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1718: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1724: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1738: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1742: Mr. CRITZ.

H.R. 1789: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1802: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 1897: Mr. STIVERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 1903: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1946: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2028: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2082: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 2088: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 2106: Mr. PENCE and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 2108: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2139: Mr. DENT, Mr. HURT, Mr. KIND, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 2140: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2168: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2179: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2194: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2245: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 2256: Mr. POLIS, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2257: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 2295: Mr. SCHILLING.

H.R. 2310: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 2311: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 2313: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2335: Mr. MICA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FINCHER, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.

H.R. 2479: Mr. TONKO and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2505: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 2514: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 2529: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 2540: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2557: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2569: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. NEAL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 2599: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2697: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 2717: Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2866: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 2900: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 2978: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 2989: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3000: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 3001: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 3032: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 3039: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3046: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 3061: Mr. KEATING, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 3067: Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 3068: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 3074: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 3100: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3151: Mr. REYES and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 3187: Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 3238: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3264: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 3307: Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3364: Mr. TONKO, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3395: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 3420: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3461: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WEST, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. AMASH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3485: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3487: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 3506: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 3523: Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. SHULER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3526: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 3565: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
H.R. 3569: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3586: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3618: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 3619: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3627: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3634: Mr. BARTLETT and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3640: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3643: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 3652: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 3664: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3676: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 3687: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3713: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 3728: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 3737: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3747: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 3767: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mrs. ADAMS.
H.R. 3770: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 3780: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3803: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 3826: Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 3828: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 3831: Mr. HALL and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 3839: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 3849: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3877: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3884: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3903: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3916: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3991: Mr. MICA and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 3993: Ms. HAHN and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4000: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4035: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 4040: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 4045: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 4049: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4055: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 4057: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 4077: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 4089: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 4114: Mr. SCHILLING.
H.R. 4120: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 4122: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 4126: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4133: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. LANDRY, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4134: Mr. OWENS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 4157: Mr. BERG, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 4160: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 4165: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 4169: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 4170: Mr. FILNER and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4180: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HERGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BERG, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 4196: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BACA, Mr. BERG, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. NUNES, Mr. REED, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 4200: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LANDRY, and Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 4215: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
H.R. 4228: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 4229: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LEVIN, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 4231: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 4236: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 4237: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 4238: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 4255: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4256: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 4266: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 4270: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 4271: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 4284: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 4290: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4293: Ms. HAHN.
H.J. Res. 88: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.J. Res. 93: Mr. GARDNER.
H.J. Res. 103: Mr. BERG and Mr. FORBES.
H.J. Res. 106: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. PENCE.
H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H. Con. Res. 113: Mr. LANDRY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
H. Res. 460: Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 549: Ms. WATERS.
H. Res. 564: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H. Res. 568: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CANSECO, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GUINTA, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 573: Mr. FILNER, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 583: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 584: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 589: Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Res. 592: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. TURNER of New York, and Mr. HUNTER.
H. Res. 601: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 2012 No. 52

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our dwelling place in all generations, help us to run when we can, to walk when we ought, and to wait when we must.

Give our lawmakers this day the wisdom to follow Your guidance. Illuminate them with Your Divine Light, providing them with a discernment greater than their own. Sustain them by the radiant vision of the ultimate triumph of Your truth. May they sense Your presence and make this day one of constant inner conversation with You. Lord, give them a productive day as they cast their burdens on You.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable TOM UDALL 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, March 29, 2012.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico 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. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2230, the Paying A Fair Share Act, with the time until 11:30 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. The majority will control the first 30 minutes and the Republicans the next 30 minutes.

The filing deadline for second-degree amendments to S. 2204 is 10:30 a.m. this morning.

At 11:30 a.m., there will be a cloture vote on the Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act.

The Transportation bill expires at the end of this month, so that will have to be addressed before we leave this week. We are waiting to see what the House is doing. As I think a lot of people know, they have tried, the Republican leadership there has tried, to bring up a bill on two separate occasions. They had to bring it down because they did not have the votes to pass what they wanted. So I assume something will pass over there—I guess. We have been waiting all week. I am confident they can scrounge up 218 votes.

BIG OIL SUBSIDIES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, over the past decade, the five major oil companies have made more than $1 trillion—that is not billions; it is ''T,'' trillions. They have also taken home billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies—our money they have also taken—to add to those grossly exaggerated profits. They get these subsidies they do not need.

You do not need to take my word for it. Even oil executives admit an industry making hundreds of billions of dollars in profits every year does not need a handout from the American taxpayer.

Former Shell CEO John Hofmeister said a decade of high gas prices is incentive enough for oil companies to drill for more oil:

My point of view is that with high oil prices, such subsidies are [totally] unnecessary.

We agree. So do almost 80 percent of the American people. There is no reason for these companies—five companies last year made $137 billion—to need subsidies from the American taxpayer.

So today Senate Republicans are going to have a chance—another chance, another opportunity—to show Americans where they stand on this issue. I hope they will allow us to invoke cloture on this and to complete this legislation today. They appear poised, however—what I have heard from my friends on the other side of the aisle—to pick the pockets of American taxpayers in order to line the pockets of these oil executives.

But unless we vote to repeal these wasteful giveaways, the country will spend another $25 billion over the next decade making these rich oil companies that much richer.

The oil executives who benefit from this bad policy—and the Republicans who go to bat for them—want you to believe repealing taxpayer subsidies will increase gas prices. It is not true. The only effective way to bring down prices at the pump is to reduce our reliance on foreign oil.

We have made progress toward that during the Obama years. For almost

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

the 4 years he has been in office, domestic oil production has increased every year, and America's dependence on foreign oil has decreased every year.

Everyone should hear again what I said: During the Obama years, domestic oil production has increased, dependence on foreign oil has decreased.

Last year, America used a lower percentage of foreign oil than at any time in almost two decades, thanks to President Obama's smart energy policies. We have heard speeches in the last couple days here in effect saying: Drill, baby, drill. We are doing a good job. We cannot produce our way out of this mess we are in. America controls less than 2 percent of the oil in the world. We use more than 20 percent of it. And even though we are doing better—and that is good—we must lessen our dependence. We must become energy independent. And we can do that.

There are huge discoveries of natural gas that the Republicans voted against using. Can you imagine that? A bipartisan bill, Menendez-Burr, to use the natural gas. We have more natural gas reserves than any other country in the world. So we wanted to start a program here: Why don't we use some of it? Boone Pickens—by the way, who is not a Democrat—it is his idea, joined by others: to move the big fleets we have. Millions of these 18-wheelers every day use all this fuel unnecessarily. We could convert these to natural gas—less polluting, easier on the engines. But the Republicans voted against that. I guess the oil companies would rather we use their oil.

The prices at the pump continue to rise. That is because chanting, as I said, ''drill, baby, drill'' is not a comprehensive solution to this Nation's energy problems, including high gas prices. We know what is going on in the Middle East. We know there are complicated issues. We need to continue responsible domestic oil exploration. But we cannot drill our way to energy independence, as I have said. America must also invest in clean energy technologies that will free us from our addiction to oil over the long term.

President Obama was in Nevada last week. Between a place called Railroad Pass and my home in Searchlight, there is a huge what we used to call a dry lake. On that—Boulder City now owns that real estate—they have allowed huge construction projects of solar. You drive by that—it used to be, when I was a little boy, we would drive by that dry lake, and if you looked out there, it looked as though there was water. It was a mirage. Now it is not a mirage. It looks like a lake because there are all those solar panels—more than a million of them there producing huge amounts of energy, nonpolluting. That is the way it should be. We should do lots more of that.

Repealing $24 billion in lavish subsidies to oil companies would pay for those clean energy investments, with money to spare. With the savings, we can help move forward proven technologies such as solar, wind, advanced batteries, and even next-generation vehicles. We can give innovators the tools they need to bring the next electric car or advanced solar panel from the drawing board to the boardroom.

As most everyone knows, my wife has not been well, so I have not been going to Nevada as much as I had over the 30 years I have been here. But I am going out this coming week because she is doing much better. One of the people I am going to visit next week is a man by the name of Byron Georgiou, who has developed a company for electric cars. I am looking forward to that. They are a manufacturer there in Nevada. It is programs like this that we need. We need to give innovators the tools they need to bring the next electric car, as we have in Nevada, or advanced solar panel from the drawing board to the boardroom, and we can pay down the deficit with the money that is left over. But we cannot do any of that if we continue to give taxpayer dollars to the most profitable corporations in the world—corporations that made, as I indicated, a record $137 billion in profits last year. It is easy to keep track of because there are only five of them, these multinational corporations.

This morning, when the Republicans consider whether to put oil company coffers ahead of taxpayers' wallets, I hope they consider this fact: The five major oil companies raked in last year $260,000—it is actually more—more than $260,000 in profits every minute of every day for 1 year. They did not take Christmas off. It was still made during Christmas: $265,000 a minute. During Thanksgiving, New Year's, they got the money; more than $260,000 a minute. That is a huge amount: $260,000 in profits every minute—every minute—24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It takes a typical family 5 years to earn what those oil companies took home in profits in a single minute last year.

American families are struggling. Big oil companies are not. Before my Republican colleagues vote to send another taxpayer dollar to Big Oil, I hope they will consider the $260,000 a minute, and I hope they will make the right decision as we vote at 11:30 today.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Mr. President, would the Chair announce the business of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

IMPOSING A MINIMUM EFFECTIVE TAX RATE FOR HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2230, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 339 (S. 2230) a bill to reduce the deficit by imposing a minimum effective tax rate for high-income taxpayers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11:30 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. GILLIBRAND). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIG OIL SUBSIDIES

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I rise today in a moment when America is in crisis, and I don't think we are paying appropriate attention to the problems that befall our society. There are still too many people out of work, too many people who can't afford health care presently, and too many people who can't educate their children because they don't have the means. They are struggling. Millions of homes are still on the edge of foreclosure. And here we see a situation that is unacceptable under any stretch of the imagination.

I rise today to talk to the American people who are struggling every week to provide the necessities for family life. At the same time, I ask my Republican colleagues why they would insist on continuing tax subsidies—gifts, really—to multibillion-dollar oil companies at the expense of ordinary, hard-working, middle-income families. Right now, these families are forced to come up with $4 per gallon—$60 to $80 dollars, typically—to fill the tank every time they have to go to the gas station. That is a huge burden. The big five oil companies have made almost $1 trillion in profits in the last decade. Look at how much money these companies made in the last year alone. It was a record $137 billion between the big five oil companies.

Look at them: ExxonMobil—these poor guys need a subsidy. They only made $41 billion—$41 billion—in a single year. Look down the list. The last of the five must believe that trying to catch up is pretty tough. They only made $12 billion. That is Conoco, the last. In 1 year, they made $12 billion.

Given how well these companies are doing, why are we giving them billions of dollars in tax breaks? The legislation we are voting on today presents a better idea. It says we should end these tax breaks and instead invest in clean energy solutions that can break our dangerous dependence on oil.

Investing in renewable energy has helped launch industries that create jobs and clean up our air and provide homemade — homemade — American power. Clean energy is also our best chance to break through spiraling gas

prices and our reliance on foreign oil. One would think our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would want to put a stop to the punishing effects of higher and higher gas prices on middle-income working people. Why wouldn't they want to end America's dependence on fossil fuels and eliminate needless tax breaks for oil companies? Two words: Big Oil.

Big Oil is doing all it can to protect their tax breaks. Even a retired chairman and CEO of Exxon said it is not necessary; they do not need it. But they are taking it. Big Oil is doing all it can to protect their tax breaks, and the Republicans are lining up to help Big Oil.

It is time to tell the truth. Making oil companies pay their fair share in taxes is not going to raise the price of gas, contrary to what they publish. It just means Big Oil executives might have to trim their sail a little bit and share in the problems we have. A long time ago when I was a soldier, we had an excess profits tax for companies that made, in a way, unconscionable amounts of money based on the situation our country was facing. So it is just a matter of sharing some of the responsibility our country has in order to keep everybody feeling as though they are participating in the American dream, not a nightmare.

While millions of Americans are struggling every week to pay their bills, everybody should take a look at how much oil companies are paying their executives. Here is a fellow who personally runs ExxonMobil, the CEO, and he was paid $29 million last year. That is what I said, $29 million. Conoco Phillips' CEO received $18 million, and Chevron's exec made $16 million in income in 1 single year.

By the way, that is from money earned for an essential product. When we look at gasoline, it almost compares to having medicines available because when we look at the cost of gasoline, we might ask: What would it take to educate all the children who can learn? Way less than we see demonstrated on these charts and their balance sheets. Working men and women in this country on average make just over $27,000 a year—$27,000 a year.

I don't begrudge high profits. I really don't. I ran a big company, a company I helped start, which has 45,000 employees. It is a huge company. It is a company that calculates the employment records every month. The company is called ADT. So I don't mind big profits.

The question is, Who are you taking them from and how critical is the product they are being forced to buy? Right now, people are paying an average of $3.91 per gallon of gas.

What about the people who live in other places? We picked at random a county in Mississippi. The county is called Issaquena County. Last year, the entire income for all the people in that county who were working was just over $16 million. All the people in a single county made $16 million. This poor guy at Chevron made $16 million by himself, and the others would leave all of those in that county way behind. A single oil company CEO made more in 1 year than all the people in that county put together. These hard-working people are already contributing to the income of oil executives whenever they fill up their gas tanks. Is it fair to ask them to chip in with their tax dollars to pay even more toward these record-setting salaries?

Over the last 10 years, CEO pay at Exxon and Chevron has more than tripled. Over the same period, gas prices have nearly tripled. The picture is clear: Working people are struggling to fill up their tanks while oil executives are struggling to carry their big fat paychecks to the bank. It is almost beyond belief that Senators are lining up to protect tax breaks for oil companies—some Senators, I say—beyond belief.

I say to them: Mind your responsibilities. You were elected not just by oil company executives or even oil company employees. Let's focus on the hard-working Americans who are paying more and more at the gas pump, the clean energy workers who might lose their jobs, and our men and women in uniform who put their lives on the line to protect oil supplies.

The American people know these subsidies are unnecessary, that they are ineffective, and they are immoral considering the conditions that exist in our society. Continuing to subsidize oil companies only increases our dependence on dirty fuels. It keeps us on a dead-end road to sky-high energy bills, more oilspills, and dangerous pollution levels.

So I call on my colleagues to kick Big Oil off of the welfare rolls and invest in clean energy jobs. Let's end the industry's tax breaks and break our country's addiction to oil and other dirty fuels. Let's invest in clean energy and smart transportation, not windfalls for oil industry executives and lobbyists. Let's make certain our children and our grandchildren inherit a country that is fiscally sound, morally responsible, and free from its dependence on oil.

Let's not worry about the oil companies. They can take care of themselves. Let's stop this drain on our society, this drain on working-class citizens. Let's pay attention to the millions and millions of people in America who say: Just give us a chance, give us a chance to make a decent living; give us a chance to educate our children; give us a chance to keep our jobs; give us a chance to maintain our homes; get us off the possible foreclosure line. That is what we are looking for.

That is the purpose of this legislation—to say to the American people: Look in this Chamber, Mr. and Mrs. America. Look in this Chamber and see the people who are supporting Big Oil profit fattening. Look at those who are supporting these profits.

Again, I don't mind companies making profits, but when the profits come in almost blood money, when you think of the effect gasoline has on family life, it is unfair, it is indecent, and it is improper.

With that, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Our friends on the other side, the Senate Democrats, have put on a clinic this week on how not to run a serious legislative body. If they have achieved anything at all, it is to make Americans even more frustrated with Congress, as if that were possible.

Faced with skyrocketing gas prices, Senate Democrats turned to a bill that even they admit doesn't lower them. Then, to make matters worse, they blocked Republicans from offering anything that might. That was their brilliant plan on how to deal with gas prices: raise taxes on energy companies, when gas is already hovering around $4 a gallon, then block consideration of anything else just to make sure gas prices don't go anywhere but up.

Somehow they thought doing this would set up some kind of political win for them, which, frankly, I don't understand. I mean, I can't imagine anybody giving them any high-fives for not lowering gas prices. But, anyway, that was obviously the plan. It appears to have fallen short because now they want to move off this issue and on to another political vote to yet another debate where the goal isn't to make a difference but, rather, to make a point—to increase taxes not lower prices at the pump.

Well, I don't expect this next vote will have the political punch they expect either. But that is the Democratic plan anyway. It is getting quite tedious. Day after day after day, Senate Democrats all choose to come out here not so we can make an actual difference in the lives of working Americans and families struggling to fill the gas tank, but so we can watch them stage votes for show. For some reason they thought they would put some political points on the board this week if the American people saw them voting for a tax hike we all knew ahead of time didn't have the votes to pass.

That didn't work. If anyone has any doubt about that, just ask yourself why they were moving to actually get off of it. Now they think they will score political points by staging another vote on a tax hike we know doesn't have the votes to pass.

None of this makes sense to me. But that is how the Democrats have chosen to run this place. If they want to keep trying to distract the American people from the fact they do not have any solutions to the problems we face, that is their prerogative. But that is not going to keep Republicans from talking about ours. That is not going to keep us from trying to actually make a difference around here.

Surveys show two-thirds of Americans disapprove of the way the President is handling high gas prices.

We know high gas prices are having a negative impact on Americans' daily lives. So we think the American people are entitled to this debate. They sent us to do something other than put on a show, and that is why we will continue to insist on a serious debate.

The majority leader frequently complains there isn't any time to focus on priorities such as cybersecurity, postal reform, and the Export-Import Bank, not to mention maybe passing a budget for the first time in 3 years. Yet he seems to find the time to hold not one but two political show votes on tax hikes.

The way I see it, the American people didn't send us to score political points. As I said, they sent us to make a difference. So I will be voting against this tax hike on American energy manufacturers, and I would urge my colleagues to do the same.

I hope that when the Senate returns in April, Democrats will have heard from their constituents and will focus on jobs and prices at the pump—rather than the latest political vote.

Mr. REID. Madam President, if my friend would yield. I have a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I will be happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote on S. 2204, which is currently set for 11:30, be moved to start at 11:15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Members should not be worried about this because we will keep the vote open until at least noon. So everybody who was scheduling to vote at 11:30 can still do that.

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. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, we have all been following what has been going on across the street this week with great interest. While we all have our preferences, none of us knows at this point how the Supreme Court will rule. But one thing we should all be able to agree on is that the President's health care bill is a mess, an absolute mess.

The American people clearly don't like it. Polls show the majority want the law repealed. More than two-thirds of the public, including most Democrats, believe the core of this bill is unconstitutional. It is loaded, literally loaded with broken promises.

The President said it would lower costs. It is, in fact, raising costs. Proponents said it would create jobs. Now we know it means fewer jobs. The President said families would save on their premiums. They are, in fact, going up. He said people would be able to keep the insurance they have and like. They will not. CBO's most likely prediction finds 3 to 5 million Americans will lose their current plan every single year. The President said he would protect Medicare, but, instead, the law raids Medicare for over $500 billion, cutting billions from hospitals, nursing homes, hospices, and Medicare Advantage.

The President promised the American people their taxes wouldn't go up one penny. Two years later, the American people found out their taxes will be going up by more than $550 billion. The Joint Committee on Taxation found no fewer than 11 separate taxes and penalties that fall squarely on the middle class.

Remember the CLASS Act? The administration said it would be fiscally stable and would reduce the deficit. A couple months ago, it was determined to be unsustainable and was shut down before it even began.

The President told the American people, ''Federal conscience laws will remain in place.'' Two years later, he turned around and gave his approval to HHS to mandate that religious-affiliated schools, universities, hospitals, and charities would have to violate their religious tenets or pay a hefty fine.

Finally, the health care law will increase Medicaid rolls by nearly 25 million people, costing already cash-strapped States another $118 billion—money many Governors, including Kentucky's, don't know where to get.

This law is bad for Kentucky, it is bad for the country, and it is bad for health care. Americans don't want it. Regardless of what the court decides this summer, it should be repealed and it should be replaced. It should be replaced with commonsense reforms that lower costs and that Americans actually want—reforms that protect jobs and State budgets, reduce the deficit, reform entitlements, and strengthen Medicare.

One broken promise is one too many. This law is full of broken promises from top to bottom.

Two years ago, then-Speaker PELOSI said we would have to pass this bill to find out what was in it. Now we know. The American people have had a chance to decide for themselves. They don't like it. They want it repealed, and that is what we plan to do.

TORNADO RELIEF

Madam President, I once again share with my colleagues stories of the heartbreaking events in my home State of Kentucky in the aftermath of the horrific wave of storms and tornadoes that ravaged my State, along with several others in the Midwest, earlier this month.

As I have already stated on the floor, these were very severe tornadoes, with at least 11 funnel clouds confirmed by the National Weather Service to have touched down in my State, blowing at wind speeds up to 125 miles an hour.

We know 24 Kentuckians lost their lives and more than 300 were injured. Many homes, churches, schools, and places of business were destroyed. Scenes of destruction still exist across the State in places such as Magoffin County, Menifee County, Kenton, Morgan, Laurel, Lawrence, Martin, Pulaski, Johnson, and Trimble, all those counties in my State which were among the hardest hit.

Kentuckians are working hard to rebuild. I am pleased to say that despite the tragedy of lives lost, families grieving, and memories destroyed forever, there is some good news to report; that is, how inspiring it is to see so many good-hearted Kentuckians come together to provide for their neighbors in the wake of these tornadoes.

Take, for example, the congregation of Arthur Ridge Baptist Church in the town of East Bernstadt, located in Laurel County. Thanks to the leadership of Pastor Steve Smith, Arthur Ridge Baptist Church opened its doors within hours of the storm's end to provide food and shelter for those who needed it.

Pastor Smith kept the church doors open for 24 hours a day and served up to 700 meals a day to local residents who had no food, no kitchen, and no home to call their own. According to Pastor Smith, people from all over the area pitched in. Folks from different churches worked to prepare meals, and many residents donated items such as dishes, silverware, toiletries, pillows, and blankets for care packages to distribute to the victims of the storm. Local businesses did their part too. The nearby Little Caesar's pizza in London gave away 120 pizzas in 1 day, soon after the tornadoes. Many other local restaurants donated food as well.

Thanks in part to the efforts of Pastor Smith and the congregation of Arthur Ridge Baptist Church, life is just a little bit better for many in East Bernstadt. At first, the church had to tend to people's most immediate and ''simple needs—water, a hot meal, an air mattress to sleep on,'' says Pastor Smith, who is a Laurel County native and has been the pastor at Arthur Ridge now for 6 years. He says, however, ''People are over the shock and awe.''

Weeks after the tornadoes passed, the church was still open 14 hours a day, distributing 125 to 150 meals a day and running a clothing distribution center. Pastor Smith's latest focus was on finding a place to set up donated washing and drying machines so local storm victims without homes can actually clean their clothes.

Over 3,500 people have registered to volunteer in the region, and as of last week over 25,000 meals had been served to displaced families.

This is just one story of how many Kentuckians have joined together to help the least fortunate in my State. Hawk Creek Baptist Church in Laurel County, First Baptist Church of East Bernstadt, and Trinity Freewill Baptist Church of Martin County also opened their doors to provide shelter and relief to displaced Kentuckians and the volunteers working to help them in the days after the disaster struck.

Jim Paul, director of the organization called Ken-Tenn Relief Team, was in East Bernstadt the morning after the storms with food supplies. He trucked in a tractor-trailer load of donated food and other items and personally volunteered dozens of hours in at least three counties to aid storm victims.

In Morgan County, the local Appalachian Regional Healthcare hospital suffered serious damage. Every second-floor window of the hospital was literally blown out, doors were torn off their hinges, and part of the roof was ripped off. Dozens of people were injured and the patients had to be evacuated to nearby hospitals.

Luckily, Martie and Teresa Johnson, owners of a nearby Wendy's restaurant, stepped in to help. They served 450 hot meals to the cleanup crew who came in to repair the Morgan County ARH hospital and also traveled to Salyersville and gave away food there.

One television station in Hazard, WYMT, held a telethon to raise money for victims across the State. I was pleased to play a small part in that effort myself, as the television station asked me to record a greeting describing the devastating effects of the tornados. The people of the region raised over $180,000 in the telethon for disaster relief.

The local J.C. Penney of Corbin donated clothing and shoes to area elementary school students, and the employees of the store took up a collection to donate winter, spring, and summer clothing for the children.

''Some of [the employees] don't have a lot to give, but when this came up, they all wanted to know what else we needed,'' says Tiffany Flint, the Corbin J.C. Penney store manager.

We hope it will help the children to look good and feel good. We just wanted to do this to help them get back on their feet.

The men's soccer team from Kentucky's University of the Cumberlands donated some of their time to help the less fortunate. Head soccer coach Brenton Benware, his staff, and nearly 30 student athletes drove to East Bernstadt to help clean up debris in the area.

''Going . . . was just another reminder of how blessed we really are,'' said Coach Benware. ''I think we were all deeply affected by what we saw and reminded how important it is to serve and help our neighbors in times of need.''

While there, the University of the Cumberlands soccer team may have run into the soccer team from Union College, which also traveled to Laurel County to help. The team stacked wood from downed trees, cleared debris from backyards, and helped a man move a displaced steel roof that the tornado had deposited in his yard.

Union College dean of students Debbie D'Anna was responsible for sponsoring the trip, while the school's campus food services donated snacks and bottled water, and James Jimerson of the school's physical plant loaned out tools. Local businesses, such as Knox Hardware and Pope's Lumber, donated work and cleaning supplies. Many faculty, staff and students of Union College donated items such as food, clothing, and other essentials.

In Salyersville, a town in Magoffin County, the block known as ''Restaurant Row'' was hit by a tornado and nearly every restaurant on it destroyed. One of the few left was a Dairy Queen owned by Doug and Sue Mortimer.

On the night of the storms, they opened their restaurant, running on generator power, and served free meals to the volunteers working to clean up the wreckage.

Several Home Depot stores in Kentucky and Indiana contributed to the relief efforts as well. In the West Liberty area, district manager Becky Young and store manager Jim Householder coordinated donations of approximately $2,600, and Jim's store employees were out immediately after the storm handing out paper towels, trash bags, and gloves to relief volunteers.

Other Home Depot stores in Kentucky and Indiana, led by district manager Tim Choate and district human resource manager Lee Ann Bruce, donated thousands of dollars' worth of products such as chainsaws, gloves, respirators, tarps, water, and trash bags to organizations such as the Henryville Fire Department and local United Way chapters. And store employees volunteered to assist those organizations in the recovery.

Lowe's stores in Kentucky have also pitched in, providing gloves, tarps, shovels, bleach, and other supplies to communities all across the State. In addition to over $300,000 donated by the company to relief efforts after the storms, the Lowe's district manager for Kentucky, Stephen West, dispatched ''Lowe's Heroes,'' store employees who are volunteering their time and construction know-how.

Local Walmart stores in Kentucky as well as the company's foundation have provided tens of thousands of dollars' worth of water, cleaning supplies, baby food, diapers, and more to help the community. Bob Gound, the market human resources manager for Walmart locations in eastern Kentucky, has taken the lead in coordinating these efforts. And local store employees are making bag lunches and handing them out in the hardest-hit Kentucky communities.

I have seen firsthand in my recent visits to the Bluegrass State both how severe the destruction is, and how hard the people of Kentucky are working to rebuild and lift their neighbors out of the dire circumstances that the cruel forces of nature have put so many of them in.

It is thanks to altruistic and generous Kentuckians like Pastor Steve Smith, among many others, that I am confident that the Kentuckians hurt by these storms will recover. I and my staff throughout the State have heard so many heart-warming stories like the few I have just shared that it would not be possible for me to recite them all on this Senate floor.

But I hope that the few stories I have shared are more than enough to reassure my colleagues, the people of Kentucky, and the world that we Kentuckians are stout of heart and firm in our resolve. We will prevail over this tragedy. We will rebuild towns like East Bernstadt to be better than they were before. And the families of Kentucky will hopefully one day heal the wounds in their hearts and continue on.

TRIBUTE TO LAURA DOVE

Madam President, I know I have inconvenienced the Senator from Georgia, but I have one more rather brief comment. I would like to say a few words about Laura Dove, who is leaving us this week, sitting right here at the table on the Republican side of the Chamber in the well.

For C–SPAN2 watchers out there, Laura is the assistant secretary for the minority. We wish she were the assistant secretary for the majority, but she is assistant secretary for the minority, which means she is one of the people who make this place run every day but whose names you don't hear on the rollcall.

She has put in her time, starting out as a page in high school and later moving to the Republican cloakroom. She did a stint at the Senate Republican Conference and the National Republican Senatorial Committee. And then Dave Schiappa, the Secretary for the Minority, hired her back into his shop about 10 years ago.

And she's done a fabulous job. Senate work is in Laura's DNA. Her dad's a past Senate parliamentarian. And she's been an invaluable member of the floor team for as long as I can remember—counseling members on the floor, working with committees to clear legislation, and doing countless other essential tasks, big and small, that nobody watching from home would even notice.

She always has a smile, always handles the pressure down in the well with a cool-head, and I know she's been an anchor for Dave over the years. So we will miss having her around.

And we wish her all the best as she moves onto other things.

I know she wants to travel with her husband Dan, and her two children Jakey and Abby. I don't think any of us would be surprised if Laura came back. But for now, I thank her for her service to the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. I would note that it is never an inconvenience to be deferred by a beautiful lady, and again I take all the remarks made by the leader about Ms. Dove, and I would add one thing about the best and greatest institution in America, the U.S. Senate, and that is that a young mother of two has become an institution to herself. Laura, we appreciate all you have done.

MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I rise to talk about two specific subjects, one of them a very troubling comment picked up by a microphone that was not believed to be live, made by President Obama to President Medvedev of Russia. It is a troubling comment to me because I spent most of the previous year in the Senate as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee working on the New START treaty, which the Senate adopted with 71 favorable votes a year ago, a treaty that is a treaty on offensive missiles, not defensive missiles nor strategic missiles.

It is a treaty that began under Ronald Reagan, was ratified by George H.W. Bush shortly after the fall of the Berlin Wall, was extended under George W. Bush and terminated a couple of years ago and needed to be renewed. It is a treaty that did three things. First of all, it reduced offensive weapons held by the Russians and the Americans; second, gave us unilateral access to Russia and the Russians unilateral access to us to trust but verify the warheads that existed; and third, new identification systems and holographs that made it almost impossible to hide or mimic nuclear warheads. It is a comprehensive treaty that is important to America, important to the free world, and, quite frankly, important to Russia.

I would like to quote from the Washington Post exactly what the President was picked up as having said when he was talking to Mr. Medvedev after their official conversation.

I quote from the Washington Post:

> On all these issues, but particularly missile defense, this, this can be solved—

I underline, nobody knows what ''this'' means—

> but it's important for him to give me space.

President Medvedev said back:

> Yeah, I understand.

Then the President said the following:

> This is my last election. After my election, I [will] have more flexibility.

That flexibility obviously refers back to ''this,'' which was in the first comment.

So as a continuing member of the Foreign Relations Committee, one who is proud of the work we did on the START treaty but one who understands particularly the commitments of the country, I think it important that the President clarify what ''this'' meant and how flexibility would be applied if he were reelected as President of the United States for this reason: In the President's letter to the Senate to endorse the New START treaty and ask for its ratification, he said the following: that he pledged in his message to the Senate on the New START treaty ''to continue development and deployment of all stages of the Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense in Europe, including qualitative and quantitative improvements to such system.'' That is a unilateral statement.

I met with Vice President JOE BIDEN in his office outside this Chamber during the debate. Vice President BIDEN committed the administration in terms of continuing on missile defense. I met with Secretary of State Clinton. I met with Ellen Tauscher, who was one of the chief negotiators and chief operatives, a former Member of the House working for the State Department. There was never any wiggle room nor need for flexibility. The United States was committed to missile defense in Europe, we remain committed to this day, and it is important that the President reaffirm that and it not be in any way confused or blurred by the comments picked up by that microphone. It is too important to the country, it is too important to this body, and it is too important to me for us to be able to trust the words of each other, not to find out sometime later that they want flexibility to possibly move from those words. Nuclear defense clearly is very sensitive with the Russians, and I understand that. If there are negotiations on that, that ought to be in the open, not after we have time for flexibility. It ought to be forthright.

I also would like to add that there is another missile defense issue that looms out there that we have to pay attention to. Israel is surrounded by missiles with warheads to injure the people of that country and take the country down. A missile defense system for Israel would be equally as important as missile defense deployment would be for the Eastern European countries.

So missile defense was a vision of Ronald Reagan's, continued under every President of the United States since Ronald Reagan, and it is important that we remain committed to it. I believe it is particularly important to understand what the President said, particularly on missile defense, what ''this'' meant when he asked for flexibility, because there should be no wiggle room in our desire to protect and defend democracy not only in the United States but around the world.

Madam President real quickly, we talked all week about gas prices, and there has been a lot of demonization from both sides. I am a pretty simple guy. I was a businessman for 33 years, went and got a degree in college in business, studied economics in high school, and learned one principle of free enterprise and competition: prices are determined by supply and demand. If your supply goes down and your demand goes up, your prices go up. On the contrary, if the supply is plentiful and demand goes down, your prices go down. You can blame gas companies, presidents' salaries, anything you want to blame; the fact is, we are talking out of the side of our mouth—and particularly in the administration—when it comes to exploration for natural resources in the United States of America, and only can we become energy independent when we develop all of our resources. I support that. I drive a hybrid car. I am not just somebody who talks about it, I believe it is important. It reduces my consumption, it extends my miles per gallon, and it is better for the environment.

But we have proven through the Solyndra and other cases that some of the alternative energy sources were either not perfected or frankly just don't work. So while we are developing ones that do, we should be robustly exploring in the gulf, in Alaska, in the Midwest, in the Northwest, and offshore, such as my State of Georgia, the resources we know exist to raise the supply of petroleum in the United States and lower the price to the American taxpayer.

All four sources of energy that are safe and reliable should be promoted. That includes nuclear energy. I am very proud and I am thankful to the President that he issued the loan guarantee on the first reactors licensed in this country since 1978. They are in Plant Vogtle in Augusta or Burke County, GA. But his Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission voted no on that final approval. He was outvoted 4 to 1, but he voted no. That sends a signal that we may talk on one hand about having robust development of all resources, but when it comes to playing our hand on the actual vote, we really don't do it. The same thing is true with the Keystone Pipeline. You can't just approve the pipeline to the south without connecting it to the north because if you do, you don't get the petroleum.

We can blame whomever we want to blame, but the fact is facts are stubborn, and supply and demand is what dictates price. We should robustly be exploring the natural resources of the United States for America to have less dependence on foreign oil and more dependence on our own oil where we know we have resources. We should pay attention to our environment and recognize that no country in the world has done a better job in the modern era since the industrial revolution of cleaning up its environment than the United States of America. No one looks after their environment harder than the United States of America. We owe it to our people to look equally hard at the cost of gasoline, the price of petroleum, and the robust exploration of our own natural resources here at home for less dependency overseas.

I yield the floor and defer to the Senator from Louisiana, who has a lot of offshore resources of his own.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise to talk about one of the most pressing challenges Louisiana families—indeed, most American families—face, and that is the price at the pump and the enormous hit that is to their family budgets, their pocketbooks, their wallets. It is really making life very difficult in the midst of a very weak economy.

A few years ago the price was $1.84. That was on the day Barack Obama was sworn in as President of the United States. Now it has more than doubled; it is $3.80-plus. It seems to be rising every day, and that is a real crisis to a lot of American families. We should be committed here in the Senate, here in Washington, to connecting with the real world and focusing on real problems and real crises. For millions of Louisiana and American families, that is absolutely it. Unfortunately, I don't see real solutions and a real policy to address that coming out of the President or some of my colleagues on the Senate floor. Right now, to the minute, as we speak on the Senate floor, the President is speaking at the White House, and he is laying out his proposal to raise taxes on domestic energy companies and domestic oil and gas production. That is not a policy that is going to help Louisiana and American families with the price at the pump. In fact, it is a policy that is going to make it worse and not better.

Folks get it in the real world. They certainly do in Louisiana. When we increase taxes on something, those are costs that almost every business, if they possibly can, is going to pass on to consumers. That is pushing prices up, not down.

It is also the first rule of economics, as my colleague from Georgia said, supply and demand. If we tax something more, we get less of it. If we increase taxes on domestic energy producers, on domestic oil and gas, we will get less of it. Less supply means the price goes up. So those are two compelling reasons this proposal is not going to help Louisiana families and American families with their struggles with the price at the pump. It is going to make it even worse, when it has been getting worse on its own for a lot of related reasons, very dramatically. So that is not a policy. That is not a commonsense or a real-world solution.

Likewise, one of the few other things I have heard from the President in terms of this matter is essentially begging other countries to increase their production. I don't think that is a policy worthy of America either. I think the perfect symbol for that approach is the President bowing to the princes of Saudi Arabia. It is a symbol of his approach of trying to deal with the price at the pump, and it is not good enough and it is not worthy of the American people.

Other folks have also adopted this approach. Senator SCHUMER, our colleague in this Chamber, recently wrote Secretary of State Clinton on February 28, 2012, just a few weeks ago:

> To address this situation—

Meaning the price at the pump—

> I urge the State Department to work with the government of Saudi Arabia to increase its oil production, as they are currently producing well under their capacity.

Begging Saudi Arabia is not an adequate solution, and it is not a policy worthy of America.

President Obama's own Energy Secretary Secretary Chu said even more recently, on March 20 of this year:

> We're very grateful that Saudi Arabia has extra capacity and it feels confident that it can fulfill any potential deficits, at least the way the current markets are now, the current demand I should say, are now.

Again, begging Saudi Arabia, begging the Middle East, begging other countries, that is not an adequate policy and it is not a policy worthy of America.

President Obama has done a world tour doing some of this in other countries. Notably, on March 20, 2011, when my part of the country was still struggling with the de facto moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico, a permit logjam blocking us from producing good, reliable American energy, putting Americans, Louisianans to work, the President went to Brazil to beg them to produce their resources and to promise them that the United States would be a great customer. Quote:

> We want to help you with the technology and support to develop these oil reserves safely. And when you're ready to start selling, we want to be one of your best customers. At a time when we've been reminded how easily instability in other parts of the world can affect the price of oil, the United States could not be happier with the potential for a new, stable source of energy.

He means drilling in Brazil. I have to say this was like rubbing salt in the wound to most Louisianans. As I said, this was March 2011, a year ago, and we were still suffering from a continuing de facto moratorium that the President had imposed following the BP incident. So he was going to Brazil and urging them to drill, urging them to explore, committing America to that, and refusing to do it in America in the Gulf of Mexico. That is not a commonsense solution. That is not a real-world policy. That is not a policy worthy of America. None of this begging is.

Other countries do have an energy policy, and it is not begging; it is developing. It is controlling their own future. Very recently in the press there have been reports that PetroChina has now become the leading company publicly traded in terms of production of oil, far surpassing Big Oil and all the other companies that have been demonized by my colleagues on the left on the Senate floor.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have the press report printed for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 29, 2012]

PETROCHINA PRODUCED MORE OIL THAN INDUSTRY GIANT EXXON MOBIL IN 2011

(By Associated Press)

NEW YORK.—A big shift is happening in Big Oil: an American giant now ranks behind a Chinese upstart.

Exxon Mobil is no longer the world's biggest publicly traded producer of oil. For the first time, that distinction belongs to a 13-year-old Chinese company called PetroChina. The Beijing company was created by the Chinese government to secure more oil for that nation's booming economy.

PetroChina announced Thursday that it pumped 2.4 million barrels a day last year, surpassing Exxon by 100,000. The company has grown rapidly over the last decade by squeezing more from China's aging oil fields and outspending Western companies to acquire more petroleum reserves in places like Canada, Iraq and Qatar. It's motivated by a need to lock up as much oil as possible.

The company's output increased 3.3 percent in 2011 while Exxon's fell 5 percent. Exxon's oil production also fell behind Rosneft, the Russian energy company.

PetroChina's rise highlights a fundamental difference in how the largest petroleum companies plan to supply the world as new deposits become tougher to find and more expensive to produce.

Every major oil company has aggressively pursued new finds to replace their current wells. But analysts say Western oil firms like Exxon Mobil have been more conservative than the Chinese, mindful of their bottom line and investor returns. With oil prices up 19 percent in 2011, they still made money without increasing production.

PetroChina Co. Ltd. has a different mission. The Chinese government owns 86 percent of its stock and the nation uses nearly every drop of oil PetroChina pumps. Its appetite for gasoline and other petroleum products is projected to double between 2010 and 2035.

''There's a lot of anxiety in China about the energy question,'' says energy historian Dan Yergin. ''It's just growing so fast.''

While PetroChina sits atop other publicly traded companies in oil production, it falls well short of national oil companies like Saudi Aramco, which produces nearly 8 million barrels a day. And Exxon is still the biggest publicly traded energy company when counting combined output of oil and natural gas. PetroChina ranks third behind Exxon and BP in total output of oil and natural gas.

PetroChina is looking to build on its momentum in 2012.

''We must push ahead,'' PetroChina chairman Jiang Jiemin said in January.

PetroChina has grown by pumping everything it can from reserves in China, estimated to contain more than 6.5 billion barrels. It drilled thousands of oil wells across vast stretches of the nation's northern grasslands. Some of those fields are ancient by industry standards, dating close to the beginning of China's communist government in the 1950s.

The commitment to aging fields distinguishes PetroChina from its biggest Western rivals. Exxon and other major oil companies typically sell their aging, low-performing fields, or they put them out of commission.

PetroChina also has been on a buying spree, acquiring new reserves in Iraq, Australia, Africa, Qatar and Canada. Since 2010, its acquisitions have totaled $7 billion, about

twice as much as Exxon, according to data provider Dealogic.

Several other Chinese companies have become deal makers around the globe as well. Total acquisitions by Chinese energy firms jumped from less than $2 billion between 2002 and 2003 to nearly $48 billion in 2009 and 2010, according to the International Energy Agency. More times than not, the companies are paying above the industry average to get those deals done.

It's making some in the West nervous.

In 2005, for example, CNOOC Ltd., a company mostly owned by the Chinese government tried to buy American oil producer Unocal. U.S. lawmakers worked to block the deal, asking President Bush to investigate the role the Chinese central government played in the process. Chevron Corp. eventually bought Unocal for $17.3 billion.

''There's a resistance to Chinese investment in (U.S.) oil and gas,'' Morningstar analyst Robert Bellinski says. ''It's like how Japan was to us in the 1980s. People think they're going to take us over. They're going to buy all of our resources.''

That's unlikely to happen. It doesn't make economic sense to export oil away from the world's largest oil consumer.

But the Chinese could make it tougher for Big Oil to generate returns for their shareholders. China's oil companies have been willing to outspend everyone and that drives up the price of fields and makes it more expensive for everyone to expand.

''You now have to outbid them,'' says Argus Research analyst Phil Weiss. ''If you can't, you're going to have access to fewer assets.''

Longer term, Chinese expansion globally will bring benefits to the U.S. and other economies. By developing as many oil wells as possible—especially in Africa, Iraq and other politically unstable regions—China will help expand supply.

''Frankly, the more risk-hungry producers there are, the more oil will be on the market, and the cheaper prices are,'' says Michael Levi, an energy policy expert at the Council on Foreign Relations.

Despite its swift expansion, PetroChina and other Chinese companies still have much to prove to investors, analysts say.

PetroChina's parent, China National Petroleum Corp., for example, has spent millions of dollars in Sudan to provide highways, medical facilities and shuttle buses for the elderly. Oil companies typically don't do that. All of that increases the cost of business and minimizes the returns for shareholders.

In 2009 and 2010, PetroChina's profit margins for its exploration and production business were only about two-thirds that of Exxon Mobil's. Its stock price has climbed less than 1 percent, in the past year, compared with a 3.7 percent rise in the stock of Exxon Mobil Corp.

''You have to ask yourself: What is the purpose of PetroChina?'' Bellinski says. ''It is to fuel China. That's it. Although they're a public company, I'm very skeptical that they have any interest in shareholder value creation.''

Mr. VITTER. The Chinese are not going around the world begging. The Chinese are developing. The Chinese are trying to control their own destiny, and PetroChina is now the leading company in terms of producing oil.

Petrobras in Brazil is another example. Brazil is developing its resources very aggressively. That is what I referred to when the President went there a year ago and applauded them and encouraged them with giving them U.S. resources to do it in terms of loan guarantees, and the President absolutely promised we would be a great customer.

The Brazilians are not traveling the world begging. The Brazilians are controlling their own destiny. The Brazilians are responsibly developing their own resources, and our President even applauds that while refusing to do the same in this country.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have the press report printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 19, 2012]

CHINA GETS JUMP ON U.S. FOR BRAZIL'S OIL—TWO EXPORT PACTS A COUP FOR BEIJING

(By Kelly Hearn)

BUENOS AIRES.—Off the coast of Rio de Janeiro—below a mile of water and two miles of shifting rock, sand and salt—is an ultradeep sea of oil that could turn Brazil into the world's fourth-largest oil producer, behind Russia, Saudi Arabia and the United States.

The country's state-controlled oil company, Petrobras, expects to pump 4.9 million barrels a day from the country's oil fields by 2020, with 40 percent of that coming from the seabed. One and a half million barrels will be bound for export markets.

The United States wants it, but China is getting it.

Less than a month after President Obama visited Brazil in March to make a pitch for oil, Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff was off to Beijing to sign oil contracts with two huge state-owned Chinese companies.

The deals are part of a growing oil relationship between the two countries that, thanks to a series of billion-dollar agreements, is giving China greater influence over Brazil's oil frontier.

Chinese oil companies are pushing to meet mandatory expansion targets by inking deals across Africa and Latin America, but they are especially interested in Brazil.

''With the Lula and Carioca discoveries alone, Brazil added a possible 38 billion barrels of estimated recoverable oil,'' said Luis Giusti, a former president of Venezuela's state oil company, PDVSA, referring to the new Brazilian oil fields.

''That immediately changed the picture,'' he said, adding that Brazil is on track to become ''an oil giant.''

During Mrs. Rousseff's visit to China, Brazil's Petrobras signed a technology cooperation deal with the China Petroleum & Chemical Corp., or Sinopec.

Petrobras also signed a memorandum of understanding with Sinochem, a massive state-owned company with interests in energy, real estate and agrichemicals.

The Sinochem deal aims to identify and build ''business opportunities in the fields of exploration and production, oil commercialization and mature oil-field recovery,'' according to Petrobras.

The relationship with China goes back to at least two years before Mr. Obama came to Brazil to applaud the oil discovery and tell Mrs. Rousseff:

''We want to work with you. We want to help with technology and support to develop these oil reserves safely, and, when you're ready to start selling, we want to be one of your best customers.''

China rescued Petrobras in 2009, when the oil company was looking at tight credit markets to finance a record-setting $224 billion investment plan. China's national development bank offered a $10 billion loan on the condition that Petrobras ship oil to China for 10 years.

A chunk of Brazil's oil real estate appeared on China's portfolio in 2010, when Sinopec agreed to pay $7.1 billion for 40 percent of Repsol-YPF of Brazil, which has stakes in the now internationally famous Santos Basin, and the Sapinhoa field, which has an estimated recoverable volume of 2.1 billion barrels. Statoil of Norway also agreed that year to sell 40 percent of the offshore Peregrino field to Sinochem.

Last year, Sinopec announced it would buy 30 percent of GALP of Brazil, a Portuguese company, for $3.5 billion. GALP has interests in the Santos Basin and a 10 percent stake in the massive Lula field.

''The $5.2 billion cash-in we will get from Sinopec is paramount for our strategy in Brazil,'' GALP CEO Manuel Ferreira de Oliveira told Bloomberg News.

''It will give us a rock-solid capital base as we enter a decisive investment period at the Santos Basin. This operation values our existing Brazilian assets at $12.5 billion and is really a landmark for the company and for our shareholders.''

News reports in December said Sinopec is the current favorite to buy stakes in Brazilian oil owned by Britain's BG Group, which also has interests in the massive fields of Carioca, Guara, Lula and Lara.

On Jan 8., the French company Perenco announced it was selling Sinochem a 10 percent stake in five offshore blocks located in the Espirito Santos Basin. Some of the transactions still await approval by Brazil's government.

In December, Venezuelan Oil Minister Rafael Ramirez publicly reiterated his government's commitment to an oil refinery joint venture with Petrobras.

That project reportedly is set to be funded by China's national development bank. Some news reports have quoted the head of China's development bank saying that new deals with Brazil are under consideration.

James Williams, an energy economist with the U.S. consulting group WTRG Economics, said the Chinese are taking on big risks with ultra-deep-water investments.

''But for them, the benefits are greater, as they become partners with companies that have better technology and expertise,'' he said.

Mr. VITTER. According to recent press reports, there is a budding and building relationship between Brazil and China, and China is taking advantage and forming contracts to take advantage of that resource. We should learn a thing or two from other folks around the world, and we should not just beg; we should build and develop. We should take our own future into our own hands, and we have an enormous opportunity to do that.

The United States is actually the single most energy-rich country in the world, bar none. When we look at total energy resources, we lead the world. Russia is second, and other countries follow way behind. Saudi Arabia is third but cannot compare in terms of total resources. No Middle Eastern country can compare, and China is below that. We have the resources. We are the single most energy-rich country in the world, and this map shows it.

We have enormous reserves, particularly shale in the West, natural gas in

finds on land, and offshore enormous potential of reserves of oil. Literally, there are hundreds of years' worth. So what is the problem? The problem is we are the only country in the world that puts well over 90 percent of those resources off-limits and doesn't develop them, but we can do better.

We can reasonably, responsibly, and safely open that access. We can do what Brazil is doing; we can do what China is doing. We do not have to beg. We can have a policy worthy of America and Americans. We can take control of our own destiny.

What will that mean? It will mean great U.S. jobs, which by definition cannot be outsourced. We cannot have a domestic energy job producing good, reliable energy in the United States and outsource it to China or India. We will build more energy independence, not having to beg Saudi Arabia or go to Brazil as a customer or anything else. We will even increase revenue to lower deficit and debt. After the Federal income tax, the biggest source of revenue to the Federal Government is royalty or revenue on domestic oil production. It is second only to Federal income tax. It would be enormous new revenue to reduce deficit and debt. And, of course, we can help lower the price at the pump. We can increase supply, which lowers the price.

So I urge us to do what the American people want us to do: to adopt common sense, to adopt a real policy, and to take control of our own destiny. Begging is not a policy, at least not one worthy of Americans. This tax proposal to increase taxes on U.S. oil companies and domestic oil production is not a policy that will do anything but increase the price at the pump, decrease supply, and that is the opposite of what we need. Let's do what will make a difference: increase supply, control our own destiny, and do more right here at home.

I yield back the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

RISING TO THE OCCASION

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, in a moment I am going to speak about energy. But, first of all—as I was waiting to have the opportunity to do this—I want to thank Senator MCCONNELL for giving us an update on what is going on in Kentucky. We do a lot of very important things here. One of the things I am going to talk about, energy, is one of the most important, and yet it is good to hear the stories of ordinary Americans doing extraordinary things. This truly is what our country is all about, and my thoughts and prayers are with the people of Kentucky. But it is so refreshing—we talk a lot about our problems, but the strength of America is people like the folks in Kentucky and all throughout America who rise to the occasion as they need to.

The increasing price of gas is a costly reminder of how dependent our country is on foreign oil. This is one of the most pressing issues we face today because the price at the pump directly impacts our everyday lives, and Arkansans are telling me they are worried about what it is doing to their bottom line.

Americans are frustrated with the increase in the cost of gas, and rightfully so. In my home State of Arkansas, the cost for a regular gallon of gas is up 22 cents from a month ago according to AAA. The letters, calls, e-mails and Facebook posts I receive from Arkansas are saying the same thing. It is harder to fill their tanks while making ends meet.

Arkansas families are faced with tough choices because the rising prices are dipping into their family's disposable income. The increase in the price of gas puts a strain on family budgets.

Earlier this week I hosted a townhall with Arkansans throughout the State. While I expected the major discussion to be about this issue, I was surprised at how much it dominated the conversation. During the event we took an informal poll asking participants if the increase of gas has forced significant changes in their daily habits. Seventy-eight percent of those who answered said the price had a significant impact.

Sarah, from Mountain Home, AK, said on her Facebook page that the increase in gas prices has forced her family to allocate more money for fuel expenses, which leaves less money for food, making it frustrating. Sarah and other Arkansans should not have to choose between getting gas to get to work and the necessities they need in the household.

Chris from Mena, AK, wrote that he notices an increase in the price of groceries. He said:

> People should be aware of how fuel costs affect everything we buy and do.

I agree with Chris because the increased price for gas adds to the transportation costs that are passed along to consumers.

Donnie Smith, the CEO of the Springdale-based Tysons Food, told the Arkansas Business Journal that with Springdale as a price point, there has been an increase of more than 55 percent in the cost of diesel in the past 5 years. This is significant because the company uses fuel to transport feed to family farmers, chickens to and from the farms, and the finished products to customers around the world.

American families and businesses deserve a plan that will help bring down the prices at the pump. The legislation before this Chamber proposed to raise taxes on American energy producers. This will not change supply and demand, as Senator ISAKSON talked about a few minutes ago. These are basic truths. Supply and demand does control costs. This will do nothing to that.

Again, hard-working Americans will be left with the bill as a result if this bill were passed. I believe the better way begins with adopting an energy strategy that increases production of American energy in a clean, efficient way through developing wind, solar, and hydrogen technologies as well as tapping into the vast majority of natural resources our country is blessed with.

The reality of our country's nonexistent energy policy is it forces us to rely on the Middle East for oil. We import about 9 million barrels of oil every day, half of our supply. This is costly to our economy, our citizens, and it threatens our national security. This is the only developed country in the world that refuses to use its natural resources. Opening Alaska's Wildlife Refuge and increasing offshore exploration on the Outer Continental Shelf is a step in the right direction that puts us on a path of energy independence. We can boost our domestic energy supply through the development of the Keystone XL Pipeline. The proposed 1,700-mile pipeline would transport 700,000 barrels of oil per day from Canada to U.S. refineries in the gulf coast and allow us to get reliable and secure oil from our largest trading partner and trusted ally. Unfortunately, while I support this project and voted in favor of it several times in this Chamber, the project was rejected by the majority after President Obama took the time to lobby his Members to vote against it after vetoing the project earlier this year.

There is no time like today to pass legislation to fully utilize the resources we have been blessed with in our country, but this should not come at the cost of our energy producers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you very much, Mr. President. If the Chair would please let me know when I have used 5 minutes, I would appreciate that.

We have a very important vote in front of us that goes to the question of whether consumers are going to continue to be held hostage by basically having one energy source at the pump or whether we are going to give competition to the oil companies and if we are going to give consumers choice.

I believe we need to do everything; there is no question about that in my mind, but that doesn't mean having a Tax Code that has embedded in it for almost 100 years special tax breaks and subsidies for the oil companies, and the other new clean energy alternatives that are growing and creating jobs in our country do not have the same treatment. In fact, they limp along with a tax cut that expires every year, not sure if it is going to continue, which is what is happening right now.

People are losing their jobs right now in the areas of wind production and other areas because they are not sure what is going to happen. Yet we give preferential treatment to an industry right now whose top five companies are making about $260,000 a minute—a minute. For people in Michigan, the

average wage does not equal $260,000 a year, yet $260,000 a minute in profits for the oil companies, and we as customers, as consumers, have the great privilege of on the one hand paying whatever they want to charge at the pump because there are no alternatives and not enough choices, and at the same time out of the other pocket we get to subsidize them.

One hundred years ago those subsidies probably made a lot of sense. I am sure I would have voted for them as we were starting the new industrial economy and incentivizing the production of oil certainly made sense. I still support the efforts for small businesses and local efforts, but the top five companies do not need taxpayer subsidies right now when they have the highest profits of any business in the world.

So what are we talking about? We are talking about—in tough times and budget deficits and when we need to be focused on jobs and getting us off of foreign oil—making choices that make sense for the future and not the past. That means closing down these special subsidies for the top five companies that, again, are earning profits of about $260,000 every single minute, and turning those dollars over to new clean energy alternatives such as biofuels, wind, solar, electric batteries, and all of the things that need to happen—including natural gas, which my colleague from New Jersey has been a champion of—so that we actually have real competition and we can actually go look at the price at the pump and say, you know what, it is too much; I am going to do something else.

We are beginning that process with new electric vehicles and I am proud that those are being made in Michigan. We have advanced biofuels right now. If we didn't have advanced biofuels at the pump in the few places we do, we would actually see prices a dollar higher on average than they are right now. So there is a little bit of competition, but we have a long way to go.

This bill takes dollars from subsidies that are no longer needed, that don't make sense from the American taxpayers' standpoint or an energy standpoint, and turns them over to continue 19 different tax cuts for entrepreneurs, small businesses, and those who are creating the new clean energy alternatives in the future.

Some of my colleagues on the other side have said that taking away government subsidies will increase prices. It is amazing to me that somehow Friday seems to increase prices; Memorial Day seems to increase prices. I think whatever the market will bear increases prices. But when the CEOs of the big five companies came to the Finance Committee I actually asked them—because folks are saying taking away government subsidies for them will increase prices. I said: How much do we have to pay you to bring down the price? Give me a number. How much do we have to pay you to bring down the price?

Finally, one of the CEOs actually said: Well, I did not say we would be raising gas prices at the pump. I did not hear anyone else say that, either.

So that is what they said. They were not willing to go on record as saying they would raise the prices at the pump.

Instead of throwing huge government handouts at some of the most profitable companies ever, we should be paying down the debt and we should be providing tax cuts for the jobs and the new alternatives for the future, and I urge my colleagues to support this very important bill.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. ENZI. Today I wish to discuss high gasoline prices and to express my concern that the legislator we are debating will only cause the price at the pump to increase. We need to have a serious debate about energy policy in the Senate. We have not passed substantial energy legislation since 2007, and without a sound energy policy, we will continue to see price instability.

Unfortunately, the legislation we are debating is not that sound energy policy. Instead, it is an effort at political theater, designed to force a vote on a proposal that the majority finds politically popular.

Republicans understand that the problem we face today will not be solved by taxing the five largest oil companies. Unlike the majority, we understand that you cannot expect to lower energy prices when you increase taxes. Increasing taxes will lead to higher prices.

I want to see lower prices, and so I oppose S. 2204. Instead of passing this legislation, the Senate should take up any one of the ideas my colleagues and I have proposed.

The Senate should pass legislation to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline so we can obtain more of our energy from Canada as opposed to countries like Saudi Arabia. The Senate should pass legislation to prohibit the EPA from implementing its greenhouse gas policy—which will make it more difficult to use our most abundant, domestic energy source—coal—to power our homes, businesses, and daily lives.

The Senate should pass legislation to open up more areas of the Outer Continental Shelf to exploration and production, and should require the administration to grant permits for responsible energy development. We should also pass legislation to open up a small area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, ANWR, to energy development.

Any one of those actions would have a much more positive impact on our Nation's energy situation than the legislation we are debating today. S. 2204 is an effort to punish the Nation's five largest energy companies because oil prices are high.

Republicans stand ready to have a serious debate on energy because we know our policies are the best solution for achieving energy security. We recognize that the problems we are facing are an undersupply of oil as well as an instability in some countries where a substantial amount of oil is produced.

To address these issues, I want to produce more American oil on American soil. I want to see more oil produced in regions like the ANWR. I want to determine what technology is needed to recover the nearly 800 billion barrels of oil shale that the Rand Corporation has suggested are recoverable. I want to see permits granted in areas of Wyoming so we can develop our State's coal bed methane. We also want to see more wind turbines and solar energy panels in places where they make sense.

Republicans truly support an ''all of the above'' approach. We support traditional sources like coal, oil, and natural gas. We support alternative sources like wind and solar. And our record shows that to be the case.

President Obama claims to support an ''all of the above'' approach. However, his record shows something different. Earlier this week, his administration released a rule that will make it exceedingly difficult to build a coal-fired power plant in the future. That action follows his administration's decision in 2010 to put a moratorium on leasing in the Gulf of Mexico and their decision to put in place policies that make it more difficult to develop natural resources on our Federal lands. President Obama claims to support natural gas—at the same time his administration seeks to stop hydraulic fracturing, the tool that has allowed us to access our abundant natural gas reserves.

President Obama also claims that there isn't a silver bullet to bring prices down. That may be true, but if you add up all of his administration's efforts to hold up American energy production, there are a number of measures we could undertake to make our situation better. Unfortunately, the legislation we are debating today is not one of those measures.

What's further unfortunate about S. 2204 is that it is an attempt to punish a sector of our economy that is doing well. The oil and gas sector has created jobs during the recession and employs more than 9 million American workers. It is a sector that employs a lot of people in my State. In 2010, more than 21,000 workers were employed in the oil and gas industry in Wyoming. Instead of punishing these companies for their success, we should be finding ways to work with them so they can put more Americans back to work.

It is valuable to have a discussion about energy like we have had this week. It allows us to point out the differences between the vision we offer of more production and more jobs versus the vision of our colleagues on the other side, which is essentially higher taxes and higher energy prices. When we have finished voting on S. 2204, which everyone acknowledges will fail, we should sit down and have a full debate about our energy future. I am confident that our vision is the right one if

we want an America that has a secure energy future.

I urge my colleagues to oppose S. 2204.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act, which I have cosponsored.

This legislation would repeal five specific tax subsidies and a royalty relief provision to the largest oil companies, which simply do not need them and which our Federal Government definitely cannot afford. And this bill would invest the savings from repealing these subsidies to extend vital clean energy incentives that have recently expired. It would also save billions of dollars in order to reduce the deficit.

This is a simple vote, really. If you are for subsidizing profitable and polluting industries and raising taxes on clean, innovative, and renewable energy companies, you should not support this bill. But if you are for fiscal responsibility, balancing the Federal budget, and investing in a cleaner energy industry that is less dependent on international oil markets and suppliers, you should vote yes.

If you are against increasing taxes on clean energy sources such as wind, solar, and energy efficiency, you should vote yes. And if you believe that we cannot afford to spend Federal dollars subsidizing an industry that needs no help, you should vote yes.

Oil prices have risen to well above $100 per barrel, and according to AAA, California currently has the highest gasoline prices of any State in the continental United States, currently at $4.30 per gallon of regular unleaded.

But these higher prices are not the result of a change in the cost of producing and refining oil.

According to a Finance Committee analysis of the SEC filings of the three largest oil companies in the United States that filed, it costs them an average of $11 to produce one barrel of oil. At today's prices that is nearly $100 in pure profit for each barrel.

The result is massive oil company profits on the backs of American consumers. Last year, the top five oil companies made more than $135 billion in profit. That is an increase of 80% over what they made in 2010.

Yet the largest oil companies are not using these profits to produce more oil. Oil production for the biggest five oil companies was down 4 percent last year.

Instead of using their enormous revenues to invest in drilling, the big five oil companies are buying back stock, issuing dividends, and lobbying governments.

For example, Shell Oil's profits increased by 54 percent between 2010 and 2011. But its production decreased by 3 percent.

And the American taxpayer is providing oil subsidies that increase profits, stock prices, and dividends—and don't produce more oil or lower gasoline prices.

U.S. taxpayers subsidize these hugely profitable oil companies to the tune of over $2 billion dollars per year, year after year.

Some Members of Congress still believe these subsidies lead to lower gas prices, despite all evidence to the contrary.

As Severin Borenstein, the codirector of University of California Center for the Study of Energy Markets, recently said:

> The incremental change in production that might result from changing oil subsidies will have no impact on world oil prices, and therefore no impact on gasoline prices.

According to an analysis by the Congressional Research Service, repealing tax subsidies for Big Oil would not result in higher gasoline prices.

CRS concludes that because the current $100-per-barrel price of oil far exceeds the cost of production, it is unlikely that a small increase in taxes would reduce output in a manner that decreases supply resulting in higher gasoline prices.

Yet these subsidies continue.

This bill eliminates five tax subsidies that lower the tax burden for oil companies without producing a public benefit.

These changes will prevent oil companies from deducting things like payments to foreign governments and also prohibit oil companies from claiming that oil production is ''domestic manufacturing'' deserving of incentives designed to help manufacturers compete with Chinese factories.

This legislation also includes the key provisions of the Deepwater Drilling Royalty Relief Prohibition Act, a bill Senator BILL NELSON and I introduced to eliminate royalty relief that rewards dangerous oil drilling methods.

By eliminating sections 344 and 345 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 that provided mandatory royalty relief for deepwater gas and oil production on the Outer Continental Shelf, this bill will ensure that Americans receive fair value for federally owned mineral resources.

In 2005, Congress created this royalty-relief program to encourage exploration and production in the ocean's very deepest waters.

But the BP Deepwater Horizon catastrophe showed that safety and response technologies are not sufficient in deep waters to justify this incentive.

When the Deepwater Horizon well blew out, 11 people died and 17 others were injured. Oil and gas rushed into the Gulf of Mexico for 87 days.

Oil slicks spread across the Gulf of Mexico, tar balls spoiled the pristine white sand beaches of Florida, wetlands were coated with toxic sludge, and more than one-third of Federal waters in the gulf were closed to fishing.

This week, the National Academy of Sciences found that plumes of subsurface oil substantially damaged a community of deep-sea gulf corals.

Drilling in deep water presents substantially more challenges and technical difficulties than drilling in shallow water or on shore.

The ocean currents on the surface and in the water column exert torque pressure on the pipes and cables, which are longer and heavier.

The ocean pressure increases dramatically at depth, and the pressure in a well can exceed 10,000 pounds per square inch.

The volume of drilling mud and fluids is greater, and many technical procedures can only be accomplished with the use of remotely controlled robots thousands of feet below the surface.

Methane hydrate crystals form when methane gas mixes with pressurized cold ocean waters, and the likelihood of these crystals forming increases dramatically at a depth of about 400 meters.

This crystallization repeatedly impeded efforts to stop the gushing oil and was a primary reason it took so long to stop BP's Deepwater Horizon spill.

Bottom line: the risks of drilling for oil in thousands of feet of water are far higher than other oil exploration methods, and spills are both ecologically devastating and hard to stop.

American taxpayers should not forego revenue in order to incentivize this most dangerous form of offshore drilling. It is not good environmental policy, and it is not good energy policy either.

I believe that global warming is the biggest environmental crisis we face, and the biggest culprit of global warming is manmade emissions produced by the combustion of fossil fuels like oil and coal.

That is why I believe it is unconscionable that Congress allowed the taxes on renewable sources of energy to go up on December 31, while taxpayer-funded subsidies continue to finance production of fossil fuels.

I have worked with my colleagues on a number of legislative initiatives designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, increase energy efficiency, and incentivize the use of renewable energy.

One of our biggest victories has been an aggressive fuel economy law, called the Ten in Ten Fuel Economy Act, which was enacted in 2007.

In order to implement this law, the Obama administration has raised fleetwide fuel economy standards to 35.5 mpg in 2016—a 40-percent increase above today's standard. The fleetwide average will rise to 54.5 mpg by 2025.

This is important because these standards will dramatically reduce the economic burden of massive swings in the price of oil and gasoline on American families.

By 2025, the average new car will reduce what an American family spends on gasoline by $5,200 to $6,600 during the life of vehicle, and that is assuming relatively affordable gas prices in the $3 per gallon range.

If prices were to stay at today's levels, this law will save American families even more money.

The other positive development is that the domestic renewable energy industry has grown dramatically over the last few years due to the Federal incentives that are expiring and which this legislation would extend.

The Treasury Grants Program, which expired in December, has helped fund the installation of more than 22,000 renewable energy projects with a generating capacity of more than 14,000 megawatts.

The production tax credit has allowed wind power capacity to more than triple since 2005. If the production tax credit is not extended by the end of this year, Navigant Consulting estimates that annual installations of wind will drop by more than 75 percent, wind-supported jobs will decline from 78,000 in 2012 to 41,000 in 2013, and total wind investment will drop by nearly two-thirds, from $15.6 billion in 2012 to $5.5 billion in 2013.

We simply cannot afford as a nation to abandon the renewable energy industry just as it is emerging as a major force in our economy.

These are private sector jobs in a growing industry that is competing globally.

Just 2 years ago, the United States added more new capacity to produce renewable electricity than it did to produce electricity from natural gas, oil, and coal combined, for the first time. A great deal of this growth can be attributed to government renewable energy incentives. That is where public investment in energy development should go.

The Obama administration has offered up millions of acres of Federal land for oil extraction by oil companies. As a result, production on these Federal lands has increased.

In fact, of the over 12,000 permits that the Obama administration has issued since 2009, 7,000 sit idle.

But the fact is that whether or not the Federal government has opened enough land to oil drilling has almost nothing to do with gas prices, even though many politicians argue it does.

According to a statistical analysis of 36 years of monthly, inflation-adjusted gasoline prices and U.S. domestic oil production by the Associated Press released this month, ''there is no statistical correlation between how much oil comes out of U.S. wells and the price at the pump.''

The AP writes:

> If more domestic oil drilling worked as politicians say, you'd now be paying about $2 a gallon for gasoline. . . . More oil production in the United States does not mean consistently lower prices at the pump.

Since February 2009, U.S. oil production has increased 15 percent when seasonally adjusted. Prices in those 3 years went from $2.07 per gallon to $3.58. It was a case of drilling more and paying much more.

U.S. oil production is back to the same level it was in March 2003, when gas cost $2.10 per gallon when adjusted for inflation. But that is not what prices are now.

I don't believe oil companies need taxpayer dollars to help them out. They are already reaping record profits.

Over the last decade, the five largest oil companies have enjoyed nearly $1 trillion in profits and tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies. Yet we continue to use taxpayer dollars to add to their bottom line. This is unacceptable.

Oil reserves are a public resource. When a private company profits from those public resources, American taxpayers should receive a royalty as compensation. And when oil companies profit by charging $4 per gallon of gas, they should pay income taxes like the rest of us do instead of relying on billions of dollars of tax subsidies to avoid their obligations.

In these critical economic times, every cent of the people's money should be spent wisely.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I have been monitoring the debate on my Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act and I keep hearing over and over from our friends on the other side of the aisle that if we keep giving the oil companies taxpayer money, they will do the right thing. The problem is we already know that is not true.

First of all, the United States has only 2 percent of the world's oil reserves, so we cannot drill our way out of this problem even if we wanted to. But, more importantly, we cannot trust the big five oil companies to simply do the right thing.

Let's look at the record. Last year, the big five oil companies took $2 billion of your money and saw their profits shoot up to $137 billion—an impressive 75-percent increase in profits. Did they use that extra money we gave them in our subsidies to produce more oil? No, they didn't. They took your money and they didn't produce a drop more of oil. Despite the fact that overall U.S. oil production is higher now than it has been in the last 8 years, last year these five companies actually produced 4 percent less oil.

So here is another way to look at it. As each of these companies pocketed our subsidies to pad those profits, they did not use this windfall to produce more oil. If we take the word of our friends on the other side of the aisle, we have a contract, in essence, with these five companies. We pay them $2 billion and they give us more oil. Last year, they broke that contract and produced less. So it appears that these poor oil companies took the taxpayers' $2 billion and instead of having to suffer with only $135 billion in profits, they made $137 billion in profits last year.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I would be happy to at the end of my remarks.

What a heartwarming story of Robin Hood in reverse—taking from the American taxpayer to give to the rich. So congratulations, Big Oil, you got $2 billion extra in profits and we got 4 percent less oil.

But, of course, we are not just seeing less oil, we are also seeing the American driver gouged with higher gasoline prices. What happens when taxpayers are forking over $2 billion in subsidies a year to highly profitable oil companies that, in turn, produce less? We get a double whammy with $4-a-gallon gas at the pump and a bigger burden on taxpayers. How is that a fair return on our taxpayer dollars? It is pretty generous to Big Oil, which stands to profit $1 trillion over the next decade while getting $24 billion in subsidies, but it is a bad deal for consumers struggling to make ends meet.

First, the Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act takes back $24 billion in taxpayer subsidies to Big Oil and stops that insanity. The next step the bill takes is investing in alternatives to oil—biofuels, natural gas, propane, and a refueling infrastructure for these fuels as well. By investing in these alternatives we finally give Big Oil some competition in the marketplace that will give consumers the choice to use cheaper fuels as well as drive down gas prices.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in getting back to reality and stop subsidizing industries that need it the least and start investing in the 21st century industries that will help us compete with China, that will create jobs, that will improve our environment and make us more energy secure. It is time we stopped trusting Big Oil to do the right thing with our money and use it on things that actually make sense.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have one question before this morning's vote—one simple question: Is this the best we can do? Is this the best we have to offer folks who are staring at $4-a-gallon gasoline, a bill that even Democrats admit won't do anything at all to lower the price of gas, and a process that blocks any other idea from even coming to the floor for a vote? Is this the best we can do? No other idea has been allowed other than a proposal that will inevitably raise the price of gasoline at the pump. Does anybody think the Senate has done its job on this issue?

Well, if you don't, if you think we should do more for the American people at a time when they are paying $4 a gallon for gas than raise taxes on energy manufacturers and block a pipeline from Canada, then you ought to vote against cloture. You should stand with Republicans and insist we do more to lower gas prices in this country.

I see the President made a statement a little while ago in support of this proposed tax hike. My question is: Where

was the White House when the Democrats voted to actually get off of this proposal? Maybe they were too busy lining up votes against the Keystone Pipeline. Maybe the President was too busy telling the Russians about how he is hoping for more flexibility.

My point is Democrats don't have to take orders from the White House. They don't need to serve the President's political strategy. They can do what their constituents want them to do on this issue. They can vote to stay on this bill and fight for real solutions to the problems of high gas prices and any other number of issues the Democrats refuse to face, for that matter. We can use this institution to actually make a difference. I hope at some point that is what my colleagues on the other side decide to do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

REPEAL BIG OIL TAX SUBSIDIES ACT—RESUMED

Pending:

Reid amendment No. 1968, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 1969 (to Amendment No. 1968), of a perfecting nature.

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions, Reid amendment No. 1970, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 1971 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 1970), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 1972 (to amendment No. 1971), of a perfecting nature.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on S. 2204, a bill to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation.

Harry Reid, Robert Menendez, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeff Merkley, Patrick J. Leahy, Michael F. Bennet, John F. Kerry, Al Franken, Tom Udall, Jeanne Shaheen, Bill Nelson, Daniel K. Akaka, Claire McCaskill, Christopher A. Coons, Jack Reed, Richard Blumenthal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 2204, a bill to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted: ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 63 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Akaka	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Harkin	Pryor
Bingaman	Inouye	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kerry	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cantwell	Kohl	Schumer
Cardin	Lautenberg	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Snowe
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Collins	Lieberman	Tester
Conrad	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—47

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Heller	Paul
Blunt	Hoeven	Portman
Boozman	Hutchison	Risch
Brown (MA)	Inhofe	Roberts
Burr	Isakson	Rubio
Chambliss	Johanns	Sessions
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Coburn	Kyl	Thune
Cochran	Landrieu	Toomey
Corker	Lee	Vitter
Cornyn	Lugar	Webb
Crapo	McCain	Wicker
DeMint	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—2

Hatch	Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 47. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The senior Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, we just had a vote. Imagine for a minute we had a government that was spending too much money, and imagine for a minute that we needed to spend less money; that we needed to change our Tax Code to a Tax Code that was fair, simpler, and didn't pick winners and losers. Imagine for a minute this was a crisis, and imagine for a minute this crisis was being wielded like a political 2 by 4 by the majority of the Republicans who serve in the Senate—the debt crisis.

Then imagine for a minute that we had the most profitable corporations in the history of the planet and they were booking $30 billion in profit every quarter; over $130 billion in profits year after year, didn't matter whether the economy was bad, good or indifferent—amazing profits.

Then imagine for a minute this government—that doesn't have enough money, where the debt is the political talking point of my friends across the aisle—tries to do something simple by saying maybe we shouldn't be spending money on the most profitable corporations in the world. That is what this vote just was.

How seriously can we take anybody who talks about debt reduction if they are not willing to pluck the low-hanging fruit of subsidies to a group of folks who, frankly, in Missouri, I guarantee you most people I represent would say are the least deserving of extra help from the Federal Government right now.

If we think about it, what we are doing is we are borrowing money to prop up, to the tune of billions of dollars a year, already wildly profitable corporations that don't have to pay us royalties because they get to deduct the royalties they pay other countries.

Seriously, if this was a fairytale I was reading to my grandsons—if I was reading this fairytale to Ian or Levy or Isaac—they would say: Well, this obviously is fiction because this couldn't be true. But it is, and that is what I call the definition of a special interest—that oil is so special around here, wields so much power and so much money that it turns all the talk about debt reduction into empty rhetoric.

Last year, the five companies spent $38 billion boosting their share prices just through stock buybacks—$38 billion in stock buybacks last year. In other words, the five largest oil companies spent in a single year on stock buybacks alone what they are claiming they need in taxpayer-funded subsidies over the next 10 years.

According to ExxonMobil's quarterly filings, every time the price of oil goes up by $1, they bring in $350 million in annual profit. These companies don't need these subsidies.

I hear people say, Well, if you don't give them the subsidies—which, by the way, is chickenfeed to them. What, $6 billion, $8 billion a year is nothing if you are banking $30 billion in profits a quarter. I have heard people say, If we don't give them this extra help, then they are going to quit exploring for oil and the price of gas will go up. That is so dumb. They have had these subsidies for 30, 40, 50 years. I think most of Americans realize the price of oil has gone up just fine during that time. We are paying plenty at the gas pump right now, and they have got those subsidies. How is that working out for us? Those subsidies are really keeping down the price of gasoline, aren't they?

The former Shell CEO, John Hofmeister, is on record as saying:

> In the face of sustained high oil prices it is not an issue—for large companies—of needing the subsidies to entice us into looking for and producing more oil . . . my point of view is that with high oil prices such subsidies are unnecessary.

This is the CEO of Shell. He is admitting on the record that these subsidies

are unnecessary. At the time the Shell CEO said that, the price of oil was trading between $95 and $98 a barrel. Currently, it is at $105 a barrel. Contrary to the claims that some are making, eliminating these subsidies will not raise gas prices.

Last year, the companies spent $70 million to lobby to keep their subsidies. They get about $30 in tax breaks for every $1 they spend in lobbying. No wonder they spent that much on lobbying.

I want to take people at their word, and I want to take people seriously about debt reduction. I have cosponsored spending caps with my Republican colleagues. I have worked hard on reforming the way we spend money around here, whether it is contracting or earmarks. But with all due respect, I don't know how the American people can take anyone seriously about debt reduction if they are not willing to cut off from the spigot the most wealthy, profitable corporations in the history of the world.

How will we ever be able to look our grandchildren in the eye and say, You know, we took care of your future by making sure that our government was fiscally balanced. How can we ever do that if we can't do this as an easy first step? Can you imagine how paralyzed this place will be when we start talking about the kinds of cuts that hurt people who need them? And by the way, they are willing to make those. Talk about fairness. Think about this for a minute, economic fairness.

The Ryan budget would want to hold onto more tax breaks for multimillionaires—in fact, do more tax breaks for multimillionaires—while they say to seniors, You know, we think it is time for you to wrestle with insurance companies for your health care. I know what it is like to wrestle with insurance companies for health care. Every American does. My mom doesn't have to. She is on Medicare. It gives her peace of mind.

If you look at what our friends are proposing in terms of fairness and you look at the vote we just had, in Missouri we would say that dog don't hunt. It doesn't work.

I hope in good faith that my Republican colleagues will quit thinking we need to continue to write checks to the wealthiest corporations in the history of the planet. I think Missourians—when I fill up my gas tank over the next 2 weeks as I travel around Missouri, I am going to stop people at the gas station and say, Do you think the royalties ExxonMobil pays to another country should be deducted from what they owe us? Think about that. It is ludicrous in this financial environment that we are in, in the U.S. Government. There are real people hurting out there, and we need to treat them fairly. We can start by pushing Big Oil away from the taxpayer trough, and I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will reconsider and that we will get a chance to vote on this again and that they can show the American people we all get it.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). The Senator from Rhode Island.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the changes the affordable care act is making to the way care is delivered in our health care system. This is a topic that has not received much public attention. Instead, the public debate has largely focused on contentious flashpoints such as the individual mandate or preposterous false claims about death panels or rationing or socialized medicine.

While these contentious debates have raged on, there has been a quiet, steady, and important effort made by the health care industry, by State and local leaders, and by the Obama administration to improve our model of health care delivery. Progress made on these efforts is steadily transforming the care that is delivered under our health care system, from care that is disorganized and fragmented and often riddled with error, to care that is coordinated, efficient, and the high quality Americans deserve. By improving the quality of care and our health outcomes, these delivery system reforms promise to significantly reduce health care costs. Care gets better, costs go down, a true win-win.

I came to the floor today to release a report on health care delivery system reform and on the administration's progress implementing these provisions of the affordable care act. I undertook this project with the support and assistance of Chairman HARKIN and Senator MIKULSKI, both strong advocates and experienced legislators on the types of reforms that are highlighted in the report.

The report makes the case for the reforms our country urgently needs in order to tackle our health care cost problem. My report defines five priority areas of health care delivery system reform: payment reform, quality improvement, primary and preventive care, administrative costs, and health information infrastructure. It outlines the potential cost savings in each area.

It also highlights successes across the country from leading private health providers such as Geisinger Health Systems in Pennsylvania, Intermountain Healthcare in Utah, and the Marshfield Clinic in Wisconsin, to the State of Vermont's Blueprint for Health, to several examples in my home State of Rhode Island, which has shown great leadership. We have much to learn from these efforts, and the affordable care act gives us the tools to support this type of reform across the country.

The problem is our health care delivery system remains clumsy and wasteful. We spend more than 18 percent of America's gross domestic product on our health care system every year. To put that into context, the highest any other industrialized country spends is approximately 12 percent of gross domestic product on health care. Eighteen percent United States of America; least efficient other industrialized country in the world, 12 percent. Huge room for improvement. In a nutshell, we overspend and underachieve.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers estimated that over $700 billion a year can be saved without compromising health outcomes. The Institutes of Medicine put the savings from these kinds of reforms at $765 billion a year. The New England Health Care Institute projected $850 billion in savings annually, and the Lewin Group and former Bush Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill have estimated the savings at $1 trillion a year. Whichever is accurate, this is clearly an enormous opportunity and it is right before us. We can achieve better results for American patients and families, and spend less to do it.

As I said, the solutions fall into five priority areas: payment reform, primary and preventive care, measuring and reporting quality, administrative simplification, and health information infrastructure. These solutions do not cut benefits; they do not increase premiums. Instead, they realign incentives to reduce or get rid of overpriced or unnecessary services, inefficiently delivered care, excessive administrative costs, and missed prevention opportunities.

In this report, we outline actual savings and care improvements that can be found in each priority area. For example, payment reform refers to the new payment reform models that pay doctors more for getting better results, as opposed to ordering more procedures.

In 2010, Blue Shield of California collaborated with Hill Physicians Medical Group and Catholic Healthcare West, California's largest hospital chain, on a pilot program for the California Public Employees Retirement System. The pilot program focused on improved coordination of care by sharing clinical and case management information across medical facilities and among physicians.

In its first year, the Blue Shield pilot program reported impressive results: Readmissions were reduced by 15 percent; hospital days were reduced by 15 percent; inpatient stays of 20 or more days were reduced by 50 percent, cut in half—all saving millions of dollars.

In primary and preventive care—as a country, we don't devote nearly enough resources to primary care and prevention. Only 6 percent to 8 percent of health care spending goes to primary care, to your regular doctor appointments. That is less than the percentage that goes in private insurance to insurance company overhead.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to give an example: When colorectal cancer is found early and treated, the 5-year survival

rate is 90 percent. But screening rates for colorectal cancer are low. The National Health Interview Survey found that in 2005, only half the population aged 50 and older received recommended screening for colon cancer. The American Cancer Society has found that increased colorectal screening in the pre-Medicare population could save lives and reduce subsequent Medicare treatment costs by $15 billion over 11 years.

On measuring and reporting quality, we don't do this anywhere near well enough. Nearly 1 in every 20 hospitalized patients in the United States gets a hospital-acquired infection. This is very expensive and it is preventable. A hospital-acquired infection should be a never event. Yet it costs our health care system approximately $2.5 billion a year in harmful costs we could avoid.

Administrative simplification. The proportion of the U.S. health care dollar that is lost to administration has always been high relative to our peer countries. The cost of administration by insurance companies is not only high itself, but it creates a shadow cost imposed on providers who have to fight back against the insurance company claims denial apparatus, and that cost is probably even higher.

A study published in Health Affairs documented that physicians spent on average 142 hours annually interacting with health plans, totaling nearly 7 percent of total health care costs. That is just the physician's time. That doesn't count all the nonphysician office staff dedicated to administration and chasing the insurance companies.

Last, health and information technology. Health information technology is the essential underlying framework for health care delivery system reform. It is the foundation on which other delivery system reforms can be built. In 2000, the Institute of Medicine estimated the number of deaths resulting from medical error as high as 98,000 American deaths annually. The most common cause of those preventable injuries and deaths in hospitals was medication errors, which can be reduced dramatically through the adoption of computerized physician order entry systems—health information technology.

The reform areas my report discusses synchronize with one another, and there is a growing national movement of providers and payers and States that recognize their critical importance. Focusing on quality rather than quantity and focusing on efficiency rather than volume will better serve not only their patients but their bottom line.

The report I am releasing today looks at 45 provisions in the affordable care act that promote these delivery system reforms. From the discussion one would not know that virtually one-third of the affordable care act was about these delivery system reforms because they have been noncontroversial, but they are in there and they are important.

The report also assesses the administration's progress in implementing them. We found that the administration has already implemented 25 provisions fully and made significant progress on two others. The complexity and sheer number of reforms included in the law make this accomplishment in a relatively short period of time noteworthy.

In addition to the hurdles presented by our fragmented health care system, there has been resistance in Congress to the administration's implementation efforts that has also created barriers. For the 20 delivery system provisions that have not yet been implemented, lack of congressional funding is a significant factor in delaying their forward progress.

In these reform provisions, the affordable care act is supporting and building upon the efforts undertaken by the private sector by realigning incentives in the health care system to support private sector efforts. A broad array of pilot and demonstration programs has been launched, from which best practices will be deployed nationwide. The process to get to a more sustainable path will be one of, as CBO Director Elmendorf said, ''experimentation and learning. It will be a process of innovation.''

The affordable care act improves the conditions that allow that innovation to take place, and it has the mechanisms needed to propagate those reforms widely throughout the system as quickly as possible once they are proven effective.

American ingenuity can overcome our toughest challenges, not through command and control but through dynamic, flexible, and persistent experimentation, learning, and innovation. We are at a fork in the road on our health care future. One path we could travel is to protect the dysfunctional status quo and cut benefits to pay for the waste. That is the way a lot of my colleagues want to go.

The other way is to shift incentives so that we innovate toward better, safer health care—which costs less. We as Americans need to trust that the path of innovation and experimentation is the right one and not give up on these efforts.

Last year, George Halvorson, who is the CEO of Kaiser Permanente and knows a little something about health care, said it this way:

> There are people right now who want to cut benefits and ration care and have that be the avenue to cost reduction in this country and that is wrong. It's so wrong it's almost criminal.

He continued:

> It's an inept way of thinking about health care.

The affordable care act has the tools that enable providers to focus on quality rather than quantity, efficiency rather than volume, and patients rather than their bottom line, to avoid the inept way of thinking about health care.

As I close, let me say that throughout the process of writing this report I found one thing to be glaringly absent; that is, a cost savings goal set by the administration for us to reach toward on these delivery system reform provisions.

In 1961, President Kennedy declared that within 10 years the United States would put a man on the Moon and return him safely. This message was clear, it was direct, and it created accountability. As a result, a vast mobilization of private and public resources occurred to collaborate in innovative ways to achieve the President's purpose.

While the issue facing our country in health care is different, the urgency and the need to mobilize the public and private sectors toward improving quality and reducing cost is the same. So I challenge the administration to set a cost-savings target for delivery system reform. A cost-savings target will focus, guide, and spur the administration's efforts in a manner that vague intentions to bend the health care cost curve will never do. It also will provide a measurable goal by which we can evaluate our progress.

A clear and public goal will help make this vision of our health care system a reality. It will drive forward progress, and it will generate momentum to achieve that goal.

I urge the administration: Set a goal you are prepared to be accountable to meet.

When President Kennedy announced in September of 1962 that America would strive to put a man on the Moon, he said:

> We choose to go to the moon in this decade . . . not because [it is] easy, but because [it is] hard, because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one we are willing to accept, one we are unwilling to postpone, and one which we intend to win.

We need to face the challenge posed by the rising health care costs in our system. We need to recognize we cannot postpone finding a solution. We can win this challenge, we can drive our system toward a sustainable path of higher quality care and improved outcomes, and we can do so by setting clear goals and supporting the measures in the affordable care act that propel us in that direction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I want to speak for a moment to the issue that was raised by my colleague from Missouri. Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL came to the Senate floor to take note of the vote that had just been issued, the rollcall that was just finished on a measure offered by Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey. It was pretty straightforward.

Here is what it said: The Federal tax subsidies of $2 billion a year to the biggest oil companies in America should end right now. The money in those subsidies should be used to develop other

forms of energy—good for our future, clean for our environment, lessening our dependence on foreign oil—and the balance should be put into reduction of our deficit. Two billion dollars a year is going to the four biggest oil companies in America.

How are they doing? We all know how they are doing. Last year, again, they broke all records in the history of American business, reporting profits of $137 billion. The notion that we would take away $2 billion from these oil companies and put it into deficit reduction and energy research that could be good for our future seems like a given. In fact, it seems so easy that when we had a vote earlier this week to bring up this measure, over 90 Senators voted yes; let's go to it.

What happened on this vote today? We needed 60 votes, which sadly has become the norm in this Chamber. We needed 60 out of 100 Senators to say stop the fat-cat subsidies to the oil companies. We couldn't get it. We got exactly two Republican Senators to vote with us—two. It is a sad reality that many of the same Senators who wax eloquent on the Senate floor about our deficit and what to do about it, when it comes to a simple, straightforward vote to stop this wasteful, unwarranted subsidy to the most profitable companies on Earth, could not bring themselves to say no to Big Oil.

Meanwhile, families and businesses all across Chicago, IL, and America are paying more and more at the pump. Last Sunday I saw my first one—hang on, America; you are going to see one too—$5.03 a gallon. It was downtown Chicago at a BP station. Hang on tight, there is more to come from these oil companies that will then turn around and report the biggest profits ever in American business history.

We pay at the pump and we pay with our taxes. What is left? Here was our chance to stand up and do something. We know $4 billion is not going to change the oil industry, and it is not going to change Washington. But at least it was a statement about where we stand when comes to age-old indefensible tax subsidies to the biggest and most profitable companies in America. We couldn't bring ourselves to do it.

I agree with Senator MCCASKILL. These folks who get up and wail and cry about the deficit—call up this rollcall and ask them where in the heck they were when we had one chance to do something positive.

It is not the biggest disappointment of the week. There are two others that trump it. I have to tell you, it is hard for me to believe that again we were unable to get a bipartisan group together to start the conversation about post office reform in America. It is the most honored Federal agency.

When people are asked across America, what agency of government do they have a positive feeling about, it is the post office. They make jokes about it—we all do—but we know in our heart of hearts it is the best Postal Service in the world. We can still take an envelope and for less than 50 cents put it in a box and be confident that in a matter of a couple of days or three it is going to be delivered in the lower 48.

There are not many countries on Earth that even get close to making that claim for less than 50 cents. It is so good that the so-called package express folks who were trying to make this a private sector undertaking use the post office. They use the post office because of the efficiency of their delivery for the last mile of delivery.

So we have a problem. Fewer people are using first-class mail. They are using e-mail, bill payer. Revenues are down. Postal employees are down to around 600,000. Those who are retired are around 450,000. We need to bank money for retirees in the future. We are facing the need to make some hard choices about the Postal Service.

The Postmaster General came to my office about 5 months ago now. We sat down with Mr. Donahoe and said: Before you make harsh decisions about the Postal Service, closing post offices, reducing the mail deliveries and the like—before people's jobs are on the chopping block or at least in question, give Congress a chance to at least come up with a better approach.

Historically, that was a challenge Congress always accepted because we knew when it is something that big and important as the Postal Service, which is enshrined in our Constitution, it is our job. We are supposed to do that work.

So I asked him to postpone, if he would, until May 15, any closures of facilities so the House and the Senate could have a chance to act. I have been waiting. It has been hard to get into the Senate calendar. This week was our chance. Senator HARRY REID said we are going to bring it up because it is an important debate. We need to get together.

We called the bill on the Senate floor to move to this debate on the post office. To their credit, the independent Democratic chairman of the jurisdictional committee, Senator JOE LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, and the Republican ranking member, Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine, both voted to move to this measure.

I felt good about the fact that they were working together, along with TOM CARPER of Delaware and others, in a bipartisan effort to make this post office what we need it to be. I have confidence in Senators LIEBERMAN and COLLINS because they have done historic work in the past when it came to reforming our intelligence agencies after 9/11; the two of them did it. I credit them, many times publicly, for their bipartisan cooperation. Here we had another chance: We are going to bring postal reform to the floor, and we failed to get 60 votes.

Unfortunately, we could not get more than five from the other side of the aisle to even engage in the debate on Postal Service reform. Now we will be gone for 2 weeks. When we return, it will be a lot closer to April 15 and a lot more challenging for us to get anything done. Those two disappointments—that we could not seize $4 billion in savings for the deficit in oil company subsidies and that we wouldn't accept our responsibility to deal with postal service reform—I am afraid that has been matched and trumped by what is going on in the House of Representatives.

Think about this: Two weeks ago we passed a bipartisan bill on the floor of the Senate for the Federal Transportation bill. When it comes to our economy and its future, it is hard to think of anything more important than investing in highways, mass transit, airports and ports, and rail lines to make sure that we have an economy ready to compete in the 21st century, that businesses can locate in America with confidence that their products can move to the markets as quickly as possible.

This bill comes up every 5 years, and it is a political piece of cake. Democrats and Republicans agree. We all have needs in our States and districts, and we always come together with a bipartisan bill. We did in the Senate.

Two Senators couldn't be further apart on the political spectrum than BARBARA BOXER of California and JIM INHOFE of Oklahoma. But you know what. They accepted their political responsibility and came up with a bipartisan Federal transportation bill that passed the Senate 74 to 22.

Meanwhile, what was happening in the House? The House was just one crash after another. Their first highway bill went nowhere—rejected. Their second highway bill they would not even call for a vote. Time passed, and more and more of these measures were falling apart. They withdrew the chairman of the committee in the House in charge of it and said: We are going to put somebody else in. They brought in another name. I couldn't keep up with it.

The Speaker of the House and the House Republican caucus made a dog's breakfast out of this Federal Transportation bill. Today, to add insult to injury, they not only would not call our bipartisan bill, which is all we have asked for—I see Senator BOXER on the floor. All we said is, bring the Boxer-Inhofe bill to a vote in the House. It is a bipartisan bill. It is good for this country. For goodness' sakes, vote on it.

No, we are not going to do it. If it isn't the House Republican bill, we are not going to consider it.

What do they do instead? Senator BOXER can explain what they did instead. They said: We will kick the can down the road. We will extend the highway taxes for 90 days and get back to you later.

A person might think, no harm, no foul. Just extending it 90 days, there is no harm. Wrong. State after State, county after county will tell you that

this 90-day extension freezes efforts to build projects across America and will cost us at least 100,000 jobs. The number may be much larger, but it will cost us at least 100,000 jobs. Do we need jobs at this moment in time in America? I should say so. In the midst of a recovery from a recession, one of the areas hit the hardest is the construction industry. And it is not just a matter of the workers out there on the job, it is all of their suppliers. The truck-drivers, the material men, and all of them are now going to be put on hold because the Speaker of the House refuses to call a bipartisan Senate transportation bill for a vote.

That is all we asked—up or down, call it for a vote. Why wouldn't he call it for a vote? Because it would pass. To his embarrassment, it would pass. Well, he got his way, I guess. He is going to send us a 90-day extension. The alternative of letting the highway trust fund lapse is not a reasonable one, not one any of us would embrace. But what a wasted opportunity.

My colleague and good friend, who is sitting right here and has been in this business, the House and the Senate, for a long time, poured her heart and soul into that Federal Transportation bill. She accomplished what nobody thought she could. When she said she was going to sit down with Senator JIM INHOFE of Oklahoma and work it out, we said: Bet that works; the two of them are so different. But when it comes to this measure, they see eye to eye. They worked it out. I am proud of what they did. I didn't like everything in the bill, but nobody does. But I voted for it, saying it is bipartisan, it moves our country forward, and it creates almost 3 million jobs. The Boxer-Inhofe bill creates and saves almost 3 million jobs. Is that important at this moment in our history? You bet it is. If you are not in favor of creating good-paying jobs right here in America for American families, what the heck are you doing in this business? And instead, the House said: No, we will not even let you vote on this measure. House Democrats tried the entire week to get this measure up. Even a few—just a few—House Republicans spoke up and said: Bring it up for a vote. It wasn't good enough.

I know the Senator from California is here, and I want to give her a chance to say a word about the impact of the measure that just passed the House of Representatives. She has gone in it, in many cases State by State, to measure what it means to just extend the highway trust fund and not pass a bill that can create and save up to 3 million jobs. She told me that in my State, it was something like 4,000.

Mrs. BOXER. More than that—about 4,500.

Mr. DURBIN. There are 4,500 jobs lost if we let the federal transportation program expire this summer because Speaker BOEHNER refuses to call up this bill. That is the reality. Is it any wonder that the approval rating of Congress is in single digits when you take a hard look at what this does to our Nation? At a time when we need Congress to work together, the Speaker will not call the bipartisan bill from the Senate. The Senate will not take up postal reform. The Senate refuses to even cut the $4 billion subsidy to the biggest oil companies in America.

It is a disappointment to me because many of us worked hard to come here. I feel honored to have this job and feel a responsibility to the people we represent. I think the Senate, on those two votes I mentioned, and the House with their action today have let down the people of this country.

I would like to yield to the Senator from California. I have another statement to make, but I want to give her a chance.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes and then return the floor to Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered

Mrs. BOXER. I was going to wait until the House actually sent over this extension before saying anything, but I was so impressed with Senator DURBIN's explanation that I felt I should come to the floor and thank him so much. His leadership on this and also, Madam President, your deep concern for your State, which actually has the largest job loss numbers because they are being very conservative about what they do on the ground—not everybody understands the way the transportation programs work in our States. The Federal Government pays for about 75 percent of many projects and the State pays 25 percent. But the States go out and they front the money and then they bill the Federal Government. Well, the signal that has been sent from the House today is a disastrous signal because it is a signal to all of our States that they better beware because there is no guarantee they will ever get those funds back from the Federal Government.

You know, I love it when we make history here, but I love it when we make good history here. Today, by the House's action, I believe they have become the first House of Representatives ever to allow this highway trust fund to go bankrupt because right now the fund is not sufficient and has to be filled. That is why part of the wonderful result of the Senate bill—and Senator INHOFE and I appreciate getting a lot of credit, but we actually had four committees that did their work: Senators JOHNSON and SHELBY over in Banking, and we had Senators ROCKEFELLER and HUTCHISON over in Commerce. But a very tough job was given to Senator BAUCUS, and he worked hand-in-glove with the Republicans, particularly with Senators such as Senator THUNE, to come up with a pay-for.

Well, here we have an extension with no revenues in it, Madam President, so naturally your State is very worried, as are all of our States, and I am going to quickly go through what we know so far. We know that Illinois is having big trouble because their contract-letting cannot go forward in 12 particular jobs, and that is going to result in a scaleback of 4,500 jobs. They are scaling back right now, as Senator DURBIN said, at a time when we need jobs. North Carolina has 41,000 jobs that cannot be filled. Nevada has 4,000 jobs, Maryland has 4,000, and Michigan has 3,500. I see the great Senator from Rhode Island here. We got word from his director, Mike Lewis, from the Rhode Island Department of Transportation, that there are job delays, and it looks as if 1,000 jobs will not be filled. In West Virginia, 1,200 jobs will not be filled.

We are in trouble. You know what, it is like taking a hammer and hitting your head: Why do they do it? They don't have to. They don't have to do this. They are wreaking havoc on the Nation with this extension. And Chairman MICA said today: This must be the last extension. Fine. It should not even be an extension. They should take up and pass the Senate bill. How many bills do we have that have 74 votes in favor? And if Senator LAUTENBERG had not been at a funeral, it would have been 75. Three-quarters of this Senate came together around this bill. So the House is wreaking havoc on the Nation. Right now, you could fill 14 Super Bowl stadiums with unemployed construction workers—1.4 million. And why are they doing it? Because they don't want to deal in any way with the Democrats.

Senator INHOFE and I were so thrilled to work together. I see the senior Senator from Alaska who helped us draft our bill with Senator BEGICH. They crossed party lines. We have a great bill. Is it perfect? Of course not. Is it strong? Yes. Is it paid for? Yes. Will it protect 1.9 million jobs and create an additional million? Yes. That is great news. But the House has decided—the only people in America not to get this is the House of Representatives over there, the Republicans.

I see my colleague here, and I am glad to yield for him.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I wonder if the Senator would yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Setting aside the questions that this raises about the House's ability to govern, which I think are raised by this issue but focusing on this highway question, it is now the end of March. If we go 90 days, 30 days takes us through the end of April, 30 more days takes us through the end of May, and 30 more days takes us through the end of June. There is a seasonal component to getting this work done, is there not? What is the effect of our entire highway, road, and bridge industry having no certainty about what their funding is going to be until practically the Fourth of July

with the construction season then underway?

Mrs. BOXER. Well, the question is very important. This is the worst possible time because now, if you can't enter into new contracts, you lose the building season. And it is particularly brutal right now on the businesses and on the workers.

Let me be clear. This is a 90-day extension without any hopes of them finishing their work. They didn't say that in the 90 days, they would get the job done, get to conference, and get the bill to the President; they are just saying 90 days with no commitment to go to conference.

I will come back and we will attempt to attach the Senate bill to the extension. Madam President, I hope you will have the opportunity to work on that with me because our States are counting on us, and we have to be strong and we have to keep fighting for one simple premise: that the House should have the right to vote on the Senate-passed bill.

I am very proud to be here. I will be here this afternoon as long as it takes. I say to my friend from Rhode Island, I hope he can be there, as well as my friend from Illinois. As soon as we get their extension, which makes no commitment to go to conference, we are going to try to attach the Senate bill to the extension and send it into conference, and I hope my friends will be here to help me with that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I see my friend from Alaska is on the floor, and I would like to yield to her and ask unanimous consent that I be recognized after her statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate the courtesy of my colleague from Illinois, and I also will follow on Senator BOXER's comments on the importance of this highway transportation bill.

I think we recognize that, while far from being perfect—I am not convinced we develop any perfect legislation around here—it is an extraordinarily good-faith effort, a very strong bipartisan demonstration in this body, and deserves to have this support. I applaud Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE for their work on that.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Madam President, just very briefly, I wanted to take a few minutes this morning to speak about an event that just happened outside on the lawn of the Capitol. About maybe 50 or 60 Alaskans and some wannabe Alaskans gathered in a rally, a march that we have entitled ''Choose Respect.'' This is an effort that has stemmed from the actions of our Governor in Alaska to shine the spotlight on domestic violence and sexual assault and to come together as communities, as a State, to speak up and to turn around the statistics that are so devastating in our State when it comes to domestic violence and sexual assault.

Over the past few years, the Governor has led the charge in organizing rallies in the State of Alaska during the last week of March. This morning in our State there will be 120 different rallies going on in communities such as Anchorage and Fairbanks, our larger communities, but also in smaller villages such as Kooskia and Tanana, communities where the numbers are small but the passions on the issues I think are very strong and robust. The Governor has commissioners in Barrow, in Tanana, in Cordova, in Nome, and in Galena, all leading the march to stand up and speak out about domestic violence. I wish to acknowledge what the Governor has done in his effort to spotlight this and to work to reduce the rates of domestic violence, sexual assault, and child abuse through this ''Choose Respect'' initiative. We have great Alaskans standing together and, again, a real commitment to make a difference.

Unfortunately, my colleagues have heard me say this before, that in a State such as Alaska where I think we have unparalleled beauty, we also have an ugly side to our State that is manifested in statistics we see with violence against women and particularly violence against Native women. Violence against Native women has reached epidemic proportions. We are at a point where Native women experience domestic violence and sexual assault at rates 2½ times higher than other races. In the lower 48, women on reservations are 10 times more likely to be murdered. Systematic legal barriers and ineffectual or deficient law enforcement mechanisms result in women, children, and families living in fear. In Alaska, nearly one in two women has experienced partner violence and close to one in three has experienced sexual violence. Overall, nearly 6 in 10 Alaska women have been victims of sexual assault or domestic violence. This is absolutely unacceptable. That is the reality we are living with as a State now, and it is absolutely unacceptable.

Alaska's rate of forcible rape between 2003 and 2009 was 2.6 times higher than the national rate. Tragically, about 9 percent of Alaska mothers reported physical abuse by their husband or their partner during pregnancy or in the 12 months prior to pregnancy. These are horrifying statistics.

These statistics bring me to the issue of violence against women and the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA, the bill we have been talking about and hopefully will be bringing to the floor soon. A measure such as this I think is incredibly important as a vehicle for us to stand behind women and men. It doesn't make any difference if one is from a rural part of the country or an urban part of the country; it is an issue that I think we know rips at the heart of who we are.

In so many of the Alaskan villages, victims of domestic violence and sexual assault face some pretty unique challenges and therefore horrific challenges. It may be that there is no full-time law enforcement presence, there is no local justice infrastructure. In many situations villages are landlocked. There are no roads in. The only way in and out is by airplane. So we have a situation where we can have an individual who has been victimized, with no law enforcement presence in the community whatsoever. It may take State troopers days—days—to be able to respond to an incident, depending on weather conditions. Imagine yourself in that situation. You have been a victim of domestic violence. You seek help. There is none in the village and no way away from your perpetrator.

I think we recognize that one thing we can and must do is make sure there is a safety net available to address the immediate survival needs of the victim and the survival needs of their children in the short term. Only with this level of confidence can one gather the courage to leave an abusive situation.

One final comment on VAWA, and then I will yield to my colleague who has given me the courtesy of the floor right now. I think we recognize in Alaska that the Violence Against Women Act does offer a ray of hope, if you will, for those who are not only the victims but for those who help assist the victims of domestic violence and sexual assault in our villages. It will provide for some increased resources to our rural and to our very isolated communities. It will help to establish a framework for the Alaskan Rural Justice Commission which has been a great venue to make sure we are all understanding what the tools are and how we adapt to those tools. It also recognizes Alaska's Village Public Safety Officer Program as law enforcement so that VAWA funds can be directed to providing a full-time law enforcement presence in places that have none.

We have a lot of issues we need to work through. We believe the reauthorization of VAWA will help us with that. So as we join with other Alaskans in the State and those here in Washington, DC, to choose respect for all women, for all in our communities, I think it is important that there are some tools we can put in place to help not only the people of my State but victims of domestic violence wherever they may be.

With that, I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

THE DREAM ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Senate is not a place for sprinters, only long-distance runners, because sometimes we need patience beyond human endurance to see an idea that one believes is meritorious finally make it—to get passed by the Senate and maybe

even the House or maybe even signed into law. Sometimes it happens quickly; more often it takes a long time.

My personal story that kind of leads when it comes to examples is the DREAM Act, which I introduced 11 years ago. This was legislation that addressed a problem I learned about from my Chicago office. We got a phone call. The phone call was from a mother. She was Korean American and she ran a drycleaners. In Chicago, 75 percent or more of the drycleaning establishments are owned by Korean families. She came to this country years before, brought her little girl with her, and then raised a family, and she became an American citizen.

Fast forward to her little girl who became a musical prodigy. In fact, she was in demand at some of the best music institutions in America, including the Julliard School of Music and the Manhattan Conservatory of Music, offering her admission to come and develop her skills as a concert pianist. As her daughter filled out the form to apply to these schools, she turned to her mother and said: Where it says ''nationality'' what should I write? Her mother said: I don't know. We never filed any papers for you after you came to America. The daughter said: What can we do? The mother said: We can call DURBIN.

So they called my office and we checked with the Immigration Service. They came back and said, the law is very clear that when a child is brought to this country and through no fault of their own is undocumented, the law is clear they have to leave for at least 10 years. They have to go back to wherever they were before or anywhere they want to go, but they can't be here. I thought to myself: This girl did nothing wrong. Mom and dad didn't file the papers and here she is in this predicament.

So I introduced the DREAM Act. It has five simple provisions. Here is what it says: If you came to the United States as a child, if you have been a long-term U.S. resident, if you have good moral character, if you graduate from high school and you either complete 2 years of college or serve in the U.S. military, we will put you on a path to become a citizen of the United States. You have to earn it. We are not going to give it to you, but we are going to give you that chance. Just because mom and dad may have done an illegal act, we will not hold you as a child responsible for it.

The net result of this bill, when it becomes law, will strengthen our military—and we have the support from military leaders all across the United States; they want these young men and women to enlist. They will bring diversity and talent to the military. It will also mean they will be contributing to America with their higher education. They are going to be tomorrow's doctors and engineers, soldiers and teachers. We don't want to lose their talents. We don't want them educated in America for 13 years and then cast aside. We want them to stand and be part of our future and make us a stronger Nation.

Keep in mind that for most of these students it comes as a shock when they finally ask the questions and get the answers and realize the flag they have been pledging allegiance to every single day is not the flag of their country. They are people without a country. That is what the DREAM Act is about—to give them a chance.

We have asked the Obama administration on a bipartisan basis to not deport these eligible young people, for they have done nothing wrong. If they do something wrong, it is another story. But if they have done nothing wrong, don't focus on deporting them. What we are trying to do is to give them a chance—just a chance—to earn their way to the American dream. I think the administration's new deportation policy is sensible and I think these young people deserve a chance.

I can give these speeches for a long time and they don't mean much until we meet the DREAM Act students. Let me show my colleagues two handsome young men from Illinois: Carlos and Rafael Robles. I met them both. Carlos and Rafael were brought to the United States by their parents when they were children. Today, Carlos is 22, Rafael is 21. They grew up in suburban Chicago in my home State of Illinois. They graduated from Palatine High School where they were both honor students. In high school, Carlos was the captain of the tennis team and a member of the varsity swim team. He volunteered with Palatine's physically challenged program where every day he helped to feed lunch to special needs students. Carlos graduated from Harper Community College and is now attending Loyola University in Chicago majoring in education. His dream is to become a teacher. Do we need more good teachers in America? You bet we do.

Listen to what one of Carlos's high school teachers said about him:

> Carlos is the kind of person we want among us because he makes the community better. This is the kind of person you want as a student, the kind of kid you want as a neighbor and friend to your child, and most germane to his present circumstance, the kind of person you want as an American.

One of Carlos's college professors wrote and said:

> He is, very simply, the finest student I have ever had the opportunity to mentor.

Rafael, his younger brother, has a lot in common with Carlos. In high school, Rafael was captain of the tennis team and a member of the varsity swim team and soccer team. He graduated again from Harper Community College—understand these young men would attend college in America with no Federal assistance—none. They have to pay for it out of their pocket. So he graduated from Harper Community College. Now he is at the University of Illinois in Chicago where he is majoring in architecture.

Here is what one of Rafael's teachers in high school said about him:

> Rafael is the kind of person I have taught about in my Social Studies classes—the American who comes to this country and commits to his community and makes it better for others. Raffi Robles is a young man who makes us better. During my 28 year career as a high school teacher, coach, and administrator, I would place Raffi in the top 5 percent of all the kids with whom I have ever had contact.

Here is the unfortunate part of the story about these two amazing young men. They were both placed in deportation proceedings. I asked the administration to consider their request to suspend their deportations and they agreed to do it, for the time being. I think it was the right thing to do. Carlos and Rafael are represented by volunteer lawyers in Chicago.

After I met Carlos and Rafael, they sent me a letter asking Members of Congress to support the DREAM Act, and here is what they said:

> We ask you today to see it in your heart to do the right thing, to listen, and to reward the values of hard work and diligence, values that made America the most beautiful and prosperous country in the world and that we're sure got you, as members of Congress, to where you are today in life. These are values we have come to admire and respect in the American people. We will continue to uphold these values until the last of our days—we hope eventually as citizens of the United States, a country we now see as home.

So I ask my colleagues who are critical of the administration's deportation policy or have difficulties with the DREAM Act, Would America be a better place if Carlos and Rafael are deported? Of course not. These two young men grew up here, they were educated here, they have done well here, they have earned their way here. They want to be part of our future.

They are not isolated examples. There are literally thousands of them just like Carlos and Rafael across this country.

When I introduced this bill 11 years ago, and I would give a speech like this and leave a hall, I could count on, if it were nighttime, someone standing by my car quietly as I approached and started to leave. They would ask me: Senator, can I speak to you for a minute.

Sure.

Senator, I am one of those students.

They were afraid of being deported if they raised their hand and identified themselves at the meeting. That has all changed now, and it has changed for the better. These young men and women are courageously stepping forward to identify themselves. It is no longer a mystery of who they are or what they want to be. They are real flesh and blood. They are children. They are the people you sit next to in church. They are the folks who are working hard next to your son or daughter in the library at school. You are cheering them on on the football field. You are watching them lead the USC Marching Trojan Band. You are watching as they are aspiring to become tomorrow's scientists, engineers,

doctors, lawyers, and teachers. They deserve a chance, and we should give them that chance by passing the DREAM Act.

I hope my colleagues will consider doing that as quickly as possible. They want peace of mind, they want a future, and we need them in America's future.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BARBARA MIKULSKI

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, I come here today to pay tribute to Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI on becoming the longest serving woman in the history of Congress.

First and foremost, I feel deeply privileged to be able to serve alongside Senator MIKULSKI. She blazed a path that allowed the rest of us, and people like me, to be here today. Along the way, she distinguished herself as not only a leader and tenacious advocate for the people of Maryland but for all Americans.

Senator MIKULSKI's path to the U.S. Senate prepared her well to be an effective fighter for her constituents. Ever the dedicated public servant, Senator MIKULSKI worked as a Baltimore social worker, community activist, and as a city council member. She brought an urgency and an unrelenting commitment to service to her work and the people she represented. It can be seen in the legislation she has fought for and the causes she has championed during her 25 years in the Senate.

I am proud to say the first bill I cosponsored when I came to the Senate 3 years ago was one of Senator MIKULSKI's—the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. This bill—which ensures that no matter your gender, race, national origin, religion, age or disability, you will receive equal pay for equal work—the fight to get it signed into law is a perfect example of the tenacity and sense of fairness that drives BARBARA MIKULSKI.

I am particularly grateful to her for her mentorship. On the day I was sworn in to the Senate, I was standing in the back of the Chamber waiting to walk down to the well. My colleague from North Carolina, Senator BURR, was with me. Senator MIKULSKI came up to me and asked who was going to escort me to the well to be sworn in. I, obviously, said: My colleague from North Carolina. She said: Well, you need a woman too. And with that, I was both humbled and honored to have her escort me down the Chamber aisle to be sworn in as a U.S. Senator.

Her generosity in sharing her experience and her expertise did not stop on that day. She is always encouraging, supportive, and eager to foster a spirit of teamwork. I especially appreciate that Senator MIKULSKI embraces the need for bipartisanship, which no doubt is why she is and has been so effective, accomplished, and widely respected.

Everyone knows well and respects Senator MIKULSKI for her advocacy on behalf of women and families. In this regard, she is truly a role model. During the debate on health care reform, her tireless fight to ensure that women's preventive services, including screenings for breast cancer and cervical cancer, would be covered with no out-of-pocket expenses is legendary.

Her ability to see and understand people's needs is clearly reflected in her Spousal Anti-Impoverishment Act, which protects seniors across the country from going bankrupt while paying for a spouse's nursing home care. It is no wonder she is beloved, not only in the Third District, which she represented for 10 years in the House, but by all the people of Maryland whose interests she fights for every single day.

As one of the 17 women now serving in the Senate, it is hard to imagine what it must have been like when she arrived here 25 years ago as one of two women. I am grateful she and the other female Senators have paved the way.

BARBARA MIKULSKI is the dean of the women Senators, and her bipartisan women's dinners are among my favorite Senate traditions. I thank Senator MIKULSKI for her leadership and strong belief in the empowerment of women in our communities and in public office. For those of us who came to Washington to make a difference, BARBARA MIKULSKI has set a very high bar.

I congratulate Senator MIKULSKI for this extraordinary and historic accomplishment. I look forward to many more years of serving alongside her.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, I will speak for a couple minutes on the Transportation bill.

I have come to the floor to express my support for passing the Senate bill before the current Transportation authorization expires this Saturday. This would create and sustain nearly 41,000 jobs in North Carolina and across the country close to 3 million jobs.

Earlier today, the House passed a short-term 90-day extension. Unfortunately, passing another stopgap extension is not the solution that businesses, States, and the entire country needs.

Short-term extensions create instability and uncertainty in funding, and without that certainty, States such as mine, North Carolina, cannot plan or move forward with projects, which jeopardizes tens of thousands of projects and millions of jobs in America. Once again, that is 41,000 jobs in North Carolina.

Upgrading our infrastructure is not a Democratic or a Republican priority; it is truly an American priority.

The Senate Transportation funding bill makes critical investments in transportation and infrastructure in North Carolina and across our Nation.

The return on investment, when it comes to infrastructure, is high. Moody's estimates that for every $1 spent on infrastructure, our GDP is raised about $1.59.

Additionally, for every $1 billion spent on infrastructure, 11,000 to 30,000 jobs are created—jobs that North Carolina desperately needs.

Failure to pass the Senate Transportation bill could put these millions of jobs and $1.2 billion worth of North Carolina construction projects in jeopardy.

This Transportation bill we are talking about is truly an economic engine. My State currently receives only about 92 cents for every $1 we pay into the highway trust fund. This new legislation would ensure that at least 95 percent of North Carolina's payments to the highway trust fund will come back to our State—nearly 3 percent more than we currently receive.

Maintaining and upgrading our infrastructure is not just about creating jobs in the construction sector; it is the lifeblood of our communities. We need to make sure businesses have roads to access their plants and factories, rail, ports, and airport runways to export goods across the globe and to keep pace with the 24/7 global economy.

To put this in a global perspective, China currently spends four times as much on infrastructure as we do in the United States. We cannot allow this to continue. This is about staying competitive and leveraging commonsense investments that will enable our economy to grow.

This Transportation funding bill will be used to improve our roads, bridges, and mass transit systems—projects that will put North Carolinians back to work and help American businesses compete in our global economy.

I urge my colleagues to take up and pass the Senate Transportation funding bill without delay.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. HOEVEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2264 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, with that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUSTICE GINSBURG ON CONSTITUTIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Supreme Court Justice Ginsburg, on a recent trip to Egypt, made comments that garnered public notice. She said:

I would not look to the U.S. Constitution if I were drafting a constitution in the year 2012. I might look at the constitution of South Africa.

She also spoke favorably of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the European Convention on Human Rights.

Although some people have criticized Justice Ginsburg for speaking negatively about the U.S. Constitution while abroad, I think she has a right to say what legal documents countries should consider that are now writing constitutions. But I do not agree with her those other constitutions are better examples of constitutions today than the U.S. Constitution is.

Some people who have criticized Justice Ginsburg's preference for the other constitutions she named have focused on the positive rights contained in those documents. Some of those constitutions, such as South Africa's, protect the right to ''make decisions concerning reproduction,'' to ''inherent dignity,'' and the right to have an environment protected ''through reasonable legislative and other measures that prevent pollution and environmental degradation.'' The European Convention on Human Rights guarantees a right to education. Of course, none of these constitutions contain anything like a second amendment right for the citizens to defend themselves.

Our Constitution is all about limiting the power of government. Americans do not fully trust the power of government, and Americans insist on rights that are protected against government action. In other words, our Constitution was intended to last for centuries, with the same meaning, even as those principles were applied to new situations. Our judges should reflect that philosophy, which is at the heart of our Constitution. If other countries feel differently, that is their right.

I think praise for those foreign constitutions rather than our own raises a much more serious issue—the role of the judiciary. Our Constitution made a judiciary that was the least dangerous branch, as Hamilton said. Policy is to be made by elected officials who answer to the voters and can be replaced; whereas, judges, under our Constitution, cannot be replaced. They have a lifetime position, short of impeachment.

The foreign constitutions that were named create a much different judiciary. The Canadian Supreme Court has stated their charter of rights and freedoms ''must be capable of growth and development over time to meet new social, political and historical realities often unimagined by its framers. The judiciary is the guardian of the Constitution and must, in interpreting its provisions, bear these considerations in mind.''

The European Convention has been interpreted by the European Court of Human Rights to be a ''living instrument.''

Madam President, these are explicit statements—that Justice Ginsburg's preferred constitutions are ''living constitutions.'' A living constitution is one in which the meaning changes over time. Judges decide that new circumstances require a living constitution to mean something it did not mean sometime before. They say the constitution must keep up with the times. A living constitution can mean whatever judges want it to mean, completely contrary to what our forefathers had in mind when they wrote our Constitution.

Our Constitution is not a living constitution. Judges are not to make up its meaning as they go along over time. Even President Obama's Supreme Court nominees told us the role of a judge under our Constitution is not to interpret words however they believe new circumstances might warrant. ''It's the law all the way down,'' Justice Kagan said. We should be skeptical of a living constitution that opens the door for judges to impose their values, not those of the Framers of the Constitution, on the citizenry of this country.

The Canadian Charter says it ''guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and Democratic society.'' The Canadian Supreme Court interprets that provision in light of a highly generalized four-part test that invites judges to insert their own policy preferences.

Similarly, the South African Constitution provides that its rights can be limited if they ''are reasonable and justifiable in an open and democratic society based on human dignity, equality, and freedom.'' It tells courts explicitly to apply a six-part subjective balancing test that allows judges to interpret this provision however they want.

How would you like to live under a constitution such as that?

These constitutions Justice Ginsburg endorses invite judges to rule however they want on any question of rights. That is not consistent with traditional American notions of the rule of law, of a government of laws and not a government of people. Some judges may prefer constitutions in which judges are free to displace democratic decision-making on policy questions that are to be decided by elected representatives of the people under our Constitution. I do not. Our Constitution does not. We do not live in a government of, by, and for the judiciary.

But no one should think that the Canadian or the South African Constitutions fully protect rights that Americans think are precious, such as freedom of speech. Under the Canadian Charter, reasonable limits on free speech include prohibiting so-called hate speech against a group.

Finally, it is important to recognize why some of us on the Judiciary Committee continue to press judicial nominees on their adherence to the Constitution without reference to foreign law. For instance, Justice Breyer has stated that foreign judges also interpret ''texts that more and more protect basic human rights.'' He has stated that he looks to the decisions of the European Human Rights Court and to Canadian cases as well, because they are ''relevant'' even if they do not control. He says, ''[W]e can learn something about our law and our documents from what happens elsewhere.''

What Justice Ginsburg did was to make very clear that which had only been implied in the past, making very clear that there are some in this country who feel that our venerable Constitution is outdated. If they treat that document as it was written and understood by the Framers, then their decisions will often lead to results they do not like as a policy matter. But if they can cite decisions from foreign courts and interpret constitutions that contain all kinds of different rights and that give judges unbridled power to make policy decisions at the expense of the elected representatives of the people, then they can reach decisions that our Constitution otherwise would not allow.

It is not simply a disinterested survey of what other courts around the world are doing. It opens the door to a search for preferred liberal activist outcomes. These are the very high stakes at issue when we discuss whether it is appropriate for judges to cite or rely on foreign law in interpreting the U.S. Constitution.

We need to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. We need to preserve, protect, and defend the rights of American citizens. Justice Ginsburg and others who have a judicial longing for other constitutions that protect different rights and give unelected judges power that, under our Constitution, self-governing people exercise themselves—I tell those judges, including Justice Ginsburg, that is the wrong approach.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OIL SUBSIDIES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, just a few minutes ago, I was presiding over the Senate and I heard remarks from my friend, the senior Senator from Missouri, CLAIRE MCCASKILL, who sits next to me. I was intrigued by her response to the vote that had just taken place for my colleagues who

preach every day about deficit reduction. As Senator MCCASKILL said, they had an opportunity to pick the lowest hanging fruit there is, take away the tax breaks and the tax dollar subsidies that go to the oil interests in this country.

Think about that. We are giving incentives. Taxpayers are spending hard-earned dollars coming from workers in Dayton and Springfield and Akron and Canton that go directly to the most profitable industry in the history of the world, perhaps, particularly the big five oil companies, making billions and billions of dollars. Yet we are simply saying it is OK to give them those kinds of tax breaks and tax subsidies.

That is even putting aside the fact that every time there is a pipeline outage or every time there is a fire in a refinery or every time there is turmoil in the Middle East, the oil companies and the speculators use it as a chance to spike up oil prices. They do it over and over like clockwork. A problem in Iran? Prices go up. A fire in a refinery? Prices go up. An outage in a pipeline? Prices go up.

The Presiding Officer from Vermont, with his bill, has led this effort to get the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Department of Justice to put the government on the side of the motorist, of small businesses, of the consumer. Just as Senator MCCASKILL said earlier, to save tax dollars is really obvious and, on the other side, to make sure we go after the speculators when they rip us off.

According to a recent study, 56 cents of the price of every gallon of gas you buy when you go to the pump in gas stations all over America goes to the hedge fund operators and speculators. That is about $10 to $12 to $15 a tank depending on how big a car you drive.

On the one hand, we are not saying no more tax breaks. On the other hand, we are not saying to the speculators: Stop this. You are not going to get away with this anymore. The government has to be on the side of the middle class here and fight back.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am going to speak for about 10 minutes. If someone else comes to the floor, I will be happy to shorten that, but I had to come to the floor to support the leadership of Senator BARBARA BOXER and Senator INHOFE from Oklahoma, who have worked for over a year to bring a very balanced and fundamentally important and essential infrastructure bill to the floor of the House.

We have many arguments on this floor. We have been arguing about judges. I heard Senator GRASSLEY give a pretty tough speech voicing his opinion of some of our Supreme Court Justices. I do not agree with much of what he said, but he is entitled to his opinion. We have those debates. There are good people on both sides. We are debating oil taxes and whether the oil industry is paying too much or too little. You could have arguments about that.

But even our children in kindergarten and even our citizens who do not pay attention to some more difficult arguments understand roads, bridges, and mass transit. They understand hardhat jobs. They see people every day laying bricks, pouring concrete, going to work at steel mills and factories that produce the materials that build our infrastructure. They drive over potholes all day long. They ride down the interstates with 18-wheelers whizzing by them in smaller cars because they are trying to be more fuel efficient, with their heart in their chest, with their children in the backseat, and they look up to Congress, to the House of Representatives, and say: Where is our Transportation bill?

This Transportation bill was not written by one Senator and voted on by a slim majority. This Transportation bill that the House refuses to even consider was built by one of the more progressive and one of the most conservative Members of this body. It was voted on almost unanimously out of committee, brought to the floor of the Senate just a couple of weeks ago, and received over 75 votes in a body that cannot decide about our judges, really, we can't decide about the post office, we can't decide about oil and gas taxes. But 75 of us said that we are tired of running our highways and our transit on 90-day, 30-day, 60-day extensions. I think this is the 26th short-term extension since 2009. What way is this to run a government?

For the other side of this building that talks about putting business practices to work, let's be more efficient in the way we operate, and let's operate more like a business, do you know, Mr. President, any business in America, large or small, that operates with a 30-day vision? Do you know one? I don't know one. I understand businesses have 6-month plans, a year, but they always have that 5-year long range. They might have 6-month goals. I don't know one business in America that operates on a 30-day plan.

Here we are at the ninth hour again. We have a bill. We produced a bill. If the House had a bill—I am a centrist—if the House had a bill, I would be working with the middle of the road over there, trying to say: This is what your bill does. This is what our bill does. We can't have our way completely here in the Senate, although I would like to have our way more of the time, but I understand.

They do not have a bill. They do not have a bill to negotiate because they cannot even get a bill together among the three committees of jurisdiction over there.

Again, if they had a bill, I know Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE would be happy to negotiate. Maybe they want a 4-year bill, we want a 2, maybe we negotiate a 3. They don't like the mass-transit portion; we like the mass-transit portion; we could come to some terms. They don't like the way the formula works; we like the general way the formula works; we could come to terms. I understand that.

But what I do not understand, what no one in the country understands—what the mayors are having a hard time understanding, what the Governors are having a hard time understanding and the businesses that operate in my State, represented by the chamber of commerce, the NFIB, and the Main Street Alliance of small businesses from the left to the center to the right—what they do not understand is how you do not have a bill at all and you have not been able to put one together. We have now been in this Congress for a year and a half. You have had 1½ years to put a bill together, and you have not come up with one.

We put one together that looks pretty good. No one that I know of from any group has said anything really bad about our bill. It is pretty plain in one sense. It is not changing the course of Western civilization; it is just trying to fund roads, bridges, and transit, which is fundamental to the operations not only of our government but our economy and, frankly, the economy of the world because without highways it is hard to import or export products. This bill has impacts way beyond America.

For the life of me, I cannot understand how the House of Representatives is going to leave and go on vacation and think they have done their job by giving us another 90-day extension.

I do not know what the leadership is going to do, but I want my vote recorded as no. I am not going to hold up everybody here over the holidays, but I want to say that I want my vote recorded as no. I am not going to continue to support 30-day, 60-day, 90-day extensions to a transportation bill that really, in the scheme of things, should not be that complicated to pass. There are other much more controversial things about which we could be having very serious debates. Building highways and roads and transit should not be one of them.

We are hurting jobs. We heard the Republicans—I cannot blame the Republicans in the Senate. I think they have been for the most part really terrific, actually, working with Senator BOXER. They have even given a majority of the votes. So I guess my focus is really on the Republicans in the House. I don't think they have taken the time to really look at the Senate bill to see how balanced it is, and one part I wish they would read, which is the part I want to talk about for the next 5 minutes—and I know other Senators are here to speak—I hope the gulf coast Members from Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida—and together that is a pretty big coalition; I don't know the total number, but I think there have to be over 75 Members from Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and Florida—I hope they read the section of the Transportation bill that talks about the RESTORE Act.

I have spent a great deal of time over here with my good friend and wonderful leader, Senator SHELBY, with Senator BOXER, with over 300 organizations, for over a year, to build a bill that is now part of the Transportation bill that, in addition to building highways in Florida and transit and roads in Alabama and Mississippi, will also for the first time in the history of our country—the first time—direct a significant portion of penalty money paid by a polluter, BP, that polluted the gulf coast—a good company in some ways but really messed up that well, though, and they just spilled gallons and gallons and millions of barrels of oil. We have shrimp that are coming in our nets with no eyes. We have turtles that are washing up on our shores dead. We have research needs in the gulf coast that—there has been no time in our history where we have needed that money more.

My question is to the gulf coast Republican Members and Democratic Members. What is it about this bill that is driving you so crazy that you can't accept $10 billion that the Federal Government is trying to give you? Because that is what the RESTORE Act could potentially send to the gulf coast, a portion of the fine. We don't know whether that fine is going to be $5 billion or $10 billion or $20 billion, but we do know it is going to be substantial because under current law they have to pay $1,000 for every barrel spilled or $4,200 if it was gross negligence.

In the Senate Transportation bill, this body showed rare bipartisan support and concern for the gulf coast, America's energy coast. We showed an understanding of the great erosion that is taking place in the delta of Louisiana, which drains 40 percent of the continent. We showed understanding that so much of our shipping and seafood industry relies on this coast—not that the other coasts are not vitally important—and we showed we understand the underinvestment that has been made. So 75 percent of the Senate basically stood and said: OK. Let's redirect this penalty money to where the injury is. That is the RESTORE Act, and that is in the Senate bill we sent over to the House, which they have absolutely just rejected.

I don't know what magic there is about the next 90 days, but I know what I am going to do. I am going to register my vote as no, and I am going to go home and work harder in Louisiana and along the gulf coast to explain to the people of our region how much is at stake by getting a longer term Transportation bill. Maybe 2 years is not as long as we would like to have, but it is better than 30 days, it is better than 60 days, and it is better than 90 days.

I will ask and explain that not only is the Transportation bill vital for Louisiana's projects but for approving the RESTORE Act, which I know the House has indicated their support for. They have indicated a support for the concept of the RESTORE Act, but the act itself is in the Transportation bill.

So I am going to wrap-up. There are other Members on the floor who will speak. I thank the leader, BARBARA BOXER, who is here.

But for 90 days let's get back to work and go for a long-term Transportation bill that is a real jobs bill that will help the whole country but particularly the gulf coast with the RESTORE Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I see the Republican leader is on the floor, and I understand there may be a unanimous consent that is propounded, and I can offer some remarks in the context of an objection and a counterproposal, if the minority leader would like to proceed now.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would say to my friend from Rhode Island, I am not the one who will be asking consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak until I get a signal from the majority leader that he will seek recognition, at which point I will yield the floor.

I wished to follow in the footsteps of Senator LANDRIEU of Louisiana and reflect my own dismay and dissatisfaction with the situation we are in right now. The House extension on the highway bill, which we are going to be asked to proceed with, is going to cost—as far as the estimates I can see so far—around 100,000 jobs, and that is damage to our economy. That is a self-inflicted wound. More specifically, it is a House-inflicted wound, and I would very much like to see the Senate fight to force action on the Senate highway bill. It is a bipartisan bill with amendments and is fully paid for. This is a serious bill, as opposed to inflicting this kind of damage on our economy with a short-term extension.

Does the majority leader seek recognition?

Mr. REID. Yes, I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to H.R. 4281, the Surface Transportation Extension Act, which was received from the House and is now at the desk; that the bill be read three times and the Senate proceed to vote on that matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. There are several of us who reserve our right to object. What the House has done is guaranteed job losses for this country. They are already dithering on the Senate bill. Their not taking it up for a vote has cost us about 100,000 jobs. Thousands of businesses are at stake, and eventually we are talking about 3 million jobs at stake. The fact that they would do this without any commitment to get to conference, without any commitment to finish their job and run off on vacation is the reason I am reserving the right to object.

I ask that the unanimous consent request be modified so an amendment, which is at the desk, the text of S. 1813, the surface transportation bill, passed by the Senate on March 14, 2012, by a large bipartisan majority vote of 74 to 22, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for modification?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The problem with accepting the Boxer amendment is that it would shut down the Federal-Aid Highway Program, which means States wanting reimbursement for projects will not get paid. It will cause already nervous State Department of Transportation directors to cut back further on the work because there will be no reimbursements on Federal projects, and it would cost the highway trust fund $100 million per day for any day the gas tax is not collected, thereby adding to the deficit.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. CARDIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Reserving the right to object, and I was listening to the distinguished Republican leader, let me challenge some of the assumptions so maybe we can get to a consent. In talking to Members of the House of Representatives, I am very confident there is ample support to pass not only the bipartisan surface transportation bill that passed this body by an overwhelming vote but a consensus bill that came out of our committees by unanimous vote in both the Environment and Public Works Committee and the Banking Committee. There is general agreement that this bill should be enacted into law.

I am confident that if the Speaker of the House brings this bill to the floor of the House of Representatives, it will be passed. There are adequate votes for it.

To my friend, the distinguished Republican leader, here is the problem: If we pass another short-term extension, we are going to lose jobs. In my own

State of Maryland, we cannot let the contracts on major maintenance projects with a 90-day extension. We cannot move forward with the planning of our highways, our bridges, our transit systems with another short-term extension. This takes us to the middle of the summer. We lose the construction season on getting transportation work done.

I urge the distinguished leader that we do have the opportunity to pass the bill right now, and if we stand firm and tell the House of Representatives we want to do what is right for the American people, that in the Senate we had a bipartisan bill, a consensus bill—what's happening in the House is extremely partisan. Let's get together on the most important jobs bill we can pass. It is thousands of jobs in Maryland, and it is millions of jobs in this Nation that are affected by passing a surface transportation bill.

With that, I am hoping I convinced the distinguished Republican leader.

I ask unanimous consent that the request be modified so that an amendment, which is at the desk, the text of S. 1813, the surface transportation bill, passed by the Senate on March 14, 2012, by a large bipartisan majority vote of 74 to 22, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I will spare the Senate the repetitious repeating of my remarks with regard to the initial Boxer modification, but the principles remain the same.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I would like to join my colleagues in trying to find a way to attach the Senate bill which passed this body better than 3 to 1, with a huge bipartisan majority, which is a good bill. It was paid for and had weeks of collegial work, back and forth, with bipartisan amendments, which is a serious bill that every major business group in the country, every major labor group in the country, and even environmental groups are supporting.

As the Senator from Maryland has said, it would certainly virtually be passed by the House if the Speaker would only bring it up, but for partisan reasons the House has refused to even bring it up for a vote. Instead, they sent us this extension which will cost 100,000 jobs.

It is my view that if we can send it back in this form, we will not experience the parade of horribles that the distinguished Republican leader has suggested because it will not come to that point. They will, in fact, pass the Senate bill and we will have a real highway bill and not a partisan extension that kills 100,000 jobs.

It is 1,000 jobs in my home State of Rhode Island. We have over 10 percent unemployment. This is a self-inflicted wound that hits Rhode Island, that hurts my home State. It makes no sense. Therefore, I ask, again—and I apologize for coming back to this, but I think it is important that we try to defend this body, which has worked well together, which has made a sensible, serious bill and is being infected by the dysfunction that is presently taking place in the House. This extension is a representation of that dysfunction.

So I again ask unanimous consent that the majority leader's request be modified so the amendment at the desk, the text of our highway bill, S. 1813, be added to the bill, that the text be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

I thank both the majority leader and minority leader for their patience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am not going to object, but I wish to reiterate the comments of my colleagues from California, Maryland, and Rhode Island. I know my colleague from Louisiana will do the same. We have a broad bipartisan bill. Transportation and highways are a linchpin of our economic recovery, not only in the jobs they create now, rebuilding and building highways, but in making our economy more efficient.

China is building four times the infrastructure we are. India is building more infrastructure than we are, and in the Senate—to the credit of both sides—we have a broad bipartisan bill that moves us forward. It is not everything I would want or any of us would want. It was put together masterfully by Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE, who are political opposites.

The House, in its paralysis—because there is a small group who, frankly, don't believe the government should be an infrastructure at all—ties it in a knot and forces us with the awful choice of either shutting things down because they are not going to budge or just renewing an old bill which needs updating, which throws people out of work. They are creating paralysis in this country in the case of infrastructure and in many other cases.

If the public wants to know why the country is not growing at a greater rate, wants to know why there is such high unemployment in the construction industries, look at the ideologues over there and their refusal to face reality, to deal with their colleagues, and to put this country—not us—in a take-it-or-leave-it position. This 90-day extension is not the way to go. The way to go is to pass the Senate bill, and I hope those on the other side of the aisle, pushed by outside folks from business management and others all across the country, will see the error of their ways and change their ways over the next few months.

I thank my colleague, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. And I might object, because I think this is a very serious matter. I am reserving the right to object because, as the majority leader well knows, if we would follow Senator BOXER's leadership, sending the Senate bill back to the House, we would not only not lose any jobs, we would create 1.9 million jobs, and for the Restore Act, which is very important to the gulf coast, it would create another 300,000 jobs.

The only action that is going to cause job loss is the action we are basically being forced to accept right now, sent over by a partisan House of Representatives, to go to another short-term extension. This country doesn't need short-term extensions, it needs long-term answers, and it needs jobs they can count on.

Every business in America relies on this Transportation bill. We have now been going to short-term extensions for 3 years. It is time to stop.

I want my leader, who is on the Senate floor, to know I may object in the next few minutes, but I absolutely will object to any other short-term resolution on this bill for as long as this Congress is in session. This is enough.

Now, had this bill gotten out of here with just Democrats on it, I would say we don't have a leg to stand on because we don't have a balanced bill, and we can't jam this through on the other side. But this bill got out of here with 75 or 76 votes. Now, 2 years is not 5 years, but it is better than 3 months. It is a bill we could pass and build on. It is a bill that assures people can go to sleep tonight knowing they have a job tomorrow.

So I object to the minority leader's comments about this bill, that our action is going to lose jobs. No, we have been here working hard to save jobs. I hope when the Republicans go home they will hear from the business community, from the right, the middle, and the left; I hope they will hear from environmental groups: What are you guys doing?

The final comment I want to make as I am objecting is, if the House had a bill, then this would be a negotiation between two bills. The problem is they don't even have a bill. How do we negotiate with a group that doesn't have a bill? They have ideas, they have philosophies, they have platforms, and they have speeches, but they don't have a bill. We couldn't negotiate with them if we wanted to. There is no bill.

This is why we are telling the country: Look, we don't know what their problem is—they have many—but we have a bill. So if they can't get their bill together, take the one we put together. But, no, that is too simple for them.

So I am reserving the right to object. I am going to listen to what my leader has to say, and I might object. I know everybody wants to go home. I know we want to have this unanimous consent agreement. But my State not only has its transportation money wrapped up in this, it has its hope for the future wrapped up because the Restore Act is in that bill.

For the first time, this Senate stood up since I have been here and said: You are right, gulf coast. You do a lot. You have been injured a lot, and we are going to help you. So that bill is in there too, which is why I am hard-pressed to say I will vote for a 90-day extension.

So reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent the request be modified so an amendment, which is at the desk, the text of S. 1813, the surface transportation bill, passed by the Senate on March 14, 2012, by a large bipartisan majority of 74 to 22 be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request of the majority leader?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4281) to provide an extension of Federal aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, having been read the third time, the question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4281) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this has been a difficult time for everyone, and we have what none of us wanted. Our bill was passed in the Senate by a very nice bipartisan margin. I hope during the Easter recess, the House will be able to come back with something they can—as Senator LANDRIEU mentioned, at least have some piece of legislation they can give to us and try to work toward a conclusion or accept our bill, which is our preference.

So I appreciate very much the comments of my colleagues, and I appreciate their patience and understanding of the situation we find ourselves in, which is not a good one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I know my colleague Senator COLLINS is waiting to speak. I will be very brief.

Let's be clear what just happened. What just happened is the House sent us a 90-day extension of our transportation programs with not one dime of revenue in there to fund those, and the highway trust fund is on the road to bankruptcy. So they are the first in my memory—the first legislative body in the Capitol—to ever extend for this period of time without a dollar, which means an acceleration of bankruptcy of the trust fund.

What else did they do? They just guaranteed 100,000 people are not going to get their jobs, and they guaranteed hundreds of businesses are not going to get jobs. They sent out a signal that America should be ready for hardship because they didn't even have the decency to put in that extension a written commitment to produce a bill, to get to conference with us, and to get a bill to the President. No, they run off on their vacation and leave people twisting in the wind.

Well, I want it to be known I am one of the chairs who worked on the bill. There are many other people who were fantastic on this bill from both sides of the aisle. I know—I spoke to Senator INHOFE today about this—we want this bill done. I am going to use every tool at my disposal as one Senator to keep the pressure on the Republican House.

Speaker BOEHNER: You are not Speaker of the Republicans, you are Speaker of the House. Reach your hand across the aisle, as Senator INHOFE reached across the aisle to me and I reached across to him; and JAY ROCKEFELLER reached across to Senator HUTCHISON and she reached across; and TIM JOHNSON reached across to SHELBY and he reached across; and MAX BAUCUS had an array of Republicans work with him in the Finance Committee. We know we can do this.

But what the House has done is send a very clear message of job loss and hardship. It is unacceptable. I look forward to working on this every single day. Now we have 90 days. Tomorrow it will be 89, and then 88. We are going to count down, and we are going to keep the pressure on, and we are not going to let this transportation program go up in smoke because it has been in place since Dwight Eisenhower was President.

It is a sad day for America today, a very sad day. But we will never give up over here, and JAMES INHOFE isn't going to give up, and we are going to fight hard to get a bill.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the revenue title to the highway bill that the Senate passed earlier this month.

Gandhi said: ''Truth quenches untruth.''

I rise to quench untruth. I understand some of our colleagues in the House have mischaracterized the Senate's highway bill by saying that it wasn't paid for.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Senate highway bill is fully paid for and supports more than 1.6 million jobs across the country. It will also ensure there is still money in the Highway Trust Fund at the end of the bill's 2-year authorization.

I want to explain exactly how we fund this bill so everyone is clear.

As chairman of the Committee on Finance, I worked very hard with members of both parties to put together a funding package that would:

First, pay for a reauthorization bill through September of 2013;

Second, not add a single dime to the deficit or the debt; and,

Third, not leave the Highway Trust Fund bankrupt at the end of the proposed reauthorization.

According to estimates from the Congressional Budget Office and the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Highway Trust Fund needs $5.6 billion to pay for the Senate's proposed reauthorization.

In addition, the U.S. Department of Transportation said we need a so-called ''cushion'' of extra money in the Highway Trust Fund at the time of the bill's proposed September 30, 2013 expiration.

I am pleased to report that Senate Republicans and Democrats ultimately came together to put $9.2 billion into the Highway Trust Fund within the next two years, paying for the bill and leaving a sizable $3.6 billion cushion at the end of the authorization period.

Actually, in total, we put $14 billion into the Highway Trust Fund within the budget window of the next 10 years.

Focusing on the nexus to transportation and energy, we were able to transfer an immediate $3 billion surplus in the Leaking Underground Storage Tank trust fund—the so-called ''LUST Fund''—into the Highway Trust Fund. This was an idea offered by a number of Finance Committee Republicans. Like the Highway Trust Fund, the LUST Fund relies on the fuel tax for funding.

In addition, Finance Committee Republicans also proposed routing a third of the future fuel tax revenues intended for this storage tank fund into the Highway Trust Fund. This raises nearly another $700 million over 10 years.

Next, we transferred into the Highway Trust Fund revenues that the general fund would receive from fees on cars that don't comply with fuel efficiency standards and the tariff on foreign automobile imports.

Together, these provisions provide nearly $5 billion for the Highway Trust

Fund, with about $1.6 billion coming in the first 2 years.

Then, we replenished the general fund for the amounts we moved into the Highway Trust Fund. We did this by clamping down on tax cheats and unscrupulous Medicare providers, as examples.

Finally, after accommodating Republican Senators' concerns at markup to rework some elements of our proposal, we accepted a widely supported idea to stabilize required contributions into pension plans.

The pension plan beneficiaries will still be able to rely on the plans getting funded, but employers will have a more predictable and realistic schedule for how much to contribute.

This provision raised sufficient revenue to enable us to then transfer another $4.5 billion into the Highway Trust Fund in the first 2 years, bringing the 2-year total to about $9.2 billion, well more than the $5.6 billion needed to just pay for the bill.

This pension stabilization provision raised more than $9 billion in total, which also enabled us to accept a Republican amendment to put additional money into the Highway Trust Fund in future years. This brought the 10-year total to approximately $14 billion, as I stated earlier.

My understanding is that this increase in general fund revenue to plus up the Highway Trust Fund would be considered acceptable under the House Republicans' proposed budget with its ''Reserve Fund.''

It is also my understanding that the House's proposed 5-year bill will leave the Highway Trust Fund at the brink of insolvency by the bill's proposed conclusion, unlike the Senate's carefully crafted compromise that I have just described.

The House leadership should not make inaccurate claims about the Senate's bill to camouflage their own inability to pass a long-term bill and unwillingness to work out compromises.

We just passed yet another short-term extension to provide funding for only 90 days. We can't keep kicking the can down the road. Pretty soon there will be no road left to kick the can down.

The easiest way to work together and forge a solution to create jobs and fund our Nation's highway system is for the House to take up the Senate's bill. It's a good bill. It provides certainty so businesses and communities can plan construction projects and create jobs.

It is fully paid for. In fact, it ensures the Highway Trust Fund will remain solvent even after the end of the bill. It gives us time to address the longer-term needs of our national program, and how we are going to pay for it.

The House Republican leadership should set partisanship aside. They should realize there are no Republican or Democratic roads or bridges. There are only American ones. It is time to work together and not leave the Highway Trust Fund insolvent.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, during the past week, the Supreme Court heard arguments on the constitutionality of President Obama's health care law. This week also marks the 2-year anniversary of the President's signing that law.

There is no question that our health care system required and still requires significant reform. In passing this law, however, Congress failed to follow the Hippocratic oath of ''first, do no harm.'' The new law increases health care costs, hurts our seniors and health care providers, and imposes billions of dollars in new taxes, fees, and penalties. This, in turn, will lead to fewer choices and higher insurance costs for many middle-income American families and most small businesses—the opposite of what real health care reform should do.

I find it particularly disturbing that President Obama's health care law does not do enough to rein in the cost of health care and to provide consumers with more affordable choices. In fact, Medicare's Chief Actuary estimates the law will increase health care spending across the economy by more than $300 billion. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says the law will actually increase premiums for the average family plan by $2,100. Moreover, a recent report issued by the CBO found that the new law will cost $1.76 trillion between now and the year 2022. That is twice as much as the bill's original 10-year pricetag of $940 million.

The new law will also mean fewer choices for many middle-income Americans and small businesses. All individual and small group policies sold in our country will soon have to fit into one of four categories. One size does not fit all.

In Maine, almost 90 percent of those purchasing coverage in the individual market have a policy that is different from the standards in the new law.

I am also very concerned about the impact of the law on Maine's small businesses, which are our State's job creation engine. The new law discourages small companies from hiring new employees and from paying them more. It could also lead to onerous financial penalties even for those small businesses that are struggling to provide health insurance for their employees.

According to a Gallup survey taken earlier this year, 48 percent of small businesses are not hiring because of the potential cost of health insurance under the new law. The Director of the Congressional Budget Office has testified that the new health care law will mean 800,000 fewer American jobs over the next decade.

Even when the law tries to help small businesses, it misses the mark. For example, I have long been a proponent of tax credits to help small businesses afford health insurance for their employees. The new credits for small businesses in the health care law, however, are so poorly structured and phased out in such a way that businesses will actually be penalized when they hire new workers or pay their employees more. Moreover, they are temporary. The tax credits are temporary and can only be claimed for 2 years in an insurance exchange.

I am also very concerned that the new law is paid for, in part, through more than a $500 billion cut in Medicare—a program which is already facing serious long-term financing problems. It simply does not make sense to rely on deep cuts in Medicare to finance a new entitlement program at a time when the number of seniors in this country is on the rise. We need to fix and save Medicare, not add to its financial strains.

Moreover, according to the administration's own Chief Actuary, those deep Medicare cuts could push one in five hospitals, nursing homes, and home health providers into the red. I am particularly concerned about the impact on rural States like Maine. Many of those providers could simply stop taking Medicare patients. That would jeopardize access to care for millions of our seniors.

It did not have to be that way. The bitter rhetoric and the partisan gridlock over the past few years have obscured the very important fact that there are many health care reforms that have overwhelming support in both parties.

For example, we should have been able to agree on generous tax credits for self-employed individuals and small businesses to help them afford health insurance. That would have reduced the number of uninsured Americans. We should have been able to agree on insurance market reforms that would prevent insurance companies from denying coverage to children who have preexisting conditions, that would permit children to remain on their parents' insurance policies until age 26, that would require standardized claim forms to reduce administrative costs, and that would allow consumers to purchase insurance across State lines. Those are just some examples of health care reforms that would enjoy and do enjoy widespread bipartisan support.

We also should be able to agree on delivery system reforms that reward value over volume and quality instead of quantity. We should be able to agree on reforms that increase transparency throughout the health care system so consumers can compare prices and quality more easily.

I know the Presiding Officer's State, and Dartmouth College in particular, has done a great deal of work in this

area, as have many health care providers and many hospitals in the State of Maine. They are experimenting with new delivery models that will help them better control chronic disease treatments, which, in turn, will not only improve the quality of health care but also help to lower costs.

We should be able to agree on ways to address the serious health care workforce shortages that plague rural and small-town America. Simply having an insurance card will do you little or no good if there is no one available to provide the health care.

In short, I believe we made—Congress made—a real error in passing ObamaCare. We should repeal the law so we can start over, to work together in a bipartisan way to draft a health care bill that achieves the consensus goals of providing more choice, containing health care costs, improving quality and access, and making health care coverage more affordable for all Americans.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I am here today to share a new and stunning revelation unearthed by my staff on the Senate Budget Committee. One of my responsibilities as the ranking member is to look at the long-term cost of legislation, so we wanted to ascertain the long-term cost of the President's health care bill—I mean the kind of long-term cost analysis that has been going on for a number of years with regard to Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid, over a 75-year period. I was floored by what we discovered.

First, let's put in a little context. President Obama told the American people repeatedly that his health care bill would cost $900 billion over 10 years and that it would not add one dime to the public debt. But we have shown that the cost score for the first 10 years of implementation, when the bill is fully implemented, is actually $2.6 trillion—almost three times as much.

In addition, the offsets used to reduce the law's official cost were enormous and phony, as I have discussed before and will detail at another time. These are unacceptable offsets. You have heard the story of Mr. Mistoffelees, the Napoleon of Crime. I say that this bill is the Napoleon of criminal offsets. The more we learn about the bill, the more we discover it is even more unaffordable than was suspected.

Over a period of about 3 months, our staff worked diligently to estimate the new unfunded liability that would be imposed by the passage of this legislation. This is not the total cost of the bill but the unfunded mandatory coverage obligations incurred by the U.S. Government on behalf of the people of the United States over a period of time.

An unfunded obligation is basically the amount of money we will have to spend on a mandatory expense that the bill does not have a funding source to meet—money we don't have but money we are committed to spend. It is this kind of long-term unfunded obligation that will place this Nation's financial situation at such great risk. It is the thing that has called witness after witness before the Budget Committee, on which I am ranking member, who tell us we are on an unsustainable path. That means money we will either have to print, borrow, or tax to meet the obligations we would incur as a people as a result of the passage of this bill.

For instance, it is widely agreed that Social Security has an unfunded liability of $7 trillion over 75 years. That is an enormous sum. It is double the entire amount of the U.S. budget today. My staff used the models that are used by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. They talked with the individual experts about these numbers and worked diligently to come up with a figure using appropriate methods. That figure, using the administration's own optimistic assumptions and claims about the cost of the law, is an incredible $17 trillion that would be added to the unfunded liabilities of the United States over the next 75 years. That is more than twice the unfunded liability of Social Security.

I wish to emphasize that this $17 trillion figure is not an estimate based on what we think the bill will really cost if all the administration's claims and promises were to be proven false—and certainly there have been matters proven false already. We used the administration's own figures. So the unfunded liability is almost certainly not going to be less than $17 trillion, but if any more of the administration's claims unravel—as so many already have—the cost of the program's unpaid-for obligation will rise radically higher than $17 trillion. For instance, former CBO Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin, an expert in these matters, says that millions more individuals may lose their current employer coverage and be placed into the government-supported exchanges than currently projected—than what the administration has projected. But we didn't follow Mr. Holtz-Eakin's arguments or concerns; we took the administration's assumptions.

Let me briefly explain some of what now comprises this additional $17 trillion in unfunded obligations.

Madam President, $12 trillion is for the health care law's premium subsidy program. You see, the law created new regulations that drive up the price of insurance for millions of Americans. The writers of the law knew it would inflate the cost of insurance premiums, so to cover that cost, they had to include new government subsidies so people could pay for their more expensive insurance.

On Medicaid, this new health care law has added another $5 trillion to its unfunded liabilities. This is on top of the substantial unfunded obligations the Federal and State governments have already had to take on in order to support Medicaid. They have protested vigorously to us, warning of these additional deep expenditure requirements that are falling on the States.

These figures don't even account for the dozens of new bureaucracies that will be created to implement the President's health care law or the expansion of the bureaucracies. Those costs are not included in the $17 trillion or the cost estimates the administration used for the bill. For instance, the IRS has requested 4,000 new IRS agents and $300 million in additional funds for their part in implementing the new law.

At a time when we should be trying—we have to—to shore up programs that are threatened by default—Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid—this health care law adds an entirely new obligation—one we cannot pay for—and puts the entire financing of the U.S. Government in jeopardy. We don't have the money. We don't have another $17 trillion in unfunded liabilities that we can add to our account. We have to reduce the ones we have. This has been obvious for several decades. People have talked about it repeatedly.

Instead of doing something about those programs that are headed to bankruptcy, we add—under this President's determined insistence and a straight party-line vote—one of the largest unfunded mandates in history on top of what we already have. How can we possibly justify this? It cannot be justified.

This bill has to be removed from the books because we don't have the money. There are a lot of other reasons, but that is one of them. It is inescapable. It would be absolutely irresponsible for this Congress to maintain a law that would run up this kind of debt—2½ times the unfunded obligations of Social Security—and we are worried about our children being able to have their Social Security checks on time.

This is not a little bitty matter, it is important. So I will be sending a letter to the GAO, the Government Accountability Office. They do these kinds of scorings over 75 years. We will ask them to construct their independent estimate of the unfunded health care law obligations. I believe they will be similar to the ones my staff has produced. I hope they are better, but I am afraid they are not. And even if they come close to what we have calculated, it is pretty clear that the money that

will be coming in could be far less and the obligations could be far more than what are being projected, as Mr. Holtz-Eakin and others have said. It is an urgent matter.

I plan to come to the floor in the coming days to continue to explain the true fiscal cost facts about this legislation. There are many other serious problems with it. It is unpopular, unaffordable, unconstitutional, and it has to be repealed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I feel compelled to say a word on the heels of our colleague from Alabama, whom I salute as he heads off into the setting Sun. I wish him well and to have a good break.

When I was in the Navy during the Vietnam war, when we weren't flying a lot of missions off the coast of Cambodia and Vietnam, we flew into a lot of other countries, including Japan. I have always had an interest in Japan in terms of the way they provide health care. One thing that intrigues me about that is that they spend half as much money for health care as we do. They spend 8 percent of gross domestic product. We spend 16 percent of gross domestic product. They get better outcomes—everything from longer life expectancy to lower rates of infant mortality—and they cover everybody. They cover everybody. It is not socialized medicine. They have a private health care delivery system and private health insurance companies as well as we do, but they get a better result for about half the money we do, and we have to compete with them.

It is not a fair competition. We have our businesses that are competing directly with the Japanese and, frankly, with other countries as well. But when they are spending half as much money for health care, and we are trying to compete our businesses against theirs, it is not a fair fight. It is like having one arm tied behind our back.

For years, Presidents, Members of Congress—Democrat and Republican—have talked about this challenge—the fact we spend so much more money for health care than the rest of the world, and we don't get better results and, in a lot of cases, we get worse results and we don't cover everybody. We have a lot of people uncovered. That is not smart.

For years, for decades, nobody took it on. They tried during the Clinton administration but gave up during that course. They didn't have the kind of bipartisan support that is needed. Frankly, we didn't have the bipartisan support I would like to have had on health care reform when we took it up during the earlier part of this current administration.

A lot of people have focused on the individual mandate as being constitutional or unconstitutional. I am not a lawyer. I don't pretend to be an expert on that stuff. I studied a little economics when I was a Navy ROTC midshipman at Ohio State. When I got out of the Navy and moved to Delaware to get an MBA under the GI bill, I studied some more economics and all, but I don't pretend to be a lawyer. But I do know this: Health insurance companies have said to all of us—Democrats, Republicans, Presidents, now and in the past—look, if you expect us to provide health insurance for folks with preexisting conditions, you have to make sure the pool of people we have to cover includes not just people who have preexisting conditions—not just people who are sick or have illnesses or conditions that are expensive to treat—you have to make sure we have a pool of people to insure that includes some healthy people.

The way some countries deal with this is they mandate for everybody to have coverage. We didn't want to do that. We didn't want to mandate that everybody have coverage, but we wanted to incentivize people, including healthier people—including healthier young people the ages of my sons who are in their early twenties—to make sure at least some of those young men and women end up in that pool, so healthy people end up in that pool.

So part of the request from the health insurance industry, in return for doing away with preexisting conditions and basically screening out sick people, saying they are not going to provide coverage for them, was to make sure a lot of healthier people ended up being in that health insurance pool.

The way we decided to do it in the health care bill, in the law rather than just mandate people get coverage, was to incentivize them. If they choose not to, that is their business. If they happen to be poor, we will help them pay down their cost for health care. But if they are not poor, and they have the financial means, we would like for them to get coverage. We are not going to mandate it, but the first year we have the means to be able to have coverage and they choose not to, there will be a fine or a penalty of some kind—maybe a couple hundred bucks, and that will increase not to $1,000 or $2,000, but it will go up several hundred dollars in order to encourage people to get the coverage.

At the end of the day, some people will say: I am paying $600—whatever it ends up being. Maybe instead of paying this fee I should just go ahead and get some health insurance coverage. The idea is to provide some plans that are reasonably affordable so folks can take advantage of them.

So that is the issue of the mandate. The Supreme Court will decide whether under the commerce clause of the Constitution that just as we compel people to pay into Social Security, it can be a similar kind of compunction to say we would like people to get covered for health care, but in this case not to mandate it, as we do with Social Security. So we will see how it works out in the Supreme Court.

They heard arguments this week, and I am sure the arguments will continue on the air waves, at townhall meetings, and on television for months to come and maybe beyond that. Who knows. But the heart and soul of the health care reform legislation has less to do with mandates for me than it does with how to get better health care outcomes for less money. For me, that is it—better health care outcomes for less money.

We don't have to look at Japan and other countries to figure that out. All we have to do is look at places such as Minnesota's Mayo Clinic, in Ohio the Cleveland Clinic, Pennsylvania's health care delivery system, which is called Geisinger, Utah's Intermountain Healthcare, and California's Kaiser Permanente. What do they have in common? They get better health care outcomes for tens of millions of people for less money than most other health care delivery systems in this country. Better results for less money.

How do they do it? Well, they have figured out what works, and they do more of that. They figured out what doesn't work to get better health care outcomes for less money, and they do less of that. They have moved away from what we call a fee-for-service approach to health care.

People get sick, they go see a doctor, they go see a nurse. They have visits and get shots or they get lab tests done or get x-rays or MRIs. We treat people when they get sick. For years, that is the way we have done health care in this country, including Medicare and Medicaid. Much smarter ideas have come out of Cleveland's clinic, and they have a huge health care clinic in northern Ohio, the Mayo Clinic, Geisinger in Pennsylvania, Intermountain in Utah, and Kaiser Permanente mostly in California.

Here is what they do. They do not just incentivize health care providers—doctors, nurses, and hospitals—to work on people when they are sick. Their incentive works entirely different. What they do in those places is focus on how to keep people healthy, not just how to incentivize the doctors, hospitals, and nurses to keep people healthy, but how do we incentivize the patient, the person whose health is at stake, how do we incentivize them to take personal responsibility for their own health care.

In my mind that is the heart and soul of the health care reform right there. Among the smart things that work are large purchasing pools. We have an 8-million-person pool for us that we are part of. Members of Congress, our staffs, all Federal employees, Federal retirees, and our dependents are part of a huge purchasing pool called the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan. It is approximately 8 million people.

We don't have 8 million Federal employees, but we have 8 million people when we add in retirees and dependents and so forth. We are part of this big health care purchasing pool. We get lower prices.

It is not free. We pay about 28 percent of the cost of our premiums as Federal employees and servants, if you will, to people in our respective States, and our employers, the taxpayers, pay the other 72 percent or so.

But what we are going to do is provide the opportunity for individuals, for families, for businesses—small and midsize businesses—all over the country, in less than 24 months, to be able to join a similar kind of purchasing pool. We are going to start them, and every State—New Hampshire, Delaware, Alabama, and every other State—will have the opportunity to have their own large purchasing pool to be able to take advantage of lower administrative costs.

The administrative costs for our Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan is $3 out of every $100 of the cost of the premium. So $3 out of every $100 of premium costs goes for administration. In most plans for individuals, for families and small businesses, it is more like 20 or 30 percent. So 3 percent for our large purchasing pool, and we will have those available, in fact, in every State.

The other thing we have going for us in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan is we use private health insurance plans. We are not using socialized medicine or stuff like that. The private health insurance plans in the country can sign up and say they want to be able to offer their plans to the folks who are Federal employees with dependents, to Federal retirees, and so we can choose among them. So there is a lot of competition between those health insurance companies, and we get the benefit from that competition. It drives down cost. Competition helps drive down cost and improves the range of opportunities.

The other thing I like about the law is that, for the most part, insurance can't be sold across State lines. But we make an exception. I will use Delaware as an example. We are boundaried on the west by Maryland, to the north by Pennsylvania, and to the east by New Jersey. When we establish our own health insurance pool in 2014, we will have about 900,000 people. So we will have a huge health insurance pool, but we are sure not going to have 8 million people.

But what we will have under the law is the opportunity to create an interstate compact between Maryland or Delaware or Delaware and Pennsylvania or Delaware and New Jersey or maybe all of the above and have a multistate purchasing pool or exchange. The great thing about this approach is we, No. 1, will have a bigger pool, which will drive down administrative costs and increase the competition.

The health care that would be available in Delaware plans could be offered in Maryland, could be offered in Pennsylvania or offered in New Jersey. So we would have a larger purchasing pool, more competition, and a better deal for the consumer. I think that is another part of the heart and soul.

So two things, and I will close on this and then turn to what I came to the floor to talk about. But I was inspired by my friend from Alabama. In terms of the key reforms in the health care legislation, No. 1, move away from fee-for-service—just paying for treating people when they are sick. Migrate away from that. We still need to treat people when they are sick, but migrate to a system like we have at Mayo, Cleveland Clinic, Geisinger, Intermountain Health, and Kaiser Permanente where they focus on how we keep people well. Focus on prevention and wellness and focus on treating people in a coordinated fashion as a team, not as individual providers. Very smart.

The other key element is this idea of creating these large purchasing pools and trying to incentivize people to be part of the health care delivery system by taking better care of themselves. So those are the two keys.

GAS PRICES

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I want to switch gears and talk a little about gas prices. Madam President, I don't know what kind of vehicle you drive most of your miles in while in New Hampshire. The vehicle I drive most of my miles in, and have been driving in Delaware for 11 years now, is a Town and Country Chrysler minivan. When I stepped down as Governor in 2001, my old Chevrolet Corsica was about 12 or 13 years old, and my wife said: Don't you think it is about time to get something new? So I took my oldest son Christopher, who was about 12 at the time, and I said: Let's go out and shop for a new car. I thought it would be a man thing, a dad and son thing.

So we went out and drove Porsches, we drove Ferraris, and we bought a 2001 Chrysler Town and Country minivan, which he laments to this day. Anyway, fast-forward 11 years, and we had a meeting yesterday morning, as you know, with the CEO of Chrysler-Fiat, and I mentioned at the meeting that we bought this vehicle when I stepped down as Governor, and 11 years later—later this week—the odometer will reflect the numbers 300,000 and counting. It will have over 300,000 miles. We are going to go over 300,000 miles. So it was built to last. What a great car, built in this country, a terrific vehicle. But when I stopped and got gas last weekend, we paid about $3.81, and the prices continue to go up—mostly up, sometimes down, and then back up again.

What I would like to do is talk a little about high gas prices and how it puts pressure on all budgets, including the budget of my own family. We drive that vehicle a whole lot and, hopefully, will drive it a few more miles before it is ready do sit more in the driveway and take a rest.

I want to begin by acknowledging that I go home just about every night and talk to people literally almost every day, morning or evening, in Delaware. I will cover the State this weekend and for the next week or two during our recess, so I hear a lot directly from the folks I am privileged to represent about their concerns about gas prices at the pump and the kind of pressure it puts on the budgets within their own families.

I understand gas prices are at their peak. Actually, they have been higher than this. I think they were a little over 4 bucks during part of the Bush administration, but this is as high as they have been for some time. It puts a strain on American families and American businesses, and it threatens to impede or slow down our economic recovery, which is actually moving at a pretty good pace. Unfortunately, the solution is not as simple as some would suggest. If it were, we would not be having this discussion every year or two around the same time.

I am asked sometimes: Why don't we just drill more in this country? Some assume high gas prices at the pump must mean we have slowed down or stopped drilling at home.

Many are surprised by the answer, and the answer is we are drilling more in America. In fact, I believe—correct me if I am wrong—but we are drilling more in this country than we have for at least the last 8 years. Because we are drilling more, the United States is now a net oil exporter, not a net oil importer. This country, which for years we said we are the Saudi Arabia of coal, is now on its way to becoming the Saudi Arabia of natural gas. As we have opened for drilling additional acres onshore, offshore, off Alaska, and the gulf, we are in a position to become a net oil exporter.

The Obama administration has made available millions of acres for oil and gas exploration in the last year or two, approving more than 400 drilling permits since the new safety standards were put in place. These safety standards, we may recall, were implemented to make sure we didn't have a repeat oilspill disaster such as the BP oilspill that occurred almost 2 years ago today.

We have been joined on the floor by Senator NELSON of Florida, who remembers all too well the oil that washed up in places such as Pensacola, where I did basic training on my way to becoming a naval flight officer. But since we got that straightened out and put in place tighter restrictions for drilling safeguards, 400 or so new drilling permits just since then have been put in place with stronger safety standards.

As a result, we have a record number of oil rigs operating right now, more working oil and gas rigs than the rest of the world combined. Let me say that

again. With the changes that have been made, the increases in permitting in a year or two, we now have a record number of oil rigs operating right now, more working oil and gas rigs than the rest of the world combined—combined. Yet of the millions of acres our government has allowed for oil and gas development, only 25 percent of those acres are being used for production.

We have a chart that demonstrates that rather graphically. If you will, think of all this as the millions of acres that are available for oil and gas development in this country. Of all these in the orange, we have the percentage that are producing acres, that actually have permits and the oil and gas companies could be drilling; 25 percent of these are producing acres and 75 percent of these are nonproducing acres. It is not because people are drilling and coming up with dry holes; it is because, in many cases, they are not drilling.

Keep that picture in mind. You know the old saying, a picture is worth a thousand words. This is worth at least 500, maybe even more than that.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Would the Senator yield for that point?

Mr. CARPER. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Would the Senator believe that in the Gulf of Mexico, of all the production there, the percentage is even worse in all those acres that are under lease, which is 32 million acres.

Mr. CARPER. Just in the gulf?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Just in the gulf, 32 million acres. Guess how many acres are actually drilled and producing?

Mr. CARPER. Eight million.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Six million.

Mr. CARPER. Really.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Six. So 26 million acres are under lease in the Gulf of Mexico and are not being produced.

Mr. CARPER. I thank the Senator for that.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Wouldn't it suggest that they ought to use it or lose it?

Mr. CARPER. It certainly would. I thank the Senator for sharing that point with us.

So here we are, more drilling in America, onshore and offshore. We are no longer a net oil importer. We have 75 million acres that are leased and have yet to be tapped, and a lot of those are down in the gulf, as Senator NELSON suggests. Yet American consumers are still paying more at the pump.

All the while, the five largest oil companies, BP, Chevron, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil, Royal Dutch Shell Group did pretty well. They made about $137 billion last year. To top it off, these companies received billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies to drill for oil and gas, even as they are making very healthy—I think record-breaking—profits.

This doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me, but let me stop. I wish to be clear on this point. I don't think any of us should begrudge the oil and gas companies their success. They have a fair amount at risk when they drill for oil or gas, and it is not a business without risk. But this is also a business with enormous payoffs and enormous rewards for assuming those risks.

But I do question giving away billions of taxpayer dollars in drilling subsidies at a time when we are running record Federal deficits to established and successful industries that I don't think need a whole lot of financial incentive to drill more in this country. If they can make 100 or 110 bucks a barrel or so, that is pretty good incentive, at least in my mind.

Why? Because at the end of this day, it is not the solution. We can't drill our way out of the situation we are in.

I am told that, today, America consumes some 19.5 million barrels every day. The primary reason that amount is so high is because Americans have very little choice at the pump; and until recently, we had very little choice in the automotive showrooms. That has changed rather dramatically in 5 years, and it is going to change a whole lot more. But we can choose between oil and oil most of the time when we pull into a gas station to fill up. Basically, every American driver's dollars are a foregone conclusion to the oil industry.

What do we need to do about this? How about some choice. Maybe we can give Americans a choice. In the chart we have, we have solar. Some of the new vehicles that are being made actually have solar panels on their roofs.

Here we have wind. We are harnessing a lot of wind around the country. Hopefully, before long we will harness it off the east coast, maybe from North Carolina up to Maine, to provide electricity. It will help provide the juice they need for these hybrid electric vehicles that are being made more and more. We have nuclear. We have a lot of nuclear in the mid-Atlantic and the Northeast that can provide electricity, if you will, the juice, for these hybrid electric vehicles.

Here, we have companies such as DuPont in our State working with BP to actually create—not corn ethanol but ethanol, cellulosic ethanol out of corn stovers. What is a corn stover? That is the cornstalk, that is the corncob, that is the leaf of the corn—and create a fuel called biobutanol that we will hear more about in the years to come that has better energy density than corn ethanol. It mixes better with gasoline than corn ethanol. It actually travels through pipelines. Corn ethanol doesn't do that. It is like all the things corn ethanol is not.

That is the kind of stuff we ought to be doing. We need to be incentivizing—not only being involved in the R&D of that stuff but also encouraging its being used, and I think market forces will take it from there, whether the choice is natural gas, converting large diesel vehicles into using natural gas, electricity from clean energy or biofuels or nuclear.

For the first time in 30 years, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has just approved the construction of two nuclear powerplants. We went 30 years without building a new nuclear powerplant. Two are underway right now down in Georgia. They use a new design called the AP–1000, also just approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The new design is one that literally shuts down a nuclear plant. If we have a hurricane or if we have an earthquake or if we have a tsunami, basically it shuts itself down. We don't have to worry about the problems they had in Fukushima, where they lost communication, where they lost the pumping system, where all this and that happened, everything that could go wrong went wrong. These systems under the AP–1000 basically shut down by themselves. It is a much smarter approach, and it is the way the two new powerplants in Georgia are going to be built. That is part of the solution as well.

But we need investments in new fuels and investments in new vehicles and new infrastructure to use these new American-made alternative fuels. We already have vehicles that can run on biofuels and natural gas and electricity. We had the folks from the U.S. Navy in the other day, including some people from down in Florida, and they are flying Navy airplanes, Air Force airplanes, using a 50–50 mixture of jet fuel and biofuel and with no degradation in performance. We need to make those vehicles—whether they are aircraft or cars, trucks, and vans—make those vehicles and the fuels for those vehicles more available to the American people, in this case our Armed Forces. We need a choice. We need a greater choice than what we have had, and the bill offered by Senator MENENDEZ actually starts to give us that choice.

I am getting close to the end, so let me just say that instead of giving billions of dollars to oil companies to continue what they are already doing, why don't we put some Federal dollars in to work to allow real choices at the pump? It turns out that some of the folks who are doing some cutting-edge work in this turn out to be some of these oil companies. Some of the best biofuels work is being done by, I think, outfits like BP and Shell. Rather than incentivize them just to drill more, why don't we incentivize them to come up with alternative and biofuels and other kinds of renewable forms of energy? They shouldn't be cut out of that. They are energy companies. They are not just oil and gas companies. Let's incentivize them to create energy.

I wish to go back a couple years. I wish to go back to 2002. I am told that from 2002 to 2010, Chevron spent something like roughly $4.5 billion globally;

from 2002 to 2010 they did it on research and development for renewables and alternatives including geothermal, biofuels, advanced batteries, wind and solar, as well as on energy-efficient measures. That is about $4.4 billion.

In 2010 alone, ExxonMobil invested about $67 million in research and development in oil alternatives, mainly in algae research. That same year, BP spent $284 million. ConocoPhillips spent something like $34 million on research and development and demonstrations in alternative fuels.

Again, the idea is these oil companies are doing R&D. Why don't we incentivize them to do R&D for renewable fuel, not oil and gas. Oil and gas, at $100 a barrel, $90 a barrel, they don't need a whole lot in terms of incentives to drill. Let's incentivize them to do the renewable fuels.

I wish to be mindful of our time and be mindful of my colleague waiting. Let's close by saying let's put Federal dollars into choices at the pump that are developed in America. I will say that again.

We are taking money from the Treasury. We are using that money to incentivize the creation of more energy—in some cases more fuel. Rather than just incentivizing creation of traditional fuel that comes out of the ground, the oil, why don't we incentivize some of those same oil companies and a bunch of folks that aren't oil companies to create renewable fuels, the kind I just mentioned, that will be produced in America, that will help us lower our costs and create jobs while they are doing it?

If we want an apple today, when is the best time to plant a tree? The best time to plant a tree is probably 10 years ago, perhaps 6 years ago, if we nurture and care for that tree. That is what we are dealing with today. We need to start investing today for the choices in lower utility costs at the pump tomorrow.

As to building of the Keystone Pipeline, which is supported by some, opposed by others—the southern part of that is actually underway. The rest is going to be going through an approval process and should be worked out within the next year—is not going to solve the price at the pump today. What we need is what we call an all-of-the-above approach—an all-of-the-above approach—which includes nuclear, includes offshore wind, onshore wind, includes biofuels, solar, natural gas in big diesel vehicles that we transform to take natural gas—all of the above.

That is what we need to do. We need to nurture new investments for alternative fuels so we can see the economic gains sooner rather than later. I think Senator MENENDEZ's legislation does that. That is why I am calling on my colleagues to support that kind of approach, whether it is this particular approach or something similar to that.

That pretty much wraps up what I want to say. I want to thank my friend from Florida for being a voice of reason on this subject. This is a guy who is good on just using some common sense.

My dad was a naval chief petty officer for 30-some years. He used to say to my sister and me: Just use some common sense. We must not have had much as kids because he sure said it a lot. But I think the commonsense approach is an all-of-the-above approach. We need to do all of the above, and we need to incentivize the oil companies and a lot of other folks not just to drill for oil but actually to make sure there are good alternatives to that.

With that I yield to my friend and colleague and bid you adieu.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I came to the floor to talk about an outstanding citizen in our State. But before I do, while my colleague is here, I just want to thank him for a very well-reasoned statement.

What we need is overall income tax code reform. My colleague from Delaware and I have the privilege of sitting on the Finance Committee. Even though the prospects for Tax Code reform are very slim between now and the election, perhaps shortly thereafter we can get about the seriousness of the Tax Code, making it more fair, more simple, taking revenue that otherwise escapes the Treasury because it goes into all these tax preferences called tax expenditures, tax loopholes, and use that revenue to lower everybody's rates, including the individual rates and the corporate rates.

That is eminently common sense. The reason I want to point this out is because our friend from Delaware has just pointed out one of those loopholes in an industry that is certainly not hurting because the five top oil companies in the last quarter—that is 90 days—had profits, not revenue—the five top—north of $25 billion for five companies for 90 days—not revenue, profit.

We do not begrudge them the profit. But should there be these tax preferences that have been etched into the Tax Code over a century that, in fact, allow this industry to have tax preferences—in other words, deductions—of $4 billion a year?

I think that would be a place we could start on tax preferences. You are obviously not going to get it in the context of the politics of an election. And you are not going to get it in isolation. We are going to have to look at the overall Tax Code and start making it more fair for the American taxpayer. I daresay there are not very many American taxpayers who think that the IRS Tax Code is a fair code.

Mr. CARPER. Or simple.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Or simple. And as a result I thank him for his elucidation of what is a place that we could start. It is not right or left; it is not R or D; it is common sense.

One other thing I would add to the excellent presentation of the Senator, and that is that as the cost of gas creeps higher and higher—and in parts of Florida it is now $4 a gallon, and oil is being sold on the international marketplace at something like $120 a barrel—how much of that is from speculation of people who buy and sell oil contracts for future delivery? How much is from people who are not users of the oil, such as an airline that would clearly have reason to want to lock in a fixed price for oil in the future as a hedge against that price of oil going up because they are going to use that oil as fuel in their airline? No, these are the ones who are merely flipping like hamburgers the contracts, over and over, which has a tendency to raise the price of oil.

The price of a barrel of oil as it rises then clearly is going to affect the price we pay when we go into the gas station and put gas in our gas tank.

If we would start using some common sense in our approach to these things and do it in a fair way, I think we could get along so much better and the American people would feel so much better about their Tax Code.

I thank the Senator for his presentation.

Mr. CARPER. If my friend would yield to me for one more minute, a lot of people go out this time of year and they buy new cars, trucks, and vans. Traditionally the spring is when people shop for vehicles. Go back a couple of years, to 2007. In 2007 we sold 16 million cars, trucks, and vans in this country. In 2009, as we had fallen into the great recession, car sales and truck sales fell to 9 million units; from 16 million to 9 million in less than 24 months.

That has changed now. We are on our way. The CEO of Chrysler was here yesterday and said they are on their way to record profits. They paid back the rest of the money we invested in them as taxpayers. But people are starting to buy vehicles again. The average life of vehicles people own in this country is 11 years, like my Chrysler Town and Country minivan. But this is the time people will start to trade in vehicles or buy something more energy efficient.

Unlike 5 years ago, people can go into a Ford, Chrysler, GM dealership, and foreign labels as well, and buy vehicles that get 30, 35, 40 miles per gallon and more. And finally, the availability of credit has come back. I say to people who have that ability, thinking about trading and trading up, this is a great time to do it—great vehicles, great quality and much better efficiency, and that is part of the solution as well.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Senator for pulling up the chart that showed the amount of acres that are under lease and the minuscule portion of those acres—this is domestic production. We all know that domestic production has shot up in the last 3 years, considerably. Yet, of that domestic production, there still is so much capacity that is already leased out there.

I use the example of the Gulf of Mexico. In the central and the western

gulf, there are 32 million acres under lease and only 6 million acres of that 32 million are actually drilled and produced.

There is ample opportunity for additional domestic energy production on top of the substantial increase of production that has occurred over the course of the last several years if we would stop fighting about this, if we would stop beating each other over the head politically with this and get serious.

Senator CARPER remembers when he and I were young Congressmen, we had a good example of leadership. We had Tip O'Neill, the Speaker in the House, and we had Bob Michel, the Republican leader. The two of them would get into their fights but they were personal friends, so at the end of the day when it was time to stop talking and get together and build consensus to get a workable solution, they could do it. We need that kind of model operating in Washington, DC, and State capitals around the country.

Mr. CARPER. Amen.

TRIBUTE TO ROSEMARY ARMSTRONG

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I came to the floor today because I want to congratulate a Floridian, Rosemary Armstrong, along with her husband Sandy Weinberg. I want to congratulate Rosemary because she has been such a long-time advocate of pro bono legal work in our State.

She is a marvelous lawyer, a graduate of Columbia, and why she is to be congratulated at this point is that she has received the 2012 Tobias Simon Pro Bono Service Award. It is the highest honor in the State of Florida bar for pro bono legal work in our State.

This year marks the 30th anniversary of the Tobias Simon award, and it was named after the well-known civil rights attorney in Florida. The award honors the work of private lawyers for 30 years now, who provide free voluntary legal services to the poor.

Over the past 25 years, Rosemary has used her time and she has used her talent to provide those pro bono legal services. She has volunteered with the Tampa Bay Area Legal Services Volunteer Lawyers Program since 1986. She has donated 1,200 pro bono hours directly to serve those in need. She was elected to the Bay Area Legal Services Board and she served as a board member for 22 years. She has served as president of that board for 3 years.

Rosemary has handled so many cases in so many areas of the law, including elder law, housing, and juvenile dependency cases. Of particular note is the significance of her work with victims of domestic violence. Rosemary was recognized last year for her work with the Florida Bar President's Pro Bono Service Award.

This award is further recognition of her commitment and dedication to making sure everyone is well represented when they have to go through the legal process. She is supported by her family. She is supported by her husband, a fellow lawyer, Sandy Weinberg.

Again, congratulations, Rosemary Armstrong, for receiving the Tobias Simon Pro Bono Service Award.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MATT RUTHERFORD

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about a truly remarkable American—a truly remarkable visionary, a dreamer, an adventurer, a doer, and, most important, a young man who has devoted himself to the service to others far and above the normal call of duty. This young man's name is Matt Rutherford. I will tell my colleagues about him and his remarkable adventure and his feat that has been unparalleled.

He is a 30-year-old Ohioan, and here is what he has been doing since June 13 of last year. On June 13 of last year, he set sail in his 36-year-old, 27-foot Albin Vega boat named St. Brendan. He left Annapolis, MD, on June 13, 2011, and is attempting to sail nearly 25,000 miles from Annapolis, MD, up the east coast, all the way around Newfoundland, up by Greenland, through the Northwest Passage, all the way over to Alaska, then from Alaska all the way down to Cape Horn, around Cape Horn, up South America, and back into Annapolis. Now, what is so remarkable about that? Well, it has never been done before. He is doing this solo, and he is doing it nonstop. Think about that. He has never touched land and has not stopped since he left here 289 days ago.

The trip has taken Matt through some of the Earth's most treacherous oceans, including the Arctic Ocean, the oceans up around Alaska, Aleutian Straits, of course all the way down through the Pacific, around treacherous Cape Horn, and all this in a 27-foot boat, the kind of boat most sailors would maybe be comfortable on off the Eastern Shore in the Chesapeake Bay but not on a journey such as this. As I said, he has not set foot on dry land for the entire journey—a remarkable adventure.

If my colleagues wish to learn more about him, they can go to his Web site, which is called www.solotheamericas.org, and they can read all about his amazing journey. He updates his trip. The last update was yesterday. He is right now east of Cuba and the Dominican Republic, right down here, and his last posting was what he called ''Home Stretch.'' He hopes to enter the Chesapeake Bay by April 12, making his first landfall in nearly a year in Annapolis on April 13.

The Scott Polar Institute in Cambridge, England, has recognized Matt as the first person in history to make it through the fabled Northwest Passage alone, nonstop, and on such a small sailboat. It has never been done before. One would think that would be enough. No. He has continued on his incredible, remarkable journey.

Now, one might say: Why is he doing that? He is just doing it to set a record.

He has set a lot of records already. Why is he doing it? He is doing it to raise money for Chesapeake Region Accessible Boating. It is an Annapolis-based organization to provide sailing opportunities for physically or developmentally disabled people—for kids and young people who are disabled but who like to sail. And this organization, Chesapeake Region Accessible Boating, does just that—provides them that opportunity.

I had the privilege of talking to Matt Rutherford last week. He called me on his satellite phone. It was an exciting phone call for me because I have watched—I don't know Matt Rutherford personally, but I have watched his journey, and, of course, I am very enthused about the Chesapeake Region Accessible Boating organization. So in talking with him by phone I was really impressed by his courage, his character, his audacity. Above all, I am impressed by the fact that he is doing this for a cause larger than himself to make it possible for more people with disabilities to share in his passion for sailing.

Helen Keller once said, ''It is a terrible thing to see and yet have no vision.'' Well, Matt Rutherford has the gift of sight. He also has the gift of vision and indomitable courage. He is one of those remarkable human beings who dream big, who are driven by big challenges, who refuse to accept the limits and the boundaries that so-called reasonable people want to place on us. What is more, he has placed himself in the service of others less fortunate than himself.

As the lead sponsor of the Americans With Disabilities Act, I am particularly impressed that Matt is using his voyage to raise money to help people with disabilities to partake in this wonderful pastime of sailing—something which I have enjoyed all my adult life since I was in the Navy. He is doing this so that children and adults can have the same opportunity. The reason I am so enthused about this is that one of the fundamental aspects of the ADA—the Americans With Disabilities Act—is that people with disabilities should be able to participate fully in all aspects of society, and that includes access to recreational opportunities such as sailing, which can be exhilarating and empowering for children and adults with a wide range of disabilities.

I salute Matt Rutherford for his courage, for his love of sailing, and being willing to share that with the disabled community, and for using this adventure, this almost death-defying trip. For anyone who knows what it is like to be on a 27-foot boat, to go from here all the way down to Cape Horn, that is incredible. Any one of numerous storms or anything could have sunk his little boat. He has had a lot of different adventures. He sprung a leak. He has been working on that leak ever since. Someplace around here, South America, he lost his engine, so he no longer has an engine, and he keeps patching his leak all the time. Every day he has to patch his leak. So he is fighting a leak every day in his boat. Just going around Cape Horn with the tremendous waves and cross currents around Cape Horn—to take a small boat through there singlehandedly is, as I said, death-defying.

Right up in here, right off the coast of Brazil someplace, he almost got run over by a freighter. At night, he had gone to sleep for a little bit. He has a light in his boat so people can see him at night. He woke up and he looked out and saw this red light and a green light with nothing in between it coming at him. Well, it was a huge freighter, and as the Presiding Officer knows, red on one side, green on the other, bearing down on him. He turned, and it missed him just by a few feet and almost sunk him in the bow wave of the freighter that went by. So those are the kinds of things Matt has lived with almost every day for 289 days.

Matt has great skill, great courage. He is making a difference. He is going to make a difference for a lot of people. I especially think of young people with disabilities who would like to sail, and because of this organization, Chesapeake Bay Accessible Boating, they will have the opportunity to do so.

So, again, this is one of the nice things we see happening in America. We think there are no individuals with that individual kind of courage to take on the elements, to risk their lives. Well, we still have them, and Matt Rutherford stands in a line of great adventurers in our history. I applaud him for his brave spirit, and I wish him safe passage on his home stretch and on the final leg of his epic journey.

He joins the ranks of Joshua Slocum who, on Spray, was the first person to circumnavigate the globe solo. He wrote a wonderful book: ''Sailing Alone Around the World.'' He did it before the turn of the last century. He did it in the 1890s. He also joins the ranks of the next great person who sailed alone, Sir Francis Chichester, on the Gypsy Moth IV not too many years ago, who circumnavigated the globe. So to Joshua Slocum and Sir Francis Chichester we can now add Matt Rutherford, on St. Brendan, for an incredible journey around both of the Americas, solo and nonstop. It has never been done before, and it may never be done again. And he is doing it for the best of all reasons.

A courageous young man, Matt Rutherford. He is going to be back, as I said, hopefully by April 12. I hope to meet him. I have never met the young man, but I have followed his journey and his courage. He is the kind of person who just gives heart and spirit to all of us, to know there is nothing we can't do if we set our minds and our hearts to it and if we have the willpower and the courage to take it on. So I hope to meet him when he comes back—again, this young man of great courage. I hope the home stretch is one with fair winds and following seas.

Before I yield the floor, I mentioned that Matt Rutherford was doing this for the Chesapeake Region Accessible Boating organization that provides boating for people with disabilities. I would urge anyone who is interested in this and who wants to see what a great organization it is, they can go to their Web site—it is very simple—www.crabsailing.org. It is a great organization that helps people with disabilities to take up sailing and learn the art and the craft of sailing.

So, again, hats off to a remarkable young man on a remarkable journey. I wish him fair winds and a following sea in his home stretch.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. DURBIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2280 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The Senator from Rhode Island.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT DENNIS WEICHEL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today, along with my colleague from Rhode Island, to pay tribute to SGT Dennis Weichel, a Rhode Islander who served in the Rhode Island National Guard.

On March 22, Sergeant Weichel was in a convoy with his unit in Laghman Province, Afghanistan. Some children were in the road and Sergeant Weichel and other troops got out to move the children to safety. Most of the children moved out of the way, but one little girl went back to the road. As an MRAP approached, Sergeant Weichel pulled her out of the vehicle's path, but in doing so he was hit by the vehicle. He was medically evacuated to Jalalabad Medical Treatment Facility, where a surgical team worked to stabilize him. But, tragically, he died from his injuries. Because of his heroic actions, the little girl he saved was unharmed in the accident. He will be laid to rest this Monday in Rhode Island, a hero—someone who exemplifies the qualities of the American soldier: selfless sacrifice for others.

Sergeant Weichel joined the National Guard in 2001. He was posthumously promoted to sergeant. He previously deployed to Iraq as a member of Detachment 2, Headquarters, Headquarters Company, 3rd Battalion, of the 172nd Infantry, Mountain. In November 2011, he mobilized for deployment to Afghanistan with the 1st Battalion, 143rd Infantry Regiment.

Each generation of Americans is called upon to protect and sustain our democracy, and there are no greater heroes than the men and women who have worn the uniform of our Nation and who have sacrificed for our country to keep it safe and to keep it free.

It is our duty to protect the freedom they sacrificed their lives for through our service, our citizenship. We must continue to keep their memories alive and honor their heroism, not simply by words but by our deeds as citizens of this country.

Today our thoughts are with Sergeant Weichel's mother Linda, his father Dennis, brother Craig, his sisters Christine and Charlene, his children Nicholas and Hope and their mother Amanda, and his fiancee Ashley and their daughter Madison, and all his family and friends and his comrades-in-arms. We join them in commemorating his sacrifice and honoring his example of selfless service, of love, of courage, and of devotion to the soldiers with whom he served and the people of Afghanistan he was trying to help.

Sergeant Weichel is one among many Rhode Islanders who have proven their loyalty, their integrity, and their personal courage by giving the last full measure of their lives in service to our country in Afghanistan, in Iraq, and elsewhere around the globe and throughout the years. Today we honor his memory and all those who have served and sacrificed as he did.

Sergeant Weichel joins a roll of honor that includes the following Rhode Islanders killed since September 11, 2001:

SPC Dennis Poulin, Army National Guard; SGT Michael Paranzino, Army; PFC Kyle Coutu, Marine Corps; LTJG Francis L. Toner, IV, Navy; PO3 Ronald A. Gill, Jr., Coast Guard; SGT Michael R. Weidemann, Army; SGT Moises Jazmin, Army; SSG Dale James Kelly, Jr., Army National Guard; SGT Brian R. St. Germain, Marine Corps; SGT Dennis J. Flanagan, Army; 2LT Matthew S. Coutu, Army; LCPL Holly A. Charette, Marine Corps; SSG Christopher S. Potts, Army National Guard; LCPL John J. Van Gyzen, IV, Marine

Corps; CPT Christopher S. Cash, Army; LCPL Matthew K. Serio, Marine Corps; MSG Richard L. Ferguson, Army; SFC Curtis Mancini, Army Reserve; CPT Matthew J. August, Army; CW5 Sharon T. Swartworth, Army; SPC Michael Andrade, Army National Guard; SGT Charles T. Caldwell, Army National Guard; SSG Joseph Camara, Army National Guard; and SGT Gregory A. Belanger, Army Reserve.

All of these men and women have given their lives in the last decade in Afghanistan and Iraq. It is a roll of honor. It is a roll that Sergeant Weichel joins. It should be, for us, a roll not just to recognize and remember but to recommit to trying in some small way to match their great sacrifice for this great Nation.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is with great sadness but also considerable pride that I join Senator REED today to honor the service of SGT Dennis P. Weichel, Jr., of the Rhode Island National Guard, who died 1 week ago today while serving our country in Afghanistan.

Dennis' actions in defense of the lives of vulnerable civilians embody the most noble spirit of service, sacrifice, and loyalty found in the hearts of the men and women serving our Nation in uniform in the most dangerous corners of the globe. In particular, they reflect the spirit of service of the Rhode Island National Guard, which is the second most heavily deployed State guard in the country.

Dennis, who was 29 years old, lived in Providence. He had joined the Rhode Island National Guard in 2001, and he deployed to Iraq in 2005 in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom as a member of Company D, 3rd Battalion, 172nd Infantry, Mountain, Regiment. In November 2011, Dennis mobilized with Company C, 1st Battalion, 143rd Infantry Regiment, 56th Troop Command, to Camp Atterbury, IN. His unit deployed forward to Afghanistan just this month.

He had only been in Afghanistan a few weeks when his unit encountered a group of children on its way out of the Black Hills Firing Range in Laghman Province. The children were scavenging in the road for brass shell casings, which are recyclable for money in Afghanistan.

Dennis, a father of three, hopped down from his vehicle to help move the children safely out of the path of the convoy of trucks and armored vehicles. As the heavy trucks rumbled past, it appears a young Afghan girl darted back into the road to grab one last brass shell casing. Seeing one of his unit's Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles bearing down on the girl, Dennis reacted swiftly and selflessly, lifting the girl to safety and placing himself in the path of the 16-ton MRAP.

I am sure this was a parent's instinct and that Dennis had in mind his own children: Nicholas, age 8; Hope, age 6; and baby Madison. Dennis was evacuated to the Jalalabad Medical Treatment Facility, and there he succumbed to his injuries.

Dennis leaves behind his fiancee Ashley, the mother of their 8-month-old baby girl Madison. He leaves behind his former wife Amanda, who is mother to his son Nicholas and his daughter Hope. He leaves behind his mother and father Linda Reynolds and Dennis Weichel, Sr.

My deepest and heartfelt sorrows and prayers go out to all of Dennis's family and to his friends. Senator REED and I will join them this weekend to pay our respects when Dennis comes home for the last time to Rhode Island.

Dennis acted with instinctive bravery on that road in Laghman Province. His action reflected the selfless dedication of an American soldier and the heart of a father toward a child. Dennis has been posthumously promoted from the rank of specialist to sergeant, and his family will receive the Bronze Star he has been awarded for heroism.

The writer Joseph Campbell once described a hero as someone who has given his or her life to something bigger than one's self. In giving his life to save one small child, SGT Dennis Weichel has reflected great honor upon our military and its best traditions and this great Nation and the values for which it stands. He will justly be remembered a hero.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EPA

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I wish to take some time this evening to congratulate our Environmental Protection Agency and to thank them for the rule they proposed this week regarding new coal-fired powerplants.

They have taken a certain amount of heat over this rule and have been criticized. But I come from Rhode Island, and Rhode Island is a downwind State from the coal-fired powerplants of the Midwest. We pay the price for the coal power those Midwestern States burn. We pay the price in children coming in to our hospitals with asthma attacks. We pay the price in ozone levels that are outside our control. We are a State that contributes very little in pollution to other States, but we are on the receiving end. We are down the gun barrel of the big array of coal-fired powerplants in the Midwest.

They have not only continued to burn dirty coal, they have built particularly high stacks so the emissions from that coal plant get pushed into the high atmosphere and they move east toward Rhode Island in the prevailing winds and we experience that as smog, as ozone, as air pollution. So there is an element of deliberateness to this.

There are places in this country that are in compliance with air quality standards because they have put their emissions up high enough that it lands somewhere else. Rhode Island is often out of compliance with air quality standards, and it is not from emissions in our home State. So we hear a lot from the coal-burning polluters about all the terrible things the EPA rule is going to cause. It is going to cause nothing but good in Rhode Island.

It is outrageous that on a bright, clear summer day one can be driving in to work in Rhode Island and hear over the car radio the announcer letting us know that today is going to be a bad air day in Rhode Island. We look out the window and it looks absolutely beautiful, but it is going to be a bad air day, they tell us. Infants should be kept indoors in air-conditioning, seniors should not go outside, people with breathing difficulties should stay indoors, and everyone should avoid vigorous physical activity because the air quality is too poor. That is not a price a carbon polluter in one State should get to require the seniors, the children, the families in another State to have to pay.

I am delighted EPA has begun to apply this rule. Unfortunately, it only applies to new powerplants. So the existing coal-burning powerplants that create so much of this pollution in our State, we are going to need to continue to work to crack down on until these States are sufficiently responsible in their use of power and in how they burn fuel to generate their power that they are not exporting bad air and pollution to other States.

As important as this is to Rhode Island as a downwind State, as important it is to protect the lungs of our kids and our families, this is also an important step for EPA to have taken because of the global problem we have from carbon pollution. The carbon pollution we are unleashing as a country—frankly, as a species across the globe—is having a dire effect in our atmosphere. It is having a dire effect in our oceans. It is truly causing our climate to change and the changes are going to be very difficult and very dangerous for our country in the future. That is not just my opinion. That is the opinion of our military leaders. That is the opinion of our national defense intelligence establishment. It is treated as a fact in those responsible quarters of our government.

Unfortunately, here and down there in the House of Representatives, there is a campaign of denial that is being propagated that is clearly supported by the polluting industries and has the purpose of protecting their financial

interests and enabling them to continue to profit from the harm they are imposing on our oceans and on our atmosphere.

It would be nice if the laws of government could supersede the laws of nature. It would be nice if we could repeal the laws of physics, the laws of chemistry, the laws of biology, but we can't. It is arrogance to presume we could. The fact of what the carbon pollution is doing to our world can be denied in this Chamber, it can be denied down the hall in the House of Representatives all day long and all night long, and it is not going to change the result. It is actually only recently that there was a denial industry attacking the problem of climate change and trying to minimize it, trying to mock it, trying to distract people from it.

In the past, the denial industry was pointed elsewhere. In the past, the denial industry was supporting the tobacco companies in convincing people it wasn't that bad for them. The science isn't complete yet. Don't worry. There is still doubt.

It deployed itself against lead. When the dangers of lead paint became known, the denial industry went to bat for the lead industry. It denied that lead was very poisonous, said it only happened to very poor people, went through all their rigmarole. The same process: create doubt about a scientific concern in order to prevent action being taken to protect people. Now they have turned on carbon pollution.

But before they turned from tobacco and lead to carbon pollution, it was pretty well accepted how basic this science is. The first scientist to determine that carbon dioxide would have the effect of warming the atmosphere if its concentration increased was a scientist named Tyndall. I think he was Irish and wrote in England in 1865. Around the time of the Civil War, this was discovered.

By the year I was born, in 1955, there are basic texts that describe that the more carbon pollution we put into the air, the more it traps heat, the warmer the climate gets.

It is virtually indisputable what is happening to the oceans. We are not talking projections. We are not talking estimates. We are talking measurements, and the measurements show the acidity of our oceans and the increase in acidification is happening faster than it has in 3 million years. The extent of the carbon dioxide in our atmosphere now, measured, is outside of a bound that has been maintained on the surface of our planet for 800,000 years—8,000 centuries. That is a long time. We have only been farming as a species for about 10,000 years. So 800,000 takes us way back to a very primitive species. Through all that time, we have been in this bandwidth of carbon in our atmosphere and now we are out of it. We are flying out of it, and it is getting worse all the time.

Instead of taking it seriously in this building, we are listening to the siren song of the big-money polluters, as if the laws of government, the laws of Congress could repeal the laws of nature that we know—the laws of physics, the laws of chemistry, the laws of biology that are causing this to happen.

I appreciate very much the Presiding Officer, the junior Senator from Minnesota, having been so energetic and helpful in continuing to bring this thought to the Senate floor. I think we had an effective and important colloquy on the floor several weeks ago discussing this very point. I think it is important that from time to time we stand and remind our colleagues that there is a truth to this matter. The truth is that we are releasing unprecedented, massive amounts of carbon pollution into our atmosphere that, as a matter of science, the laws of physics, warm the atmosphere, and that warming atmosphere creates dramatic changes in our weather, in our coasts, in our sea levels. Our coasts are probably going to be hit the hardest of anyplace, and Rhode Island is a coastal State.

The ocean absorbs the pollution, so the harm is not just in the atmosphere and to the climate, it is to the ocean itself as its pH level changes from the absorption of carbon. Nobody doubts that the ocean absorbs carbon. There is no credible debate on that. You can measure the ocean's pH.

It is important that every once in a while we tell the truth on this because the time is coming very close when it will be past the tipping point of taking the action we need to take to protect ourselves, protect our coasts, our economy, our national security.

I wanted to take this moment as the week ended to come and share my thoughts again on this subject. I will continue to do it from time to time because I think it is important that America be a country that tells the truth about problems, and I think it is important that Rhode Island, as an ocean State, be as protected as we can from the changes we see coming.

The IPCC just reported on the weather effects of climate change and said that you cannot assign a particular storm to the effects of climate change, but in various areas you can connect the threat to climate change with varying degrees of certainty. With respect to the threat from sea-level rise and from worsened storms driving that raised sea ashore and causing flooding and damage, the certainty range was 90 to 100 percent. If we are not going to listen to warnings that the scientists now tell us are 90 to 100 percent certain, we are really making a grievous mistake.

I will conclude by thanking the Presiding Officer again for his support and help. I hope the time comes when this body can actually treat this problem in a serious and sober way and the dark hand of the polluting industry tapping on our shoulders and whispering in our ears and telling us what we can and cannot say is pushed back and instead we stand in the light of day, in the light of science and fact, and behave responsibly about the changes that are coming and our role in causing these changes.

I see the distinguished Senator from Georgia in the Chamber, and I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO FURMAN BISHER

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, next week the annual Masters Tournament will begin in Augusta, GA. It is a beautiful time of the year in our part of the world, and certainly Augusta is a little piece of Heaven, particularly this time of year.

As that tournament begins next week, there is going to be a sad note in the air because of the fact that Furman Bisher, a giant in the world of journalism, a man who has covered the Masters for the last 50 or so years, died last week at his home in Atlanta. He died at the age of 93 and passed away peacefully in his home after a storied career as one of the Nation's foremost sports writers. It was a career that lasted an astonishing 60 years.

After nearly six decades of elegant observations of the sports world for the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, Furman pecked out his final column before his October 2009 retirement on the thinning keys of his trusty Royal typewriter. His choice of instrument to convey his thoughts in this age of instantaneous, inane chatter says a lot about why newspaper readers after so many years continued to seek out Furman's Bisher's column in the AJC's sports pages.

It all came down to this: Furman's graceful prose, courtly voice and sharp observations were unfailingly backed up by old-fashioned shoe-leather reporting. He gloried in doing his homework, making that extra call, interviewing one more player or assistant coach or trainer, in order to breathe even more life into the game or the race or the fight for his readers.

It's also why Furman became a Georgia—and an American—institution. Simply put, Furman loved sports. And he loved journalism. At age 90, he was still driving out on summer nights to cover minor-league ballgames.

In his career, Furman scored many journalistic knockouts, including a 1949 interview with Shoeless Joe Jackson—the only one Jackson ever gave—regarding his involvement in the 1919 Black Sox scandal.

He got stock tips from Ty Cobb and watched Jack Nicklaus' 1986 Masters

victory. He sat in the press box at countless Falcons games at Atlanta-Fulton County Stadium and covered the Olympics, both winter and summer. He even had a hand in bringing professional sports teams to Atlanta.

He wrote 11 books, including co-authoring two editions of a Hank Aaron autobiography. And at The Masters Tournament in Augusta every April, Furman reigned among the azaleas and oaks as the dean of the sports press corps.

In a testament to his longevity in a tough business, until his retirement, Furman covered every Kentucky Derby since 1950, and every Super Bowl but the first one.

He even branched out into TV. Although I did not grow up in Atlanta, I have heard from many people that preachers across the city would cut sermons short so that their congregations could be home for Furman's kickoff on ''Football Review.''

Along the way, he earned the respect of his colleagues and the loyalty of his readers, garnering writing awards too numerous to mention. He served as president of the National Sportscasters and Sportswriters Association from 1974–1976, and of the Football Writers Association of America from 1959–1960. His features appeared in The Saturday Evening Post, Golf Digest and Sports Illustrated, to name but a few.

In 1961, Time magazine named him one of the five best columnists in the Nation. I would argue that that honor fit until the very end.

No less than the great Jack Nicklaus said of Furman's retirement: He might be turning in his last column for the newspaper, but Furman will never stop writing or giving his opinion. I guess you could say that when it comes to the last writings of Furman Bisher, I will believe it when I don't see it.

Furman would close every column with a single valediction—the word ''selah''—a Hebrew word that ends many Psalms and that exhorts the reader to reflect.

It is appropriate, then, to reflect on Furman's long, fruitful life and career, one that began in Atlanta as the Korean War was starting, when Joe Louis was still boxing, when the Minneapolis Lakers were the NBA champs, before Willie Mays had joined the major leagues and before Sports Illustrated magazine even existed.

In all the ensuing years, Furman chronicled the triumphs and the travails of the sports world and its often-all-too-human heroes. As Furman would say, ''Selah.''

I am thankful for Furman Bisher. I am pleased to have been the recipient of reading many of his articles through the years and also very proud to have called him a very good friend over the years. He was a gentleman who will be missed for his professional career as well as just being a great person and a great individual.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. CHAMBLISS. The political world this week has been focused on the U.S. Supreme Court and the arguments that have taken place over there with respect to what has been referred to as ObamaCare.

I rise today to discuss how the 2-year-old health care law is forcing more government intrusion into the lives of Americans.

After all, what could be more intrusive than the Federal Government telling you the type of health care coverage you must purchase? ''Purchase this product or face a penalty.''

With this law, I believe the American people have recognized that Congress has exceeded its constitutional authority. Just this week, a poll conducted by The Hill found that 49 percent of likely voters believe that the Supreme Court will rule against the constitutionality of the health care law, while only 29 percent believe it will be upheld. The American people have to ask themselves whether we should be able to punish citizens based whether they purchase a product from the private sector.

The Commerce Clause only allows the Federal Government to regulate ''existing activity'' that affects interstate commerce. I hope this distinction will be recognized by our justices on the Supreme Court. With no end in sight to escalating health care costs, Republicans want to see innovation within the private sector to bring about changes to our health care system. Today, Medicare and Medicaid are running up our national debt and bankrupting our states. One would think less government involvement, not more, would help bring health care costs under control. Instead, the health care law builds on this administration's desire to have the Federal Government control Americans' health care decisions. To this end, the Obama administration has created 159 new boards, bureaucracies and programs under ObamaCare.

As of this month, the administration has released more than 12,000 pages of regulations related to the law. The secretary of Health and Human Services will have the power to make more than 1,700 rulings affecting Americans and the health care they seek. Time and time again, my colleagues and I have warned that adding more red tape and bureaucratic oversight that will affect the relationship between you and your doctor is not the prescription Americans are looking for.

We want to protect the relationship between the patient and physician. Consultation between the patient and the physician should be the determining factor in what procedures that patient chooses, not someone who sits on a panel in Washington, DC.

However, this may well be the case as the health care law concentrates power in the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. This is the same task force that in November 2009 recommended that women between the ages of 40 and 49 no longer obtain annual mammograms. These are the types of recommendations that Washington bureaucrats could make in the future. I especially understand the importance of early detection of cancer, having been there myself, and will fight to see that individuals, through the recommendations of their doctors, are in charge of determining their own health care procedures.

Throughout the debate 2 years ago we constantly heard from folks on the other side of the aisle that if you liked your health care coverage, you could keep it. Well, guess what. According to the latest CBO estimates, you can ask 5 million people who will see their employer-sponsored health care end in 2016 whether they had the opportunity to keep what they like.

Further, the incentives for employers to drop their coverage and move employees onto a taxpayer-subsidized plan means we could see up to 35 million Americans lose their current coverage over the first 10 years of implementation of this law.

Washington is now in the business of reducing the flexibility of consumer-driven health care policies such as health savings accounts and flexible spending arrangements. Congress created health savings accounts to allow health care consumers who wish to participate in the program more control over their own money and how they choose to spend that money for health care services. Now contributions to these arrangements will be limited to $2,500 per year, and over-the-counter medications will require a prescription if they are purchased within these tax-free dollars. This is already leading to doctors having to fill out more paperwork so an individual can walk into a drugstore to purchase aspirin or cold medicine. Yet again this is another glaring example of bureaucratic meddling in the lives of American consumers.

Small businesses are also feeling the intrusive effects of ObamaCare. In the most recent survey of small businesses by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, an astounding 74 percent of small business owners surveyed said the health care law makes it harder for businesses to hire more employees. Think about that for a moment. Three out of four small business owners are having difficulty hiring because of the uncertainty of health care costs.

Finally, our States are also feeling the heavy hand of more government control. The Medicaid expansion that begins in 2014 will make it increasingly difficult for State leaders to balance their budgets due to strict maintenance of effort requirements. These requirements prevent States from designing health care programs specifically tailored for their own citizens.

Medicaid currently consumes about one-quarter of State budgets and ObamaCare creates the largest expansion of the program since its inception.

Through 2023, the cost to States is now estimated to be an additional $118 billion. In my home State of Georgia, the expansion will cost the State about $2.5 billion through 2020. Money in the budget to pay for this expansion will come at the expense of higher education, transportation, and law enforcement services. Nationally 24.7 million people who will be added to the Medicaid rolls will be entering a broken system where patients are denied access to about 40 percent of the physicians because reimbursement rates do not keep up with medical costs.

Two years ago the legislative process that unfolded before us was not something any Senator should be proud of today. Backroom deal making and forcing legislation through under a subversive process left the American people angry and upset with Congress. If we don't understand that, just look at the approval rating of Congress today, and this played a major role in that approval rating.

I hope in the future we will have an opportunity to revisit the system. Our system does need reforming, but it needs to be done in the right way and it needs to be done in a very transparent way. I hope we can come up with a solution that is actually supported by the American public, not solutions that make the American public angry.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMA/MEDVEDEV EXCHANGE

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today greatly disturbed and upset, as are many Americans, by the comments President Obama made on Monday to outgoing Russian President Dmitry Medvedev at the nuclear security summit in Seoul, Korea. The exchange, which was accidentally recorded by a Russian journalist, suggests that President Obama's stance on missile defense will change after the November election. It implies that the President is willing to make more concessions to an authoritarian government that has caused Americans concern time and time again. It raises questions about what else might be hidden on the President's agenda if he secures a second term in the White House.

Americans can view the recording themselves as President Obama tells Mr. Medvedev:

> On all these issues, but particularly missile defense, this can be solved but it's important for him [Putin] to give me space.

''Him'' meaning former and future President Vladimir Putin. Mr. Medvedev responds by saying:

> Yeah, I understand. I understand your message about space. Space for you.

President Obama then goes on to say:

> This is my last election. After my election, I have more flexibility.

It is unbelievable and chilling that President Obama would make his election a factor in how he deals with an important national security issue that could have dangerous implications for America and its allies. Even the hint of compromising on our missile defense capability is reckless when the prospect of nuclear-armed missiles is a real and growing threat.

Equally alarming is the looming question lingering over what the President actually means when he says ''more flexibility.'' The administration continues to press for resetting bilateral relations but fails to follow through on an approach that takes into consideration how Russia has not made good on its promises in the past. Simply put, we cannot trust the Russian Government to keep its word. We have no reason to believe that greater cooperation will come from giving the Russians what they want.

The question now arises: How can we trust our own President not to say one thing before the election and yet do something entirely different afterwards? Let us not forget the Russian Ambassador vetoed two United Nations Security Council resolutions supporting the Syrian people, a move that prompted the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Susan Rice, to say that Russia decided to stand with a dictator. Indeed, Russia seems comfortable standing beside a dictator.

In addition, Russian officials rejected the idea of tougher sanctions against Iran despite a report from the International Atomic Energy Agency reinforcing concerns about Iran's nuclear program. Russia also voted against the United Nation's General Assembly resolution expressing concern over the ''violations of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights'' in North Korea.

Many of my colleagues and I have come to the floor on multiple occasions to express our concern with Russia's deteriorating rule of law and respect for human rights. This is not the kind of relationship President Obama promised when he pressed for passage of the new START treaty in late 2010 over strong objections from many of my colleagues. It sends the wrong signal to our allies throughout Europe who are worried about undue pressure from Russia. At the end of the day, better U.S.-Russian relations are not a foregone conclusion, and President Obama would be wise to remember that one-sided promises are not the means to get there. He should also not forget that the Constitution requires the advice and consent of the Senate on foreign policy decisions.

Over the coming months the Senate will likely take up several issues related to Russia, and I look forward to having a frank discussion about the President's ideas and the President's intentions. Mr. Obama's comments in Seoul are only one instance of the President pledging to have more flexibility after election day, but they rightly cause us to speculate about what else he expects to do. Americans are right to wonder what other promises are being made that we do not know about.

At the end of the exchange in Seoul, President Obama and President Medvedev clasped hands and Mr. Medvedev promised, ''I will transmit this information to Vladimir.'' In other words, but for the accident of an open microphone, the President's intentions would have been known by Mr. Putin, but not known by the American people. Mr. Medvedev's reply is a grim reminder of what happens when one person is able to seize unrestrained power, as Mr. Putin has demonstrated, and should be a lesson for all of us. It also should give all Americans pause as we approach this fall's election.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPOSING A MINIMUM EFFECTIVE TAX RATE FOR HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 339, S. 2230 is now pending; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

> We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 339, S. 2230, a bill to reduce the deficit by imposing a minimum effective tax rate for high-income taxpayers.
>
> Harry Reid, Sheldon Whitehouse, John D. Rockefeller IV, Barbara Boxer, Patrick J. Leahy, Jeff Bingaman, Richard J. Durbin, Daniel K. Akaka, Al Franken, Jack Reed, Mark Begich, Sherrod Brown, Carl Levin, Richard Blumenthal, Bernard Sanders, Debbie Stabenow, Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived and the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 2230 occur on Monday, April 16, when the Senate resumes legislative session immediately following the vote on the confirmation of Stephanie Dawn Thacker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 231; that there be 2 hours for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on Calendar No. 231; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the Record; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I mentioned to the majority leader I have to do some more consultation over here in order to clear this nomination, but for the moment I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IIHF 2014 WORLD ICE HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the last few years, we have seen dictator after dictator tumble across the world: Qadhafi in Libya, Ben Ali in Tunisia, Mubarak in Egypt, Saleh in Yemen, and eventually Bashar al-Assad in Syria.

Yet there is one dictator who hangs on. He is the last dictator in Europe. You may not be familiar with his name, but they certainly know him in neighboring countries. He is the strong-man President of Belarus, Alexander Lukashenko.

For more than 20 years, he has ruled Belarus with an iron fist—using a barbaric combination of repression, intimidation, and torture to maintain power. He is so bold as to continue to call his security services the KGB. Can you imagine in today's world calling your security service the same name as the dread security service of the Soviet Union, the KGB?

Under Lukashenko's reign, elections have been consistently rigged, arrests have been made for political purposes, and the public's basic freedoms of speech, assembly, association, even religion—which we take for granted—are severely restricted.

As shown in this photograph I have in the Chamber, this is Alexander Lukashenko, the last dictator in Europe, the President of Belarus.

On December 19, 2010, Lukashenko was given an opportunity to ease the iron grip of his police state and move closer to democracy by holding a legitimate Presidential election. He could not bring himself to do it. He orchestrated a fraudulent election, and then he turned around on the day of the election and arrested all of his opponents who had the audacity to run against him and threw them in prison. How about that?

I was in Belarus shortly afterwards and met with their families. These people were distraught, beside themselves about what had happened.

One of these detainees who was eventually released came and saw me in November, Ales Mikhalevich, one of the Presidential candidates who had been arrested, tortured, and denied basic legal rights for months. Recently he had been given political asylum in the Czech Republic, where he continues to fight for human rights in Belarus. His wife and daughters, whom I met in Minsk, in Belarus, are still being harassed by the KGB as of today.

Ales Mikhalevich and others from the hundreds who were imprisoned have been released, but others were not so lucky.

Mikalai Statkevich, a Presidential candidate, was sentenced to 6 years and can barely receive the medical assistance he needs.

Andrei Sannikau, another Presidential candidate, was sentenced to 5 years in prison for having the boldness to run against this dictator.

A number of other political activists who have engaged in political activity which we take for granted in the United States have been languishing in prison. I thought about it this week, as the demonstrators gathered in front of the Supreme Court, marching back and forth with signs, how we take that for granted. You try to do that in a country like Belarus, you will end up in prison. Thank God the United States has a much better standard when it comes to basic rights.

Here are the names of some of the other activists Lukashenko has thrown in prison: Zmitser Dashkevich, Eduard Lobau, Paval Sevyarynets, Zmister Bandarenka, Ales Byalyatski, Mikalai Autukhovich.

Authoritarians frequently torture these activists, trying to pressure them to sign letters admitting a guilt that does not exist. But I want to speak about something that is going to come up where Belarus and Lukashenko are going to become international celebrities.

On February 16, Mikhalevich, whom I mentioned earlier, was one of the 13 who picketed the headquarters of Praugue-based automobile company Skoda, a subsidaiary of Volkswagen.

Why did they picket Skoda?

Skoda is one of the major sponsors of the International Ice Hockey Federation's World Championship, and has been for the last 19 years. In fact, Skoda's this automobile company's—relationship with the Hockey Federation is one of the longest lasting sponsorships. And much to the disbelief of the rest of the world, the International Ice Hockey Federation has chosen to host its championship in Belarus. Why? Because Lukashenko, the dictator, is such a big fan of hockey. All the while, political prisoners, including Presidential candidates, will be languishing in prison because of this dictator.

Companies such as Skoda, Nike, and Reebok are among the major corporate sponsors of this federation that is holding its championship in Belarus.

Last year, I joined Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY of Chicago and National Hockey League Hall of Famer turned European Parliamentarian Peter Stastny and wrote to the International Ice Hockey Federation President Rene Fasel, urging that the 2014 games in Belarus be suspended until the political prisoners are released. How can anyone celebrate the excitement of a world-class sports championship when people are languishing in prison for their political beliefs? They ignored our request.

I spoke to USA Hockey, which represents the United States in this federation. They paid no attention.

It turns out the International Ice Hockey Federation will be meeting next month in Finland. Belarus is likely to be on the agenda. It should be. It should be at the top of the agenda.

The honor of hosting this prestigious international sporting event in a country where the President is regarded as Europe's last dictator is hardly a reflection of the quality of the sport that is involved.

An ardent fan of ice hockey and the head of the Belarus national Olympic committee, rewarding Lukashenko with the 2014 World Ice Hockey Championship ignores his regime's atrocities.

I have tried to reach out to Skoda, owned by Volkswagen, Nike, Reebok, and other sponsors to let them know their image is at stake too if they validate this dictator's policies and give honor to a country which does not recognize the basic freedoms.

This photograph I have in the Chamber shows Skoda's CEO, Winfried Vahland, in the center, along with Hockey Federation President Fasel on the right, as they celebrate Skoda's commitment to sponsor the world championship through 2017.

Skoda contends its sponsorship of the event does not indicate approval of what is going on in Belarus—simply their dedication to hockey. That does not show much courage.

Lukashenko's preparations for this ice hockey tournament indicate that Belarus is expecting a lot of visitors and a big economic boost.

I am once again calling on the International Ice Hockey Federation in their meeting in Finland to consider this matter at the top of their agenda and to suspend their plans to hold the Federation Championship in Belarus in 2014.

There are many other countries around the world more than anxious to join them and make this a championship well deserving with a host country that is one we can be proud of.

My feelings about this are not alone. The European Union recently widened sanctions against Lukashenko and his cronies. Lukashenko promptly recalled his Belarusian representative to the EU, after which EU Ambassadors were withdrawn from Belarus.

After a summit in Brussels earlier this month, Lukashenko—never at a loss for words—criticized the European Union politicians and railed on the German Foreign Minister Guido Westerwelle, the first openly gay minister in Germany. President Lukashenko said:

> It is better to be a dictator than gay.

That is a quote. He went on to say:

> Belarusians deserve to host the World Championship in 2014 in Belarus.

That is incredible. What sports organization wants to validate those comments?

I want to close by saying, I hope the International Ice Hockey Federation's Annual Congress will make the right decision in May. I hope its corporate sponsors will feel a little uneasy being associated with Dictator Lukashenko and his policies in Belarus. I hope they will suspend the 2014 Championship unless the political prisoners are at least released and that other international sporting groups, such as the International Cycling Union, follow their example.

I want the United States, in partnership with the European Union, to continue to place pressure on Lukashenko to open his political system and to stand by the Belarusian people in their efforts to bring justice to their country.

REMEMBERING JUDGE WILLIAM HIBBLER

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to pay tribute to a great man and a great judge who passed away unexpectedly earlier this month. Judge William Hibbler had served with distinction as a Federal district court judge in the Northern District of Illinois since 1999. Bill Hibbler cared so deeply about Chicago that it sometimes surprised people to learn that he actually started life in a small town in Alabama.

His family moved to Chicago when he was a child. He graduated from St. Mel High School on the West Side and later from the University of Illinois at Chicago. He worked as a substitute teacher in the Chicago public school system to help pay his tuition at DePaul University School of Law. He started his legal career in private practice but soon felt the call of public service so he went to work as an assistant State's attorney in Cook County.

In 1986, he became an associate judge of the Cook County Circuit Court, and he served in that capacity for 13 years, until he joined the Federal bench. Judge Hibbler was active in community service throughout his career. He was a mentor to many young people.

During his confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee, I noted that some judges have an unfortunate tendency to look down on the people who come before them once they put on the judges' black robes, and I asked Judge Hibbler what type of temperament he would bring to the Federal bench. His answer said so much about the kind of man Bill Hibbler was and about his values. He said, ''The opportunity to serve is a wonderful opportunity, and we should never forget that.''

Judge Hibbbler died on March 19. He was 65 years old. The esteem in which he was held is evident in comments by other judges and by lawyers who appeared before him.

Chief Judge Jim Holderman of the Northern District praised Judge Hibbler as ''an outstanding jurist who cared deeply about our system of justice and displayed an unparalleled sense of fairness.'' Thomas Bruton, clerk of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, said: ''Judge Hibbler was a friend to everyone who met him. He was gracious, kind and a mentor to many in this court.''

U.S. Attorney Patrick Fitzgerald said, ''He was a wonderful judge and wonderful person, who treated everyone who appeared before him with great respect.'' His friend, 7th Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Anne Claire Williams, said that Judge Hibbler ''wasn't what you would call a man of many words, but each day, in his own quiet way, he made a difference in the world.''

I am proud to have joined then-Senator Carol Moseley-Braun in urging President Clinton to nominate Judge Hibbler to the Federal bench 13 years ago. His many years of distinguished service on the Federal bench only deepened my respect for him. William Hibbler loved the law, and he loved justice. He also loved his family very deeply, and I wish to offer my sincere condolences to his wife Regina, his son William, and his daughter Aviv. We are grateful for the service that their husband and father provided to the Chicago community, and we will miss him.

TRIBUTE TO MR. LEONARD GILLIAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to a true American hero who honorably answered the call to serve his country in its dire time of need, Mr. Leonard Gilliam of Laurel County, KY.

Mr. Gilliam was born in McWhorter, KY, in 1919. The 92-year-old has had an incredible life on this Earth thus far. Leonard was a country boy who had lived on his family farm his entire life. He was the first boy from McWhorter to get the call from the U.S. Army in 1941; he was 21 years old.

The newly enlisted men, along with Gilliam, headed to basic training in Fort Thomas, KY. Gilliam was trained in artillery; during training he learned how to man a tank gun. After training ended he was transferred to Fort Benning, GA, where he would reside until December of 1941. The attack on Pearl Harbor led to the declaration of war, which for Gilliam would mean being deployed to the front.

The young Leonard Gilliam knew that going to war would be difficult, and his bringing up had prepared him to face the difficult road ahead. He had spent his childhood working on the farm and walking through fields and creeks, to and from the Twin Branch School, every day. But what the eager Gilliam did not foresee was the opportunities he would be presented with during his time in the service. A chance to see the world and forge a lifelong friendship were not in the then 21-year-old's plans back then.

His much needed experience with tanks landed him a spot on the front lines, and Gilliam entered the war in Casablanca, North Africa. He traveled through Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia before heading towards Europe. Gilliam was called to invade the island of Sicily on July 10, 1942. He was later awarded the Bronze Arrowhead for his courageous actions during the invasion.

Gilliam spent time in Sicily guarding POWs. He remembers eating with them, talking with them, and even giving them cigarettes. Looking back, he says that the prisoners were some of the finest people he has ever met. He stayed at the prison in Sicily until he was called to go to Normandy. He arrived in France a mere 4 days after the invasion of the beach on June 6, 1944.

The hardships experienced by Gilliam in France were some of the toughest times of the war for him. But in the midst of a dark shadow cast by war, Gilliam met Vayne McCoy, a fellow tank gunner who would soon become his best friend. The two friends helped each other see the end of the war, and then they lost track of each other once they had returned back to the States. It wasn't until 1997—53 years later—when the two would reunite. The two war buddies shared a deep bond, one that they continue to share to this day.

The veteran now recalls the warm welcome he received when he finally made his return trip home in 1945 after 3 years overseas. Mr. Gilliam is a modest man. He feels like he is undeserving of the hero's welcome he received after World War II. He believes that the real heroes were the ones that ''stayed over there,'' the ones who made the ultimate sacrifice for their country and never got the chance to come home.

The former soldier now enjoys life as a full-time family man. He is a husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. Leonard is a remarkable man who has been on a once-in-a-lifetime adventure. Even after all that he has been through, both the good and the bad, he is still grateful he had opportunity. Although he says he wouldn't go on a trip around the world again for $1 million, he doesn't regret getting to see the world for free the first time.

In November 2011, there was an article about Mr. Leonard Gilliam published in the Sentinel Echo Silver Edition, a magazine based in Laurel County, KY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sentinel Echo: Silver Edition, Nov. 2011]

WORLD WAR II: A TRIP AROUND THE WORLD

(By Carrie Dillard)

Leonard Gilliam remembers the days when he and his family ''didn't have a cable bill, water bill or electric bill.'' The 92-year-old Laurel County native has lived on his family farm his whole life.

He was born in 1919 in McWhorter. It was a time when, he said, ''everybody used a mule pair, everybody had a milk cow and some beef cattle, and everybody had their own hogs.''

You worked hard, he said. Kept your house warm buying coal for $1 a ton at the mines or a jug of kerosene for 10 cents a gallon. You cooked on a wood stove, and there were always chores to do.

He had to ''go through the field and cross the creek twice'' on his walk to Twin Branch School each day, so when he joined the U.S. Army in 1941, he was used to walking.

During the course of his military career, Gilliam would spend approximately three years overseas, engage in six major battles and one invasion. He would end his days in World War II in Berlin, Germany, during the Army occupation in July 1945.

Gilliam was drafted. ''They didn't draft until (age) 21 in those days,'' he said. He was the first one in the McWhorter community who got the call.

''There was a busload of us left London early one morning,'' he said, on their way to Fort Thomas, Kentucky. In less than two days, a contingent from all across the state filled a train headed to Fort Bragg, North Carolina, for basic training.

Gilliam was trained in artillery. He would later man the tank gun, causing him to lose nearly all of his hearing.

He served in the 2nd Armored Division (Hells on Wheels) under division commander George S. Patton, who once said the 2nd Armored Division ''could do the impossible'' because he trained them.

Gilliam was at Fort Benning, Georgia, when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor in 1941.

''They put more guards out, more security,'' he said, ''as war was declared.'' Gilliam and his division began more practices and maneuvers, traveling back and forth from Georgia and North Carolina, until his deployment overseas. In total, Gilliam would serve six six-month tours overseas.

As a gunner, he said ''the tanks were needed on the front'' as soon as they arrived in Casablanca, North Africa. They traveled to Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia, and on July 10, they invaded the island of Sicily, for which Gilliam was awarded a Bronze Arrowhead.

''Sicily was an interesting place,'' Gilliam said. It was there he worked as a security officer at an old penitentiary, guarding POWs.

''I had a gun and they didn't, but they didn't give me any trouble,'' he said.

In fact, he said, once they got acquainted, the POWs were ''some of the finest people I met.''

He said he'd put his gun up and sit down to eat with the prisoners. They ate the same rations—MREs (meal, ready to eat) just as the soldiers did, and were even given cigarettes.

Gilliam said he and his fellow soldiers were put on a boat in Sicily and weren't told where they were headed.

''It looked like we was going to the United States,'' he said, ''but we was going toward England.''

They were on the water at Thanksgiving, and, shortly thereafter, landed in Liverpool.

The invasion of Normandy took place on June 6, 1944. Gilliam arrived just four days later.

Although he describes it as some of the roughest times in the war, it is also where he met a good friend: Vayne McCoy.

McCoy was five years younger than Gilliam, and took to him like a younger brother. Both Gilliam and McCoy were on tanks. Gilliam's was called ''Crimson Tide,'' McCoy's ''Churchill.''

The two lost track of one another after the war, but reunited in 1997, more than 50 years later. Today, they ''get together pretty often,'' Gilliam said, their families becoming like family to each other.

Gilliam said the Germans were smart, and without the combined effort of the U.S. Army and Air Force, they would not have succeeded in driving them back.

In September 1944, Gilliam crossed the Belgium border, but it wasn't an easy trek. He said it rained the whole way there and turned to snow; it was the coldest winter he'd ever felt.

The Battle of the Bulge was upon them. Standing in knee-deep snow, Gilliam said he and his fellow soldiers would fire their guns and huddle around the tank to keep warm. He was nearly overcome by the exhaust fumes from the machine just trying to get warm. Gilliam suffers from the effects of frostbite to this day.

For a time, Gilliam and his company stayed in a local farmer's barn. The owners, he said, knew of their presence, and he said the owners were overjoyed to help.

Without the protection of that barn, they likely ''would have frozen to death.'' Gilliam said the group held up in that barn, sleeping in the hayloft, for three weeks until temperatures got warmer.

Gilliam said he remembers the faces of young children as they made the journey across France, Belgium, and Holland.

''The children were standing and waving at us. If we halted for some reason, they'd climb the tanks and hug everybody.

''The look on those little children's faces, you was glad to have done that for them,'' he said.

In April 1945, Gilliam said his outfit met the Russians on the Elbe River.

''For me, the war ended. I didn't fire another shot.''

Gilliam said soldiers returning from World War II got a hero's welcome, but veterans of other wars, like the Korean War or Vietnam, did not receive the same respect. ''Soldiers of the Korean War didn't get that welcome when they came home,'' he said. ''They could've used a welcome home, too.'' But Gilliam has never considered himself a hero. Those are the ones who gave the ultimate sacrifice, he said. In 238 days of battle, the 2nd Armored Division suffered 7,348 casualties, including 1,160 killed in action.

''The heroes didn't come back. They're still there.''

His older brother, Blane, was among them. Blane Gilliam, an Army radio operator who was serving in the Pacific, was killed in action/missing in action at age 30. Gilliam received word of his death around the time he reached Germany.

Following the war, Gilliam returned home and married Wilma George, who was 11 years his junior.

''Here I was a 25-year-old man, been around the world on a killing spree,'' he said. They were married for 61 years and had three children—Wanda, Coy and Linda. Today, Gilliam has three grandchildren and two great-grandchildren. He is a member of Twin Branch Methodist Church.

''I wouldn't make that trip (again) for one million dollars,'' he said. ''But I got to see the world (for free).''

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR BARBARA MIKULSKI

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today in light of last week's celebration here in the Senate, to recognize the truly historic and remarkable accomplishment of my good friend and colleague, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI.

As we all know, Senator MIKULSKI just last week achieved another stunning milestone as she became the longest-serving woman in the history of the United States Congress, surpassing Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers. Of course, it was at the outset of this 112th Congress that Senator MIKULSKI overtook Maine's legendary Senator Margaret Chase Smith. To say it's been quite a Congress for the Gentle Lady from Maryland is the height of understatement indeed.

In the process of paying tribute to Senator MIKULSKI, I discovered some interesting information, namely that three out of the four longest serving women in the Congress were actually born in Maine—Congresswoman Rogers, Senator Smith, and myself as third longest serving woman in both the Senate and the House.

Senator Smith of course served Maine and Congresswoman Rogers represented the 5th District of Massachusetts. Both were Republicans, and both were born in Maine. And so, let me just say, as one who is privileged enough to fall into the same categories, on behalf of the great State of Maine which appears to produce women of tremendous endurance at both ends of the U.S. Capitol, we could not be more proud of the Senator from Maryland.

But the commonalities don't end there—far from it. In addition to the overlapping biographical information I just referenced, it is a point of tremendous pride that all three of us also placed the highest of premiums on serving those who have served our Nation by giving every fiber of their being to protect, defend, and secure our cherished freedoms—our courageous men and women in uniform and our veterans.

Born in Saco, ME, Edith Nourse Rogers authored legislation that made her

one of the great champions of our men and women in the military as well as our Nation's veterans. As a Member of Congress, Edith Rogers displayed a work ethic worthy of her Maine roots and was known as ''the busiest woman on Capitol Hill.''

During her storied 35-year career spanning from 1925 to 1960—still the longest tenure of any woman in the history of the U.S. House of Representatives, Congresswoman Rogers counts among her long-lasting achievements the securing of $15 million to develop a national network of veterans' hospitals in the Veterans' Administration Act, the creation of both the Women's Army Corp and the landmark GI Bill of Rights.

She also proposed the establishment of a Cabinet-level Department of Veterans Affairs immediately after World War II an achievement that would finally take place in 1989. She was held in such high esteem by our veterans that the American Legion presented her with the Distinguished Service Cross—the first woman ever to receive that prestigious honor.

The incredible inroads and contributions that Edith Rogers made on behalf of our military, Senator Smith mirrored in the Senate. And just as an aside, I think it is worth noting that both shared a floral trademark, demonstrating that they could legislate in what was then very much a man's world without sacrificing their femininity or grace. Representative Edith Rogers wore an orchid or gardenia, and Senator Smith would don her signature rose.

A lifelong native of Skowhegan, Maine, Senator Smith was also a trailblazer and a woman of phenomenal firsts—the first woman to be elected in her own right to the United States Senate; the first woman to serve on the Armed Services Committee; the first woman to serve on the Appropriations Committee; the first woman to have her name placed in nomination for the Presidency by either major political party, in 1964; the first civilian woman to sail on a United States destroyer in wartime; the first woman to break the sound barrier in a U.S. Air Force F–100 Super Sabre Fighter—at 800 miles per hour, I might add.

In fact, that reminds me of the time in 1992 when Senator Nancy Kassebaum came to visit me in Maine, and we traveled together to see Senator Smith at her home and library. Senator Smith gave us a wonderful tour—despite her failing health at the time, and I recall asking her about a bright orange suit I saw that was hanging on one of the walls. And she replied that it was her flight suit from the time she broke the sound barrier. She then told me about how she had initially questioned the less than flattering color tone until she learned that the bright orange would help them find her if she had to eject! But for all of her courage, fearlessness, and monumental leadership, one of Senator Smith's indelible achievements was shepherding the historic Women's Armed Services Integration Act.

Mr. President, I am forever humbled by the shoulders I have been so proud to stand upon. As I recall the milestones of both Congresswoman Rogers and Senator Smith, especially for our veterans and armed forces, I cannot help but think of how they paved the way for my service as the only Republican woman Senator on the Personnel Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, battling as I was at the time in the late 1990s for the fair and equitable treatment of women in the services, including assurances that men and women would train as they fight—side-by-side!

For all of their joint accolades, neither Senator Smith nor Congresswoman Rogers set out to forge news paths for women in politics. In fact, upon winning her first election to the House, Congresswoman Rogers declared, ''I hope that everyone will forget that I am a woman as soon as possible.'' What we remember about these amazing women, born in Maine, is their great integrity, love of country, and a desire to serve. No wonder they have inspired legions of women, myself included.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to honor Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI for recently becoming the longest serving woman in the history of the United States Congress. However, in doing so, I am reminded that this milestone does not define her legacy. Rather, her legacy as a coalition builder and a tenacious advocate of the marginalized defines Senator MIKULSKI's tenure as a public servant for the people of Maryland.

Throughout her career, Senator MIKULSKI pioneered the role women play in today's Congress. When she joined the Senate in 1987, Senator MIKULSKI became one of two female Senators and the first Democratic woman ever to join the upper chamber. These achievements were not due to a famous husband or father; Senator MIKULSKI was elected because of her integrity and her fiery and compassionate character. Her personal and professional experiences over the past 35 years make Senator MIKULSKI an excellent mentor for first-term female members, leading to the appropriate title: ''Dean of Women.'' I was recently reminded of ''the Dean's'' ability to rally the support of female colleagues as Senator MIKULSKI and seven of 17 female senators lent their support for the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act on the floor of the Senate. Her efforts are emblematic of a unique ability to orchestrate voices in defense of the voiceless.

Just as the Violence Against Women Act provides support to both male and female victims of domestic abuse, Senator MIKULSKI's legacy as a champion of the exploited transcends the concept of gender. From her roots as a social worker and community organizer, Senator MIKULSKI has constantly stood for social justice. She was a driving force in the landmark Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009, which furthered protections for women and others faced with discrimination in the workplace. Equal pay for equal work is a principle that Senator MIKULSKI will continue to defend. From the young lady who delivered groceries to seniors, to a passionate defender of the ethnic American, Senator MIKULSKI continues to stand in solidarity with those forced to live in the margins.

I have been proud to serve in the Senate with Senator MIKULSKI for over two decades, and I have enjoyed working with her on many issues, in addition to our time serving together on the Subcommittee on the Department of State and Foreign Operations for many years. Perhaps most memorable is a CODEL we took to sub-Saharan Africa in 1990.

While my colleagues and I applaud Senator MIKULSKI on the longevity of her career, we more importantly take this moment to celebrate the leadership and achievements that characterize her 35 years of service. How long she has served bears witness to how well she has represented the people of Maryland.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to my colleague, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, who is now the longest serving woman in the history of the Congress and congratulate her on reaching this important milestone. Senator MIKULSKI is an inspiration to us all. She had broken down not only multiple gender barriers, but legislative, economic and societal barriers as well.

Throughout her career, Senator MIKULSKI has been a champion for those who are often forgotten. Hubert Humphrey once said the moral test of government is how it treats those in the dawn of life, the twilight of life and the shadows of life. Senator MIKULSKI took this message to heart. Her life has been a life of service. She spent her career as a tireless advocate, first as a social worker in Baltimore on the city council and then in the House of Representatives where she served 10 years before coming to the Senate. For the past 25 years she has continued this advocacy and has been a strong voice on the Senate floor, as well as on the HELP Committee. I have been fortunate to serve on the HELP Committee with Senator MIKULSKI since 2009.

One of the things Senator MIKULSKI is best known for is providing good constituent services. This is something all Senate offices do and it often gets overlooked by the national and international issues of the day. But this speaks to one of the most important duties of a Senator. When your constituent's mother dies in a country halfway around the world and you suddenly need a passport or a visa, when a veteran is not getting the benefits he is entitled to or when an older citizen

cannot afford to heat their home, they can turn to their Senator's local office for help. Senator MIKULSKI makes sure she and she her staff provide help to that family or veteran or older citizen.

BARBARA MIKULSKI knows, and her work demonstrates, that the job of a Senator is not only about numbers and budgets, it is about helping people, especially the vulnerable and those without a voice or a lobbyist.

Again, I congratulate BARBARA on her accomplishment and I look forward to working with her and continuing to fight for our children, our workers and our families with her in the years ahead.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President. I come to the floor today to celebrate the service of Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, one of the most tenacious and effective senators to serve in the U.S. Senate. This month, following 41 years of public service, Senator MIKULSKI has reached a new milestone in serving in the U.S. Congress longer than any woman in history. But as she has said, ''It's not how long you serve, but how well you serve.'' Both the State of Maryland and the entire Nation have benefited from Senator MIKULSKI's stamina as well her energy, intellect, and compassion. Today, we can see the difference she has made in our schools, health care, paychecks, and workplaces.

Senator MIKULSKI follows in the footsteps of the legendary Hattie Caraway of Arkansas. As the wife of Thaddeus Caraway, a former Congressman and U.S. Senator for Arkansas, Hattie assumed her husband's place in the Senate following his death in 1931. She once said, ''The time has passed when a woman should be placed in a position and kept there only while someone else is being groomed for the job.'' A year later, she ran for reelection, becoming the first woman elected to a 6-year term. She surpassed several milestones, including serving as the first female Senator to preside over the Senate and the first woman to serve as the chairwoman of a committee.

It would take 74 more years until a woman senator chaired a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Senator MIKULSKI, now at the reins of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science, has shown great leadership and vision as chairwoman and it has been a privilege to work with her. While we share many interests, we have worked most closely to advance the growth of science parks, strengthen law enforcement, and ensure U.S. companies can compete in the 21st century. I look forward to a continued partnership, congratulate Senator MIKULSKI on this historic achievement, and express my deep appreciation for all that she has done.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise to honor and extend my warmest aloha to my longtime colleague, a fellow member of the House freshman class of 1977, and very dear friend, Senator BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, for setting a new benchmark in her career and a significant milestone in this institution: becoming the longest serving woman in the history of the U.S. Congress. With each of her many accomplishments, she inspires the next generation of young American women, and she makes their dreams that much more attainable.

My colleague from Maryland has been a true trailblazer for women in Congress. In 1987, she earned the distinction of becoming the first-ever woman U.S. Senator from Maryland, as well as the first woman Democrat to serve in both the House and the Senate. Last year, she also became the longest serving female in Senate history.

BARBARA has not only witnessed the number of females climb from just 21 when she first came to Congress in 1977 to the 92 female members serving today, her actions and spirit helped to make that feat possible. She continues to be a distinguished leader, mentor, and friend to all of her colleagues in Congress, not just the women. Although we have more work to do to eliminate gender bias and discrimination, I am glad to see that Congress has become more representative of the United States.

Throughout her over 35 years in Congress, BARBARA has remained a fearless advocate for women, working-class Americans, and Federal workers across the country, a steadfast protector of the environment, and a relentless champion of civil rights in this country.

Raised by Polish-American small business owners, she has been a longtime defender of labor rights and a fierce proponent of establishing fair and equal working conditions for all Americans regardless of race, sex, or disability. This cause led her to author the landmark women's and worker's rights legislation, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which I cosponsored, to guarantee women equal pay for equal work.

Being from a State that, like Maryland, has a large population of Federal workers, I have worked very closely with BARBARA on many issues to support our government employees. From the time that we entered the House together, she has always been a strong partner and stalwart champion for the rights of our Nation's Federal workforce, including fair pay and benefits for the dedicated men and women who make our government more secure, effective, and efficient.

BARBARA is an embodiment of the democratic spirit and continues to be a leader. She uses her great wit, humor, and boundless energy to urge Congress to take up important issues and then works with Members on both sides of the aisle to resolve differences and come together to achieve real solutions that help real working Americans every day. This is a testament to the fact that as she became the longest serving woman in the history of Congress, she has never forgotten her purpose—to make America better.

I again want to extend my aloha and my congratulations to Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI for this amazing achievement. It is a pleasure to serve with you. Thank you for your many years of outstanding service and genuine friendship, and I wish you the best as you continue your important work here in Congress.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor my colleague and mentor, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, and to celebrate her legacy as the longest serving woman in Congress. For over 35 years, Senator MIKULSKI has proudly served the people of Maryland as a tireless advocate and a selfless public servant. It is my privilege to honor her today.

The great-granddaughter of Polish immigrants, Senator MIKULSKI grew up appreciating the value of hard work and service. On the weekends she worked in her parents' East Baltimore grocery store delivering groceries to homebound elderly. It was then that BARBARA developed her deep passion for helping others.

After earning her master's degree in social work from the University of Maryland, BARBARA started a career as a social worker with Catholic Charities and Baltimore's Department of Social Services. An outspoken advocate for at-risk youth and the elderly, she quickly earned a reputation as a fighter and was elected to the Baltimore City Council in 1971. After 5 years on the city council, BARBARA ran for Congress.

In 1976, BARBARA began her first term representing Maryland's Third Congressional District. As one of only 18 women in the House of Representatives, BARBARA was a member of a small but mighty group. During her 10 years in the House, she gained a reputation as a fighter, and in 1986 the people of Maryland again chose her to represent them but this time in the Senate.

As one of only two female Senators, and the first woman elected to the Senate in her own right, Senator MIKULSKI was met with much skepticism. While outnumbered, BARBARA's determination and dedication to her constituents shined through. BARBARA is a steadfast proponent of greater access to higher education, a leader on the front of women's health, and an unwavering supporter of America's veterans. She is determined to stand up for those who are often forgotten.

A few weeks ago, BARBARA shared a touching story that I think exemplifies her character.

When BARBARA first ran for Senate in 1986, she had the opportunity to get to know Harriet Woods, who was campaigning as a Democrat for the Missouri Senate seat. BARBARA saw the significance of having two female candidates for Senate, and she was certain both of them would win. Unfortunately, it wasn't meant to be for Harriet Woods, who lost to Republican John Danforth.

On BARBARA's first day she was shown her desk on the Senate floor—she opened it and saw Harry Truman's autograph. She had Harry Truman's desk. While she was delighted to have that desk, she knew that it really belonged to the Senator from Missouri and relinquished it. She said that for years she thought about that desk and hoped that it would someday be returned to a Democrat from Missouri.

Twenty years later, on election night in 2006, BARBARA watched the election results come in from around the country—and in Missouri, in particular. She said she stayed up late in the night waiting for the final result. Once she learned of the results from Missouri, she knew that the desk that had been accidentally given to her all of those years ago would finally be returned, where it belonged. I am so pleased to know that the Truman desk was shared, if only briefly, with my friend BARBARA MIKULSKI.

BARBARA MIKULSKI is a trailblazer, a role model, and an advisor to the other women in the Senate. Today there are 17 women in the Senate, and much of that progress can be attributed to Senator MIKULSKI's leadership.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate join me in congratulating Senator MIKULSKI on this milestone and thank her for her 35 years of leadership, friendship, and service.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, today I would like to honor Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI's amazing life and career as she becomes the Senate's longest serving woman Senator. She has been a role model and inspiration to women across the country as she broke barriers in public life. When she first came to the Senate she was one of only a handful of women ever to serve in the U.S. Senate and now she is one of 17 women here on the Senate floor. Her service has made it easier for girls to dream about one day being a Senator—or President.

Senator MIKULSKI and I shared a similar experience growing up: her parents, William and Christine, opened and operated Willy's Market, a small grocery store in their working class neighborhood in East Baltimore. My parents also opened a small grocery store in Milwaukee—the first of what would become the Kohl's Food Stores and then Kohl's Department Stores.

As we have already heard here on the floor, her father would frequently open the store early so local steel workers could buy their lunches before their shift began. He would also extend credit to help customers who were having a hard time making ends meet. William Mikulski's neighbors didn't go hungry with him as their grocer. BARBARA worked at the store, and helped deliver groceries to homebound seniors in their neighborhood. She got to know her neighbors well, and she understood the important issues facing her community.

Much of what we both experienced working in our family stores and watching our parents work so hard to provide superior service to their customers, ensuring their children understood the value of hard work, treating others fairly and with dignity, and giving back to the community, influenced our views on customer service. Those views have translated into Senator MIKULSKI's constituent service here in the Senate.

BARBARA's enthusiasm and commitment to serving the people of Maryland has resulted in too many victories to mention here, but I do want to point out a few of the projects we have worked on together on the Agriculture appropriations subcommittee.

Senator MIKULSKI and I have worked closely over the years to protect USDA agriculture research in Beltsville, MD. Beltsville is a historic and crucial part of the USDA's research arm. In fact it is the largest agriculture research facility in the world and does valuable work developing the next generation of crops and farming methods that will feed a growing planet. We've also worked together on increasing funding for the Food and Drug Administration, ensuring that the food we eat and medicine we rely upon is safe.

In my work as the chairman of Agriculture Appropriations subcommittee, I have been especially thankful for the times when BARBARA has spoken passionately about the important programs we fund through the subcommittee. She has been a stalwart supporter of farmers throughout Maryland and across the country, and a true friend here in the Senate. It has been an honor to serve with her.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, my late friend Alex Haley, the author of ''Roots,'' lived his life by the motto ''Find the Good and Praise It.'' That is an easy thing to do when talking about BARBARA MIKULSKI, a friend and colleague with whom I have worked closely since I joined the Senate.

I would like to add my congratulations to those of my colleagues on Senator MIKULSKI reaching the milestone of becoming the longest serving woman in Congress. This is a remarkable achievement for a remarkable woman. For over 35 years, that is almost 13,000 days, BARBARA MIKULSKI has dedicated herself to serving the people of Maryland and representing them here in Congress.

Although Senator MIKULSKI is a proud partisan, she is one of the best advocates of bipartisanship. She understands the need to work together, to learn from one another's point of view, and to strike a deal so that each side can get something of value and move forward.

I have found that when you have BARBARA MIKULSKI by your side in a debate you always seem to win. She brings passion and dedication and tenacity to every issue she works on. Her love of the Senate, Congress in general, and the American people is infectious.

When Senator MIKULSKI and I have worked together it has always been a delightful experience. Whether authorizing the Teach for America program to allow college graduates to become teachers in our Nation's worst schools; passing America COMPETES, where we improved our energy research programs and STEM education initiatives; or working on higher education where we share a passion for eliminating costly and unnecessary Federal regulations, BARBARA MIKULSKI is a tireless friend and ally.

Congratulations, Senator MIKULSKI. The Senate is proud of you, Maryland is proud of you, and the country is proud of you.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, today I wish to offer congratulations to my friend and colleague, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, on becoming the longest serving woman Senator in American history.

As Senator MIKULSKI has said, ''It's not only how long I serve, but how well I serve.'' And she has served very, very well. Not only does Senator MIKULSKI serve in the best interests of the people of her native Maryland, but her service continues to improve the lives of Americans from coast to coast.

This comes as no surprise for a person who began her career helping at-risk children and seniors as a social worker in Baltimore. Senator MIKULSKI's nightly commute home from Washington ensures that she will not forget who she works for or where she comes from. The truth is, she never left.

Her commitment and connection to her constituents benefits us all. Her advocacy for access to better health care, improving the quality of education, investing in innovation, and protecting human dignity are not bound by the borders of Maryland. Her service benefits the people of Baltimore, MD, but also the people of Broken Bow, NE.

It is an honor to serve with Senator MIKULSKI. I enjoy her company, I respect her strength, and I admire her commitment.

Congratulations to Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI on her record-setting service. We are all the better for it.

JOBS ACT

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on H.R. 3606, the Jumpstart Our Business Startups, or JOBS, Act, which the Senate passed on Thursday, March 22, 2012, by a vote of 73 to 26. I am particularly pleased that H.R. 3606 included language from S. 1824, the Private Company Flexibility and Growth Act, which I introduced on November 8, 2011, with Senator CARPER. We authored this important measure to update the shareholder threshold after which entities must register their securities with the Securities and Exchange Commission. This and other provisions contained in H.R. 3606 will provide companies and small banks with the flexibility to grow, which will in turn lead to economic growth and job creation.

As the Commission amends its rules implementing title V of H.R. 3606, it is important that it be mindful of Congress's intent that the rules provide clear guidance to issuers on how to comply with the new provisions. For instance, section 503 of the JOBS Act requires that the SEC adopt safe harbor provisions that issuers can follow when determining whether holders of their securities received the securities pursuant to an employee compensation plan in transactions that were exempt from the registration requirements of section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933.

The issues that we would expect the Commission to address when adopting the safe harbor provisions include the steps issuers can take to obtain comfort that securities are held by persons who received the securities pursuant to an employee compensation plan and whether the issuance of those securities were exempt from Securities Act registration. To provide issuers appropriate comfort under the rules, the Commission could adopt a safe harbor provision that allows issuers, absent actual knowledge of information to the contrary, to rely on information it has about a person at the time the securities are issued. The Commission could also adopt a safe harbor provision that allows issuers to consider an issuance of securities exempt from the Securities Act if it has a reasonable belief that the exemption existed at the time the securities were issued.

The definition of an ''employee compensation plan'' should be interpreted broadly. For purposes of determining whether a person is an employee who need not be counted when an issuer is calculating the number of holders of record under section 12(g)(1)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the term ''employee'' would include persons who are current or former employees of the issuer. We would also include but not limit this exemption to other persons such as surviving spouses or family members who inherit equity securities from the employee and who need not be included in the calculation of the number of holders of record. ''Employee compensation plans'' would include but is not limited to a written compensatory benefit plan or written contract as defined in SEC rule 701 under the Securities Act of 1933.

In revising rule 506 and rule 144A to remove the prohibitions on general solicitation or general advertising, the Commission should consider practice in the market for rule 144A securities and ensure that offerings and sales of rule 144A securities can proceed on the same basis as they do currently, including from a state blue sky perspective, regardless of whether there is general solicitation or general advertising.

The Commission should also consider adopting similar safe harbor provisions for how issuers can determine whether their investors are accredited for purposes of revised Exchange Act section 12(g)(1)(A) and whether securities are held by persons who purchase such securities in crowdfunding transactions described under new Securities Act section 4(6), in accordance with new Exchange Act section 12(g)(5)(B). We believe these additional safe harbor protections would provide important guidance for issuers and should be strongly considered by the SEC.

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish rise to speak about jobs and the Massachusetts innovation economy.

In July 2010, the Kauffman Foundation noted that ''startups aren't everything when it comes to job growth. They're the only thing.'' In fact, the Kauffman Foundation found that ''without startups, there would be no net job growth in the U.S. economy.'' In Massachusetts, where we have the second largest venture capital market in the country, venture capital helps drive our innovation technology. Massachusetts public companies that were once venture-backed start-ups account for 775,151 jobs and $190 billion in revenue in the United States.

However, in the current economic climate, institutional investors are wary of investing in ideas that carry significant entrepreneurial and technological risk. With a high risk of failure and often a lack of collateral, small start-up companies cannot qualify for traditional commercial loans. Alternative capital markets are therefore critical to these engines of future economic prosperity. To give entrepreneurs and start-ups the access to capital they need to get their businesses off the ground, I introduced the Democratizing Access to Capital Act—S. 1791—to legalize crowdfunding on November 2, 2011. Crowdfunding will create a new alternative market for capital formation by allowing every American—regardless of income or wealth—to invest in a start-up or a great idea. And according to an economic model by Regional Economic Models, Inc.—REMI, crowdfunding has the potential to increase the number of start-ups by 10 percent, potentially creating hundreds of thousands of new jobs.

Recognizing that crowdfunding could provide a huge new growth engine for the Massachusetts tech sector and the Internet, our brightest economic frontier, I wrote to President Obama on February 3, 2012 to ask for his help in urging the Senate to pass crowdfunding legislation. On February 27, 2012, I hosted a roundtable with Massachusetts entrepreneurs and small businesses at Boston City Hall. And on February 29, 2012, I called on my colleagues to work together and pass a crowdfunding bill in a speech from the Senate floor.

At the same time, entrepreneurs from the Cambridge Innovation Center created a petition to show Congress their support for crowdfunding. These entrepreneurs founded wefunder.com to rally support for crowdfunding. On March 5, 2012, wefunder.com and MassChallenge, a not-for-profit organization dedicated to supporting the work of entrepreneurs, hosted a roundtable on crowdfunding in Boston. As of March 26, 2012, 3 thousand investors pledged to invest $7.5 million when crowdfunding becomes legal.

On March 8, 2012, the House of Representatives passed the Jumpstart Our Business Startups (JOBS) Act by a vote of 390–23, which included crowdfunding legislation. President Obama also issued a statement in support of the JOBS Act. Although my focus was on legalizing crowdfunding, I felt that the JOBS Act bill lacked basic investor protection standards that would give investors some confidence and help the market grow. I worked with Senators MICHAEL BENNET and JEFF MERKLEY to introduce a bipartisan compromise crowdfunding bill, the CROWDFUND Act—S. 2190, on March 13, 2012. On March 22, 2012, the Senate passed the CROWDFUND Act as an amendment to the JOBS Act, which was approved by a vote of 73–26.

The CROWDFUND Act sets the framework for developing a new market in which entrepreneurs can raise capital and ordinary investors can invest in new ideas. To create a new marketplace for investment, the CROWDFUND Act creates investor protections that are designed to balance entrepreneurs' ease of access to capital with the need for transparency.

In prescribing requirements for issuers, the CROWDFUND Act addresses the importance of providing investors accurate information. While financial disclosures are necessary for investors to make wise investment decisions, the importance of disclosure should be balanced with individuals' right to privacy. The SEC should therefore, under its rulemaking authority provided in Section 4A(b), clarify that entrepreneurs will not be asked to disclose individual personal tax returns. In addition, while the bill clearly states that issuers should be liable for material misrepresentations or omissions, issuers should not be held liable for misstatements or omissions that were made by mistake. The standard of liability for issuers as described in Section 4A(c) should be ''due diligence.'' In other words, issuers must do their ''due diligence'' to make sure that the information that they are providing to potential investors is accurate. This is a widely accepted liability standard.

Although issuers may not advertise the specific terms of an offering, the CROWDFUND Act ensures that issuers are allowed to generally advertise their offerings through email and social media channels, as long as the intermediary website remains the location for all offerings. Potential investors should be given enough information about offerings to spark their interest. To discourage fraudulent operators, provide proper investor education and ''crowdvetting'' of opportunities by impartial third parties, issuers should not be allowed to encourage investment

outside of the intermediary. In addition to facilitating communication between issuers and investors, intermediaries should allow fellow investors to endorse or provide feedback about issuers and offerings, provided that these investors are not employees of the intermediary. Investors' credentials should be included with their comments to aid the collective wisdom of the crowd.

Regulated intermediaries are necessary for investor protection; however, intermediaries should not be over-regulated. Specifically, none of the requirements placed on intermediaries should prevent an intermediary or funding portal from removing or preventing the public display of an offering that it deems not credible. To guarantee the quality of offerings, intermediaries should be able to employ a Kickstarter-like process, in which the staff of an intermediary determines which issuers are invited to present their offerings to site visitors. Intermediaries should also be allowed to inform its users about offerings that may interest them, provided that this is not explicitly or implicitly recommending the offering to an investor. Although intermediaries must only provide offering proceeds to issuers once the issuers' target offering amount is reached, intermediaries should not be required to escrow proceeds.

To streamline the offering process, it makes sense to allow intermediaries to place a hold on investor credit cards until an offer is fully subscribed. At that time, investors' credit cards should be charged and the proceeds immediately transferred to the issuer. Intermediaries should also be permitted to act as the holder of record for offerings that they facilitate to reduce compliance complexity for issuers and to increase the likelihood of subsequent funding from institutional investors. Providing holder of record services will reduce compliance complexity for issuers and place the burden of managing crowdfunded investors on the intermediary. Without this mechanism, issuer capitalization tables may become unwieldy, discouraging subsequent funding from institutional investors. In addition, intermediaries should be allowed to take an equity stake in offerings. This however, does not mean that intermediaries should be able to choose which offerings to participate in but rather it should be a standard process for any offering that the intermediary facilitates. This will incentivize an intermediary to focus on issuer quality over quantity, providing more vetting for investors and greater alignment of interests. Of course, any equity stakes by the intermediary must be fully and meaningfully disclosed to investors. Of course, any equity stakes by the intermediary must be fully and meaningfully disclosed to investors. The SEC should carefully monitor any developments in this area and adjust practices, including restricting the ability for intermediaries to take equity positions, should fraud or manipulative practices arise.

Although the CROWDFUND Act requires intermediaries to register with the SEC and become members of a self-regulatory association, all rules, regulations and registration requirements should be developed with minimal burden and cost to the intermediaries. The SEC and any relevant self-regulatory association should bear in mind that these costs will ultimately be passed through to issuers—costs should not undermine the goals of crowdfunding to create low-burden alternative means of raising capital. In addition, the crowdfunding community may develop its own self-regulatory association to specifically oversee crowdfunding intermediaries.

While preemption of State securities law is necessary for crowdfunding to function, State securities regulators should play a role in crowdfunding offerings. In addition to allowing limited State securities registration, State should retain its authority to take enforcement action with regard to any issuer or intermediary. Further, where state authority is not specifically preempted, the SEC will not presume preemption. State securities regulators are the first line of defense against fraud and their ability to continue to combat fraud should not be curtailed.

Finally, I urge the SEC to take seriously the statutory directive to complete within 270 days of enactment the rulemaking necessary to make the law effective. Crowdfunding entrepreneurs and intermediaries are eagerly awaiting the rules to take full advantage of crowdfunding's potential to unlock capital for start-ups and small businesses. Based on my office's interactions with the SEC, I believe that the SEC is committed the success of this new market, and the rulemaking should be easily completed within 270 days.

Few entrepreneurs take a new start-up to a mature company on their own. New ideas need the support of investors to survive and thrive. Investments power payrolls across our nation and every sector. It's the grease that keeps the gears in the American economy turning. Crowdfunding will allow small businesses to bypass Wall Street and go straight to Main Street for financing. We know that new businesses are the source of all of the net job creation in the United States. This CROWDFUND Act provides an avenue for new growth for that crucial sector with unlimited potential.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wish to discuss our bipartisan efforts to pass a crowdfunding amendment that provides needed flexibility but also ensures that crowdfunding has sufficient oversight and investor protections. I was proud to work with Senators MERKLEY and BROWN in crafting this bipartisan proposal. The Senate passed our amendment by a 64 to 35 margin. The House of Representatives subsequently passed our language when it considered the JOBS legislation earlier this week.

As the Securities and Exchange Commission works to implement this new law, it is my hope that it will recognize that the funding portal registration process is meant to be more streamlined and less burdensome than traditional broker-dealer registration. Given the size of the investments that are likely to occur in crowdfunding, the SEC should work to provide an appropriate level of oversight without making it cost-prohibitive to become a funding portal.

Funding portals should be allowed to organize and sort information based on certain criteria. This will make it easier for individuals to find the types of companies in which they can potentially invest. This type of capability—commonly referred to as curation—should not constitute investment advice or recommendations, which the law otherwise prohibits.

Similarly, funding portals should be allowed to engage in due diligence services. This would include providing templates and forms, which will enable issuers to comply with the underlying statute. In crafting this law, it was our intent to allow funding portals to provide such services.

We also sought to provide the Securities and Exchange Commission sufficient flexibility to promulgate rules to ensure individuals have the necessary information and protections to make informed investment decisions. It is my hope that the Commission will exercise such discretion judiciously and will not create a regulatory regime that is too cumbersome and expensive for funding portals to operate or for issuers to sell their securities. In preparing the law, we sought to find the right balance, preserving basic investor protections while ensuring enough entrepreneurial flexibility to help this promising medium take off for the good of our economy. I am hopeful that the Commission will respect this balance as it moves forward to implement this law.

Finally, we provided 270 days for the Commission to implement this new law. I hope the SEC will make every effort possible to meet this deadline.

HOUSE BUDGET PROPOSAL

Mr. BAUCUS. President Kennedy said that ''to govern is to choose.''

When you put away the charts and graphs, budgets are about choices. These choices impact our children's schools, business owners' bottom lines, and families' paychecks. And they affect how we care for our wounded veterans when they return home from fighting for us.

The House has chosen to pass the House Budget Committee chairman's budget.

Just as it did last year, this budget makes a stark choice. It shows where the House's priorities are.

Under the House plan, millionaires would receive an average tax cut of at least $150,000. Meanwhile, seniors would eventually have to pay nearly $6,000 more for their health care. That is a big increase when the average senior has a fixed income of only $25,000 a year.

Most Americans would agree that this doesn't pass the smell test.

We know we need to reduce our deficit.

But asking seniors to pay an additional quarter of their income for their health care while giving millionaires a six-figure tax break just isn't fair. It is certainly not balanced. And it is the wrong choice.

The House plan would also end the Medicare Program seniors know today. It would eliminate guaranteed benefits. It would charge seniors more for their prescriptions. It would make them pay for the screenings and doctor visits they get free now.

The millions hurt by this plan include former members of our Armed Forces who served for more than 20 years or were injured while on duty. This budget leaves these military retirees— and other seniors—high and dry.

It takes a lot of courage to serve a full career in the military. But there is nothing courageous about cutting care for our military retirees. I will stand up for our military and our seniors and make sure they have the health care they need.

The House budget also increases the eligibility age for Medicare from 65 to 67 years old. That means seniors would be forced to work later in life, just to keep their health care.

And the House budget replaces Medicare with a voucher program.

Seniors would have to use these fixed-price vouchers to purchase private insurance or Medicare. But this voucher wouldn't cover seniors' health care needs.

Seniors would be forced to make up the difference by spending thousands of dollars out of their own pockets.

To make matters worse, under the House plan, seniors would be paying more and getting less.

Private insurance companies would get to dictate what care seniors can get—and what they can't. Private companies could say a senior can't have hospice or nursing home care or they could limit hospital stays or prescription drug coverage.

The House plan would end the guaranteed benefits that Medicare protects today.

I won't let this happen. I won't let others break our promise to America's seniors. I won't let anyone dismantle Medicare.

Besides ending the Medicare seniors rely on today, the House budget does not solve our country's deficit problem. It just makes seniors and middle-class families pay more than their fair share.

Fortunately, this is not the only option we have to reduce our country's debt. We have another choice—the path we took with health reform.

We know our long-term deficits are in part due to health care costs. For the past several decades, these costs have been growing faster than inflation. This makes Medicare more expensive for the government.

That is why health reform focused on lowering overall health care costs.

This lowers premiums for seniors enrolled in Medicare today. And it helps keep the program strong for generations to come.

If we hadn't passed health reform, the deficit would be more than $1 trillion higher over the next two decades.

If we hadn't passed the affordable care act, health care spending would have doubled. We passed health reform to bend the cost curve and slow this cost growth.

Last week marked the second anniversary of the health care reform law. We are already seeing results. According to CBO, over the next 10 years, per-person Medicare costs will decrease by four percentage points compared to the past thirty years.

How did we make this progress?

We know that when doctors and hospitals don't talk to each other, patients receive the same tests twice and other duplicative services. Health reform improves coordination by giving providers incentives to work together.

We know that expensive diseases can be better managed if they are caught early. Health reform provides free preventive care to catch and treat costly chronic conditions.

We know criminals try to rip off taxpayers. Health reform provides law enforcement new tools to protect Medicare and Medicaid from fraud and recoup taxpayer dollars.

We know that some of the best ideas to lower costs don't come out of Washington. They come from our communities. Health reform leverages these good ideas by partnering with the private sector.

This is the path we need to continue down. We need to ensure these tools are successful and work to improve them. We need to build on these reforms to keep saving consumers' and taxpayers' money.

As we look to solving our country's largest problems, we need to remember our priorities.

We need to focus on fairness. We need to remember that the choices we make matter.

The choices we made in the affordable care act are making our health care system more efficient. These choices are lowering costs for everyone.

The House plan chooses to ignore rising health care costs. It simply shifts risks and costs onto the backs of America's seniors.

That is a plan that is not right for seniors. It is not right for our health care system. And it is not right for our future. The American people know which choice we should make.

HEALTH CARE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this week marks the 2-year anniversary of the signing into law of President Obama's health care bill. There was no question that our health care system required substantial reform. In passing this law, however, Congress failed to follow the Hippocratic oath, ''first do no harm.'' The new law increases health care costs, hurts our seniors and health care providers, and imposes billions of dollars in new taxes, fees, and penalties. This will lead to fewer choices and higher insurance costs for many middle-income Americans and most small businesses—the opposite of what real health care reform should do.

I find it particularly disturbing that President Obama's health care law does not do enough to rein in the cost of health care and provide consumers with more affordable choices. In fact, Medicare's Chief Actuary estimates that the law will increase health spending across the economy by $311 billion, and the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says the law will actually increase premiums for an average family plan by $2,100. Moreover, a recent report issued by the CBO found that the new law will cost $1.76 trillion between now and 2022. That is twice as much as the bill's original 10-year price tag of $940 billion.

The new law also means fewer choices for many middle-income Americans and small businesses. All individual and small group policies sold in the United States will soon have to fit into one of four categories. One size simply does not fit all. In Maine, almost 90 percent of those purchasing coverage in the individual market have a policy that is different from the standards in the new law.

I am also very concerned about the impact the law will have on Maine's small businesses, which are our State's job creation engine. The new law discourages small businesses from hiring new employees and paying them more. It could also lead to onerous financial penalties, even for those small businesses that are struggling to provide health insurance for their employees. According to a 2012 Gallup Survey, 48 percent of small businesses are not hiring because of the potential cost of health insurance under the health care law, and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office has testified that the new law will mean 800,000 fewer American jobs over the next decade.

Even where the law tries to help small businesses, it misses the mark. For example, I have long been a proponent of tax credits to help small businesses cover employee health insurance costs. The new credits for small businesses in the health care law, however, are poorly structured. They are phased out in such a way that businesses will actually be penalized when they hire new workers or pay their employees more. Moreover, they are temporary and can only be claimed for 2 years in the exchange.

Finally, I am very concerned that the new law is paid for, in large part, through more than $500 billion cuts to Medicare, a program which already is facing long-term financing problems. It simply does not make sense to rely on deep cuts in Medicare to finance a new entitlement program at a time when the number of Medicare beneficiaries is on the rise.

Moreover, according to the administration's own Chief Actuary, these deep cuts could push one in five hospitals, nursing homes, and home health providers into the red. Many of these providers could simply stop taking Medicare patients, which would jeopardize access to care for millions of seniors.

It doesn't have to be this way. The bitter rhetoric and partisan gridlock over the past few years have obscured the very important fact that there are many health care reforms that have overwhelming support in both parties. For example, we should be able to agree on generous tax credits for self-employed individuals and small businesses to help them afford health insurance, thus reducing the number of uninsured. We should be able to agree on insurance market reforms that would prevent insurance companies from denying coverage to children who have preexisting conditions, permit children to remain on their parents' policies until age 26, require standardized claim forms to reduce costs, and allow consumers to purchase insurance across State lines.

We should be able to agree on delivery system reforms that reward value rather than volume and quality over quantity and that increase transparency throughout the health care system. And we should be able to agree on ways to address the serious health care workforce shortages that plague rural and smalltown America. Simply having an insurance card will do you no good if there is no one available to provide the care.

In short, we should repeal ObamaCare so that we can start over to work together to draft a health care bill that achieves the consensus goals of providing more choice, containing health care costs, improving quality and access, and making health care coverage more affordable for all Americans.

BETTER HEALTH REWARDS PROGRAM ACT OF 2012

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to advocate for legislation my colleague, Senator PORTMAN, and I have coauthored that focuses on driving better health outcomes for America's seniors through the use of real, positive financial incentives.

I think we can all agree on a theory—the best health care is often the least expensive, and it is often health care you can have real control over—prevention.

According to the Hastings Center, 76 percent of Medicare spending is on patients with five or more chronic diseases: stroke, heart disease, diabetes and cancer lead the way. And with $2.7 trillion spent annually on health care, one of the best ways to slow the growth of that spending is to keep Americans healthier, and to do that, we have to reduce the prevalence of chronic disease.

I think Medicare can help spark that transformation. It is a large Federal program, some of the smartest health policy links the Federal Government and the private sector, and, most important, the Federal Government already pays for seniors to have an annual physical.

At present, when seniors leave that physical, too often there is no game plan or specific steps a senior can take to get healthier in the year ahead. Seniors get a bunch of numbers about their tests, possibly a prescription, and some medical lingo about their general health, but mostly everyone just hopes things will turn out OK at the next physical. Maybe it was an OK year, and that extra dessert wasn't a problem after all.

We believe that if the Federal Government is already paying for that physical, it is only common sense to wring every possible advantage for seniors out of it, specifically by giving seniors the tools to make changes that promote good health and reward them for staying motivated.

That is exactly what the bill I have written with Senator PORTMAN does. Typically, the assumption has always been that preventive care means more services. But in this case, government already pays for the service—the $3.8 billion on the annual wellness visit—and we are saying, let's get more out of that visit.

Here is how our legislation—the Medicare Better Health Rewards Program Act—would do that:

First, it is voluntary. Since we hear a little discussion about mandates these days, this is voluntary.

In year 1, a senior has their physical, has their tests run, and their health provider has a conversation with them about their health. They come up with a plan to use the next year so that the senior can get healthier. The provider then lets Medicare know their patient is participating.

In year 2, the senior comes back for their next annual wellness visit. Again, tests are run, and they discuss the changes that may have occurred over the last year. If they have gotten healthier and their provider confirms it, they are eligible for a Healthy Reward. If they haven't, they still had their physical at no out of pocket cost to them. Their provider still gets paid. The same happens again in year 3.

Finally, the money to pay these rewards comes from the fact that as participating seniors get healthier, Medicare is spending less money on them. They are saving the system money. If that occurs, those seniors who are getting healthier will be able to share in the savings.

Bottom line: Innovation is rampant in American health care, and we are here with a new strategy to bring a fresh wave of innovation to Medicare.

I would like to thank Senator PORTMAN for working with me on this new approach to Medicare reform, and I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring our legislation.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMANCIPATION DAY

Mr. CARDIN. When Congress returns to session on Monday, April 16, 2012, we will recognize an important anniversary and holiday here in Washington. That day will be the 150th anniversary of District of Columbia Emancipation Day. Nine months before President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation in January 1862, the President signed the District of Columbia Compensated Emancipation Act. The act ordered the release of the 3,100 enslaved persons of African descent held in the Nation's capital. District of Columbia residents were therefore known as the ''First Freed'' slaves by the Federal government during the Civil War.

In 1865 the Confederacy surrendered and the Civil War ended, and later that year the 13th Amendment to the Constitution was ratified, which states that: ''Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.''

Emancipation Day celebrations were held annually in the District of Columbia from 1866 through 1901, and resumed in 2002. In 2005 Emancipation Day was made an official public holiday in the District of Columbia.

On March 6, 2012, the District of Columbia City Council adopted ceremonial resolution 19–207. The resolution finds this anniversary to be ''an important, historic occasion for the District of Columbia and the nation and serves as an appropriate time to reflect on how far the District of Columbia and the United States have progressed since institutionalized enslavement of people of African descent. Most importantly, the 150th anniversary reminds us to reaffirm our commitment to forge a more just and united country that truly reflects the ideas of its founders and instills in its people a broad sense of duty to be responsible and conscientious stewards of freedom and democracy.'' I ask unanimous consent to place a copy of this resolution in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

(See exhibit 1.)

In the recent past, we have been blessed to celebrate numerous historic achievements for African-Americans in Washington, DC and throughout the Nation, including the election of the first African-American President of the United States, the dedication of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial, and the groundbreaking for the

National Museum of African American History and Culture. I congratulate the District of Columbia government and its residents on this historic anniversary.

EXHIBIT 1

A CEREMONIAL RESOLUTION: 19–207—IN THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MARCH 6, 2012

To recognize and preserve the cultural history and heritage of the District of Columbia; to formally recognize the 150th anniversary of District of Columbia Emancipation Day on April 16, 2012, as an important day in the history of the District of Columbia and the United States in that, on April 16, 1862, 9 months before President Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863 to begin to end institutionalized slavery in America, President Lincoln signed the District of Columbia Compensated Emancipation Act to release the 3,100 enslaved persons of African descent held in the nation's capital, making them the ''first freed'' by the federal government, at a cost of nearly $1 million, in 1862 funds, paid to the people who enslaved them; to recognize that, after the Civil War, formerly enslaved people and others commemorated the signing of the 1862 act by parading down Pennsylvania Avenue in festive attire, with music and marching bands, proclaiming and celebrating freedom in the District of Columbia Emancipation Day Parade, which was received by every sitting President of the United States from 1866 to 1901; and to recognize that, on March 7, 2000, the Council of the District of Columbia voted unanimously to establish April 16th as a legal private holiday, the Emancipation Day Parade resumed in the nation's capital in 2002, and, on April 5, 2005, District of Columbia Emancipation Day was made a legal public holiday, recognized annually on April 16th.

Whereas, on April 16, 1862, President Abraham Lincoln signed the District of Columbia Compensated Emancipation Act (''Emancipation Act'') during the Civil War;

Whereas, the Emancipation Act provided for immediate emancipation of 3,100 enslaved men, women, and children of African descent held in bondage in the District of Columbia;

Whereas, the Emancipation Act authorized compensation of up to $300 for each of the 3,100 enslaved men, women, and children held in bondage by those loyal to the Union, voluntary colonization of the formerly enslaved to colonies outside of America, and payments of up to $100 to each formerly enslaved person who agreed to leave America;

Whereas, the Emancipation Act authorized the federal government to pay approximately $1 million, in 1862 funds, for the freedom of 3,100 enslaved men, women, and children of African descent in the District of Columbia;

Whereas, the Emancipation Act ended the bondage of 3,100 enslaved men, women, and children of African descent in the District of Columbia, and made them the ''first freed'' by the federal government during the Civil War;

Whereas, nine months after the signing of the Emancipation Act, on January 1, 1863, President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863, to begin to end institutionalized enslavement of people of African descent in Confederate states;

Whereas, on April 9, 1865, the Confederacy surrendered, marking the beginning of the end of the Civil War, and on August 20, 1866, President Andrew Johnson signed a Proclamation—Declaring that Peace, Order, Tranquility and Civil Authority Now Exists in and Throughout the Whole of the United States of America;

Whereas, in December 1865, the 13th Amendment to the United States Constitution was ratified establishing that '' Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction'';

Whereas, in April 1866, to commemorate the signing of the Emancipation Act, the formerly enslaved people and others, in festive attire, with music and marching bands, started an annual tradition of parading down Pennsylvania Avenue, proclaiming and celebrating the anniversary of their freedom;

Whereas, the District of Columbia Emancipation Day Parade was received by every sitting President of the United States from 1866 to 1901;

Whereas, on March 7, 2000, at the Twenty Seventh Legislative Session of the Council of the District of Columbia, Councilmember Vincent B. Orange, Sr. (D-Ward 5) authored and introduced, with Carol Schwartz (R-At Large), the historic District of Columbia Emancipation Day Amendment Act of 2000, effective April 3, 2001 (D.C. Law 13–237; D.C. Official Code §§ 1–612.02a, 32–1201), and on that same date moved an emergency version of the legislation that established April 16th as a legal private holiday;

Whereas, the District of Columbia Emancipation Day Emergency Amendment Act of 2000, which established April 16th as a legal private holiday, was passed unanimously by the Council on March 7, 2000, and signed into law on March 22, 2000 by Mayor Anthony A. Williams;

Whereas, on April 16, 2000, to properly preserve the historical and cultural significance of the District of Columbia Emancipation Day, Councilmember Orange hosted a celebration program in the historic 15th Street Presbyterian Church, founded in 1841 as the First Colored Presbyterian Church;

Whereas, on April 16, 2002, after a 100-year absence, the District of Columbia, spearheaded by Councilmember Orange with the support of Mayor Anthony Williams, returned the Emancipation Day Parade to Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., along with public activities on Freedom Plaza and evening fireworks (D.C. Official Code § 1–182);

Whereas, the District of Columbia Emancipation Day Parade and Fund Act of 2004, effective March 17, 2005 (D.C. Law 15–240; D.C. Official Code § 1–181 et seq.), established the Emancipation Day Fund to receive and disburse monies for the Emancipation Day Parade and activities associated with the celebration and commemoration of the District of Columbia Emancipation Day;

Whereas, the District of Columbia Emancipation Day Amendment Act of 2004, effective April 5, 2005 (D.C. Law 15–288; D.C. Official Code § 1–612.02(a)(11)), established April 16th as a legal public holiday;

Whereas, on April 16, 2005, District of Columbia Emancipation Day was observed for the first time as a legal public holiday, for the purpose of pay and leave of employees scheduled to work on that day (D.C. Official Code § 1–612.02(c)(2));

Whereas, April 16, 2012, is the 150th anniversary of District of Columbia Emancipation Day, which symbolizes the triumph of people of African descent over the cruelty of institutionalized slavery and the goodwill of people opposed to the injustice of slavery in a democracy;

Whereas, the Council of the District of Columbia remembers and pays homage to the millions of people of African descent enslaved for more than 2 centuries in America for their courage and determination;

Whereas, the Council of the District of Columbia remembers and pays homage to President Abraham Lincoln for his courage and determination to begin to end the inhumanity and injustice of institutionalized slavery by signing the District of Columbia Compensated Emancipation Act on April 16, 1862;

Whereas, the alignment of the (1) election of the first African-American President of the United States, Barack H. Obama; (2) dedication of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial; (3) groundbreaking for the National Museum of African American History and Culture; (4) 150th anniversary of the District of Columbia Emancipation Day; and (5) 150th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 2013, are historically important for the District of Columbia and for the United States; and

Whereas, the 150th anniversary of District of Columbia Emancipation Day is a singularly important occasion that links the historic Presidency of Abraham Lincoln with the equally historic Presidency of Barack H. Obama, as the first President of the United States of African descent.

Resolved, by the Council of the District of Columbia, That this resolution may be cited as the ''District of Columbia Emancipation Day—150th Anniversary Recognition Resolution of 2012''.

SEC. 2. The Council of the District of Columbia finds the 150th anniversary of District of Columbia Emancipation Day is an important, historic occasion for the District of Columbia and the nation and serves as an appropriate time to reflect on how far the District of Columbia and the United States have progressed since institutionalized enslavement of people of African descent. Most importantly, the 150th anniversary reminds us to reaffirm our commitment to forge a more just and united country that truly reflects the ideals of its founders and instills in its people a broad sense of duty to be responsible and conscientious stewards of freedom and democracy.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon the first date of publication in the District of Columbia Register.

FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, my friend and colleague from Wyoming, Senator ENZI, and I have once again submitted a resolution to designate April as ''Financial Literacy Month'' to raise public awareness of this important issue. I would like to first thank the cosponsors of the resolution, Senators BAUCUS, BLUNT, BROWN of Ohio, CARDIN, CARPER, COCHRAN, COONS, CRAPO, DURBIN, HAGAN, INOUYE, JOHNSON of South Dakota, KOHL, LANDRIEU, LAUTENBERG, MENENDEZ, MURRAY, and WICKER. I appreciate their hard work and support in working to increase the level of financial literacy for people of all ages across America. I also thank the Senate for taking up this resolution and passing it with unanimous consent last night.

This is the tenth and final year that I have introduced this resolution, which highlights our Nation's need for investments in financial literacy, commends current efforts and initiatives to promote financial education, and encourages the administration and private institutions to continue to work toward creating a more financially literate public.

Financial literacy empowers individuals to be able to appropriately evaluate credit opportunities, successfully

save and invest for long-term financial goals in an increasingly intricate marketplace, and responsibly manage their personal, professional, and family finances. It is essential that we continue to make strides toward improving education and consumer protection, while giving individuals the necessary tools to build more financially stable families, businesses, and communities. As we continue along the path to economic recovery, it is imperative that the basics of economics, credit, and personal finance become a fundamental fixture in the American school system.

The Council for Economic Education recently released their 2011 ''Survey of the States: Economic and Personal Finance Education in Our Nation's Schools.'' According to this survey, there have been great improvements in financial literacy since the first survey in 1998. However, troublingly, in the past 2 years, progress has slowed and in some cases even reversed. Specifically, only 22 States require students to take an economics course as a high school graduation requirement, and only 16 States require the testing of student knowledge in economics. In addition, only 12 States require students to take a personal finance course either independently or as part of an economics course as a high school graduation requirement.

Also, alarmingly, according to the Gallup-Operation HOPE Financial Literacy Index, while 69 percent of American students strongly believe that the best time to save money is now, only 57 percent believe that their parents are saving money for the future. Despite clear progress in this area over the past 15 years, these most recent trends are disturbing.

There is no better time than now to invest in a better-educated, more financially savvy public. With the increased complexity of and access to today's financial products, the unscrupulous nature of predatory lenders as they enticed millions of families into complicated loans they could not afford nor understand, and people having to make important life decisions at a younger and younger age, it is critical that we ensure that students are empowered by a sound financial education by the time they graduate from high school. Our Nation cannot afford another housing crisis, and the best way to safeguard against that risk is education and promotion spreading knowledge.

I would like to thank the various organizations and individuals who are doing their part to ensure the education of personal finance reaches as many Americans as possible. Teachers, parents, financial institutions, nonprofit organizations, Governors, legislators, and other decision makers must be leaders on this issue just as all of us owe it to ourselves and our country to have adequate knowledge of personal finance.

As policymakers, we must champion these issues year round, not just in the month of April. However, focusing on Financial Literacy Month in April allows us to have a designated month when we can focus our efforts, take stock of what has been working, and improve on our work for the coming year. I thank my colleagues again for passing this resolution.

TRIBUTE TO JENNIFER L. SMITH

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise along with my colleague, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Senator SESSIONS, to pay tribute to Jennifer L. Smith, who is retiring this week after more than 32 years of distinguished service to the Congress.

Ms. Smith began her congressional career in 1979, working in the Senate. While working, she attended law school at night and became one of the Senate's Assistant Parliamentarians. She has since served as an Assistant Counsel for the House Budget Committee, the General Counsel for the Senate Budget Committee, and the Deputy General Counsel for CBO. In 2006, she returned to the Senate Parliamentarian's Office as the Senate Precedents Editor and in 2010 returned to CBO as the Associate General Counsel.

In each of her roles, Ms. Smith worked tirelessly to ensure that the decisions of each office were carefully researched, well reasoned, and fully documented.

As an attorney for CBO, Ms. Smith ensured that CBO's estimates of legislation were based on a solid understanding of the law. Her skills as an attorney have been highlighted in the diverse issues she has worked on while at CBO, ranging from immigration, to Social Security to lease-purchase issues. Her knowledge of appropriations law, copyright law, and the ethics rules of the House of Representatives rivals those of the most acknowledged experts in those fields.

Ms. Smith's excellent work has been recognized throughout her career. In 2005, for instance, as CBO's Deputy General Counsel, she received a CBO Director's Award for outstanding performance, one of many such awards.

Ms. Smith has exemplified CBO's high standard of professionalism, objectivity, and nonpartisanship. As chairman, I greatly appreciate the sacrifices that Ms. Smith—as well as her family—has made in assisting the Budget Committee and Congress.

I would like to turn to my colleague, Senator SESSIONS, for his remarks.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the chairman and join him in commending Ms. Smith for her many years of dedicated, faithful, and outstanding service to CBO, to the Senate through her work in the Parliamentarian's Office and the Budget Committee, and to the Congress and American people. We wish her all the best in her well-deserved retirement.

We hope our colleagues will join us in thanking Ms. Smith—and really all of the hard-working employees at the Congressional Budget Office—for her and their service.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE OAHU MATH LEAGUE

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the math coaches and teachers of the Oahu Math League, OML, for their outstanding service for the students of Hawaii. The Hawaii Council of Teachers of Mathematics created the OML more than 40 years ago to supplement the traditional math curriculum in Hawaii's schools and to provide students with an outlet to represent their schools in academic competition. The league is comprised two senior varsity divisions as well as one junior varsity division. The various teams represent 28 of Oahu's schools, both public and private, and over 35 coaches, each dedicated to the promotion of mathematics education in the State of Hawaii.

I wish to acknowledge the students who spend their free time after school and on weekends to prepare and compete in the OML's seven grueling meets each academic year. These students devote their extracurricular time to mastering difficult mathematic techniques and theories in order to challenge themselves in the pursuit of academic excellence. Their commitment to their education is exemplary and should be commended.

However, these young men and women would not be able to participate in the OML competitions were it not for the support and knowledge of the fundamentals of math given to them by their coaches and teachers. These devoted men and women work many hours a week outside the school day in preparation for these competitions.

I would like to recognize both the foresight of OML's founders, as well as the enduring passion and tireless diligence of the many outstanding teachers who volunteer their time and efforts each school year to make the league a success. In particular, I would like to note the extraordinary commitment of several of OML's most active supporters: Thomas Yamachika, Carl Wheeler, Hank Koszewski, Phil Abe, Clarence Kanja, Lance Suzuki, Clayton Akatsuka, Kathleen Goto, and Amy Yonashiro.

I also want to thank the nine dedicated math teachers and OML coaches, who spend a combined total of 68 hours a week preparing for meets outside of the regular school day and represent more than 180 years of math instruction and service. They are Calvin Fukuhara of Kamehameha School, Michael Park of Iolani School, Tim Cantley and Deborah Kula of Sacred Hearts Academy, Michael Ida of Kalani High School, Carolyn Okunaga of Mililani High School, Chenfu Chiang of Hanalani High School, Hal Parker of Punahou School, and Joyce Kanja of Mid-Pacific Institute.

As an educator and former principal, I know firsthand about the countless hours that go into student extracurricular activities when the school

day ends. It makes me proud to see these outstanding educators embody the spirit of service. Their dedication to their field and to the students of Hawaii is undeniable. I send my best wishes to the students, their families, teachers, and coaches and to the Oahu Math League for continued success in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL ROBERT WALK

● Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I rise to congratulate Robert Walk who is retiring from the U.S. Army with the rank of colonel. Robert dedicated more than 30 years of his life to serving our Nation as both an Active and Reserve officer. New Hampshire has been very fortunate to have a man such as Robert serving in the Army, and I am privileged to recognize his accomplishments today.

Robert comes from a patriotic family with a long history of honorable service. He chose to follow in the footsteps of his father, the late COL James Frederick Walk of Hanover, and his grandfathers, BG Arthur Richard Walk, U.S. Army, and LTC and Dartmouth College professor—Ralph Arthur Burns, Army Air Force. His brothers, LTC William Arthur Walk and LTC James Bradford Walk, all answered the same call to service.

After receiving a degree in chemical engineering from the University of New Hampshire, he served for 11 years on active duty in the Army, where he met his wife, LTC M. Angela S. Walk. Following his active-duty service, he continued his career in the Army Reserve, serving as a traditional reserve officer while pursuing a master's degree in environmental engineering. As a traditional Reserve officer, Robert held a variety of positions, working in the Army Reserve's Homeland Security Office, and in the congressionally directed Domestic Preparedness Program, before transitioning to active Guard Reserve status. His final position was serving as the chief of staff of the U.S. Strategic Command Center for Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction at Fort Belvoir.

Even in retirement, I am confident that Robert will continue to serve his Nation. On behalf of all New Hampshire residents and all Americans, I am proud to thank Robert and his entire family for their service to our great Nation.●

UNITED FARM WORKERS OF AMERICA 50TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 50th anniversary of the United Farm Workers of America, the Nation's largest farmworkers union.

In 1962, Cesar Chavez, the preeminent figure in the movement for farm laborers' rights in the 20th century, founded the National Farm Works Association, which later became the United Farm Workers, UFW.

Mr. Chavez's steely determination and use of nonviolent protest tactics in the Delano grape strike of 1965–1970; the fasts of 1968, 1972, and 1988; and numerous other strikes around the Nation became an organizing model and inspiration for the labor movement.

Driven by its core values of integrity, innovation, empowerment, nonviolence and ''Si Se Puede'' attitude, the UFW has worked valiantly and tirelessly over the past half century to achieve a number of historic gains for farmworkers. The vigorous advocacy of the UFW has enabled farmworkers to secure higher wages and safer working conditions, reduced exposure to the use of harmful and toxic pesticides, and equality and opportunities for their families.

Today, the UFW remains an ardent protector and advocate for the rights and interests of farmworkers in 10 States. The union's proud legacy of social justice and civil rights is alive and thriving.

The story of the first 50 years of the United Farm Workers is a testament to the value of perseverance and social justice. I applaud the indefatigable commitment of all UFW members, past and present, to bring justice and equality to farmworkers and to future generations.

As the members and friends of the United Farm Workers gather to celebrate this auspicious occasion, I congratulate them on their 50th anniversary and wish everyone a memorable anniversary and continued success.●

EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT

● Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish today to recognize the significant contributions that the East Bay Municipal Utility District in Oakland, CA, is making with respect to renewable energy production. East Bay Municipal Utility District is a regional water and wastewater treatment agency serving the needs of the citizens of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties in the San Francisco Bay area. I am proud to note that with 1.3 million customers in the east bay region, this agency is leading the way in developing sustainable energy and water conservation practices that benefit the region.

On April 3, the East Bay Municipal Utility District's board of directors will formally dedicate a project that will create clean energy for the region and help ensure that waste materials that would otherwise be sent to landfills are reused. This new project is the Power Generation Station Renewable Energy Expansion Project and it builds on the successful Resource Recovery Program that is already serving as a model for other wastewater treatment plants across the Nation.

The Power Generation Station Renewable Energy Expansion Project will utilize biogas, methane, produced from anaerobic digesters to power electrical generators and a new 4.6-megawatt clean-burn turbine. The source materials used by the anaerobic digesters will be waste that is currently being sent to garbage dumps. As a result of this new project, EBMUD's total production capacity at its wastewater treatment plant will be 10.6 megawatts, enough capacity to meet the electrical power demands of 13,000 homes.

The innovative Power Generation Station Renewable Energy Expansion Project will allow the East Bay Municipal Utility District to be the first agency of its kind in the Nation to generate all its own energy entirely from the production of biogas generated from waste materials. Excess energy, above and beyond that needed to meet the electrical power demands of running the wastewater treatment plant, will be sold back to the electrical grid, thereby helping to keep customer rates low by reducing EBMUD's power bill and increasing revenues from the sale of electricity. Increasing the generation of green energy supports California's goal of increasing clean energy while reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This project is particularly important because EBMUD is currently generating so much biogas from waste material that it is forced to flare the excess biogas.

At a time when all of us must find ways to reduce energy consumption and help generate renewable energy, I commend the board of directors and the employees of the East Bay Municipal Utility District for the foresight they have shown in developing and growing the Resource Recovery Program and in the construction of this important sustainable energy project. This project serves as a reminder to each of us that we can find ways to develop high-quality public services and reduce operating costs through innovative thinking and the use of technology. I congratulate East Bay Municipal Utility District for leading the way on developing clean energy.●

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL RICHARD C. GROSS

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing COL Richard ''Rich'' C. Gross on the occasion of his promotion to brigadier general in the U.S. Army. This is a tremendous honor, for which he should be especially proud.

A devoted patriot, Rich has dedicated the past 27 years to serving our Armed Forces and protecting our Nation. After graduating from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, he was commissioned in the U.S. Army as a second lieutenant in the Infantry. Rich's first assignment took him to the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, NC, where he served in numerous leadership positions. While there, he was accepted into the Army's Funded Legal Education Program. In 1993, he graduated from the University of Virginia School of Law and entered the U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's, JAG,

Corps. He later earned a master's degree in strategic studies from the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, PA.

As a JAG, Rich served in numerous positions across the world. He began serving in the 101st Airborne Division, Fort Campbell, KY. After assignments at the U.S. Army Litigation Division in Arlington, VA, and the 1st Special Operational Detachment—Delta, Fort Bragg, he was assigned to the V Corps, Heidelberg, Germany, as the deputy staff judge advocate, SJA. Most recently, he served as the SJA for U.S. Central Command, USCENTCOM, at MacDill AFB, Tampa, FL.

I had the opportunity to serve with Rich in Kabul, Afghanistan, and was able to see firsthand his strong work ethic, good character, and integrity. As the chief legal advisor for the International Security Assistance Force, ISAF, and SJA for U.S. Forces—Afghanistan, USFOR–A, Rich is an invaluable asset to our Armed Forces and, as a leader, has set an example for other service men to follow.

Rich has received numerous awards, including the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Meritorious Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, and the Non-Article 5 NATO Medal. He is a recipient of the U.S. Army Ranger Tab, Master Parachutist Badge, Air Assault Badge, and Expert Infantryman Badge.

I ask the Senate join me in congratulating Richard C. Gross on his promotion to Army, brigadier general. We thank him for his lifelong dedication to our Armed Forces and Nation. I wish Rich the very best in his future endeavors.●

REMEMBERING JUDGE DAVID HUFF

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today we honor the life and service of Judge David Huff, whose passing on March 27, 2012 signifies a great loss to Nevada's judiciary. David's commitment to the people of the State of Nevada will never be forgotten. I send my condolences and prayers to David's family in this time of mourning.

David served the communities of Fallon and Yerington for 15 years as District Court Judge for Nevada's Third Judicial District Court and the recently-formed Tenth Judicial District Court. Since being elected to the bench in 1996, David's main priority was to maintain and secure justice for the residents of Churchill and Lyon Counties. Throughout his career, David was deeply invested in community efforts to improve the justice system by developing policies that promoted excellence in court administration.

As a Vietnam veteran and Navy Justice School graduate, David made a commitment to his country long before he served the great State of Nevada. He joined the United States Navy and after being deployed, worked for the Judge Advocate General's—JAG—Corps to provide military individuals with legal support and assistance. David also served as a military judge, demonstrating his continued resolution to upholding the laws of our land.

Throughout his life, David maintained a dedication to the preservation of justice and integrity which I am honored to commend. Today, I join the Churchill County community and citizens of the Silver State to celebrate the life of an upstanding Nevadan and dedicated advocate on behalf of our State.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN HITT

● Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to a great Floridian, Dr. John Hitt, who earlier this month celebrated his 20th anniversary as the president of the University of Central Florida.

First and foremost, I would like to congratulate him on reaching this milestone, and thank him and his wife Martha for everything they have done for Central Florida over the past 20 years. When they arrived at UCF in 1992, Dr. Hitt outlined five goals for UCF that have held steadfast for two decades.

He wanted the school to offer the best undergraduate education available in Florida and achieve international prominence in key programs of graduate study and research. He wanted the school to provide international focus to UCF's curricula and research programs, become more inclusive and diverse, and to be America's leading partnership university.

This innovative vision and entrepreneurial spirit have led to UCF becoming our nation's 2nd largest university and a place among America's premier metropolitan research universities.

When Dr. Hitt arrived in Orlando, he knew that the key to making UCF a world-class university and a vital force in Central Florida was going to be through the power of partnerships.

It would be through partnerships with our community and State colleges where UCF accepts 29 percent of all Florida community and State college transfer students, making it the No. 1 destination for transfer students in the State university system and among the top universities in the United States for community college transfer students.

It would be through partnerships with industry and government that led to the growth of the Central Florida Research Park—one of the top five research parks in the country—and to the founding of the Florida High Tech Corridor Council, which links the resources and talent of UCF, the University of South Florida, and the University of Florida with high-tech companies.

And, it would be through partnerships that are profoundly transforming Central Florida, such as those that led to the creation of the UCF College of Medicine which has become the cornerstone for a growing medical sciences cluster of facilities known as the ''Medical City at Lake Nona.''

A few weeks ago, Dr. Hitt told the UCF community that if he had learned anything in 20 years, it was that our greatest danger is not to dream too large, but to dream too small. In the years that he has led UCF—and in the 50 years that he has had Martha at his side—John Hitt has stayed true to his ideals, his vision, and his heart.

Mr. President, Dr. Hitt is fond of saying that UCF ''stands for opportunity.'' That is in no small part because of his strength of character, bold vision and steady leadership. As UCF celebrates its 50th anniversary next year, Dr. Hitt's unique approach to tackling challenges and creating opportunities has taken UCF from promise to prominence. On this special anniversary, I thank Dr. Hitt for not straying from the five visionary goals that he outlined in his inaugural address two decades ago—and for showing us what is possible through passion and partnership.

Thank you, Dr. Hitt.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN W. ROWE

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to John Rowe, an individual whose keen intellect and indefatigable work ethic have transformed him into one of the country's most respected voices in the energy industry—and one that I have relied on throughout my congressional career as a source for honest analysis of public policy relating to climate change and energy markets.

Earlier this month, John spent his first day of retirement teaching students at a charter school that he financed and founded in Chicago—an action which embodies a career that has prioritized responsibility, competition, and above all, a commitment to embracing challenges. Indeed, John not only leaves Exelon a stronger company, but he bequeaths a legacy of vision and innovation to the utility sector that will truly reverberate for generations to come. It has often been noted that John holds the distinction of being the longest serving utility executive in the United States, which is also a remarkable reflection of the degree to which he is considered a preeminent and trusted voice on a range of issues from national climate policies to transmission and environmental regulations.

To think that it all began in Maine. In reflecting upon the origins of his career, John described to the New York Times last summer that he was told he could either try to become a CEO through a long and arduous climb up the corporate ladder, or he could ''go to some fairly small company that is in really big trouble and is willing to take a lot of risk.'' And the rest, as they say, is history—to the everlasting benefit of the energy industry.

John, who had virtually no experience in the energy sector, moved to Maine and joined Central Maine Power, or CMP, as CEO in 1984—as the company was confronting unparalleled challenges. It was also after he came to CMP that my husband, the former Governor of Maine Jock McKernan, and I first met John.

In Maine, John quickly demonstrated exceptional business acumen and quickly altered the discussion in Maine from one of confrontation to one of collaboration that involved regulators and the rest of the business community. He carried that experience forward to New England Electric Systems where he became a forceful voice for deregulation of the electricity markets in the 1990s. Always a strong proponent of increasing competitiveness in the electricity market, John realized that the electricity industry was on course toward a new paradigm when he remarked to the Bangor Daily News in 1995, ''We're on a route to increasing competition, and that is unlikely to be turned around.''

John steadfastly maintained that ideology throughout the rest of his career, and while he left Maine and New England for his work at Exelon and its predecessor, Unicom, he indisputably continued to influence public policy throughout the country—garnering him numerous industry accolades, including Edison Electric Institute's Distinguished Leadership Award, the Keystone Center Leadership in Industry Award, Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce Burnham Award for Business and Civic Leadership, as well as an induction to the Chicago Business Hall of Fame. But most invaluable to the Nation has been his ever-steady and thoughtful commentary on the development of sensible policies that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions while providing certainty for business investments.

Rather than challenging regulations, John has led the effort to replace antiquated Clean Air Act rules with market-based solutions that provide environmental dividends at a reduced cost to industry and consumers. Specifically, as cochair of the National Commission on Energy Policy, he developed the report, ''Ending the Energy Stalemate,'' which called for increasing and reforming fuel economy standards, addressing climate change through a mandatory market-based trading program, and increasing the development and distribution of energy-efficient products.

Specifically, the report stated that, ''improving passenger vehicle fuel economy is by far the most significant oil demand reduction measure proposed by the Commission.'' As a coauthor of the ''Ten-in-Ten'' Fuel Economy Title of the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act, I took these recommendations to heart, and with Senator FEINSTEIN, embarked on an initiative to achieve historic fuel economy standards based upon this law—which, given the increasing prices for gasoline, could not be more imperative.

However, John's true expertise, starting with his initial effort to stop the campaign to close a nuclear plant in Maine, focuses on developing a regulatory environment that provides safe nuclear power to consumers. As the operator of the largest nuclear fleet in the United States, John has meticulously worked to address the current challenges confronting additional nuclear power in the United States, while also preemptively positioning the industry for unanticipated impediments. The American nuclear power fleet is the safest in the world in part because of his unparalleled contributions.

At a time when trust of institutions, companies, and public policymakers has eroded, it is difficult to lose John's voice as a head of one of the most influential companies in the United States. John has always demonstrated a trust with his colleagues as well as policymakers, and I look forward to watching his continued contributions following his retirement as chief executive officer of Exelon.

I wish John and his wife, Jeanne, the very best in the next chapter of their lives, and I look forward to continuing to work with an individual who believes in cost-effective development of clean energy in the United States, is champion of competition, and is committed to responsibility throughout society.●

TRIBUTE TO JAMES McCORMICK

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, last week, an extraordinary West Virginian, James McCormick, received a national award, Citizen Service Before Self Honors, from the Congressional Medal of Honor Foundation. This nonprofit is dedicated to education and awareness about the Congressional Medal of Honor. James McCormick was recognized by this distinguished group for his extraordinary commitment to his fellow veterans. Mr. McCormick returned from service and rather than thinking of just himself, he realized that his fellow veterans needed to work and they needed housing.

His deep understanding of the needs of returning veterans led to the creation of his nonprofit, Raising Cane Farms. The vision is simple but important. Raising Cane Farms is an organic, environmentally friendly farm located in Mason County, WV, that grows and market bamboo for multiple uses, including sales to manufacturers of bamboo products, produce sellers, restaurants, and landscapers. But beyond that, the farm will also serve as an educational facility and place to employ veterans and provide quality jobs in an outdoors, veteran-friendly environment using both the outdoors and fellowship with other veterans to help them recover from combat disabilities.

Raising Cane Farms has been helped by dedicated partners including the Farmer Veteran's Coalition, FVC, that provided support to clear the land, build roads, establish a watering system, and build a greenhouse. Other partners include Work Vessels for Veterans, which helped with funding for a trailer, marketing and Web development support, and important introductions to other veteran farmers including Veteran Farm's pioneer Adam Burke.

As the longest serving member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am deeply moved by the courage of our veterans and their ongoing service to our country and their colleagues. James McCormick is such an inspiration.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:50 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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5. An act to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system.

H.R. 1339. An act to designate the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States.

At 1:54 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 bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4281. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Bias, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 4281. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. REID).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1339. An act to designate the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 5. An act to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–5516. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Commodity Pool Operators and Commodity Trading Advisors: Compliance Obligations'' (RIN3038–AD30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 26, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5517. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; New Mexico; Correction'' (Docket No. APHIS–2008–0124) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 26, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5518. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Bacillus pumilus strain GHA 180; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9343–1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5519. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs (DCN OSS–2012–0407); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5520. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Defense's fiscal year 2010–2018 Strategic Workforce plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5521. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Developing Countries Combined Exercise Program Report of Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5522. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Secretary's personnel management demonstration project authorities for Department of Defense Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5523. A communication from the Principal Military Deputy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Research, Development and Acquisition), transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of plans to donate the destroyer ex-EDSON (DD 946) to the Saginaw Valley Naval Ship Museum for permanent berthing and public display in Bay City, Michigan, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 26, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5524. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5525. A communication from the Chief of the Recovery and Delisting Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishing a Manatee Refuge in Kings Bay, Citrus County, FL'' (RIN1018–AX27) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5526. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the detailed boundary for the Allegheny Wild and Scenic River in Pennsylvania, added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5527. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; Regional Haze'' (FRL No. 9652–1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5528. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Quality Assurance Requirements for Continuous Opacity Monitoring Systems at Stationary Sources'' (FRL No. 9653–3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5529. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Amendment to HFO–1234yf SNAP Rule for Motor Vehicle Air Conditioning Sector'' (FRL No. 9651–3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5530. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing and Designation of Critical Habitat for the Chiricahua Leopard Frog'' (RIN1018–AX12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5531. A communication from the Chief of the Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Endangered Status, Revised Critical Habitat Designation, and Taxonomic Revision for Monardella linoides ssp. viminea'' (RIN1018–AX18) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5532. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Terrestrial Environmental Studies for Nuclear Power Stations'' (Regulatory Guide 4.11, Revision 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 26, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5533. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, a legislative proposal relative to amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5534. A communication from the Acting Director of Human Resources, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5535. A communication from the Acting Director of Human Resources, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5536. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interest on Untimely Paid Vessel Repair Duties'' (RIN1515–AD74) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5537. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to the Congress on the Implementation of the Medicare Self-Referral Disclosure Protocol''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5538. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Plan to Implement a Home Health Agency Value-Based Purchasing Program''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5539. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the establishment of a Danger Pay Allowance for Nigeria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5540. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certification for the export of defense

articles, to include technical data, and defense services related to the export of firearms to the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs in the amount of $1,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5541. A communication from the Director, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revising Standards Referenced in the Acetylene Standard'' (RIN1218–AC64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5542. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Organization and Conforming Changes to Regulations'' (Docket No. FDA–2012–N–0222) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 26, 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5543. A communication from a Member of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5544. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2-Propenoic acid, 2-methyl-, 2-ethylhexyl ester, telomer with 1-dodecanethiol, ethenylbenzene and 2-methyloxirane polymer with oxirane monoether with 1,2-propanediol mono(2-methyl-2-propenoate), hydrogen 2-sulfobutanedioate, sodium salt, 2,2′-(1,2-diazenediyl)bis[2-methylpropanenitrile]-initiated; Tolerance Exemption'' (FRL No. 9339–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5545. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Acetamiprid; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9340–7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5546. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: New Threshold for Peer Reviews of Noncompetitive Contracts'' ((RIN0750–AH66) (DFARS Case 2012–D018)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5547. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of Case-by-Case Reporting'' ((RIN0750–AH67) (DFARS Case 2012–D020)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5548. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Inflation Adjustment of Threshold for Acquisition of Right-Hand Drive Passenger Sedans'' ((RIN0750–AH65) (DFARS Case 2012–D016)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5549. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Separation of Combined Provisions and Clauses'' ((RIN0750–AH38) (DFARS Case 2011–D048)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5550. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of intent to use fiscal year 2010 Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs (NADR) funds for Global Threat Reduction activities in Libya; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5551. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (7); Amdt. No. 3466'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5552. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (30); Amdt. No. 30829'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5553. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules (4); Amdt. No. 499'' (RIN2120–AA63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5554. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; BRP-Powertrain GmbH and Co KG Rotax Reciprocating Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0836)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5555. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Creation of a Low Power Radio Service'' (MB Docket No. 99–25; FCC 12–28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5556. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Creation of a Low Power Radio Service; Amendment of Service and Eligibility Rules for FM Broadcast Translator Stations'' (MB Docket No. 99–25; FCC 12–29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5557. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2011 Report to Congress on the Disclosure of Financial Interest and Recusal Requirements for Regional Fishery Management Councils and Scientific and Statistical Committees; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5558. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Veterans Affairs Vehicle Fleet Report on Alternative Fuel Vehicles for fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5559. A communication from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board's health and safety activities relating to the Department of Energy's defense nuclear facilities during calendar year 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5560. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Construction Permit Fees'' (FRL No. 9654–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5561. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Kentucky; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan'' (FRL No. 9653–8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5562. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Determinations of Clean Data for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Standard for the Harrisburg-Lebanon-Carlisle-York, Allentown, Johnstown, and Lancaster Nonattainment Areas'' (FRL No. 9654–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5563. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Secondary National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Oxides of Nitrogen and Sulfur'' (FRL No. 9654–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5564. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's updated Strategic Plan for the period of fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5565. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement'' (RIN1515–AD86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5566. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Tobacco Prevention and Control Activities in the United States, 2008–2009''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5567. A communication from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Annual Report on The Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act for fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5568. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–321, ''Car Wash Employee Overtime Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5569. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–322, ''Lottery Amendment Repeal Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5570. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–323, ''Moratorium on Establishments Which Permit Nude Dancing Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5571. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–327, ''Workforce Job Development Grant-Making Authority Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5572. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–328, ''Board of Elections and Ethics Electoral Process Improvement Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5573. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–329, ''Unemployed Anti-Discrimination Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5574. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–330, ''Civil Marriage Dissolution Equality Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5575. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–331, ''DDOT Omnibus Conforming Temporary Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5576. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–332, ''Unemployment Compensation Funds Appropriation Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5577. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–333, ''Targeted Retirement Distribution Withholding Temporary Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5578. A communication from the Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Railroad Retirement Board's fiscal year 2011 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5579. A communication from the Director, Facilities Services Directorate, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Facilities Services Directorate/Pentagon Renovation and Construction Program Office (PENREN) annual report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5580. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Council's 2011 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5581. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Devices; Neurological Devices; Classification of the Near Infrared Brain Hematoma Detector'' (Docket No. FDA–2012–M–0206) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 29, 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5582. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding Between the Food and Drug Administration and Other Departments, Agencies, and Organizations'' (Docket No. FDA–2012–N–0205) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 29, 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–68. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to ensure that amounts credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used solely for the dredging, infrastructure, operation, and maintenance of federally authorized ports, harbors, and waterways; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 97

Whereas, domestic shippers and importers using Great Lakes and coastal ports pay more than a billion dollars per year in federal harbor maintenance taxes. Congress established the tax to fund harbor operation and maintenance, particularly dredging, at these ports; and

Whereas, despite a nearly $6 billion balance in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, our nation's dredging needs are not being met. Throughout our nation and particularly in the Great Lakes region, the lack of dredging has forced shippers to operate inefficiently and carry lighter loads, costing them millions of dollars each year; and

Whereas, the Obama Administration has only budgeted about half of the revenue collected through the harbor maintenance tax for maintaining our nation's harbors. Last year, nearly $1.5 billion were collected from shippers, but only $758 million has been allocated for dredging harbors in Michigan and other coastal states; and

Whereas, during the current turbulent economic conditions, we must make every effort to support economic activity by maintaining the infrastructure necessary for commerce. Essentially by, using harbor maintenance taxes placed in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to finance and balance other portions of the federal budget, we are breaking our promise to the shippers paying the tax and hurting our nation's economic recovery; and

Whereas, current congressional legislation (H.R. 104 and S. 412) would ensure that harbor maintenance taxes are only used for their intended purpose to maintain our nation's harbors; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to ensure that amounts credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used solely for the dredging, infrastructure, operation, and maintenance of federally-authorized ports, harbors, and waterways; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM–69. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing a request for an amendments convention to be called for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which shall provide that an increase in the federal debt requires approval from a majority of the legislatures of the separate states; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 87

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States provides authority for a convention to be called by the Congress of the United States for the purpose of proposing amendments to the constitution upon application of two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states, an ''amendments convention''; and

Whereas, the legislature of the state of Louisiana favors the proposal and ratification of an amendment to said constitution which shall provide that an increase in the federal debt requires approval from a majority of the legislatures of the separate states. therefore, be it

Resolved, Section 1. That, as provided for in Article V of the Constitution of the United States, the legislature of the state of Louisiana herewith respectfully applies for an amendments convention to be called for the purpose of proposing an amendment which shall provide that an increase in the federal debt requires approval from a majority of the legislatures of the separate states.

Section 2. That the amendments convention contemplated by this application shall be entirely focused upon and exclusively limited to the subject matter of proposing for ratification an amendment to the constitution providing that an increase in the federal debt requires approval from a majority of the legislatures of the separate States.

Section 3. This application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states have made application for an equivalently limited amendments convention.

Section 4. That a certified copy of this application be dispatched by the secretary of state (or other responsible constitutional officer) to the president of the United States Senate, to the speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to each member of the applicant's delegation to the United States Congress, and to the presiding officers of each house of the several state legislatures, requesting their cooperation in applying for the amendments convention limited to the subject matter contemplated by this application.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LIEBERMAN, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 2297. A bill to promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 112–09154).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2159. A bill to extend the authorization of the Drug-Free Communities Support Program through fiscal year 2017.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Christy L. Romero, of Virginia, to be Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program.

*Richard B. Berner, of Massachusetts, to be Director, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, for a term of six years.

*Jeremy C. Stein, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004.

*Jerome H. Powell, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2000.

*Jeremiah O'Hear Norton, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 2013.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Gregory K. Davis, of Mississippi, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi for the term of four years.

Richard Gary Taranto, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

Gershwin A. Drain, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Robin S. Rosenbaum, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2250. A bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2251. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 709 West 9th Street, Juneau, Alaska, as the Robert Boochever United States Courthouse; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2252. A bill to rebuild the American middle class by creating jobs, investing in our future, building opportunity for working families, and restoring balance to the tax code; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2253. A bill to require individuals who file under the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to disclose any financial accounts that are or have been deposited in a country that is a tax haven; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2254. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish uniform standards for the exchange of controlled substance and prescription information for the purpose of preventing diversion, fraud, and abuse of controlled substances and other prescription drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 2255. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, to add Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day as a patriotic and National observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2256. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for community-based mental health infrastructure improvement; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. REED):

S. 2257. A bill to increase access to community behavioral health services for all Americans and to improve Medicaid reimbursement for community behavioral health services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 2258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the rule providing 5-year amortization of expenses incurred in creating or acquiring music or music copyrights; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BURR, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. WEBB, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2259. A bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2012, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2260. A bill to allow taxpayers the opportunity to specify their choice of Federal budget priorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 2261. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to establish a revenue loss assistance program, repeal the direct payment and ACRE programs, extend commodity programs through 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 2262. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and extend the Fetal Alcohol Syndrome prevention and services program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

S. 2263. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to establish the National Program for Arts and Technology Act as a Federal program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 2264. A bill to provide liability protection for claims based on the design, manufacture, sale, offer for sale, introduction into commerce, or use of certain fuels and fuel additives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 2265. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to cover screening computed tomography colonography as a colorectal cancer screening test under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 2266. A bill to improve sharing of immigration information among Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials, to improve State and local enforcement of immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 2267. A bill to reauthorize the Hudson Valley National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 2268. A bill to ensure that all items offered for sale in any gift shop of the National Park Service or of the National Archives and Records Administration are produced in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 2269. A bill to permit voluntary economic activity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 2270. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to improve energy programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 2271. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the time for making S corporation elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2272. A bill to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Mount Denali; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2273. A bill to designate the Talkeetna Ranger Station in Talkeetna, Alaska, as the Walter Harper Talkeetna Ranger Station; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 2274. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a nonprofit corporation to be known as the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 2275. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to establish a grant program within the rural broadband program of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 2276. A bill to permit Federal officers to remove cases involving crimes of violence to Federal court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 2277. A bill to respond to the extreme fire hazard and unsafe conditions resulting from pine beetle infestation, drought, disease, or storm damage by declaring a state of emergency and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately implement hazardous fuels reduction projects in the manner provided in title I of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2278. A bill to provide for an exemption for community banks to certain escrow requirements under the Truth in Lending Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2279. A bill to amend the R.M.S. Titanic Maritime Memorial Act of 1986 to provide additional protection for the R.M.S. Titanic and its wreck site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 2280. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 2281. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to strengthen the ability of the Food and Drug Administration to seek advice from external experts regarding rare diseases, the burden of rare diseases, and the unmet medical needs of individuals with rare diseases; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. VITTER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2282. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 2283. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to include procedures for requests from Indian tribes for a major disaster or emergency declaration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CASEY:

S. Res. 411. A resolution congratulating the Pennsylvania State University IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon on its continued success in support of the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

S. Res. 412. A resolution commending the African Union for committing to a coordinated military response, comprised of 5,000 troops from Uganda, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and South Sudan, in order to fortify ongoing efforts to arrest Joseph Kony and senior commanders of the Lord's Resistance Army and to stop the crimes against humanity and mass atrocities committed by them; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. Res. 413. A resolution supporting the designation of April 2012 as National Autism Awareness Month; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. Res. 414. A resolution commemorating the 125th anniversary of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. Res. 415. A resolution designating April 4, 2012, as ''National Association of Junior Auxiliaries Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. Res. 416. A resolution supporting the designation of April as Parkinson's Awareness Month; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. COONS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. Res. 417. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Health Week; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. LEE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BURR, Mr. KYL, and Mr. RISCH):

S. Con. Res. 37. A concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Con. Res. 38. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, and Mr. LEE):

S. Con. Res. 39. A concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2012, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2022; to the Committee on the Budget.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS ON MARCH 28, 2012

S. 202

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 202, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States before the end of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) 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. 606

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 606, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve the priority review voucher incentive program relating to tropical and rare pediatric diseases.

S. 700

At the request of Mr. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the treatment of certain farming business machinery and equipment as 5–year property for purposes of depreciation.

S. 1131

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1131, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to establish and implement a birth defects prevention, risk reduction, and public awareness program.

S. 1147

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1147, a bill to amend the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Programs Enhancement Act of 2001 and title 38, United States Code, to require the provision of chiropractic care and service to veterans at all Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers and to expand access to such care and services, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to provide predictability and certainty in the tax law, create jobs, and encourage investment.

S. 1506

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1506, a bill to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury from expanding United States bank reporting requirements with respect to interest on deposits paid to nonresident aliens.

S. 1670

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1670, a bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1880

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1880, a bill to repeal the health care law's job-killing health insurance tax.

S. 1935

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1935, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the March of Dimes Foundation.

S. 2066

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2066, a bill to recognize the heritage of recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting on Federal public land and ensure continued opportunities for those activities.

S. 2112

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2112, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize space-available travel on military aircraft for members of the reserve components, a member or former member of a reserve component who is eligible for retired pay but for age, widows and widowers of retired members, and dependents.

S. 2121

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2121, a bill to modify the Department of Defense Program Guidance relating to the award of Post-Deployment/Mobilization Respite Absence administrative absence days to members of the reserve components to exempt any member whose qualified mobilization commenced before October 1, 2011, and continued on or after that date, from the changes to the program guidance that took effect on that date.

S. 2134

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2134, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for certain requirements relating to the retirement, adoption, care, and recognition of military working dogs, and for other purposes.

S. 2159

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2159, a bill to extend the authorization of the Drug-Free Communities Support Program through fiscal year 2017.

S. 2160

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2160, a bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2165

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2165, a bill to enhance strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2168

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2168, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to modify the definition of supervisor.

S. 2197

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2197, a bill to require the attorney for the Government to disclose favorable information to the defendant in criminal prosecutions brought by the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2213

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2213, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2213, supra.

S. 2219

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2219, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes.

S. 2221

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2221, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Labor from finalizing a proposed rule under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 relating to child labor.

S. 2222

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2222, a bill to require the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to take certain actions to reduce excessive speculation in energy markets.

S. 2233

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2233, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to stimulate international tourism to the United States.

S. RES. 380

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 380, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the importance of preventing the Government of Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons capability.

AMENDMENT NO. 1952

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1952 intended to be proposed to S. 2204, a bill to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation.

AMENDMENT NO. 1953

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1953 intended to be proposed to S. 2204, a bill to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation.

AMENDMENT NO. 1955

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1955 intended to be proposed to S. 2204, a bill to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation.

AMENDMENT NO. 1965

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1965 intended to be proposed to S. 2204, a bill to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 57

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 57, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the application of the tonnage tax on certain vessels.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 260, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 543

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 543, a bill to restrict any State or local jurisdiction from imposing a new discriminatory tax on cell phone services, providers, or property.

S. 604

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 604, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 687

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 687, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the 15-year recovery period for qualified leasehold improvement property, qualified restaurant property, and qualified retail improvement property.

S. 816

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 816, a bill to facilitate nationwide availability of volunteer income tax assistance for low-income and underserved populations, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to provide predictability and certainty in the tax law, create jobs, and encourage investment.

S. 1336

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1336, a bill to prevent immigration fraud and for other purposes.

S. 1421

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1421, a bill to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

S. 1479

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1479, a bill to preserve Medicare beneficiary choice by restoring and expanding Medicare open enrollment and disenrollment opportunities.

S. 1597

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1597, a bill to provide assistance for the modernization, renovation, and repair of elementary school and secondary school buildings in public school districts and community colleges across the United States in order to support the achievement of improved educational outcomes in those schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1718

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1718, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the application of Medicare secondary payer rules for certain claims.

S. 1737

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1737, a bill to improve the accuracy of mortgage underwriting used by Federal mortgage agencies by ensuring that energy costs are included in the underwriting process, to reduce the amount of energy consumed by homes, to facilitate the creation of energy efficiency retrofit and construction jobs, and for other purposes.

S. 1832

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1832, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1910

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1910, a bill to provide benefits to domestic partners of Federal employees.

S. 1990

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) were added as cosponsors of S. 1990, a bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to comply with the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act.

S. 2062

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2062, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to repeal certain provisions relating to criminal penalties and violations of foreign laws, and for other purposes.

S. 2065

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2065, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to modify the discretionary spending limits to take into account savings resulting from the reduction in the number of Federal employees and extending the pay freeze for Federal employees.

S. 2072

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2072, a bill to discourage disincentives to the housing missions of government sponsored enterprises and require consistent putback risks at the enterprises to assist homeowners.

S. 2076

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, a bill to improve security at State and local courthouses.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2103, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 2165

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2165, a bill to enhance strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2169

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2169, a bill to require the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

S. 2213

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2213, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 2245

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2245, a bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States.

S. RES. 356

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 356, a resolution expressing support for the people of Tibet.

S. RES. 380

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 380, a resolution to express

the sense of the Senate regarding the importance of preventing the Government of Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons capability.

S. RES. 399

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 399, a resolution calling upon the President to ensure that the foreign policy of the United States reflects appropriate understanding and sensitivity concerning issues related to human rights, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing, and genocide documented in the United States record relating to the Armenian Genocide, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 402

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 402, a resolution condemning Joseph Kony and the Lord's Resistance Army for committing crimes against humanity and mass atrocities, and supporting ongoing efforts by the United States Government and governments in central Africa to remove Joseph Kony and Lord's Resistance Army commanders from the battlefield.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2251. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 709 West 9th Street, Juneau, Alaska, as the Robert Boochever United States Courthouse; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to introduce a piece of legislation honoring a great Alaskan. Robert Boochever was a giant of my state's judicial community for over 60 years—even longer than Alaska has been a State. This legislation, naming the Juneau Federal courthouse facility in Judge Boochever's honor, is a fitting tribute to his legacy.

Robert Boochever first came to Alaska in the 1946, after having fought in World War II as a Captain in the U.S. Army. In territorial Alaska, he was an Assistant U.S. Attorney for two years, before joining a private practice in Juneau for almost 25 years, and was before long, one of the most respected lawyers in the state. He served as President of the Juneau Bar Association and the Alaska Bar Association.

In 1972, Governor Egan tapped Boochever to serve as an Associate Justice on the Alaska Supreme Court. He served on the court for eight years, three of which he had the honor of being the fourth ever Chief Justice of the Alaska Supreme Court.

President Jimmy Carter nominated Judge Boochever to be a Judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on May 22, 1980. He was quickly confirmed by the U.S. Senate and received his commission to the Federal bench about a month later. This made Judge Boochever the first ever Alaskan to be a judge on the Ninth Circuit, a court he would serve on for the next thirty years.

Judge Boochever is well known for his commitment to the city and the people of Juneau. He lived in Juneau and maintained an office there for most of his life. Even when he moved to California in his later years to facilitate travel and communications, he still maintained his Juneau office and returned to it every year with his clerks.

In addition to his impressive record of accomplishments and his years of public service, Judge Boochever was known for his love and commitment for the law. He is well known as a tireless advocate for the rights of the disadvantaged and for his strong commitment to protecting individual freedoms and First Amendment rights.

Naming the Juneau Federal courthouse facility in Judge Boochever's honor is broadly supported by Alaskans and so appropriate because he kept his chambers there for many years. In fact, this effort has the support of the Juneau Bar Association, the Alaska Bar Association's Historians Committee, the Mayor of Juneau, and many of its residents.

For all these reasons, today I am proud to introduce this legislation to designate the United States Courthouse in Juneau as the Robert Boochever United States Courthouse. He was a great man and this is a fine way to remember all he did for my State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2251

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

SECTION 1. ROBERT BOOCHEVER UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse located at 709 West 9th Street, Juneau, Alaska, shall be known and designated as the ''Robert Boochever United States Courthouse''.

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

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2253. A bill to require individuals who file under the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to disclose any financial accounts that are or have been deposited in a country that is a tax haven; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the old adage that sunlight is the best disinfectant is an old adage for one main reason: It is true.

That is why I am introducing the Financial Disclosure to Reduce Tax Haven Abuse Act of 2012, to require candidates for Federal office and certain Federal employees to disclose any financial interest they or their spouse hold that is held in an offshore tax haven.

It might seem ridiculous that we don't already know whether candidates and Members of Congress are using offshore tax havens. However, under current law, those individuals are not required to account for where their financial interests are held.

A January 26, 2012, article in the Los Angeles Times reported that Mitt Romney—a candidate for the Republican nomination for President—failed to disclose a number of accounts in countries with very low tax burdens.

Specifically, according to a review of the candidate's tax returns and financial disclosure statements:

> At least 23 funds and partnerships listed in the couple's 2010 tax returns did not show up or were not listed in the same fashion on Romney's most recent financial disclosure, including 11 based in low-tax foreign countries such as Bermuda, the Cayman Islands and Luxembourg.

The Romney campaign called the discrepancies ''trivial.''

But this information is not trivial to the American people's trust in government, and the use of offshore tax havens is not trivial to our economy.

Studies have found that tax offshore tax havens, and other similar loopholes, cost taxpayers $100 billion per year.

I want to commend Senators LEVIN and CONRAD for the work they have done to shine a light on these nefarious practices.

Those two Senators successfully included a provision in the Senate Transportation bill that will give the Treasury Department greater tools to crack down on offshore tax haven abuse. It is an important step forward, but more must be done.

The American people are rightly concerned that the wealthy and well-connected are skirting our laws to avoid taxation, and they deserve to know that the people who hope to represent them in Washington—and those who are trying to attain those positions—aren't cheating the system.

Nothing in this bill impinges on an individual's right to hold financial interests within the global economy. If there is a legitimate reason for a candidate or a Member of Congress or any other individual who files a financial disclosure to hold their money in an account on the Cayman Islands, they should have no problem explaining it to voters. But any individual who has or wants to have the public's trust should be honest about practices they have engaged in that cost the taxpayers they wish to represent billions of dollars every year. This is an important step that we must take to restore the public trust.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

S. 2253

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Financial Disclosure to Reduce Tax Haven Abuse Act of 2012''.

SEC. 2. DISCLOSURE OF ACCOUNTS HELD IN TAX HAVENS.

Section 102(b)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting '', with a specific accounting of any financial interest held by the covered individual or their spouse in a country that is considered as a tax haven as listed by the Secretary of the Treasury and made available to the filer'' after ''calendar year''; and

(2) inserting at the end the following:

''In compiling the list of tax havens under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Treasury should consider for inclusion those jurisdictions which have been previously and publicly identified by the Internal Revenue Service as secrecy jurisdictions in Federal court proceedings.''.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2256. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for community-based mental health infrastructure improvement; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce, along with my colleague, Senator STABENOW, the Community-Based Mental Health Infrastructure Improvements Act.

According to the Mental Health Association of Rhode Island, 38,000 adults and 11,000 children in the state have a serious mental illness, and approximately 15 percent of Rhode Island adults report suffering from serious psychological distress every year. Unfortunately, mental illness is often linked to poor physical health—obesity, high blood pressure, and high cholesterol.

Community mental health centers help these individuals get the mental and behavioral health care that they need to lead healthier, more productive lives through no or low-cost treatments. This cost structure has been particularly critical throughout the recent recession and as our economy continues to recover. Individuals and families didn't have to forgo health care because they lost their job or health insurance. The proof is in the numbers. In just the last 6 months of 2010, Community Mental Health Centers in Rhode Island treated nearly 30,000 individuals. The demand for care will only grow as more Americans gain access to comprehensive, affordable health insurance in 2014.

It is critical that Community Mental Health Centers have the infrastructure necessary to treat every individual who needs care. In Rhode Island, some of the community mental health centers are in older buildings that need updating. Others need more space to be able to meet current demand and prepare for the expected increase in patients in 2014. These needs are true of community mental health centers across the country. The Community-Based Mental Health Infrastructure Improvements Act would help ensure that Community Mental Health Centers have the resources to construct and modernize these mental and behavioral health facilities.

I am pleased that this legislation has been included in a broader mental health care bill, the Excellence in Mental Health Act, that I joined Senator STABENOW in introducing today. I look forward to working with my colleagues to improve our mental and behavioral health care delivery system, and urge my colleagues to support these important bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2256

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Community-Based Mental Health Infrastructure Improvements Act''.

SEC. 2. COMMUNITY-BASED MENTAL HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT.

Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART H—COMMUNITY-BASED MENTAL HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

''SEC. 560. GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY-BASED MENTAL HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may award grants to eligible entities to expend funds for the construction or modernization of facilities used to provide mental health and substance abuse services to individuals.

''(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this section, the term 'eligible entity' means—

''(1) a State that is the recipient of a Community Mental Health Services Block Grant under subpart I of part B of title XIX and a Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant under subpart II of such part; or

''(2) an Indian tribe or a tribal organization (as such terms are defined in sections 4(b) and 4(c) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act).

''(c) APPLICATION.—A eligible entity desiring a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing—

''(1) a plan for the construction or modernization of facilities used to provide mental health and substance abuse services to individuals that—

''(A) designates a single State or tribal agency as the sole agency for the supervision and administration of the grant;

''(B) contains satisfactory evidence that such agency so designated will have the authority to carry out the plan;

''(C) provides for the designation of an advisory council, which shall include representatives of nongovernmental organizations or groups, and of the relevant State or tribal agencies, that aided in the development of the plan and that will implement and monitor any grant awarded to the eligible entity under this section;

''(D) in the case of an eligible entity that is a State, includes a copy of the State plan under section 1912(b) and section 1932(b);

''(E)(i) includes a listing of the projects to be funded by the grant; and

''(ii) in the case of an eligible entity that is a State, explains how each listed project helps the State in accomplishing its goals and objectives under the Community Mental Health Services Block Grant under subpart I of part B of title XIX and the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant under subpart II of such part;

''(F) includes assurances that the facilities will be used for a period of not less than 10 years for the provision of community-based mental health or substance abuse services for those who cannot pay for such services, subject to subsection (e); and

''(G) in the case of a facility that is not a public facility, includes the name and executive director of the entity who will provide services in the facility; and

''(2) with respect to each construction or modernization project described in the application—

''(A) a description of the site for the project;

''(B) plans and specifications for the project and State or tribal approval for the plans and specifications;

''(C) assurance that the title for the site is or will be vested with either the public entity or private nonprofit entity who will provide the services in the facility;

''(D) assurance that adequate financial resources will be available for the construction or major rehabilitation of the project and for the maintenance and operation of the facility;

''(E) estimates of the cost of the project; and

''(F) the estimated length of time for completion of the project.

''(d) SUBGRANTS BY STATES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives a grant under this section may award a subgrant to a qualified community program (as such term is used in section 1913(b)(1)).

''(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Subgrants awarded pursuant to paragraph (1) may be used for activities such as—

''(A) the construction, expansion, and modernization of facilities used to provide mental health and substance abuse services to individuals;

''(B) acquiring and leasing facilities and equipment (including paying the costs of amortizing the principal of, and paying the interest on, loans for such facilities and equipment) to support or further the operation of the subgrantee;

''(C) the construction and structural modification (including equipment acquisition) of facilities to permit the integrated delivery of behavioral health and primary care of specialty medical services to individuals with co-occurring mental illnesses and chronic medical or surgical diseases at a single service site; and

''(D) acquiring information technology required to accommodate the clinical needs of primary and specialty care professionals.

''(3) LIMITATION.—Not to exceed 15 percent of grant funds may be used for activities described in paragraph (2)(D).

''(e) REQUEST TO TRANSFER OBLIGATION.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section may submit a request to the Secretary for permission to transfer the 10-year obligation of facility use, as described in subsection (c)(1)(F), to another facility.

''(f) AGREEMENT TO FEDERAL SHARE.—As a condition of receipt of a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall agree, with respect to the costs to be incurred by the entity in carrying out the activities for which such grant is awarded, that the entity will make available non-Federal contributions (which may include State or local funds, or funds from the qualified community program) in an amount equal to not less than $1 for every $1 of Federal funds provided under the grant.

''(g) REPORTING.—

''(1) REPORTING BY STATES.—During the 10-year period referred to in subsection (c)(1)(F), the Secretary shall require that a State that receives a grant under this section submit, as part of the report of the State required under the Community Mental Health Services Block Grant under subpart I of part B of title XIX and the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant under subpart II of such part, a description of the progress on—

''(A) the projects carried out pursuant to the grant under this section; and

''(B) the assurances that the facilities involved continue to be used for the purpose for which they were funded under such grant during such 10-year period.

''(2) REPORTING BY INDIAN TRIBES AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary shall establish reporting requirements for Indian tribes and tribal organizations that receive a grant under this section. Such reporting requirements shall include that such Indian tribe or tribal organization provide a description of the progress on—

''(A) the projects carried out pursuant to the grant under this section; and

''(B) the assurances that the facilities involved continue to be used for the purpose for which they were funded under such grant during the 10-year period referred to in subsection (c)(1)(F).

''(h) FAILURE TO MEET OBLIGATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If an eligible entity that receives a grant under this section fails to meet any of the obligations of the entity required under this section, the Secretary shall take appropriate steps, which may include—

''(A) requiring that the entity return the unused portion of the funds awarded under this section for the projects that are incomplete; and

''(B) extending the length of time that the entity must ensure that the facility involved is used for the purposes for which it is intended, as described in subsection (c)(1)(F).

''(2) HEARING.—Prior to requesting the return of the funds under paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall provide the entity notice and opportunity for a hearing.

''(i) COLLABORATION.—The Secretary may establish intergovernmental and interdepartmental memorandums of agreement as necessary to carry out this section.

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.''.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. REED):

S. 2257. A bill to increase access to community behavioral health services for all Americans and to improve Medicaid reimbursement for community behavioral health services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

S. 2257

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Excellence in Mental Health Act''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHING COMMUNITY BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CENTERS.

Section 1913 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(A), by striking ''community mental health services'' and inserting ''behavioral health services (of the type offered by federally-qualified community behavioral health centers consistent with subsection (c)(3))'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) services under the plan will be provided only through appropriate, qualified community programs (which may include federally-qualified community behavioral health centers, child mental health programs, psychosocial rehabilitation programs, mental health peer-support programs, outpatient addiction treatment programs, acute detoxification services, and mental health primary consumer-directed programs); and''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''community mental health centers'' and inserting ''federally-qualified community behavioral health centers''; and

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) CRITERIA FOR FEDERALLY-QUALIFIED COMMUNITY BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CENTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall certify, and recertify at least every 5 years, federally-qualified community behavioral health centers as meeting the criteria specified in this subsection.

''(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of the Excellence in Mental Health Act, the Administrator, in consultation with State Mental Health and Substance Abuse Authorities, shall issue final regulations for certifying non-profit or local government centers as centers under paragraph (1).

''(3) CRITERIA.—The criteria referred to in subsection (b)(2) are that the center performs each of the following:

''(A) Provide services in locations that ensure services will be available and accessible promptly and in a manner which preserves human dignity and assures continuity of care.

''(B) Provide services in a mode of service delivery appropriate for the target population.

''(C) Provide individuals with a choice of service options where there is more than one efficacious treatment.

''(D) Employ a core staff of clinical staff that is multidisciplinary and culturally and linguistically competent.

''(E) Provide services, within the limits of the capacities of the center, to any individual residing or employed in the service area of the center, regardless of the ability of the individual to pay.

''(F) Provide, directly or through contract, to the extent covered for adults in the State Medicaid plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act and for children in accordance with section 1905(r) of such Act regarding early and periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment, each of the following services:

''(i) Screening, assessment, and diagnosis, including risk assessment.

''(ii) Person-centered treatment planning or similar processes, including risk assessment and crisis planning.

''(iii) Outpatient mental health and substance use services, including screening, assessment, diagnosis, psychotherapy, medication management, and integrated treatment for mental illness and substance abuse which shall be evidence-based (including cognitive behavioral therapy and other such therapies which are evidence-based).

''(iv) Outpatient clinic primary care screening and monitoring of key health indicators and health risk (including screening for diabetes, hypertension, and cardiovascular disease and monitoring of weight, height, body mass index (BMI), blood pressure, blood glucose or HbA1C, and lipid profile).

''(v) Crisis mental health services, including 24-hour mobile crisis teams, emergency crisis intervention services, and crisis stabilization.

''(vi) Targeted case management (services to assist individuals gaining access to needed medical, social, educational, and other services and applying for income security and other benefits to which they may be entitled).

''(vii) Psychiatric rehabilitation services including skills training, assertive community treatment, family psychoeducation, disability self-management, supported employment, supported housing services, therapeutic foster care services, and such other evidence-based practices as the Secretary may require.

''(viii) Peer support and counselor services and family supports.

''(G) Maintain linkages, and where possible enter into formal contracts with the following:

''(i) Federally qualified health centers.

''(ii) Inpatient psychiatric facilities and substance use detoxification, post-detoxification step-down services, and residential programs.

''(iii) Adult and youth peer support and counselor services.

''(iv) Family support services for families of children with serious mental or substance use disorders.

''(v) Other community or regional services, supports, and providers, including schools, child welfare agencies, juvenile and criminal justice agencies and facilities, housing agencies and programs, employers, and other social services.

''(vi) Onsite or offsite access to primary care services.

''(vii) Enabling services, including outreach, transportation, and translation.

''(viii) Health and wellness services, including services for tobacco cessation.

''(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed as prohibiting States receiving funds appropriated through the Community Mental Health Services Block Grant under subpart I of part B of this title from financing qualified community programs (whether such programs meet the definition of eligible programs prior to or after the date of enactment of this subsection).

''(5) LIMITATION.—With respect to federally-qualified behavioral health centers authorized under this subsection, 20 percent of the total number of such centers shall become newly eligible to receive reimbursement under this section in each of the first 5 years after the initial year of eligibility through fiscal year 2022. In implementing this paragraph, the Secretary shall ensure geographic diversity of such sites, take into account the ability of such sites to provide required services, and the ability of such sites to report required data.''.

SEC. 3. MEDICAID COVERAGE AND PAYMENT FOR COMMUNITY BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CENTER SERVICES.

(a) PAYMENT FOR SERVICES PROVIDED BY FEDERALLY-QUALIFIED COMMUNITY BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CENTERS.—Section 1902(bb) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(bb)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''AND RURAL HEALTH CLINICS'' and inserting '', FEDERALLY-QUALIFIED COMMUNITY BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CENTERS, AND RURAL HEALTH CLINICS'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''(and beginning with fiscal year 2013 with respect to services furnished on or after January 1, 2013, and each succeeding fiscal year, for services described in section 1905(a)(2)(D) furnished by a federally-qualified community behavioral health center)'' after ''by a rural health clinic'';

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking the heading and inserting ''INITIAL FISCAL YEAR'';

(B) by inserting ''(or, in the case of services described in section 1905(a)(2)(D) furnished by a federally-qualified community behavioral health center, for services furnished on and after January 1, 2013, during fiscal year 2013)'' after ''January 1, 2001, during fiscal year 2001'';

(C) by inserting ''(or, in the case of services described in section 1905(a)(2)(D) furnished by a federally-qualified community behavioral health center, during fiscal years 2010 and 2011)'' after ''1999 and 2000''; and

(D) by inserting ''(or, in the case of services described in section 1905(a)(2)(D) furnished by a federally-qualified community behavioral health center, during fiscal year 2013)'' before the period;

(4) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''FISCAL YEAR 2002 AND SUCCEEDING'' and inserting ''SUCCEEDING''; and

(B) by inserting ''(or, in the case of services described in section 1905(a)(2)(D) furnished by a federally-qualified community behavioral health center, for services furnished during fiscal year 2013 or a succeeding fiscal year)'' after ''2002 or a succeeding fiscal year'';

(5) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting ''(or as a federally-qualified community behavioral health center after fiscal year 2011)'' after ''or rural health clinic after fiscal year 2000'';

(B) by striking ''furnished by the center or'' and inserting ''furnished by the federally qualified health center, services described in section 1905(a)(2)(D) furnished by the federally-qualified community behavioral health center, or'';

(C) in the second sentence, by striking ''or rural health clinic'' and inserting '', federally-qualified community behavioral health center, or rural health clinic'';

(6) in paragraph (5), in each of subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking ''or rural health clinic'' and inserting '', federally-qualified community behavioral health center, or rural health clinic''; and

(7) in paragraph (6), by striking ''or to a rural health clinic'' and inserting '', to a federally-qualified community behavioral health center for services described in section 1905(a)(2)(D), or to a rural health clinic''.

(b) INCLUSION OF COMMUNITY BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CENTER SERVICES IN THE TERM MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 1905(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' before ''(C)''; and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', and (D) federally-qualified community behavioral health center services (as defined in subsection (l)(4))''.

(c) DEFINITION OF FEDERALLY-QUALIFIED COMMUNITY BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CENTER SERVICES.—Section 1905(l) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(l)) is amended by adding at the end the following paragraph:

''(4)(A) The term 'community behavioral health center services' means services furnished to an individual at a federally-qualified community behavioral health center (as defined by subparagraph (B)).

''(B) The term 'federally qualified community behavioral health center' means an entity that is certified under section 1913(c) of the Public Health Service Act as meeting the criteria described in paragraph (3) of such section.''.

SEC. 4. COMMUNITY-BASED MENTAL HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT.

Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART H—COMMUNITY-BASED MENTAL HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

''SEC. 560. GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY-BASED MENTAL HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may award grants to eligible entities to expend funds for the construction or modernization of facilities used to provide mental health and substance abuse services to individuals.

''(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this section, the term 'eligible entity' means—

''(1) a State that is the recipient of a Community Mental Health Services Block Grant under subpart I of part B of title XIX and a Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant under subpart II of such part; or

''(2) an Indian tribe or a tribal organization (as such terms are defined in sections 4(b) and 4(c) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act).

''(c) APPLICATION.—A eligible entity desiring a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing—

''(1) a plan for the construction or modernization of facilities used to provide mental health and substance abuse services to individuals that—

''(A) designates a single State or tribal agency as the sole agency for the supervision and administration of the grant;

''(B) contains satisfactory evidence that such agency so designated will have the authority to carry out the plan;

''(C) provides for the designation of an advisory council, which shall include representatives of nongovernmental organizations or groups, and of the relevant State or tribal agencies, that aided in the development of the plan and that will implement and monitor any grant awarded to the eligible entity under this section;

''(D) in the case of an eligible entity that is a State, includes a copy of the State plan under section 1912(b) and section 1932(b);

''(E)(i) includes a listing of the projects to be funded by the grant; and

''(ii) in the case of an eligible entity that is a State, explains how each listed project helps the State in accomplishing its goals and objectives under the Community Mental Health Services Block Grant under subpart I of part B of title XIX and the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant under subpart II of such part;

''(F) includes assurances that the facilities will be used for a period of not less than 10 years for the provision of community-based mental health or substance abuse services for those who cannot pay for such services, subject to subsection (e); and

''(G) in the case of a facility that is not a public facility, includes the name and executive director of the entity who will provide services in the facility; and

''(2) with respect to each construction or modernization project described in the application—

''(A) a description of the site for the project;

''(B) plans and specifications for the project and State or tribal approval for the plans and specifications;

''(C) assurance that the title for the site is or will be vested with either the public entity or private nonprofit entity who will provide the services in the facility;

''(D) assurance that adequate financial resources will be available for the construction or major rehabilitation of the project and for the maintenance and operation of the facility;

''(E) estimates of the cost of the project; and

''(F) the estimated length of time for completion of the project.

''(d) SUBGRANTS BY STATES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives a grant under this section may award a subgrant to a qualified community program (as such term is used in section 1913(b)(1)).

''(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Subgrants awarded pursuant to paragraph (1) may be used for activities such as—

''(A) the construction, expansion, and modernization of facilities used to provide mental health and substance abuse services to individuals;

''(B) acquiring and leasing facilities and equipment (including paying the costs of amortizing the principal of, and paying the interest on, loans for such facilities and equipment) to support or further the operation of the subgrantee;

''(C) the construction and structural modification (including equipment acquisition) of facilities to permit the integrated delivery of behavioral health and primary care of specialty medical services to individuals with co-occurring mental illnesses and chronic medical or surgical diseases at a single service site; and

''(D) acquiring information technology required to accommodate the clinical needs of primary and specialty care professionals.

''(3) LIMITATION.—Not to exceed 15 percent of grant funds may be used for activities described in paragraph (2)(D).

''(e) REQUEST TO TRANSFER OBLIGATION.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section may submit a request to the Secretary for permission to transfer the 10-year obligation of facility use, as described in subsection (c)(1)(F), to another facility.

''(f) AGREEMENT TO FEDERAL SHARE.—As a condition of receipt of a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall agree, with respect to the costs to be incurred by the entity in carrying out the activities for which such grant is awarded, that the entity will make available non-Federal contributions (which may include State or local funds, or funds from the qualified community program) in an amount equal to not less than $1 for every $1 of Federal funds provided under the grant.

''(g) REPORTING.—

''(1) REPORTING BY STATES.—During the 10-year period referred to in subsection (c)(1)(F), the Secretary shall require that a State that receives a grant under this section submit, as part of the report of the State required under the Community Mental Health Services Block Grant under subpart I of part B of title XIX and the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant under subpart II of such part, a description of the progress on—

''(A) the projects carried out pursuant to the grant under this section; and

''(B) the assurances that the facilities involved continue to be used for the purpose for which they were funded under such grant during such 10-year period.

''(2) REPORTING BY INDIAN TRIBES AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary shall establish reporting requirements for Indian tribes and tribal organizations that receive a grant under this section. Such reporting requirements shall include that such Indian tribe or tribal organization provide a description of the progress on—

''(A) the projects carried out pursuant to the grant under this section; and

''(B) the assurances that the facilities involved continue to be used for the purpose for which they were funded under such grant during the 10-year period referred to in subsection (c)(1)(F).

''(h) FAILURE TO MEET OBLIGATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If an eligible entity that receives a grant under this section fails to meet any of the obligations of the entity required under this section, the Secretary shall take appropriate steps, which may include—

''(A) requiring that the entity return the unused portion of the funds awarded under this section for the projects that are incomplete; and

''(B) extending the length of time that the entity must ensure that the facility involved is used for the purposes for which it is intended, as described in subsection (c)(1)(F).

''(2) HEARING.—Prior to requesting the return of the funds under paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall provide the entity notice and opportunity for a hearing.

''(i) COLLABORATION.—The Secretary may establish intergovernmental and interdepartmental memorandums of agreement as necessary to carry out this section.

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.''.

SEC. 5. EXPANDED PARTICIPATION IN 340B PROGRAM.

Section 340B(a)(4) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256b(a)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(P) An entity receiving funds under subpart I of part B of title XIX of this Act for the provision of community mental health services.

''(Q) An entity receiving funds under subpart II of part B of title XIX of this Act for the provision of treatment services for substance abuse.''.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 2264. A bill to provide liability protection for claims based on the design, manufacture, sale, offer for sale, introduction into commerce, or use of certain fuels and fuel additives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce bipartisan energy legislation, the Domestic Fuels Act. This legislation is designed to help hard-working Americans with the high fuel prices, the high gas prices they are paying at the pump. This legislation will truly help us do ''all of the above'' when it comes to producing and providing lower cost energy for American consumers, American businesses, and to fuel our economy, help create jobs, and also to create greater national energy security. It is part of what I believe we need to do to truly have an energy security plan for our country.

I wish to take a few minutes to talk about the Domestic Fuels Act. We are going to start with a quick review of gas prices. As we all very well know, gas prices are high, and they continue to go higher. AAA indicated this week the national average for a gallon of gasoline is $3.91 a gallon. Gasoline prices, over the last 3 years of the current administration, have more than doubled from about roughly $1.87 to the national average today of more than $3.90. I believe there are nine States right now where, on average, gas is more than $4 a gallon. In Chicago, for example, I believe it is about $4.68. Over here, a few blocks from the Capitol, I checked not too long ago and it was $4.39 a gallon.

This puts enormous pressure and strain on American consumers, hard-working Americans, every day, when they are being forced to fill their car at the gas pump and spend close to $4 per gallon. Some predictions are that later this summer, it may go to $5 a gallon. Clearly, we have to find a way to help with gasoline prices across this country.

What it comes down to is supply and demand. More supply creates downward pressure on gasoline prices; more demand, of course, pushes prices higher. So we have to find ways to increase the supply and increase the supply in a dependable way. That means not only increasing supply now but having policies in place that increase supply now and in the future.

We need to send signals to the market that we are serious about growing our supply of energy—all types of energy—certainly gas and oil but all types of energy in this country, as well as working with our neighbors we can count on, such as Canada, for more supplies to help reduce the price of gasoline and, frankly, reduce the cost of all types of energy to help get the economy going, to have more national security and more jobs to put the 13 million people who are unemployed back to work. Energy is a key aspect of creating the type of economic environment that will help us do that.

This chart shows our current level of crude oil production. The first bar shows that between ourselves and Canada, we produce just under 10 million barrels of crude and crude equivalent right now. In North America—Canada and the United States—we produce under 10 million barrels of crude today. That comes not only from conventional oil but oil shale, tight oil, oil sands, Arctic, and offshore—all these different sources.

Under the current policies, we can see by looking at this next bar that over the next 15 years the supply of oil and gas coming from Canada and the United States will shrink. Under the current policies and the current approach, without the kind of energy policy we need in this country, we actually will have less oil and gas from Canada and the United States over the next 15 years.

The key is this: We have to implement the kind of energy policy that will help us produce more energy, oil and gas, and from all sources, traditional and renewable. That is what we are talking about with this Domestic Fuels Act.

The third bar on this chart shows that just from oil and gas, with the right kinds of policies over the next 15 years—this is a 15-year timeframe—we can produce more oil and gas in Canada and the United States than we consume. So before we bring in other types of energy—biofuels and any other types, any renewable energy we want to include, just from oil and gas, with the right kinds of policies in Canada and the United States, over the next 15 years we can produce more energy than we consume.

Think what that means in terms of helping bring down the price of gasoline and in terms of creating jobs in our country; think of what that means in terms of national security, not needing to depend on crude oil from the Middle East. That is just with the right policies to develop more oil and gas. Of course, we can develop all the other types of energy resources as well.

Let's not take 15 years to get this done. Let's have a plan for national energy security that gets it done in the next 5 to 7 years. There is no question we can do it. We can absolutely do it. How do we do it? Very simple and very common sense. When we talk about producing ''all of the above,'' let's actually do that. Let's not say ''all of the above'' and then block energy production. Let's have the kinds of energy policies in place, traditional sources and renewable sources, on a bipartisan basis. Let's put the types of policies in place that will truly help us get to energy security, and let's do it over the next 5 to 7 years. Let's increase oil production in the United States and Canada. Let's have the policies that help us produce more oil onshore and off. Let's increase natural gas production and usage.

Again, let's join with Canada and do this with North American energy. We have incredible potential with Canada. We are the closest friends and allies in the world. Let's increase the renewable fuels we produce right here at home. We can do that with a market-based approach. Let's increase our use of renewable fuels with market-based approaches that work. Let's use technology to drive energy production—produce more energy—with better environmental stewardship.

We can do all these things. When we talk about an energy security plan or the path to energy security in our country, these are very commonsense steps. I have bills, as do other Members of this body, on a bipartisan basis, to do all these things—increase oil production, increase the use of natural gas, increase renewables with market-based approaches, and use technology

to drive energy and do it with better environmental stewardship.

One of the things I submitted legislation to do is approve the Keystone Pipeline. It is an issue that has been very much in the national discussion. It has gotten a lot of attention. It is a straightforward concept. It simply says let's develop the infrastructure in our country, so that as we produce more oil in Canada—Canada has the third largest oil reserves in the world. No. 1 is Saudi Arabia, No. 2 is Venezuela, and No. 3 is Canada. Let's work with Canada to tap and use more of that oil. If we don't, it will go to China. But we can do it. We simply have to develop the infrastructure and work with Canada.

What has the opposition to that oil development been? A number of arguments have come up. The main one behind it is, some people say we don't want to produce oil in the oil sands; we don't want to do that. The concern, in their opinion, is greenhouse gas. It has about a 6-percent higher greenhouse gas emission than conventional drilling production.

The important point is—going back to the last chart, which I mentioned in the national energy security plan is let's use technology to produce more energy with better stewardship. What I mean is, when we talk about the oil sands, rather than using the current excavation method, 80 percent of the new development is going to in situ, which is essentially drilling. So it is basically the same footprint and same greenhouse gas emissions as conventional drilling for oil and gas. So let's use that new technology to produce more energy, more oil in the Canadian oil sands, and do it with better environmental stewardship.

We will then be getting oil from a dependable ally, rather than getting 30 percent of our crude from the Middle East and Venezuela. It is just common sense. We win with more energy at a lower cost. We win with job creation, and we win with better environmental stewardship. We need to just get the right policies, the right law, and the right approach to how we regulate these things in place.

That is what the Domestic Fuels Act is all about. It is an example of exactly how we do that. The Domestic Fuels Act essentially says, all right, when we pull up to the gas station, we should be able to get whatever fuel provides the best energy for what we need at the best possible price.

It is about consumer choice, and it is about lowering the cost at the pump.

Right now, when you pull in, very often the petroleum retail marketer has multiple tanks in order to dispense various types of fuel. It might be traditional gasoline from petroleum, it might be some blend of petroleum and ethanol, he might have biodiesel, and increasingly service stations, gas stations, are looking to market natural gas. But think about it. If they have to have a different set of tanks, different set of piping, and different dispensers for each type of fuel, then they have to make a choice, don't they. They can maybe offer gasoline from petroleum, they can maybe offer some ethanol blend, they can maybe offer biodiesel, or maybe they try natural gas; right?

But if they have to have tanks and pumps and piping for each one, think of the cost—hundreds of thousands of dollars.

So how do you get consumer choice? How do you get consumer choice in there? Also, how do you get the lowest price? If petroleum-based gasoline versus ethanol-based is cheaper, well, then, maybe they want to offer straight petroleum, not have a blend. But if they can mix it with ethanol, offer even up to E85, and that is cheaper, they may want to offer that. If they want to offer biodiesel rather than traditional diesel or if they want to offer natural gas—because increasingly we have trucks and buses particularly in our urban areas using natural gas—how do they do it? That is the point.

What this act provides is that the EPA has to streamline the process so a service station or gas station can use their existing tanks and equipment so they can decide to offer any one of those products. Now we have more consumer choice and we have a way to drive down prices at the pump—drive down the cost of gasoline, drive down the cost of biofuels, drive down the cost of natural gas, or whatever it is—consumer choice, lower prices, and that extends back through the production chain as well. If I produce ethanol, if I produce biodiesel, if I produce gasoline or natural gas, I know I am going to be able to market those products to consumers.

This is about looking to the future instead of looking to the past. This isn't about government spending any more money. This is about the government empowering industry, empowering entrepreneurship, empowering the energy sector, and empowering our consumers with choice and lower costs at the pump. It is just common sense. It is just common sense. We give the marketer a way to market whatever product makes the most sense and whatever best serves the consumers at the best price. We give them liability protection so they know they can go forward and offer these different products without worrying about being sued and losing their livelihood so they are willing to do it. We provide a clear and simple pathway so they know what they have to accomplish in order to best serve their consumers and build their business.

This is about the right kind of legal framework. This is about the right kind of legislation that is clear, understandable, and empowering. This is how we get government working for people rather than people working for government. This is how we build the right kind of energy future based on all of the above. This isn't just about saying, hey, let's do all of the above when it comes to energy development. This is about doing it. This is about making a difference for the American consumer, and we can do it.

This legislation is bipartisan legislation. I am very pleased Senator ROY BLUNT of Missouri is cosponsoring it with me, along with AMY KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota, MIKE CRAPO of Idaho, and I believe we will have many others joining us on both sides of the aisle. Also, we are working with Representative JOHN SHIMKUS in the House who will be introducing companion legislation as well.

The other point I want to make in concluding is that we have broad-based support from companies and people who work in the traditional energy sector as well as the renewable energy sector, who make the equipment that dispense gasoline and other types of fuel products and the people who sell gasoline and all types of fuel. They are all onboard.

Let me give an example. From the renewable fuels energy sector, we have the Renewable Fuels Association endorsing this legislation, and also Growth Energy. From traditional oil and gas, the American Petroleum Institute has endorsed this legislation, as has Tesoro Corporation and ExxonMobil, and there are many others. From the service stations—the marketers that actually dispense the product—endorsing this legislation is the National Association of Convenience Stores, the Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America, the Petroleum Marketers Association of America, and the National Association of Truck Stop Operators. From the people who make the equipment, the manufacturers that make the equipment, we have received endorsements as well from the American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers and also the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute.

Look, everybody is onboard. Now we need to get to work and get it in place. This is about building the right kind of energy future for our country. We have to get going. Gasoline prices are $4 at the pump, and they are going higher. We can do something about it, and that is exactly what we need to do.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort on behalf of the American people.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 2271. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the time for making S corporation elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Small Business Election Simplification Act with my friends, Senators SNOWE and ENZI.

I want to thank them for this collaboration, and I especially want to acknowledge Senator SNOWE for her leadership. As Ranking Member of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, Senator SNOWE is one

of the Senate's experts on small business issues. She is always working to make sure that the Federal Government meets the needs of small businesses and is committed to creating the best possible environment for entrepreneurs.

That is exactly what our legislation is about—making it easier and more straightforward for entrepreneurs to start small businesses.

When starting up a new business, entrepreneurs often choose to organize their business as an S Corporation because of its simplicity. Owners of S Corporations report business income on their individual tax returns. So instead of having their business profits taxed at the corporate level of 35 percent, they pay taxes at their individual income tax rate. Not only is this simpler, but it also often saves small business owners money.

To become an S Corporation, small business owners have to go through what's called an ''election process'' and submit an election form to the IRS. The deadline to submit this election form is currently set a year in advance of the tax return deadline for businesses. This means that a new small business owner must know to submit the election form a full year before they have to do their taxes.

Unsurprisingly, many first-time business owners are unaware of this rule and therefore miss the election deadline. These taxpayers must wait an additional year before their business becomes an S Corporation, which can have serious tax consequences. Or they must go through a late election process with the IRS, which can be time-consuming and costly.

This is a real problem. In 2009, nearly 100,000 S Corporation returns could not be processed as filed. That was almost a quarter of all new S Corporation filings. Missing or late elections is one of the main reasons that returns are rejected as filed.

The National Taxpayer Advocate—whose job is to watch out for the needs of taxpayers—described the current S Corporation election process as an undue burden on small businesses. Simplifying the S Corporation election process was one of 11 legislative recommendations outlined in the National Taxpayer Advocate's 2011 Annual Report to Congress.

Our legislation does just that. The Small Business Election Simplification Act would extend and coordinate S Corporation deadlines. It would match the S Corporation election deadline for new businesses with the deadline for tax returns. This would reduce the number of taxpayers who inadvertently miss the S Corporation election deadline and suffer negative tax consequences.

To further simplify the process and reduce paperwork, our legislation would also allow new small businesses to elect to become an S Corporation simply by designating the election on their S Corporation tax return. This would eliminate the need for business owners to fill out an additional election form.

Here in the Senate, we are always saying that small businesses are the engine of our economy; that they are the job creators; and that we need to support entrepreneurs coming up with the next big idea that will get our economy growing again.

Passing the Small Business Election Simplification Act is one thing we can do to help them. It can make a difference right now. By making it easier and more straightforward for new small businesses to become S Corporations, our legislation would free business owners to concentrate on the important stuff—like growing their business and hiring new workers, instead of worrying about IRS election form deadlines and learning about complicated business tax rules.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and send it to the President's desk to be signed into law as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2271

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Election Simplification Act''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MAKING S CORPORATION ELECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 1362 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) WHEN MADE.—

''(1) RULES FOR NEW CORPORATIONS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An election under subsection (a) may be made by a small business corporation for any taxable year at any time during the period—

''(i) beginning on the first day of the taxable year for which made, and

''(ii) ending on the due date (with extensions) for filing the return for the taxable year.

''(B) CERTAIN ELECTIONS TREATED AS MADE FOR NEXT TAXABLE YEAR.—If—

''(i) an election under subsection (a) is made for any taxable year within the period described in subparagraph (A), but

''(ii) either—

''(I) on 1 or more days in such taxable year and before the day on which the election was made the corporation did not meet the requirements of subsection (b) of section 1361, or

''(II) 1 or more of the persons who held stock in the corporation during such taxable year and before the election was made did not consent to the election,

then such election shall be treated as made for the following taxable year.

''(C) ELECTION MADE AFTER DUE DATE TREATED AS MADE FOR FOLLOWING TAXABLE YEAR.—If—

''(i) a small business corporation makes an election under subsection (a) for any taxable year, and

''(ii) such election is made after the due date (with extensions) for filing the return for such year and on or before the due date (with extensions) for filing the return for the following taxable year,

then such election shall be treated as made for the following taxable year.

''(2) RULES FOR EXISTING C CORPORATIONS.—In the case of any small business corporation which was a C corporation for the taxable year prior to the taxable year for which the election is made under subsection (a), the rules under this paragraph shall apply in lieu of the rules under paragraph (1):

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An election under subsection (a) may be made by a small business corporation for any taxable year—

''(i) at any time during the preceding taxable year, or

''(ii) at any time during the taxable year and on or before the 15th day of the 3d month of the taxable year.

''(B) CERTAIN ELECTIONS MADE DURING 1ST 2½ MONTHS TREATED AS MADE FOR NEXT TAXABLE YEAR.—If—

''(i) an election under subsection (a) is made for any taxable year during such year and on or before the 15th day of the 3d month of such year, but

''(ii) either—

''(I) on 1 or more days in such taxable year and before the day on which the election was made the corporation did not meet the requirements of subsection (b) of section 1361, or

''(II) 1 or more of the persons who held stock in the corporation during such taxable year and before the election was made did not consent to the election,

then such election shall be treated as made for the following taxable year.

''(C) ELECTION MADE AFTER 1ST 2½ MONTHS TREATED AS MADE FOR FOLLOWING TAXABLE YEAR.—If—

''(i) a small business corporation makes an election under subsection (a) for any taxable year, and

''(ii) such election is made after the 15th day of the 3d month of the taxable year and on or before the 15th day of the 3rd month of the following taxable year,

then such election shall be treated as made for the following taxable year.

''(D) TAXABLE YEARS OF 2½ MONTHS OR LESS.—For purposes of this paragraph, an election for a taxable year made not later than 2 months and 15 days after the first day of the taxable year shall be treated as timely made during such year.

''(3) AUTHORITY TO TREAT LATE ELECTIONS, ETC., AS TIMELY.—If—

''(A) an election under subsection (a) is made for any taxable year after the date prescribed by this subsection for making such election for such taxable year or no such election is made for any taxable year, and

''(B) the Secretary determines that there was reasonable cause for the failure to timely make such election,

the Secretary may treat such an election as timely made for such taxable year.

''(4) MANNER OF ELECTION.—Elections may be made at any time as provided in this subsection by filing a form prescribed by the Secretary. For purposes of any election described under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide that the election may be made on any timely filed small business corporation return for such taxable year, with the consents of all persons who held stock in the corporation during such taxable year included therewith.

''(5) SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations, rules, or other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate for purposes of applying this subsection.''.

(b) REVOCATIONS.—Paragraph (1) of section 1362(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''subparagraph (D)'' in subparagraph (C) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) AUTHORITY TO TREAT LATE REVOCATIONS AS TIMELY.—If—

''(i) a revocation under subparagraph (A) is made for any taxable year after the date prescribed by this paragraph for making such revocation for such taxable year or no such revocation is made for any taxable year, and

''(ii) the Secretary determines that there was reasonable cause for the failure to timely make such revocation,

the Secretary may treat such a revocation as timely made for such taxable year.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to elections for taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2273. A bill to designate the Talkeetna Ranger Station in Talkeetna, Alaska, as the Walter Harper Talkeetna Ranger Station; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would officially rename the Talkeetna Ranger Station in Talkeetna, Alaska, the Walter Harper Talkeetna Ranger Station.

The Talkeetna Ranger Station, which is the home of Denali National Park's mountaineering rangers, sits just about 100 miles south of the entrance to the park. Of course, the landmark that's most commonly linked to both the park and the ranger station itself happens to be the mountain that features a summit which represents the highest point in North America: Denali.

In fact, anybody who intends to attempt a climb of Mt. McKinley is required to first stop at the Talkeetna Ranger Station for their permit and mountain orientation.

It is only fitting, then, that we honor the memory of Alaska Native Walter Harper by forever linking his name with this specific ranger station. It was Mr. Harper, that 100 years ago next year became the first person to reach the summit of Mt. McKinley.

My bill is a simple one, and it is not likely to gain much notice outside of Alaska. Within my home state, however, this small gesture means a great deal. Alaskans, like the people who call any other state home, are proud of the historical accomplishments of their fellow Alaskans. Walter Harper was one such Alaskan, and his feat is one that will always be remembered.

Certainly, officially designating the Talkeetna Ranger Station—the very building where any hiker today planning to climb Mt. McKinley is required to first stop—the Walter Harper Talkeetna Ranger Station is a fitting tribute to the man himself, as well as his spot in our state's history books.

June 7 of next year, 2013, will mark the 100 year anniversary of Mr. Harper's historic climb. It would truly be special for Alaska and Alaskans to have this designation in place by that date.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 2276. A bill to permit Federal officers to remove cases involving crimes of violence to Federal court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of a bill that I am introducing on behalf of a bipartisan group of Senators, the Officer Safety Act of 2012, S. 2276. This bill allows a Federal law enforcement agent, who stops a violent crime while off-duty and is indicted in a State court for those actions, to petition for the State criminal prosecution against him to be removed to Federal court.

The bill effectuates this change by amending the Federal removal statute, found in 28 United States Code, Section 1442, to clarify when a Federal law enforcement officer is acting under the color of his office.

As a 2003 Judiciary Committee report stated, ''Law enforcement officers are never 'off-duty.' '' Many are required to carry an off-duty weapon. When they fly on personal business, they are expected to carry their weapon and check-in with the airline as a Federal law enforcement agent so they can defend the pilots and passengers if something bad happens. In fact, Federal agents are specifically paid to be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Agents can be disciplined if they are not available when called.

They are not even allowed to engage in activities on their personal time that regular citizens take for granted, like coaching their kids' sports teams, if it might interfere with their ability to respond to a crisis.

Federal law enforcement agents are extensively trained, at the expense of the taxpayer for the benefit of the taxpayer. They not only train in basic academies, but they are required to participate in additional and regular training and re-certifications many times each year. If training is missed or if standards are not up to par, the agent is disciplined or removed. Federal law enforcement agencies take training requirements very seriously. The United States is known for having the best trained Federal law enforcement officers in the world.

So what if one of these exceptionally trained Federal law enforcement agents walks into the grocery store on a Saturday and witnesses a woman being repeatedly hit by her husband; do we want him to walk past the woman? No. The taxpayers spend money on his training so that he can protect victims, not walk away from them. In this situation, we all hope that he would use his training to protect the victim. But when he steps in to protect the victim from a crime of violence occurring in his presence, he risks state criminal prosecution and damage to his career. That might lead him to hesitate. This is contrary to good public policy. If we were the victim in this scenario, every one of us would want that Federal law enforcement officer to help us.

If a Federal agent acts to protect an individual in his presence from a crime of violence, as taxpayer dollars have trained him to do, and then is indicted in State court for that act, he should have the right to defend himself within the Federal court system.

So the Officer Safety Act amends the removal statute, found in Title 28, United States Code, Section 1442, to clarify when a Federal law enforcement officer is acting under the color of his office. This bill does not provide immunity for law enforcement agents, and it does not grant them additional authority. It doesn't even guarantee that the case will be moved from State to Federal court: the State will be heard and its position will be weighed by the judge before deciding if removal is appropriate. It does allow a Federal law enforcement officer/agent, who is indicted in a State court for actions related to his protection of a victim of a violent crime that is committed in the officer's presence, to petition for that criminal case to be removed to Federal court, where the officer will be required to defend his actions.

Current law provides that removal is proper so long as defendants demonstrate that they are officers of the United States that acted ''under color of'' their office and have a ''colorable federal defense''.

In general, a Federal agent acts ''under color of'' his office when he takes actions that are necessary and reasonable for the discharge of his Federal responsibilities. Accordingly, the prototypical example of a Federal officer acting under color of his office is a Federal law enforcement officer who kills someone while performing an act related to Federal law enforcement and, in the subsequent State homicide prosecution, claims he was acting in self-defense and/or is entitled to official immunity. The Supreme Court has upheld this prototypical example as appropriate for removal from State court to Federal court.

The primary restraint on the current statute's scope is its limitation to defendants who acted under color of Federal office or, in other words, while performing official duties. Defendants must show in their petition for removal that there is a causal nexus between the actions challenged and their Federal duties.

The history of the removal statute explains why this is important. The statute dates back to 1815. It was passed in response to the New England States' opposition to the trade embargo with England during the War of 1812. The law provided for the removal to Federal court of any suit or prosecution commenced in State court against a Federal customs officer or other persons enforcing Federal customs laws.

Thus, Federal agents did not need to fear performing their jobs because the local authorities opposed the embargo and wanted to stop them from enforcing it.

A few decades later, the U.S. Government encountered a similar problem in South Carolina, which in 1833 declared certain Federal tariff laws unenforceable within its borders. Congress responded by authorizing the removal of any suit or prosecution commenced in a State court against an officer of the United States for the enforcement of the Federal revenue laws.

During the Civil War and the Reconstruction era, Congress' disenchantment with State courts in the South led to new Federal officer removal laws. In the 1863 Habeas Corpus Act, Congress provided for the removal of suits or prosecutions against persons acting under Federal authority for actions, or failures to act, during the Civil War. In addition, Congress passed a removal statute similar to those of 1815 and 1833, authorizing the removal of suits or prosecutions commenced in State court against Federal officers for actions, or omissions, related to the collection of Federal revenue. However, it was not until the enactment of the Judicial Code of 1948 that Congress extended the statute to cover all Federal officers.

The courts view the history behind section 1442 and its statutory predecessors as justification for construing the statute broadly to assure the supremacy of U.S. law and protect Federal operations against interference from State judicial proceedings.

This bill does not infringe upon States' rights, as they retain the same due process rights to be heard on the question of removal that have existed since the early 1800s. In fact, this Congress passed a bill by unanimous consent that amended this statute, without a word about States' rights.

Today, Federal law enforcement officers, whether or not in uniform, require protections when they take actions to assist citizens. Civil liability protections are provided to officers under The Good Samaritan Act, codified at Title 28, United States Code, Section 2671. This bill, the Officer Safety Act, while modeled on the Good Samaritan Act, is narrower, more restrictive, and provides no liability protection. Rather, this bill clarifies the ''color of law'' prong required in the removal process, as courts have invited Congress to clarify.

The bill makes no change to the current standards governing when removal is permissible, and therefore leaves alone existing standards and case law. But it provides that in three situations, the law enforcement officer who is a defendant in a State criminal prosecution will be deemed to have acted under color of his or her office: when the officer protects a victim from a violent crime committed in the presence of the officer; when the officer provides immediate assistance to an individual who suffered or is about to suffer imminent bodily harm; and when the officer prevents the escape of an individual the officer reasonably believes committed or was about to commit, in the presence of the officer, a crime of violence that resulted in or was likely to result in serious bodily injury. I believe that in these situations, the Federal courts should always determine that the law enforcement officer acted under the color of his or her office for purposes of determining whether to grant the officer's removal petition. But the courts remain free to determine under current law that there are other circumstances in which an officer seeking removal satisfies the color of office standard.

So the bill is a modest change that nevertheless provides an important layer of safety for the people who risk their lives day-in and day-out to protect us. It will help make our communities safer and protect those who are sworn to guard and serve the American public.

This principle and this bill are supported by the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association, and the National Border Patrol Council.

I want to thank Senator COONS, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who co-chairs the Senate Law Enforcement Caucus, and is a co-sponsor on this bill. He understands the need to support law enforcement officers who risk their lives every day so that we can sleep safely at night.

Further, I want to thank Senators COBURN and SESSIONS, also members of the Judiciary Committee and co-sponsors. They, too, understand this allows us to support Federal agents without spending a dollar.

''Law enforcement officers are never 'off-duty.' '' To expect them to standby while a victim suffers violent acts in his presence is contrary to the oath they take to protect and renders their tax-funded training wasted as a citizen becomes a victim. Please join me in protecting those who protect us.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 2280. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau reported that outstanding student loan debt in America has hit the $1 trillion mark—student loans.

A CFPB official was cited by Bloomberg News saying that ''excessive student debt could slow the recovery of the housing market, as young people repay money for their education rather than buying homes.'' Massive student debt is also affecting consumers' ability to purchase goods and services.

Yesterday, at the Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government hearing focusing on student debt, Treasury Secretary Geithner came to talk about it. While the overall growth of student indebtedness is troubling, the most pressing concern is private student loans.

Secretary Geithner also recognized that private student loans do not come with any of the consumer protections that Federal loans do. Private student loans are far riskier. Federal student loans have fixed, affordable interest rates—3.4 percent. They also have a variety of consumer protections. The Federal loans have forbearance in times of economic hardship, and they offer manageable repayment options, such as the income-based repayment plan.

Private student loans, on the other hand, often have high variable interest rates—some have been quoted at 18 percent, the kind of rates you are careful about when it comes to your credit—and they have hefty origination fees and a lack of repayment options. Private lenders have targeted low-income borrowers with some of the riskiest, highest cost loans.

In many respects, private student loans are like credit cards—except unlike credit card debt, private student loan debt can never be discharged in bankruptcy. In 2005, Congress changed the bankruptcy laws. I want to make a point here: I voted against it. Congress changed the bankruptcy laws and included a provision making private student loan debts nondischargeable in bankruptcy, except in the rarest of circumstances. I have never found one that qualifies. That means students are stuck with their loans for life.

While the volume of private student loans is down from its peak a few years ago when it accounted for 26 percent of all student loans, private lending is still aggressively promoted by the for-profit college industry. The Project on Student Debt reports that 42 percent of for-profit college students had private loans in 2008, up from 12 percent 5 years earlier. For-profit college students also graduate with more debt than their peers who graduate from public or private and non-private colleges. Many for-profit colleges employ a business model that steers students into private student loans because of the 90/10 rule.

For the record, private for-profit schools can only receive 90 percent of their revenue from the Federal Government. They are the closest darn thing to a Federal agency you have ever seen, except they are making millions of dollars at the expense of the government and unsuspecting students and their families. So to find the 10 percent of nonfederal money, for-profit schools get the students to sign up to pay for 10 percent of their education in private student loans, even if they qualify for Federal loans, which are a much better deal.

The 90/10 rule that requires at least 10 percent of revenue from non-Federal

student aid sources makes this an imperative for many for-profit schools. As a result, many students are encouraged to take up private loans when they are still eligible for Federal loans—even when the lenders know the students are going to default—so schools can comply with the 90/10 rule.

Kari Schaab contacted my office seeking relief from her burdensome student debt. She received a bachelor of arts from the International Academy of Design and Technology, a for-profit college. When she spoke to an admissions representative, she was enrolled almost immediately. Looking back, she says of the school: ''They take whoever is willing to pay.''

She was assured she would be able to obtain a position in her field that would help her pay off her student debt. Reflecting on her experience, she said: ''I was young and didn't understand how much I would owe or what the loans were. I trusted them.''

After completing her BA program, she decided that she would pursue a master's in her field. What she found out shocked her. No schools would accept her degree. It was a worthless diploma. With no job, no future in her chosen field, and about $58,000 in debt, she decided to switch careers entirely so that she would be able to pay off her student loans.

She currently attends Oaktown Community College for nursing. She is unable to get a mortgage because of her old student loan debt of $58,000. Worse yet, her parents, trying to help her out, took out $19,000 in loans to help pay her tuition. Her parents are currently in chapter 13 bankruptcy, but that loan won't be discharged.

We need to begin now to address this looming student debt bomb crisis. We need to protect students and prevent more students from stepping into the same traps that have caught so many others.

Today, Senator TOM HARKIN and I are introducing the Know Before You Owe Private Student Loan Act of 2012. Here is what it says: It requires the prospective borrower's school to confirm the student's enrollment status, the cost of attendance, and the estimated Federal financial aid assistance before the private student loan is approved. Often, students haven't applied for Federal student aid before they are asked to apply for private student loans, which are not nearly as generous or flexible.

Requiring school certifications also gives the school the opportunity to make students aware of Federal Government student aid options.

The bill requires schools to counsel the student about their options, tell them how the private student loan will affect those options, and what it will cost to repay the loans. Basics.

In addition, schools will be required to inform students about the differences between Federal and private student loans. And the differences are dramatic. This will give students time to weigh their options, make a choice, and be informed.

When students such as Kari contact my office about their student loans, they often don't know the difference between the two types of loans. They said: ''It was just a student loan, Senator.'' Most go on to say that if they had known, they would have thought more carefully about a private student loan and the debt they were incurring.

For those students who do decide to take out a private student loan, the bill requires lenders to provide the borrower with quarterly up-to-date information about their balance and interest rate.

Finally, the bill requires lenders to report information to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau about how many students are taking out loans and at what rates. There is very little information about private student loans currently available. More information will help Congress and the CFPB effectively inform consumers about these private student loans.

This legislation is supported by a huge coalition of education, student, and consumer organizations. I want to thank TOM HARKIN for his work on this bill, especially all of the hard work he has put in on these for-profit colleges.

Mr. President, it is finally dawning on a lot of Members of Congress as they see programs such as ''Frontline'' talking about the for-profit college industry, and as they meet these students who are going to these worthless for-profit colleges—students who are just stacking up debt for a worthless diploma—it is time for our Federal Government to step up. How can we blame a student or their family if they are going to a school where we, the Federal Government, are willing to offer Pell grants and Federal loans? What is a student to think? Well, if it is good enough for the Federal Government to loan money, it must be a good school.

In fact, in many instances—in most instances—these for-profit schools are not good schools. They are not offering a good education. There are exceptions, but too many of them are just bad operations. We subsidize them. Ninety to ninety-five percent of their revenue comes straight from the Federal Government. When they talk about freezing Federal employees' salaries, we ought to freeze the employees at these for-profit schools. They are the closest thing to Federal employees we have—95 percent Federal. We don't hear that from the other side of the aisle. But it is a fact.

I will tell you this: This student loan debt bomb we are facing, which I talked to Secretary of the Treasury Geithner about yesterday, is going to explode on us, just as the subprime market loans did. More and more students are going into default. They can't pay back these student loans, and they are going to face life decisions that will change their futures and the future of the American economy.

We now have 40 percent of students who are making payments on their student loans—40 percent. Sixty percent are not. Some are still in school, I will concede that point, but many of them just can't do it. We pile this debt on, we give them preferred treatment in the Bankruptcy Court so the lenders can't have the debt discharged, and we sit there and watch as the lives of these young people deteriorate.

As one young lady testified at my hearing that she borrowed $37,625 from the Federal government, $40,925 in private loans. She went to the Harrington College of Design in the suburbs of Chicago and ended up with a worthless diploma—worthless. Five years later, her debt is no longer $78,000; it is $98,000. It just keeps going up. She pays $830 a month, and the private student loan debt is exploding right in front of her. She can't pay it. She doesn't know what she is going to do. She said she is going to have to give up the little home she and her husband just bought. It looks pretty desperate for her, and her desperate situation faces her at the age of 32—32.

How do we let this happen? Don't we have an obligation as a government, as a people, to stop this exploitation of children and their families? That is what is going on.

This bill I have put in today will require these schools—all schools—to tell the students first that they have Federal loan eligibility left. It is 3.4 percent, not 18 percent. There is loan forgiveness if they become a nurse or a teacher. It is based on the amount of income they have later in life what their repayment is going to be. If they do get into trouble, they can have a delay in payment without watching their loan just stack up. These are basic things we build into the law to help students. Students and their families ought to know that, and that is what this bill is about.

I commend this bill to my colleagues. I hope they will join Senator HARKIN and me. I want to offer this on the Senate floor, and I want some colleagues to go home and face this student loan issue and listen to the families they represent. We are hearing from our Web site, and I invite students and families to come to my official Web site to tell their stories. As we learn what it is all about, we see the need to move on this, and move quickly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

S. 2280

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Know Before You Owe Private Student Loan Act of 2012''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)) is amended—

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

''(3) INSTITUTIONAL CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), before a creditor may issue any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall obtain from the relevant institution of higher education where such loan is to be used for a student, such institution's certification of—

''(i) the enrollment status of the student;

''(ii) the student's cost of attendance at the institution as determined by the institution under part F of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

''(iii) the difference between—

''(I) such cost of attendance; and

''(II) the student's estimated financial assistance, including such assistance received under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other financial assistance known to the institution, as applicable.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a creditor may issue funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection without obtaining from the relevant institution of higher education such institution's certification if such institution fails to provide within 15 business days of the creditor's request for such certification—

''(i) the requested certification; or

''(ii) notification that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request.

''(C) LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—If a creditor issues funds without obtaining a certification, as described in subparagraph (B), such creditor shall report the issuance of such funds in a manner determined by the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (9), (10), and (11) as paragraphs (10), (11), and (12), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

''(9) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—

''(A) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO STUDENTS.—

''(i) LOAN STATEMENT.—A creditor that issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall send loan statements, where such loan is to be used for a student, to borrowers of such funds not less than once every 3 months during the time that such student is enrolled at an institution of higher education.

''(ii) CONTENTS OF LOAN STATEMENT.—Each statement described in clause (i) shall—

''(I) report the borrower's total remaining debt to the creditor, including accrued but unpaid interest and capitalized interest;

''(II) report any debt increases since the last statement; and

''(III) list the current interest rate for each loan.

''(B) NOTIFICATION OF LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—On or before the date a creditor issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall notify the relevant institution of higher education, in writing, of the amount of the extension of credit and the student on whose behalf credit is extended. The form of such written notification shall be subject to the regulations of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

''(C) ANNUAL REPORT.—A creditor that issues funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau containing the required information about private student loans to be determined by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, in consultation with the Secretary of Education.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—Section 140(a)(7)(A) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)(7)(A)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii);

(2) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding after clause (i) the following:

''(ii) is not made, insured, or guaranteed under title VII or title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292 et seq. and 296 et seq.); and''.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shall issue regulations in final form to implement paragraphs (3) and (9) of section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by subsection (a). Such regulations shall become effective not later than 6 months after their date of issuance.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (28) and inserting the following:

''(28)(A) The institution shall—

''(i) upon the request of a private educational lender, acting in connection with an application initiated by a borrower for a private education loan in accordance with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act, provide certification to such private educational lender—

''(I) that the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, is enrolled or is scheduled to enroll at the institution;

''(II) of such student's cost of attendance at the institution as determined under part F of this title; and

''(III) of the difference between—

''(aa) the cost of attendance at the institution; and

''(bb) the student's estimated financial assistance received under this title and other assistance known to the institution, as applicable; and

''(ii) provide the certification described in clause (i), or notify the creditor that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request—

''(I) within 15 business days of receipt of such certification request; and

''(II) only after the institution has completed the activities described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) The institution shall, upon receipt of a certification request described in subparagraph (A)(i), and prior to providing such certification—

''(i) determine whether the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, has applied for and exhausted the Federal financial assistance available to such student under this title and inform the student accordingly; and

''(ii) provide the borrower whose loan application has prompted the certification request by a private education lender, as described in subparagraph (A)(i), with the following information and disclosures:

''(I) The availability of, and the borrower's potential eligibility for, Federal financial assistance under this title, including disclosing the terms, conditions, interest rates, and repayment options and programs of Federal student loans.

''(II) The borrower's ability to select a private educational lender of the borrower's choice.

''(III) The impact of a proposed private education loan on the borrower's potential eligibility for other financial assistance, including Federal financial assistance under this title.

''(IV) The borrower's right to accept or reject a private education loan within the 30-day period following a private educational lender's approval of a borrower's application and about a borrower's 3-day right to cancel period.

''(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the terms 'private educational lender' and 'private education loan' have the meanings given such terms in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the effective date of the regulations described in section 2(c).

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 24 months after the issuance of regulations under section 2(c), the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Secretary of Education shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the compliance of institutions of higher education and private educational lenders with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by section 2, and section 487(a)(28) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)), as amended by section 3. Such report shall include information about the degree to which specific institutions utilize certifications in effectively encouraging the exhaustion of Federal student loan eligibility and lowering student private education loan debt.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. VITTER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2282. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the reauthorization of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, NAWCA. This bill has overwhelming bipartisan support, and I am pleased to have Senators BOXER, VITTER, LANDRIEU, COCHRAN, JOHNSON, and KLOBUCHAR as original cosponsors.

In fact, this is a conservation program that has long enjoyed support on both sides of the aisle. Back in 2006, I worked with my colleagues to pass the last reauthorization of this program by unanimous consent and was pleased that President Bush signed the bill into law.

This bill also has the support of many conservation and hunting groups including: Archery Trade Association, Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Boone and Crockett Club, Bowhunting Preservation Alliance, Catch-A-Dream Foundation, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Conservation Force, Dallas Safari Club, Delta Waterfowl, Ducks Unlimited, Izaak Walton League of America, Mule Deer Foundation, National Assembly of

Sportsmen's Caucuses, National Rifle Association, National Trappers Association, National Wild Turkey Foundation, North American Bear Foundation, North American Grouse Partnership, Orion-The Hunters' Institute, Pheasants Forever, Pope and Young Club, Public Lands Foundation, Quail Forever, Quality Deer Management Association, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Ruffed Grouse Society, Safari Club International, Texas Wildlife Association, The Conservation Fund, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, Whitetails Unlimited, Wildlife Forever, and Wildlife Management Institute

NAWCA was first enacted in 1989 and incentivizes non-federal contributions to maintain and restore wetland habitat throughout North America. Since its inception, each Federal dollar has been matched, on average, by $3.20 in state and private funds. Not only do these funds help to support waterfowl populations that were once nearing all time lows, these voluntary projects also support nearly 7,500 new jobs annually.

The success of this program lies in the fact that these projects are not top down regulations coming from the Federal Government. These projects involve multiple partners from private organizations and the Federal Government who work together voluntarily to protect and restore millions of acres of wetlands.

In my home State of Oklahoma, NAWCA currently has 12 projects either completed or underway. These projects have conserved 26,869 acres of wildlife habitat and leveraged $11.3 million in partner contributions. These projects benefit outdoor recreation, hunting and fishing, as well as boosting local economies.

NAWCA is a great example of how environmental conservation should be achieved. This program should put to rest the notion that voluntary efforts aren't successful. I would argue that these voluntary programs have been more successful and more cost effective than other mandatory Federal regulations.

I look forward to this reauthorization moving quickly through the Senate. Thank you.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 411—CONGRATULATING THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY IFC/PANHELLENIC DANCE MARATHON ON ITS CONTINUED SUCCESS IN SUPPORT OF THE FOUR DIAMONDS FUND AT PENN STATE HERSHEY CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr. CASEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 411

Whereas the Pennsylvania State University IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon (referred to in this preamble as ''THON'') is the largest student-run philanthropy in the world, with 700 dancers, more than 300 supporting organizations, and more than 15,000 volunteers involved in the annual event;

Whereas student volunteers at the Pennsylvania State University annually collect money and dance for 46 consecutive hours at the Bryce Jordan Center for THON, bringing energy and excitement to the Pennsylvania State University campus for the mission of conquering pediatric cancer and promoting awareness of the disease to thousands of individuals;

Whereas all THON activities support the mission of the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital, which provides financial and emotional support to pediatric cancer patients and their families and funds research on pediatric cancer;

Whereas, each year, THON is the largest donor to the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital, having raised more than $88,000,000 since 1977, when the 2 organizations first became affiliated;

Whereas, in 2012, THON set a new fundraising record of $10,686,924.83, surpassing the previous record of $9,563,016.09, set in 2011;

Whereas THON—

(1) has helped more than 2,000 families through the Four Diamonds Fund;

(2) is helping to build a new Pediatric Cancer Pavilion at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital; and

(3) has supported pediatric cancer research that has caused some pediatric cancer survival rates to increase to nearly 90 percent; and

Whereas THON has inspired similar events and organizations across the United States, including at high schools and institutions of higher education, and continues to encourage students across the United States to volunteer and stay involved in great charitable causes in their communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Pennsylvania State University IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon (referred to in this resolution as ''THON'') on its continued success in support of the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital; and

(2) commends the Pennsylvania State University students, volunteers, and supporting organizations who worked hard to put together another record-breaking THON.

SENATE RESOLUTION 412—COMMENDING THE AFRICAN UNION FOR COMMITTING TO A COORDINATED MILITARY RESPONSE, COMPRISED OF 5,000 TROOPS FROM UGANDA, THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC, THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO, AND SOUTH SUDAN, IN ORDER TO FORTIFY ONGOING EFFORTS TO ARREST JOSEPH KONY AND SENIOR COMMANDERS OF THE LORD'S RESISTANCE ARMY AND TO STOP THE CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY AND MASS ATROCITIES COMMITTED BY THEM

Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. BROWN of Ohio) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 412

Whereas the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) is one of Africa's oldest and most violent armed groups, responsible for committing crimes against humanity against civilian populations, including women and children, and believed to be operating since 2006 in the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and what would become South Sudan;

Whereas the ongoing atrocities committed by LRA members target innocent civilians, including women and children, and include abduction, murder, mutilation, burning and looting of villages, and destruction of communities and livelihoods, causing the massive displacement of human populations and creating a humanitarian crisis;

Whereas the abduction of children and their forced conversion into LRA fighters is an LRA hallmark and involves initiating children into combat through brutal methods and brainwashing and subjects girls to forced sexual slavery and servitude;

Whereas the governments of those countries most affected by the LRA's reign of terror for over twenty years, including Uganda, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and what would become Southern Sudan, are leading efforts, with international support, to apprehend Kony and neutralize the LRA;

Whereas the African Union convened a regional ministerial meeting in October 2010 to bring together countries affected by the LRA, the United Nations, and international partners to address the LRA threat and promote humanitarian assistance and development aid to affected populations, and subsequently authorized, in November 2011, the Regional Cooperation Initiative for the Elimination of the Lord's Resistance Army (RCI-LRA), with a mission to strengthen the operational capabilities of the affected countries and create an environment conducive to stabilizing those areas;

Whereas, on March 5, 2012, the nonprofit organization Invisible Children reinvigorated the national and global dialogue on the LRA and Kony by engaging millions of young citizens via creative social media and inspiring them to demand action and accountability of global leaders, which in turn has mobilized leaders within and outside of the United States Government in support of these concerns;

Whereas, on March 24, 2012, the African Union's Special Envoy for the LRA, Francisco Madeira, and Head of the United Nation's Regional Office for Central Africa, Abou Moussa, launched the operational phase of RCI-LRA by formally announcing the planned deployment of up to 5,000 soldiers to advance anti-LRA and anti-Kony efforts, and the next day formally inaugurated the Headquarters of the Regional Task Force in South Sudan to coordinate efforts to eliminate Kony and neutralize the LRA;

Whereas, in December 2008, Operation Lightning Thunder, a multinational effort, failed to capture and kill Kony in northern Congo, and escaping LRA fighters killed more than 800 civilians, abducted at least 160 children, and pillaged villages en route to the Central African Republic in an incident known as the Christmas Massacres, according to Human Rights Watch; and

Whereas enhanced international and regional cooperation and coordination are necessary to apprehend Kony and LRA leaders while protecting civilian populations against devastating retaliatory attacks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the African Union for committing to enhanced troop deployments that will fortify the military response to the Lord's Resistance Army, in coordination with the Governments of Uganda, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the Republic of South Sudan, in order to strengthen ongoing efforts

to arrest Joseph Kony and senior commanders of the Lord's Resistance Army;

(2) supports increasing collaboration and coordination between the African Union and the Governments of Uganda, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the Republic of South Sudan so that together they may swiftly and effectively implement RCI-LRA and bring Kony's criminal spree to an end;

(3) supports ongoing efforts by members of the United States Armed Forces currently deployed to serve as advisors to and partners of these national militaries and African Union forces; and

(4) supports continued efforts by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and other representatives of the United States Government to work with partner nations and the international community to strengthen the operational capabilities of African Union and other regional military forces deployed as part of RCI-LRA to protect civilians and neutralize the leadership of the Lord's Resistance Army.

SENATE RESOLUTION 413—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF APRIL 2012 AS NATIONAL AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. CASEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 413

Whereas autism is a general term used to describe a group of complex developmental brain disorders known as pervasive developmental disorders, commonly known as autism spectrum disorders;

Whereas autism is a neurodevelopmental disorder that results in difficulties with communication and social interaction, as well as repetitive behaviors;

Whereas autism affects individuals differently, mildly affecting some and significantly disabling others;

Whereas according to a 2012 report published by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as of 2008, autism affects an estimated 1 in every 88 children in the United States, including 1 in 54 boys, which is a 23 percent increase from 2006;

Whereas autism is 4 times more likely to be diagnosed in boys than in girls;

Whereas autism can affect anyone regardless of race, ethnicity, or other factors;

Whereas the lifetime incremental cost of caring for a person with autism is $3,200,000;

Whereas the cost nationally of caring for persons affected by autism is estimated to be at least $90,000,000,000 per year;

Whereas the number of autistic adults grows daily and, absent fundamental breakthroughs, will continue to increase in the years and decades ahead;

Whereas it is both a moral and fiscal imperative that services be made available that maximize the potential of each unique adult living with autism to contribute to the greatest extent possible to the society and economy of the United States;

Whereas it is well established that early intervention can improve outcomes by significantly improving the cognitive, language, and adaptive skills of people with autism;

Whereas the promise of early intervention is not being realized as close to 80 percent of adults with autism, even those without an intellectual disability, are unemployed and living at home with relatives rather than independently;

Whereas a variety of physical, medical, and mental-health issues may accompany autism, resulting in marked functional impairment in all activities of daily living;

Whereas these conditions may include epilepsy, Down syndrome, fragile X syndrome, gastrointestinal problems, immune-system disorders, sleep disturbance, sensory integration dysfunction, and metabolic disorders;

Whereas many individuals on the autism spectrum face co-occurring mental-health challenges, including anxiety, obsessive compulsions, and depression;

Whereas individuals living with autism are highly valued and deserve the highest level of dignity and acceptance by society; and

Whereas April 2012 would be an appropriate month to designate as National Autism Awareness Month to increase public awareness of the need to support individuals with autism and the family members and medical professionals who care for individuals with autism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support designating April 2012 as National Autism Awareness Month;

(2) recognizes and commends both individuals living with autism and the parents and relatives of those individuals for the sacrifice and dedication in providing for the special needs of autistic individuals and for absorbing financial costs for specialized education, medical clinical interventions, and support services;

(3) recognizes that—

(A) autism is a major public health crisis that is taking an enormous toll on millions of families who need answers that can come only through further research;

(B) meeting the education, employment, and service-provision needs of individuals on the autism spectrum is a clear and compelling public policy issue that requires a rapid national response; and

(C) individuals and families are desperate to access services that are, at this point, inadequate to meet the current and growing needs of individuals with autism;

(4) stresses the need to begin early intervention services soon after a child has been diagnosed with autism, noting that there is a strong consensus that intensive treatment as soon as possible following diagnosis can significantly improve cognitive functioning, language, and adaptive behavior, reduce the cost of lifetime care, and yield the most positive life outcomes for children with autism;

(5) recognizes—

(A) the importance of assistance in the areas of comprehensive early intervention, health, recreation, job training, employment, housing, transportation, and early, primary, and secondary education; and

(B) that with access to, and assistance with, this type of service and support, individuals with autism can live rich, full, and productive lives;

(6) recognizes that services for transitioning youth and adults with autism are an especially pressing need, as are services that enhance the safety of individuals with autism of any age; and

(7) recognizes that by providing adequate service and support at crucial points in life, adults with autism can become tax-paying citizens with productive and rewarding lives.

SENATE RESOLUTION 414—COMMEMORATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT PEMBROKE

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. HAGAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 414

Whereas the University of North Carolina at Pembroke (referred to in this preamble as ''the University'') was founded on March 7, 1887, in Robeson County, North Carolina by an act of the General Assembly of North Carolina;

Whereas the University, originally named the Croatan Normal School, was created in response to a petition from the Indian people of Robeson County;

Whereas the University was founded for the purpose of training American Indian school teachers;

Whereas the University opened in the fall of 1887 with 15 students and 1 teacher;

Whereas the University moved to its present location in Pembroke, North Carolina in 1909;

Whereas a 2-year program beyond high school was added to the University in 1926;

Whereas the length of the program of college studies at the University was extended to 4 years in 1939;

Whereas, in 1941, the General Assembly of North Carolina changed the name of the University to Pembroke State College for Indians;

Whereas, until 1953, the University was the only State-supported 4-year college for Indians in the United States;

Whereas, in 1969, the General Assembly of North Carolina changed the name of the University to Pembroke State University and made the University a regional State university that provided instruction at both the undergraduate level and the graduate level;

Whereas, in 1972, the General Assembly of North Carolina established the 17-campus University of North Carolina system and made Pembroke State University 1 of the constituent institutions of the system;

Whereas, on July 1, 1996, Pembroke State University became the University of North Carolina at Pembroke;

Whereas, today, approximately 6,000 students from diverse backgrounds are enrolled in 41 undergraduate programs and 17 graduate programs at the University of North Carolina at Pembroke; and

Whereas March 7, 2012, marks the 125th anniversary of the founding of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commemorates the 125th anniversary of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke.

SENATE RESOLUTION 415—DESIGNATING APRIL 4, 2012, AS ''NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR AUXILIARIES DAY''

Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. PRYOR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 415

Whereas the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries and the members of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries provide valuable service and leadership opportunities for women who wish to take an active role in their communities;

Whereas the mission of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries is to encourage member chapters to render charitable services that—

(1) are beneficial to the general public; and

(2) place a particular emphasis on providing for the needs of children; and

Whereas since the founding of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries in 1941, the

organization has provided strength and inspiration to women who want to effect positive change in their communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 4, 2012, as ''National Association of Junior Auxiliaries Day'';

(2) recognizes the great contributions made by members of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries to their communities and to the people of the United States; and

(3) especially commends the work of the members of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries to better the lives of children in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 416—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF APRIL AS PARKINSON'S AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mrs. HUTCHISON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 416

Whereas Parkinson's disease is the second most common neurodegenerative disease in the United States, second only to Alzheimer's disease;

Whereas there is inadequate comprehensive data on the incidence and prevalence of Parkinson's disease, as of 2011, it is estimated that the disease affects from 500,000 to 1,500,000 people in the United States;

Whereas although research suggests the cause of Parkinson's disease is a combination of genetic and environmental factors, the exact cause and progression of the disease is still unknown;

Whereas there is no objective test for Parkinson's disease, and the rate of misdiagnosis can be high;

Whereas symptoms of Parkinson's disease vary from person to person and include tremors, slowness, difficulty with balance, swallowing, chewing, speaking, rigidity, cognitive problems, dementia, mood disorders, such as depression and anxiety, constipation, skin problems, and sleep disruptions;

Whereas medications mask some symptoms of Parkinson's disease for a limited amount of time each day, often with dose-limiting side effects;

Whereas ultimately the medications and treatments lose their effectiveness, generally after 4 to 8 years, leaving the person unable to move, speak, or swallow;

Whereas there is no cure, therapy, or drug to slow or halt the progression of Parkinson's disease; and

Whereas increased education and research are needed to help find more effective treatments with fewer side effects and, ultimately, an effective treatment or cure for Parkinson's disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of April as Parkinson's Awareness Month;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Parkinson's Awareness Month;

(3) continues to support research to find better treatments, and eventually, a cure for Parkinson's disease;

(4) recognizes the people living with Parkinson's who participate in vital clinical trials to advance knowledge of the disease; and

(5) commends the dedication of local and regional organizations, volunteers, and millions of Americans across the country working to improve the quality of life of persons living with Parkinson's disease and their families.

SENATE RESOLUTION 417—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH WEEK

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. COONS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 417

Whereas the week of April 2, 2012, through April 8, 2012, is National Public Health Week;

Whereas the theme for National Public Health Week in 2012 is ''A Healthier America Begins Today: Join the Movement'';

Whereas since 1995, public health organizations have used National Public Health Week to educate the public, policymakers, and public health professionals about issues that are important to improving the health of people in the United States;

Whereas preventing diseases and injuries is critical to helping people live longer, healthier lives while managing health-related costs;

Whereas chronic diseases, such as heart disease, cancer, and diabetes are responsible for millions of premature deaths and cause the people in the United States to miss 2,500,000,000 days of work each year, resulting in lost productivity totaling more than $1,000,000,000,000;

Whereas in 2012, people in the United States are living 78 years on average, but only 69 of these years are spent in good health;

Whereas despite providing some of the best health care in the world, the United States still ranks below many countries in life expectancy, infant mortality, and many other indicators of healthy life;

Whereas studies have shown that small strategic investments in prevention could result in significant savings in health-care costs; and

Whereas in communities across the United States, more people are changing the way they care for their health by avoiding tobacco use, eating healthier, becoming more physically active, and preventing unintentional injuries at home and in the workplace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Public Health Week;

(2) recognizes the efforts of public-health professionals, the Federal Government, States, municipalities, local communities, and every person in the United States in preventing disease and injury;

(3) recognizes the role of public health in improving the health of people in the United States;

(4) encourages increased efforts and resources to improve the health of people in the United States through—

(A) strategies to promote community health and prevent disease and injury; and

(B) strengthening of the public health system of the United States; and

(5) encourages the people of the United States to learn about the role of the public health system in improving health in the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 37—SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013, AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2022

Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. LEE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BURR, Mr. KYL, and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. CON. RES. 37

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social Security.
Sec. 103. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 104. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 201. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for improper payments.

TITLE III—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 301. Discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2013 through 2022.
Sec. 302. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 303. Emergency legislation.
Sec. 304. Adjustments for the extension of certain current policies.
Sec. 305. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 306. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 307. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 308. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2022:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $2,060,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,222,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,462,866,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,651,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,812,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,947,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,089,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,244,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,407,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,575,255,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: –$232,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: –$328,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: –$353,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: –$364,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: –$382,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: –$405,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: –$429,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: –$463,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: –$499,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: –$540,226,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013: $2,843,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,740,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,759,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,864,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,939,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,016,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,164,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,285,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,393,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,561,218,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013: $2,883,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,759,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,755,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,860,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,920,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,995,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,133,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,240,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,361,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,529,438,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS(ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013: $822,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $536,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $292,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $209,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $107,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $47,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $44,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: –$4,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: –$45,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: –$45,817,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013: $16,899,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $17,623,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,107,497,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,496,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $18,791,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $19,055,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $19,364,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $19,655,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $19,829,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $20,012,601,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013: $12,263,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,888,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,276,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,567,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,754,302,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,878,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $14,000,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $14,081,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $14,055,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $14,049,329,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013: $675,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $731,427,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $772,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $821,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $872,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $919,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $965,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $1,010,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,055,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,102,093,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013: $759,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $824,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $865,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $909,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $959,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $1,013,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $1,072,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $1,136,188,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,202,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,271,585,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $5,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $6,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $6,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $6,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $6,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $6,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $6,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $6,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,220,000,000.

SEC. 103. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $290,000,000.

SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2022 for each major functional category are:
(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $553,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $564,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $577,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $574,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $585,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $584,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $598,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $590,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $612,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $605,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $625,346,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $618,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $639,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $629,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $653,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $641,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $664,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $653,333,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $26,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $24,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $20,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $18,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,968,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $20,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,351,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $21,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,387,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $21,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $21,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $21,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $22,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,958,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $25,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $25,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, $25,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $25,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $25,180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $25,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $25,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $25,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $25,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $25,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,110,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $4,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $2,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$90,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $27,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $26,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $26,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,433,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $27,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $27,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,990,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $27,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $26,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $25,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,779,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $20,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $19,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $18,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $17,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $17,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $17,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $17,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,106,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $17,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $16,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $14,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,386,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $7,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$1,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $5,163,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$5,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $3,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$11,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $3,191,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$12,668,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $3,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$13,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $2,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$19,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $2,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$20,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $1,191,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$14,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $3,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$13,896,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $83,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $83,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $73,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $74,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $75,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $75,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $75,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $76,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $76,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $77,753,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,753,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $10,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $11,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $11,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $11,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,305,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $11,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $11,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $11,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $11,209,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $11,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,020,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $62,036,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $54,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $58,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $64,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $72,102,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $74,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $75,745,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $73,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $84,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $85,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,210,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $351,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $348,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $359,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $355,012,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $351,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $337,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $341,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $340,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $343,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $349,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,156,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $356,785,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $357,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $374,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $364,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $372,368,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $381,779,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $381,829,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $522,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $522,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $548,036,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $547,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $572,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $571,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $621,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $620,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $639,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $638,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $662,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $661,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $724,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $724,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $777,760,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $777,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $830,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $830,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $917,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $917,837,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $513,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $515,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $461,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $463,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $451,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $453,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $446,514,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $447,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $432,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $432,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $423,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $424,396,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $433,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $434,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $433,849,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $434,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $438,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $458,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $459,223,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $43,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $52,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $57,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $62,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $68,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,079,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $134,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $136,990,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $139,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $148,058,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $146,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,327,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $144,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $153,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $157,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $156,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $161,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $171,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $169,302,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $57,081,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $47,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $47,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $48,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $47,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $46,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $46,775,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $46,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $51,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,510,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,022,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,844,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,490,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $21,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $21,163,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $21,284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $21,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $21,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,477,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $356,871,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $356,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $372,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $406,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $406,919,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $460,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $460,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $515,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $515,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $553,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $553,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $599,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $599,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $636,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $636,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $658,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $658,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $680,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $680,273,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$76,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$76,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$79,197,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$79,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$85,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$85,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$96,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$96,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$100,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$100,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$107,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$107,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$114,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$114,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$117,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$117,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$119,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$119,655,000,000.
(21) Global War on Terror and Related Activities (970):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $90,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $20,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR IMPROPER PAYMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by eliminating or reducing improper payments and use such savings to reduce the deficit. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

TITLE III—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 301. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2013 THROUGH 2022.

(a) SENATE POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or joint resolution) that would cause the discretionary spending limits other than those allocated to function 970 for war efforts overseas in this section to be exceeded.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—This subsection may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(b) SENATE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the Senate and as used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) for fiscal year 2013, $985,469,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,118,113,000,000 in outlays;

(2) for fiscal year 2014, $995,547,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,079,448,000,000 in outlays;

(3) for fiscal year 2015, $1,004,921,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,053,804,000,000 in outlays;

(4) for fiscal year 2016, $1,015,924,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,060,609,000,000 in outlays;

(5) for fiscal year 2017, $1,030,766,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,066,221,000,000 in outlays;

(6) for fiscal year 2018, $1,043,364,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,080,039,000,000 in outlays;

(7) for fiscal year 2019, $1,056,286,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,091,895,000,000 in outlays;

(8) for fiscal year 2020, $1,069,722,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,104,053,000,000 in outlays;

(9) for fiscal year 2021, $1,085,565,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,115,780,000,000 in outlays; and

(10) for fiscal year 2022, $1,103,426,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,134,954,000,000 in outlays.

SEC. 302. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2012, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2013.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $28,500,000,000 in new budget authority in each year; and

(2) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 402 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) shall no longer apply.

SEC. 303. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) (relating to pay-as-you-go), section 311 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress) (relating to long-term deficits), and section 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) (relating to short-term deficits), and section 301 of this resolution (relating to discretionary spending). Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of this resolution.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''direct spending'', ''receipts'', and ''appropriations for discretionary accounts'' mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(5) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 304. ADJUSTMENTS FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN CURRENT POLICIES.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—For the purposes of determining points of order specified in subsection (b), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the estimate of the budgetary effects of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that contains one or more provisions meeting the criteria of subsection (c) to exclude the amounts of qualifying budgetary effects.

(b) COVERED POINTS OF ORDER.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments pursuant to this section for the following points of order only:

(1) Section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) (relating to pay-as-you-go).

(2) Section 311 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress) (relating to long-term deficits).

(3) Section 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) (relating to short-term deficits).

(c) QUALIFYING LEGISLATION.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments authorized under subsection (a) for legislation containing provisions that—

(1) amend or supersede the system for updating payments made under subsections 1848 (d) and (f) of the Social Security Act, consistent with section 7(c) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–139);

(2) amend the Estate and Gift Tax under subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, consistent with section 7(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010;

(3) extend relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax for individuals under sections 55–59 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, consistent with section 7(e) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010; and

(4) extend middle-class tax cuts made in the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (Public Law 107–16) and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief and Reconciliation Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–27), consistent with section 7(f) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(d) LIMITATION.—The Chairman shall make any adjustments pursuant to this section in a manner consistent with the limitations described in sections 4(c) and 7(h) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–139).

(e) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this section, the terms ''budgetary effects'' or ''effects'' mean the amount by which a provision changes direct spending or revenues relative to the baseline.

(f) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on December 31, 2011.

SEC. 305. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

SEC. 306. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 307. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002).

SEC. 308. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 38—PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 38

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, March 29, 2012, through Sunday, April 1, 2012, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, April 16, 2012, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day through Friday, April 13, 2012, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its majority leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, April 16, 2012, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at

such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 39—SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013, REVISING THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012, AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2013 THROUGH 2022

Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. CON. RES. 39

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social Security.
Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 201. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for the sale of unused or vacant Federal properties.
Sec. 202. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for selling excess Federal land.
Sec. 203. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for the repeal of Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws.
Sec. 204. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for the reduction of purchasing and maintaining Federal vehicles.
Sec. 205. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for the sale of financial assets purchased through the Troubled Asset Relief Program.

TITLE III—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 301. Discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2012 through 2022, program integrity initiatives, and other adjustments.
Sec. 302. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 303. Emergency legislation.
Sec. 304. Adjustments for the extension of certain current policies.
Sec. 305. Point of order against any budget resolution without the passage of a balance budget amendment.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

Sec. 311. Oversight of Government performance.
Sec. 312. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 313. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 314. Rescind unspent or unobligated balances after 36 months.

TITLE IV—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 401. Reconciliation in the Senate.
Sec. 402. Directive to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate to replace the sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011.

TITLE V—CONGRESSIONAL POLICY CHANGES

Sec. 501. Policy statement on social security.
Sec. 502. Policy statement on medicare.
Sec. 503. Policy statement on tax reform.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF CONGRESS

Sec. 601. Regulatory reform.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2022:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $1,896,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $1,615,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $1,740,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,261,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,406,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,651,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,965,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,186,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,419,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,663,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,822,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: −$23,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: −$675,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: −$845,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: −$537,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$559,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$521,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$365,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$312,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: −$257,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −$214,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: −$263,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $3,519,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,084,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,106,658,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,117,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,283,243,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,458,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,659,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,893,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,090,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,262,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,464,458,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $3,565,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,109,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,098,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,092,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,256,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,408,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,594,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,842,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,027,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,208,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,417,978,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $1,043,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $795,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $631,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $62,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $31,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$111,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$285,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$302,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: −$395,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −$504,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: −$501,000,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $11,368,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $12,197,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,912,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,084,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,230,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,147,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $12,912,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $12,631,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $12,261,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $11,787,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $11,328,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $11,242,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $12,089,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,812,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $12,966,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,076,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,017,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $12,784,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $12,534,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $12,191,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $11,739,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $11,290,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $627,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $698,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $728,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $770,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $819,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $868,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $914,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $958,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $1,004,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,049,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,096,000,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $770,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $813,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $857,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $901,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $950,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $1,004,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $1,063,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $1,127,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $1,197,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,269,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,345,264,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $5,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,793,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $5,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $6,043,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $6,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $6,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $6,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $6,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $7,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $7,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,257,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $7,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $7,796,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,745,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2011 through 2021 for each major functional category are:
(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $549,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $559,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $562,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,049,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $562,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $570,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $574,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $579,797,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $580,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $591,058,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $583,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $602,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $613,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $603,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $625,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $615,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $638,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $627,214,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $651,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $645,558,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $57,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $14,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $20,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $11,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,423,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,746,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $13,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $14,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $14,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $14,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $15,217,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,742,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $19,605,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $19,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $20,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $20,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $21,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $21,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $21,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $22,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,234,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $22,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $23,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,964,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $914,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $944,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $885,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $1,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $1,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $955,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $37,109,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $24,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $24,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $25,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $26,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $26,745,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $27,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $27,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,561,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $27,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,787,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $20,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $20,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $20,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $20,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $20,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $20,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $21,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,990,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $21,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $21,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,631,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,583,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $42,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $12,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,996,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $12,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $12,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $15,199,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $15,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $16,368,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $16,930,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $17,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $230,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $88,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $77,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $76,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $77,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $78,217,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $79,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $79,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $80,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $81,266,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $81,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,078,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $82,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,495,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $18,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $11,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $12,036,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $12,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $12,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $12,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $13,163,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,325,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $13,890,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,647,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $88,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,484,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $33,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $30,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $32,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,490,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $42,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,022,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $46,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $49,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $49,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,122,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $50,554,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,920,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $357,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $358,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $338,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $334,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $348,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $338,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $359,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $357,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $365,157,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $364,094,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $374,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $373,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $385,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $381,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $397,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $417,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $403,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $419,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $415,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $431,913,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $427,453,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $487,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $487,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $509,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $510,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $534,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $533,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $355,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $347,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $362,716,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $355,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $362,163,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $357,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $369,163,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $368,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $364,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $371,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $636,453,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $385,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $383,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $396,715,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $395,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $408,219,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $407,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $422,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $427,176,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $779,797,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $776,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $823,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $819,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $866,901,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $863,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $912,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $908,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $960,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $956,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,075,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,010,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,075,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,070,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,140,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,134,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $1,210,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,204,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $1,283,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,276,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $1,360,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,353,009,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $126,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,262,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $132,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $135,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $138,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $147,201,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, $146,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $145,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $154,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $159,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $163,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $173,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $172,995,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $51,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $50,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,113,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $41,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $42,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $45,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $43,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $44,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $45,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $45,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $46,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $51,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,151,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $24,163,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $23,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $23,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,217,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $224,064,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $224,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $183,281,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $183,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $184,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $184,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $211,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,497,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $293,109,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $293,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $361,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $361,394,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $440,040,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $440,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $501,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $501,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $536,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $565,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $565,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$588,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$588,933,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2012
(A) New budget authority, −$45,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$45,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$57,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$57,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$71,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$71,118,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$79,148,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$79,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$92,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$92,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$91,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$91,236,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$56,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$56,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$58,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$58,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$58,990,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$58,990,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$55,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$55,589,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$91,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$91,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$95,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$95,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$96,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$96,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$101,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$101,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$104,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$104,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$117,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$117,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$123,045,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$123,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$133,352,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$133,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$138,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$138,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$144,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$144,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$150,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$150,911,000,000.
(21) Global War on Terrorism (970):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $126,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(22) Congressional Health Insurance for Seniors (990):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $539,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $466,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $468,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $494,278,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $494,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $513,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $511,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $544,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $542,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $577,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $575,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $623,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $623,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $666,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $664,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, $712,662,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $710,662,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR THE SALE OF UNUSED OR VACANT FEDERAL PROPERTIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by selling any unused or vacant Federal properties. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR SELLING EXCESS FEDERAL LAND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by selling any excess Federal land. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF DAVIS-BACON PREVAILING WAGE LAWS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports from savings achieved by repealing the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 204. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR THE REDUCTION OF PURCHASING AND MAINTAINING FEDERAL VEHICLES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by reducing the federal vehicles fleet. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR THE SALE OF FINANCIAL ASSETS PURCHASED THROUGH THE TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by selling financial instruments and equity accumulated through the Troubled Asset Relief Program. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

TITLE III—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 301. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2012 THROUGH 2022, PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) SENATE POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or joint resolution) that would cause the discretionary spending limits in this section to be exceeded.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—This subsection may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(b) SENATE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the Senate and as used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) for fiscal year 2012, $1,201,863,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,308,512,000,000 in outlays;

(2) for fiscal year 2013, $934,104,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,023,435,000,000 in outlays;

(3) for fiscal year 2014, $891,861,000,000 in new budget authority and $965,519,000,000 in outlays;

(4) for fiscal year 2015, $906,188,000,000 in new budget authority and $943,141,000,000 in outlays;

(5) for fiscal year 2016 $921,824,000,000 in new budget authority and $955,362,000,000 in outlays;

(6) for fiscal year 2017, $939,918,000,000 in new budget authority and $964,874,000,000 in outlays;

(7) for fiscal year 2018, $958,654,000,000 in new budget authority and $974,728,000,000 in outlays;

(8) for fiscal year 2019, $977,693,000,000 in new budget authority and $998,696,000,000 in outlays;

(9) for fiscal year 2020, $997,939,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,018,172,000,000 in outlays;

(10) for fiscal year 2021, $1,018,340,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,038,189,000,000 in outlays; and

(11) for fiscal year 2022, $1,040,081,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,064,838,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted in conformance with the adjustment procedures in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2), or the offering of an amendment or motion thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon—

(A) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, budgetary aggregates, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(B) following any adjustment under subparagraph (A), the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS TO SUPPORT ONGOING OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES.—

(A) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, allocations to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and aggregates for one or more—

(i) bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or passed by the House of Representatives;

(ii) joint resolutions or amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(iii) amendments between the Houses received from the House of Representatives or Senate amendments offered by the authority of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; or

(iv) conference reports;

making appropriations for overseas deployments and other activities in the amounts specified in subparagraph (B).

(B) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(i) for fiscal year 2012, $126,544,000,000 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(ii) for fiscal year 2013, $50,000,000,000 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(iii) for fiscal year 2014, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(iv) for fiscal year 2015, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(v) for fiscal year 2016, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(vi) for fiscal year 2017, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(vii) for fiscal year 2018, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(viii) for fiscal year 2019, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(ix) for fiscal year 2020, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(x) for fiscal year 2021, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(xi) for fiscal year 2022, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 302. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2012, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2013.

SEC. 303. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all

fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) (relating to pay-as-you-go), section 311 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress) (relating to long-term deficits), and section 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) (relating to short-term deficits), and section 301 of this resolution (relating to discretionary spending). Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of this resolution.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''direct spending'', ''receipts'', and ''appropriations for discretionary accounts'' mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(5) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 304. ADJUSTMENTS FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN CURRENT POLICIES.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—For the purposes of determining points of order specified in subsection (b), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the estimate of the budgetary effects of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that contains one or more provisions meeting the criteria of subsection (c) to exclude the amounts of qualifying budgetary effects.

(b) COVERED POINTS OF ORDER.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments pursuant to this section for the following points of order only:

(1) Section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) (relating to pay-as-you-go).

(2) Section 311 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress) (relating to long-term deficits).

(3) Section 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) (relating to short-term deficits).

(c) QUALIFYING LEGISLATION.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments authorized under subsection (a) for legislation containing provisions that—

(1) amend or supersede the system for updating payments made under subsections 1848 (d) and (f) of the Social Security Act, consistent with section 7(c) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–139);

(2) amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in order to establish a single, flat tax rate of 17 percent consistent with section 7(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010; and

(3) extend relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax for individuals under sections 55–59 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, consistent with section 7(e) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(d) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this section, the terms ''budgetary effects'' or ''effects'' mean the amount by which a provision changes direct spending or revenues relative to the baseline.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on December 31, 2012.

SEC. 305. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY BUDGET RESOLUTION WITHOUT THE PASSAGE OF A BALANCE BUDGET AMENDMENT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any budget resolution following the enactment of this resolution until a balance budget amendment to the Constitution has been adopted.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) SUNSET.—This section shall expire after the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced budget.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 311. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list reports. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on the Budget.

SEC. 312. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 313. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002).

SEC. 314. RESCIND UNSPENT OR UNOBLIGATED BALANCES AFTER 36 MONTHS.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall require that any unobligated or unspent allocations be rescinded after 36 months.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments resulting from the required rescissions shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

TITLE IV—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 401. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) SUBMISSION TO PROVIDE FOR THE REFORM OF MANDATORY SPENDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 1, 2012, the Senate committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the United States Senate. After receiving those recommendations from the applicable committees of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.—The Committee on Foreign Relations shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $2,864,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(B) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $2,432,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(C) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND ENERGY.—The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Energy shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $6,100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(D) COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—The Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $3,422,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(E) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $1,584,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(F) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $3,473,634,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(G) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $7,818,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(b) SUBMISSION OF REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the Senate revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

SEC. 402. DIRECTIVE TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET OF THE SENATE TO REPLACE THE SEQUESTER ESTABLISHED BY THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011.

(a) SUBMISSION.—In the Senate, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a bill carrying out the directions set forth in subsection (b).

(b) DIRECTIONS.—The bill referred to in subsection (a) shall include the following provisions:

(1) REPLACING THE SEQUESTER ESTABLISHED BY THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011.—The language shall amend section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to replace the sequester established under that section consistent with this concurrent resolution.

(2) APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.—The bill referred to in subsection (a) shall include language making it application contingent upon the enactment of the reconciliation bill referred to in section 401.

TITLE V—CONGRESSIONAL POLICY CHANGES

SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress and the relevant committees of jurisdiction enact legislation to ensure the Social Security System achieves solvency over the 75 year window as follows:

(1) The legislation must modify the Primary Insurance Amount formula between 2018 and 2055 to gradually reduce benefits on a progressive basis for works with career-average earnings above the 40th percentile of new retired workers.

(2) The normal retirement age will increase by 3 months each year starting with individuals reaching age 62 in 2017 and stopping with the normal retirement age reaches the age of 70 for individuals reaching the age of 62 in 2032.

(3) The earliest eligibility age will be increased by 3 months per year starting with individuals reaching age 62 in 2021 and will stop with the reaches age 64 for individuals reaching the age 62 in 2028 or later.

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress and the relevant committees of jurisdiction enact legislation to ensure a reduction in the unfunded liabilities of Medicare as follows:

(1) Enrolls seniors in the same health care plan as Federal employees and Members of Congress, similar to the Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan (FEHBP).

(2) Beginning on January 1, 2014, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall ensure seniors currently enrolled or eligible for Medicare will have access to Congressional Health Care for Seniors Act.

(3) Prevents the Office of Personnel and Management from placing onerous new mandates on health insurance plans, but allows the agency to continue to enforce reasonable minimal stands for plans, ensure the plans are fiscally solvent, and enforces rules for consumer protections.

(4) The legislation must create a new ''high-risk pool'' for the highest cost patients, providing a direct reimbursement to health care plans that enroll the costliest 5 percent of patients.

(5) Ensures that every senior can afford the high-quality insurance offered by FEHBP, providing support for 75 percent of the total costs, providing additional premium assistance to those who cannot afford the remaining share.

(6) The legislation must increase the age of eligibility gradually over 20 years, increasing the age from 65 to 70, resulting in a 3-month increase per year.

(7) High-income seniors will be provided less premium support than low-income seniors.

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress and the relevant committees of jurisdiction enact legislation to ensure a tax reform that broadens the tax base, reduces tax complexity, includes a consumption-based income tax, and a globally competitive flat tax as follows:

(1) This concurrent resolution shall eliminate all tax brackets and have one standard flat tax rate of 17 percent on adjusted gross income. The individual tax code shall remove all credits and deductions, with exception to the mortgage interest deduction, offsetting these with a substantially higher standard deduction and personal exemption. The standard deduction for joint filers is $30,320, $19,350 for head of household, and $15,160 for single filers. The personal exemption amount is $6,530. This proposal eliminates the individual alternative minimum tax (AMT). The tax reform would repeal all tax on savings and investments, including capital gains, qualified and ordinary dividends, estate, gift, and interest saving taxes.

(2) This concurrent resolution shall eliminate all tax brackets and have one standard flat tax of 17 percent on adjusted gross income. The business tax code shall remove all credits and deductions, offsetting these with a lower tax rate and immediate expensing of all business inputs. Such inputs shall be determined by total revenue from the sale of good and services less purchases of inputs from other firms less wages, salaries, and pensions paid to workers less purchases of plant and equipment.

(3) The individuals and businesses would be subject to taxation on only those incomes that are produced or derived, as a territorial system in the United States. The aggregate taxes paid should provide the ability to fill out a tax return no larger than a postcard.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF CONGRESS

SEC. 601. REGULATORY REFORM.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress and the relevant committees of jurisdiction enact legislation to ensure a regulatory reform as follows:

(1) APPLY REGULATORY ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS TO INDEPENDENT AGENCIES.—It shall be the policy of Congress to pass into law a requirement for independent agencies to abide by the same regulatory analysis requirement as those required by executive branch agencies

(2) ADOPT THE REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT (REINS).—It shall be the of Congress to vote on the Executive In Need of Scrutiny Act, legislation that would require all regulations that impose a burden greater than $100 million in economic aggregate may not be implement as law unless Congress gives their consent by voting on the rule.

(3) SUNSET ALL REGULATIONS.—It shall be the policy of Congress that regulations imposed by the Federal Government shall automatically sunset every 2 years unless repromulgated by Congress.

(4) PROCESS REFORM.—It shall be the policy of Congress to implement regulatory process reform by instituting statutorily require regulatory impact analysis for all agencies, require the publication of regulatory impact analysis before the regulation is finalized, and ensure that not only are regulatory impact analysis conducted, but applied to the issued regulation or rulemaking.

(5) INCORPORATION OF FORMAL RULEMAKING FOR MAJOR RULES.—It shall be the policy of Congress to apply formal rulemaking procedures to all major regulations or those regulations that exceed $100,000,000 in aggregate economic costs.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1998. Mr. REID (for Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2297, to promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

SA 1999. Mr. REID (for Mr. PAUL) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 80, condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1998. Mr. REID (for Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2297, to promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 5, after line 6, add the following:

SEC. 4. PROJECT FOR NAVIGATION, WASHINGTON CHANNEL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The portion of the project for navigation of the Corps of Engineers at Potomac River, Washington Channel, District of Columbia, as authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831; 49 Stat. 1028), and described in subsection (b), is deauthorized.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT.—The deauthorized portion of the project for navigation is as follows: Beginning at Washington Harbor Channel Geometry Centerline of the 400-foot-wide main navigational ship channel, Centerline Station No. 103+73.12, coordinates North 441948.20, East 1303969.30, as stated and depicted on the Condition Survey Anacostia, Virginia, Washington and Magazine Bar Shoal Channels, Washington, D.C., Sheet 6 of 6, prepared by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore district, July 2007; thence departing the aforementioned centerline traveling the following courses and distances: N. 40 degrees 10 minutes 45 seconds E., 200.00 feet to a point, on the outline of said 400-foot-wide channel thence binding on said outline the following 3 courses and distances: S. 49 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds E., 1,507.86 feet to a point, thence; S. 29 degrees 44 minutes 42 seconds E., 2,083.17 feet to a point, thence; S. 11 degrees 27 minutes 04 seconds E., 363.00 feet to a point, thence; S. 78 degrees 32 minutes 56 seconds W., 200.00 feet to a point binding on the centerline of the 400-foot-wide main navigational channel at computed Centerline Station No. 65+54.31, coordinates North 438923.9874, East 1306159.9738, thence; continuing with the aforementioned centerline the following courses and distances: N. 11 degrees 27 minutes 04 seconds W., 330.80 feet to a point, Centerline Station No. 68+85.10, thence; N. 29 degrees 44 minutes 42 seconds W., 2,015.56 feet to a point, Centerline Station No. 89+00.67, thence; N. 49 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds W., 1,472.26 feet to the point of beginning, the area in total containing a computed area of 777,284 square feet or 17.84399 acres of riparian water way.

SA 1999. Mr. REID (for Mr. PAUL) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 80, condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights; as follows:

On page 5, line 4, strike the words ''all available''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 29, 2012, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 29, 2012, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 29, 2012, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 29, 2012, at 2:15 p.m., to hold a African Affairs Subcommittee hearing entitled, ''A Closer Look at Nigeria: Security, Governance, and Trade.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of Senate, in order to conduct a hearing entitled, ''FDA User Fee Agreements: Strengthening FDA and the Medical Products Industry for the Benefit of Patients'' on March 29, 2012, at 10 a.m., in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 29, 2012, at 9:30 a.m. in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 29, 2012, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''S. 2219, the ''Democracy Is Strengthened by Casting Light on Spending in Elections Act of 2012 (DISCLOSE Act of 2012).''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 29, 2012, at 10 a.m. in room 432 of the Russell Senate Office building to conduct a hearing entitled ''The FY 2013 Budget Request for the Small Business Administration.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONTRACTING OVERSIGHT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Contracting Oversight of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 29, 2012, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Contracts: How Much Are They Costing the Government?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 29, 2012, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Cate Cravath, Katie Hoppe, and Michael Finn, interns with the Budget Committee, be granted the privilege of the floor during the remainder of today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Lucy Stein and Sarah Newman of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 344, 346, 422, 493, 494, 495, 496, 499, 500, 504, 505, 506, 507, 511, 514, 515, 516, 517, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 541, 543, 544, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 608, 614, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 641, 642, 643, 648, 649, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Foreign Service; that the nominations be confirmed

en bloc; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I will not be objecting, but I do want to briefly make a comment. This is the result of a successful discussion among the majority leader, the White House, and myself. Based on the White House assurance that there will be no recess appointments during the upcoming adjournment, I will not be objecting.

I wish to say to my friend, the majority leader, this is the way we ought to be conducting business. I think it was a successful negotiation, and I certainly do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, very quickly—I know the Republican leader is in a hurry—I agree. This is the way we should legislate. I hope—maybe not in the 2-week period we come back, but after that—we start doing appropriations bills. We are both committed—the Republican leader and I—we are committed to doing appropriations bills this year, and we have to do that. We cannot let other things stand in the way of getting them done. I appreciate the cooperation of the White House and my friend the Republican leader.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Martin J. Gruenberg, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term expiring December 27, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Thomas J. Curry, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of the Currency for a term of five years.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Michael A. Hammer, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Public Affairs).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Charles DeWitt McConnell, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Fossil Energy).

David T. Danielson, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy).

LaDoris Guess Harris, of Georgia, to be Director of the Office of Minority Economic Impact, Department of Energy.

Gregory Howard Woods, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Energy.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

James R. Hannah, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2013.

Daniel J. Becker, of Utah, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2013.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Roberta S. Jacobson, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Western Hemisphere Affairs).

Elizabeth M. Cousens, of Washington, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Elizabeth M. Cousens, of Washington, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Michael E. Horowitz, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of Justice.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Rebecca M. Blank, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Jon D. Leibowitz, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of seven years from September 26, 2010.

Maureen K. Ohlhausen, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of seven years from September 26, 2011.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Kathryn Keneally, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Maurice A. Jones, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Thomas Hoenig, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of six years.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Deepa Gupta, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2016.

Christopher Merrill, of Iowa, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2016.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

Stephanie Orlando, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for the remainder of the term expiring September 17, 2011.

Stephanie Orlando, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2014.

Gary Blumenthal, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2013.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Wendy M. Spencer, of Florida, to be Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Mary John Miller, of Maryland, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

Kathleen Kerrigan, of Massachusetts, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for the term of fifteen years.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Alastair M. Fitzpayne, of Maryland, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Margaret Ann Sherry, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security.

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Eduardo Arriola, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation for a term expiring October 6, 2016.

J. Kelly Ryan, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation for the remainder of the term expiring September 20, 2012.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Michael James Warren, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2014.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

David J. McMillan, of Minnesota, to be a Member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, vice Scott Kevin Walker.

Wenona Singel, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Anuj Chang Desai, of Wisconsin, to be a Member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the term expiring September 30, 2011.

Anuj Chang Desai, of Wisconsin, to be a Member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the term expiring September 30, 2014.

Dennis J. Erby, of Mississippi, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Mississippi for the term of four years.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Earl W. Gast, of California, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Anne Claire Richard, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Population, Refugees, and Migration).

Tara D. Sonenshine, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy.

Robert E. Whitehead, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Togolese Republic.

Larry Leon Palmer, of Georgia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Barbados, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Antigua and Barbuda, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

Jonathan Don Farrar, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Panama.

Phyllis Marie Powers, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Nicaragua.

Nancy J. Powell, of Iowa, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Personal Rank of Career Ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Bruce J. Sherrick, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation.

Chester John Culver, of Iowa, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation.

JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL FELLOWSHIP FOUNDATION

Catherine Allgor, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation for a term expiring September 27, 2014.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Thomas M. Harrigan, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of Drug Enforcement.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Gina K. Abercrombie-Winstanley, of Ohio, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Malta.

Julissa Reynoso, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.

William E. Todd, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

Jacob Walles, of Delaware, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Tunisian Republic.

Pamela A. White, of Maine, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Haiti.

John Christopher Stevens, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Libya.

Tracey Ann Jacobson, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kosovo.

Kenneth Merten, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Croatia.

Mark A. Pekala, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Latvia.

Richard B. Norland, of Iowa, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Georgia.

Jeffrey D. Levine, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Estonia.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Frederick D. Barton, of Maine, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Conflict and Stabilization Operations).

Frederick D. Barton, of Maine, to be Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization.

Linda Thomas-Greenfield, of Louisiana, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Director General of the Foreign Service.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Jeremiah O'Hear Norton, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 2013.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Gregory K. Kavis, of Mississippi, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi for the term of four years.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

PN1345 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (4) beginning Olga Ford, and ending Margaret Shu Teasdale, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 2, 2012.

PN1347 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (65) beginning Terry L. Murphree, and ending Andrew J. Wylie, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 2, 2012.

PN1408 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (2) beginning Morgan D. Haas, and ending Stephen L. Wixom, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 29, 2012.

NOMINATIONS DISCHARGED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate proceed to the consideration of Presidential nominations 1134, 1135, 1136, 1137, and 1312; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, there be no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment as Vice Commandant of the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under Title 14, U.S.C., Section 47:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. John P. Currier, 0852

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the U.S. Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under Title 14, U.S.C., Section 50:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Paul F. Zukunft, 7122

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the U.S. Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under Title 14, U.S.C., Section 50:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Manson K. Brown, 6734

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the U.S. Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under Title 14, U.S.C., Section 50:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Peter V. Neffenger, 7652

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Coast Guard Reserve under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203(A):

To be captain

Patrick K. Aboagye, 6749
David R. Allen, 2274
William F. Csisar, 6055

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 258, 259, 262, and 264; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, there be no intervening action or debate; that no motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD and President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Phyllis Nichamoff Segal, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2013.

Lisa M. Quiroz, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring February 8, 2014.

Marguerite W. Kondracke, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring June 10, 2014.

Richard Christman, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for the remainder of the term expiring October 6, 2012.

Mr. REID. I know there is one Senator very happy about that. That is Senator MIKULSKI. I am glad we were able to get this done.

NOMINATION DISCHARGED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate proceed to the consideration of Presidential nomination 1311, Christy L. Romero, of Virginia, to be special inspector general for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, which was reported out by the Banking Committee today; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, there be no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Christy L. Romero, of Virginia, to be Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR NO. 460

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, April 16, 2012, at 4:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 460; that there be 60 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote with no intervening action or debate on Calendar No. 460; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 38, the adjournment resolution, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) to provide for the conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 38

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, March 29, 2012, through Sunday, April 1, 2012, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, April 16, 2012, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day through Friday, April 13, 2012, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its majority leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, April 16, 2012, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

PROMOTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOUTHWEST WATERFRONT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 352, H.R. 2297.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2297) to promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Lieberman amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any related statements be printed in the RECORD as if read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1998) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To deauthorize a portion of the project for navigation of the Corps of Engineers at Potomac River, Washington Channel, District of Columbia)

On page 5, after line 6, add the following:

SEC. 4. PROJECT FOR NAVIGATION, WASHINGTON CHANNEL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The portion of the project for navigation of the Corps of Engineers at Potomac River, Washington Channel, District of Columbia, as authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831; 49 Stat. 1028), and described in subsection (b), is deauthorized.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT.—The deauthorized portion of the project for navigation is as follows: Beginning at Washington Harbor Channel Geometry Centerline of the 400-foot-wide main navigational ship channel, Centerline Station No. 103+73.12, coordinates North 441948.20, East 1303969.30, as stated and depicted on the Condition Survey Anacostia, Virginia, Washington and Magazine Bar Shoal Channels, Washington, D.C., Sheet 6 of 6, prepared by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore district, July 2007; thence departing the aforementioned centerline traveling the following courses and distances: N. 40 degrees 10 minutes 45 seconds E., 200.00 feet to a point, on the outline of said 400-foot-wide channel thence binding on said outline the following 3 courses and distances: S. 49 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds E., 1,507.86 feet to a point, thence; S. 29 degrees 44 minutes 42 seconds E., 2,083.17 feet to a point, thence; S. 11 degrees 27 minutes 04 seconds E., 363.00 feet to a point, thence; S. 78 degrees 32 minutes 56 seconds W., 200.00 feet to a point binding on the centerline of the 400-foot-wide main navigational channel at computed Centerline Station No. 65+54.31, coordinates North 438923.9874, East 1306159.9738, thence; continuing with the aforementioned centerline the following courses and distances: N. 11 degrees 27 minutes 04 seconds W., 330.80 feet to a point, Centerline Station No. 68+85.10, thence; N. 29 degrees 44 minutes 42 seconds W., 2,015.56 feet to a point, Centerline Station No. 89+00.67, thence; N. 49 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds W., 1,472.26 feet to the point of beginning, the area in total containing a computed area of 777,284 square feet or 17.84399 acres of riparian water way.

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

The bill (H.R. 2297), as amended, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

H.R. 2297

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 2297) entitled ''An Act to promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.'', do pass with the following amendment:

On page 5, after line 10, add the following:

SEC. 4. PROJECT FOR NAVIGATION, WASHINGTON CHANNEL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The portion of the project for navigation of the Corps of Engineers at Potomac River, Washington Channel, District of Columbia, as authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831; 49 Stat. 1028), and described in subsection (b), is deauthorized.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT.—The deauthorized portion of the project for navigation is as follows: Beginning at Washington Harbor Channel Geometry Centerline of the 400-foot-wide main navigational ship channel, Centerline Station No. 103+73.12, coordinates North 441948.20, East 1303969.30, as stated and depicted on the Condition Survey Anacostia, Virginia, Washington and Magazine Bar Shoal Channels, Washington, D.C., Sheet 6 of 6, prepared by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore district, July 2007; thence departing the aforementioned centerline traveling the following courses and distances: N. 40 degrees 10 minutes 45 seconds E., 200.00 feet to a point, on the outline of said 400-foot-wide channel thence binding on said outline the following 3 courses and distances: S. 49 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds E., 1,507.86 feet to a point, thence; S. 29 degrees 44 minutes 42 seconds E., 2,083.17 feet to a point, thence; S. 11 degrees 27 minutes 04 seconds E., 363.00 feet to a point, thence; S. 78 degrees 32 minutes 56 seconds W., 200.00 feet to a point binding on the centerline of the 400-foot-wide main navigational channel at computed Centerline Station No. 65+54.31, coordinates North 438923.9874, East 1306159.9738, thence; continuing with the aforementioned centerline the following courses and distances: N. 11 degrees 27 minutes 04 seconds W., 330.80 feet to a point, Centerline Station No. 68+85.10, thence; N. 29 degrees 44 minutes 42 seconds W., 2,015.56 feet to a point, Centerline Station No. 89+00.67, thence; N. 49 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds W., 1,472.26 feet to the point of beginning, the area in total containing a computed area of 777,284 square feet or 17.84399 acres of riparian water way.

CONDEMNING THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN FOR HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 345, S. Res. 80.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 80) condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of the Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 1999

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Paul amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to and that the Senate proceed immediately to a voice vote on adoption of the resolution, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1999) was agreed to, as follows:

On page 5, line 4, strike the words ''all available''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 80), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, and that any related statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble reads as follows:

S. RES. 80

Whereas, in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2006, 2008, and 2009, Congress declared that it deplored the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha'i community and would hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha'i faith;

Whereas the 2010 Department of State International Religious Freedom Report stated, ''Since the 1979 Islamic Revolution, more than 200 Baha'is have been killed, and many have faced regular raids and confiscation of property.'';

Whereas the 2009 Department of State Human Rights Report stated, ''The government [of Iran] continued to repress Baha'is and prevent them from meeting in homes to worship. It banned them from government and military leadership posts, the social pension system, and public schools and universities unless they concealed their faith.'';

Whereas, on October 15, 2010, the United Nations Secretary-General issued a special report on human rights in Iran, stating that ''the Baha'i, who comprise the country's largest non-Muslim religious minority, face multiple forms of discrimination and harassment, including denial of employment, Government benefits and access to higher education'';

Whereas, on December 21, 2010, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/RES/65/226) noting ''serious ongoing and recurring human rights violations'' in Iran, including against the Baha'i community;

Whereas, in November 2007, the Ministry of Information of Iran in Shiraz jailed Baha'is Ms. Raha Sabet, 33, Mr. Sasan Taqva, 32, and Ms. Haleh Roohi, 29, for educating underprivileged children, and gave them 4-year prison terms;

Whereas Ms. Sabet remains imprisoned in Iran;

Whereas Ms. Sabet, Mr. Taqva, and Ms. Roohi were targeted solely on the basis of their religion;

Whereas, in March and May of 2008, intelligence officials of the Government of Iran in Mashhad and Tehran arrested and imprisoned Mrs. Fariba Kamalabadi, Mr. Jamaloddin Khanjani, Mr. Afif Naeimi, Mr. Saeid Rezaie, Mr. Behrouz Tavakkoli, Mrs. Mahvash Sabet, and Mr. Vahid Tizfahm, the members of the coordinating group for the Baha'i community in Iran;

Whereas, in August 2010, the Revolutionary Court in Tehran sentenced the 7 Baha'i leaders to 20-year prison terms on charges of ''spying for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, propaganda against the regime and spreading corruption on earth'';

Whereas the lawyer for these 7 leaders, Mrs. Shirin Ebadi, the Nobel Laureate, has been denied all access to the prisoners and their files;

Whereas these 7 Baha'i leaders were targeted solely on the basis of their religion;

Whereas, in February 2011, the Revolutionary Court in Tehran sentenced human rights activist and follower of the Baha'i faith, Navid Khanjani, to a 12-year prison term on charges of ''propaganda against the regime by publishing news, reports, and interviews with foreign TV and radio,'' among others;

Whereas the Government of Iran is party to the International Covenants on Human Rights; and

Whereas the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–195) authorizes the President and the Secretary of State to impose sanctions on ''the officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals who are responsible for continuing and severe violations of human rights and religious freedom in Iran'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights;

(2) calls on the Government of Iran to immediately release the seven leaders and all other prisoners held solely on account of their religion, including Mrs. Fariba Kamalabadi, Mr. Jamaloddin Khanjani, Mr. Afif Naeimi, Mr. Saeid Rezaie, Mr. Behrouz Tavakkoli, Mrs. Mahvash Sabet, Mr. Vahid Tizfahm, Ms. Raha Sabet, and Mr. Navid Khanjani;

(3) calls on the President and Secretary of State, in cooperation with the international community, to immediately condemn the Government of Iran's continued violation of human rights and demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion, including Mrs. Fariba Kamalabadi, Mr. Jamaloddin Khanjani, Mr. Afif Naeimi, Mr. Saeid Rezaie, Mr. Behrouz Tavakkoli, Mrs. Mahvash Sabet, Mr. Vahid Tizfahm, Ms. Raha Sabet, and Mr. Navid Khanjani; and

(4) urges the President and Secretary of State to utilize measures, such as those available under the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 and Executive Order 13553, to sanction officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for egregious human rights violations in Iran, including against the Baha'i community.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE PEOPLE OF TIBET

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 347, S. Res. 356.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 356) expressing support for the people of Tibet.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations without amendment and an amendment to the preamble, as follows:

[Omit the part printed in boldface brackets and insert the part printed in Italic.]

S. RES. 356

Whereas Tibet is the center of Tibetan Buddhism, and His Holiness the Dalai Lama, Tenzin Gyatso, is the most revered figure in Tibetan Buddhism;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China continues to enforce policies that infringe on fundamental freedoms of Tibetans, including punitive security measures against monasteries, mass arrests, and restrictions on freedom to practice religion;

Whereas both the Dalai Lama and the Kalon Tripa, Dr. Lobsang Sangay, the prime minister democratically elected by the Tibetan exile community, have specifically stated that they do not seek independence for Tibet from China;

Whereas, in his inaugural address on August 8, 2011, Kalon Tripa Sangay stated that he will ''continue the Middle-Way policy, which seeks genuine autonomy for Tibet within the People's Republic of China'';

Whereas, according to the Department of State's 2011 Report on Tibet Negotiations, since 2002, nine rounds of talks between the Government of the People's Republic of China and envoys of the Dalai Lama ''have not borne concrete results'';

Whereas, despite persistent efforts by the Dalai Lama and his representatives, the Government of the People's Republic of China and envoys of the Dalai Lama have not held any formal dialogue since January 2010;

[Whereas, since March 2011, at least 16 Tibetans have set themselves on fire, and at least 12 have died;**]**

Whereas, since March 2011, more than two dozen Tibetans have set themselves on fire, and at least 19 have died;

Whereas the repressive policies of the Government of the People's Republic of China have created an environment of despair, hopelessness, and frustration among many Tibetans;

Whereas, on November 1, 2011, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief, Heiner Bielefeldt, expressed concern over ''restrictive measures'' implemented by the Government of the People's Republic of China in Tibetan monasteries, stating that such measures ''not only curtail the right to freedom of religion or belief, but further exacerbate the existing tensions, and are counterproductive'' and affirming that ''the right of members of the

monastic community, and the wider community to freely practice their religion, should be fully respected and guaranteed by the Chinese Government'';

Whereas, on January 24, 2012, Maria Otero, Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy and Human Rights, and United States Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues, issued a statement expressing concern about ''reports of violence and continuing heightened tensions in Tibetan areas of China, including reports of security forces in Sichuan province opening fire on protesters, killing some and injuring others'';

Whereas the Constitution of the People's Republic of China guarantees freedom of religious belief for all citizens, but the July-December 2010 International Religious Freedom Report of the Department of State states that ''the [Chinese] government's repression of religious freedom remained severe in the Tibet Autonomous Region and other Tibetan areas'';

Whereas, on March 10, 2011, His Holiness the Dalai Lama announced that he would relinquish his last remaining governmental duties in the Central Tibetan Administration, and would turn over political authority to the leadership democratically elected by Tibetans in exile;

Whereas, on March 20, 2011, the Tibetan government in exile conducted competitive democratic elections that were monitored by international observers and deemed free, fair, and consistent with international standards;

Whereas nearly 50,000 people in over 30 countries, more than half of all the eligible Tibetan exiles voters, participated in the March 20, 2011, elections;

Whereas Dr. Lobsang Sangay was elected Kalon Tripa, or prime minister, of the Central Tibetan Administration after receiving 55 percent of votes in the March 20, 2011, election and was inaugurated on August 8, 2011;

Whereas Kalon Tripa Sangay was selected to study in the United States under the Department of State's Tibetan Scholarship Program, earning a doctorate in law from Harvard University, and served as a Senior Fellow at the East Asian Legal Studies Program at Harvard Law School;

Whereas Kalon Tripa Sangay, while at Harvard University, promoted dialogue among Tibetan exiles and Chinese students and visiting Chinese scholars to enhance mutual understanding and advance the prospects for reconciliation; and

Whereas it is the objective of the United States Government, consistent across administrations of different political parties and as articulated in the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (subtitle B of title VI of Public Law 107–228; 22 U.S.C. 6901 note) to promote a substantive dialogue between the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Dalai Lama or his representatives in order to secure genuine autonomy for the Tibetan people within China:

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a vote on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (No. 356) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 356

Whereas Tibet is the center of Tibetan Buddhism, and His Holiness the Dalai Lama, Tenzin Gyatso, is the most revered figure in Tibetan Buddhism;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China continues to enforce policies that infringe on fundamental freedoms of Tibetans, including punitive security measures against monasteries, mass arrests, and restrictions on freedom to practice religion;

Whereas both the Dalai Lama and the Kalon Tripa, Dr. Lobsang Sangay, the prime minister democratically elected by the Tibetan exile community, have specifically stated that they do not seek independence for Tibet from China;

Whereas, in his inaugural address on August 8, 2011, Kalon Tripa Sangay stated that he will ''continue the Middle-Way policy, which seeks genuine autonomy for Tibet within the People's Republic of China'';

Whereas according to the Department of State's 2011 Report on Tibet Negotiations, since 2002, nine rounds of talks between the Government of the People's Republic of China and envoys of the Dalai Lama ''have not borne concrete results'';

Whereas despite persistent efforts by the Dalai Lama and his representatives, the Government of the People's Republic of China and envoys of the Dalai Lama have not held any formal dialogue since January 2010;

Whereas, since March 2011, more than two dozen Tibetans have set themselves on fire, and at least 19 have died;

Whereas the repressive policies of the Government of the People's Republic of China have created an environment of despair, hopelessness, and frustration among many Tibetans;

Whereas, on November 1, 2011, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief, Heiner Bielefeldt, expressed concern over ''restrictive measures'' implemented by the Government of the People's Republic of China in Tibetan monasteries, stating that such measures ''not only curtail the right to freedom of religion or belief, but further exacerbate the existing tensions, and are counterproductive'' and affirming that ''the right of members of the monastic community, and the wider community to freely practice their religion, should be fully respected and guaranteed by the Chinese Government'';

Whereas, on January 24, 2012, Maria Otero, Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy and Human Rights, and United States Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues, issued a statement expressing concern about ''reports of violence and continuing heightened tensions in Tibetan areas of China, including reports of security forces in Sichuan province opening fire on protesters, killing some and injuring others'';

Whereas the Constitution of the People's Republic of China guarantees freedom of religious belief for all citizens, but the July-December 2010 International Religious Freedom Report of the Department of State states that ''the [Chinese] government's repression of religious freedom remained severe in the Tibet Autonomous Region and other Tibetan areas'';

Whereas, on March 10, 2011, His Holiness the Dalai Lama announced that he would relinquish his last remaining governmental duties in the Central Tibetan Administration, and would turn over political authority to the leadership democratically elected by Tibetans in exile;

Whereas, on March 20, 2011, the Tibetan government in exile conducted competitive democratic elections that were monitored by international observers and deemed free, fair, and consistent with international standards;

Whereas nearly 50,000 people in over 30 countries, more than half of all the eligible Tibetan exiles voters, participated in the March 20, 2011, elections;

Whereas Dr. Lobsang Sangay was elected Kalon Tripa, or prime minister, of the Central Tibetan Administration after receiving 55 percent of votes in the March 20, 2011, election and was inaugurated on August 8, 2011;

Whereas Kalon Tripa Sangay was selected to study in the United States under the Department of State's Tibetan Scholarship Program, earning a doctorate in law from Harvard University, and served as a Senior Fellow at the East Asian Legal Studies Program at Harvard Law School;

Whereas Kalon Tripa Sangay, while at Harvard University, promoted dialogue among Tibetan exiles and Chinese students and visiting Chinese scholars to enhance mutual understanding and advance the prospects for reconciliation; and

Whereas it is the objective of the United States Government, consistent across administrations of different political parties and as articulated in the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (subtitle B of title VI of Public Law 107–228; 22 U.S.C. 6901 note) to promote a substantive dialogue between the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Dalai Lama or his representatives in order to secure genuine autonomy for the Tibetan people within China: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) mourns the death of Tibetans who have self-immolated and deplores the repressive policies targeting Tibetans;

(2) calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China to suspend implementation of religious control regulations, reassess religious and security policies implemented since 2008 in Tibet, and resume a dialogue with Tibetan Buddhist leaders, including the Dalai Lama or his representatives, to resolve underlying grievances;

(3) calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China to release all persons that have been arbitrarily detained; to cease the intimidation, harassment and detention of peaceful protestors; and to allow unrestricted access to journalists, foreign diplomats, and international organizations to Tibet;

(4) calls on the Secretary of State to seek from the Government of the People's Republic of China a full accounting of the forcible removal of monks from Kirti Monastery, including an explanation of the pretext or conditions under which monks were removed and their current whereabouts;

(5) commends His Holiness the Dalai Lama for his decision to devolve his political power in favor of a democratic system;

(6) congratulates Tibetans living in exile for holding, on March 20, 2011, a competitive, multi-candidate election that was free, fair, and met international electoral standards;

(7) reaffirms the unwavering friendship between the people of the United States and the people of Tibet; and

(8) both—

(A) calls on the Department of State to fully implement the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (subtitle B of title VI of Public Law 107–228; 22 U.S.C. 6901 note), including the stipulation that the Secretary of State seek ''to

establish an office in Lhasa, Tibet, to monitor political, economic, and cultural developments in Tibet'', and also to provide consular protection and citizen services in emergencies; and

(B) urges that the agreement to permit China to open further diplomatic missions in the United States should be contingent upon the establishment of a United States Government consulate in Lhasa, Tibet.

CONDEMNING VIOLENCE BY SYRIA AGAINST JOURNALISTS AND EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE SENATE FOR FREEDOM OF THE PRESS IN SYRIA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 348, S. Res. 391.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 391) condemning violence by the Government of Syria against journalists, and expressing the sense of the Senate on freedom of the press in Syria.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations without amendment and an amendment to the preamble, as follows:

[Omit the part printed in boldface brackets and insert the part printed in italic.]

S. RES. 391

[Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 1738 (2006) obliges states to ensure the safety of journalists in war zones;**]**

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 1738 (2006) stresses the obligations of states under international law to ensure the safety of journalists in war zones;

Whereas, since the uprisings in Syria began in January 2011, the Government of Syria has denied entry to foreign journalists and arrested, abducted, beaten, tortured, and killed journalists, photographers, and bloggers to prevent the free flow of accurate information to the outside world;

Whereas restrictions imposed by the Government of Syria on media have made it extraordinarily difficult to verify death tolls and the exact nature and course of events within the country;

Whereas Syrian state media reports differ significantly from the few independent reports that make their way out of Syria;

Whereas Reporters Without Borders, an international nongovernmental organization that advocates freedom of the press and freedom of information, has listed Bashar al-Assad as a Predator of Freedom of the Press;

Whereas the League of Arab States called for the media to be allowed into Syria during its monitoring mission that was suspended indefinitely on January 28, 2012, due to the ''critical deterioration of the situation'' in Syria;

Whereas freelance journalist Ferzat Jarban was tortured and killed on November 19 or 20, 2011, after filming protests in Al-Qassir, Syria;

Whereas videographer Basil al-Sayed died on December 27, 2011, from a gunshot wound he suffered 5 days earlier at a checkpoint in the Baba Amr neighborhood in the city of Homs, Syria;

Whereas Shukri Abu al-Burghul of the state-owned daily Al Thawra and Radio Damascus died on January 3, 2012, in Damascus, Syria from a gunshot wound to the head he suffered four days earlier;

Whereas Gilles Jacquier, a correspondent with France 2 television, was killed in a grenade explosion on January 11, 2012, while covering demonstrations in the city of Homs;

Whereas freelance journalist Mazhar Tayyara, a videographer and photojournalist who contributed to Agence France-Presse and other international outlets, was killed by government forces' fire in the city of Homs on February 4, 2012;

Whereas New York Times correspondent Anthony Shadid died of an asthma attack on February 16, 2012, while attempting to leave Syria after reporting inside the country for a week, gathering information on the Free Syrian Army and other armed elements of the resistance to the government of President Bashar al-Assad;

Whereas freelance journalist Rami al-Sayed, who filmed videos of Syrian security forces' repressive acts, was killed on February 21, 2012, while covering the bombardment of the city of Homs by Government of Syria forces;

Whereas journalist Marie Colvin of the Sunday Times, a United States citizen, and freelance photojournalist Remi Ochlik were killed on February 22, 2012, after their makeshift press center in Homs was struck by rockets fired by Government of Syria forces;

Whereas, on February 22, 2012, Department of State Spokesman Mark Toner stated, ''[T]oday, we're also clearly deeply troubled and saddened by reports that American journalist Marie Colvin and French journalist Remi Ochlik were killed today in Homs as a result of the intense shelling, the ongoing intense shelling by the Syrian regime. . . . We, of course, extend our deepest condolences to their families and loved ones and just note that their sacrifice in chronicling the daily suffering of the people of Homs stands as a testament to journalism's highest standards.'';

Whereas 13 opposition activists in Syria were killed during a weeklong attempt to rescue 4 foreign journalists, 2 of whom were injured, who were trapped in Homs as a result of the bombardment by the Government of Syria that killed Marie Colvin and Remi Ochlik;

Whereas videographer Anas al-Tarsha, who documented unrest in the besieged city of Homs, was killed by a mortar round while filming the bombardment of the city's Qarabees district on February 24, 2012;

Whereas, from 1992 through 2010, zero journalists were killed in Syria according to the Committee to Protect Journalists; and

Whereas the Government of Syria has continued to arbitrarily arrest and detain prominent Syrian journalists and bloggers:

Mr. REID. I ask that the Senate now vote on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 391) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 391

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 1738 (2006) stresses the obligations of states under international law to ensure the safety of journalists in war zones;

Whereas, since the uprisings in Syria began in January 2011, the Government of Syria has denied entry to foreign journalists and arrested, abducted, beaten, tortured, and killed journalists, photographers, and bloggers to prevent the free flow of accurate information to the outside world;

Whereas restrictions imposed by the Government of Syria on media have made it extraordinarily difficult to verify death tolls and the exact nature and course of events within the country;

Whereas Syrian state media reports differ significantly from the few independent reports that make their way out of Syria;

Whereas Reporters Without Borders, an international nongovernmental organization that advocates freedom of the press and freedom of information, has listed Bashar al-Assad as a Predator of Freedom of the Press;

Whereas the League of Arab States called for the media to be allowed into Syria during its monitoring mission that was suspended indefinitely on January 28, 2012, due to the ''critical deterioration of the situation'' in Syria;

Whereas freelance journalist Ferzat Jarban was tortured and killed on November 19 or 20, 2011, after filming protests in Al-Qassir, Syria;

Whereas videographer Basil al-Sayed died on December 27, 2011, from a gunshot wound he suffered 5 days earlier at a checkpoint in the Baba Amr neighborhood in the city of Homs, Syria;

Whereas Shukri Abu al-Burghul of the state-owned daily Al Thawra and Radio Damascus died on January 3, 2012, in Damascus, Syria from a gunshot wound to the head he suffered four days earlier;

Whereas Gilles Jacquier, a correspondent with France 2 television, was killed in a grenade explosion on January 11, 2012, while covering demonstrations in the city of Homs;

Whereas freelance journalist Mazhar Tayyara, a videographer and photojournalist who contributed to Agence France-Presse and other international outlets, was killed by government forces' fire in the city of Homs on February 4, 2012;

Whereas New York Times correspondent Anthony Shadid died of an asthma attack on February 16, 2012, while attempting to leave Syria after reporting inside the country for a week, gathering information on the Free Syrian Army and other armed elements of the resistance to the government of President Bashar al-Assad;

Whereas freelance journalist Rami al-Sayed, who filmed videos of Syrian security forces' repressive acts, was killed on February 21, 2012, while covering the bombardment of the city of Homs by Government of Syria forces;

Whereas journalist Marie Colvin of the Sunday Times, a United States citizen, and freelance photojournalist Remi Ochlik were killed on February 22, 2012, after their makeshift press center in Homs was struck by rockets fired by Government of Syria forces;

Whereas, on February 22, 2012, Department of State Spokesman Mark Toner stated, ''[T]oday, we're also clearly deeply troubled and saddened by reports that American journalist Marie Colvin and French journalist Remi Ochlik were killed today in Homs as a result of the intense shelling, the ongoing intense shelling by the Syrian regime. . . . We,

of course, extend our deepest condolences to their families and loved ones and just note that their sacrifice in chronicling the daily suffering of the people of Homs stands as a testament to journalism's highest standards.'';

Whereas 13 opposition activists in Syria were killed during a weeklong attempt to rescue 4 foreign journalists, 2 of whom were injured, who were trapped in Homs as a result of the bombardment by the Government of Syria that killed Marie Colvin and Remi Ochlik;

Whereas videographer Anas al-Tarsha, who documented unrest in the besieged city of Homs, was killed by a mortar round while filming the bombardment of the city's Qarabees district on February 24, 2012;

Whereas, from 1992 through 2010, zero journalists were killed in Syria according to the Committee to Protect Journalists; and

Whereas the Government of Syria has continued to arbitrarily arrest and detain prominent Syrian journalists and bloggers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls on the Government of Syria to immediately open the country up to independent and foreign journalists and immediately end its media blackout;

(2) condemns in the strongest possible terms the Government of Syria's abuse, intimidation, and violence towards journalists, videographers, and bloggers;

(3) calls on the Government of Syria to immediately release all journalists, videographers, and bloggers who have been detained, arrested, or imprisoned;

(4) pays tribute to the journalists who have lost their lives while reporting on the conflict in Syria;

(5) commends the bravery and courage of journalists who continue to operate in harm's way;

(6) supports the people of Syria seeking access to a free flow of accurate news and other forms of information;

(7) recognizes the critical role that technology plays in helping independent journalists report the facts on the ground;

(8) condemns all acts of censorship and other restrictions on freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of expression in Syria;

(9) strongly condemns all nations that assist or enable the Government of Syria's ongoing repression of the media; and

(10) reaffirms the centrality of press freedom to efforts by the United States Government to support democracy and promote good governance around the world.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF SENATE IN SUPPORT OF NATO AND NATO SUMMIT BEING HELD MAY 20 THROUGH 21, 2012

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 349, S. Res. 395.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 395) expressing the sense of the Senate in support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the NATO summit to be held in Chicago, Illinois, from May 20 through 21, 2012.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations without amendment and an amendment to the preamble, as follows:

[Omit the part printed in boldface brackets and insert the part printed in italic.]

S. RES. 395

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty, signed April 4, 1949, in Washington, District of Columbia, which created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (referred to in this preamble as ''NATO''), proclaims: ''[Members] are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area. They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defence and for the preservation of peace and security.'';

Whereas NATO has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security cooperation and an enduring instrument for promoting stability in Europe and throughout the world for over 60 years;

Whereas the NATO summit in Chicago, Illinois, is an opportunity to enhance and more deeply entrench those principles, which continue to bind the alliance together and guide our efforts today;

Whereas the new Strategic Concept, approved in Lisbon, **[**Spain**]** *Portugal* in November 2010, affirms that all NATO members ''are determined that NATO will continue to play its unique and essential role in ensuring our common defence and security'' and that NATO ''continues to be effective in a changing world, against new threats, with new capabilities and new partners'';

Whereas the Chicago Summit will mark a critical turning point for NATO and a chance to focus on current operations, future capabilities, and the relationship between NATO and partners around the world;

Whereas the Chicago Summit will be the first NATO summit held in the United States since the 50th anniversary summit was held in Washington, District of Columbia, in 1999 and the first NATO summit held outside of Washington, District of Columbia;

Whereas NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen said, ''Chicago is a city built upon diversity, and on determination. Those are values that underpin NATO too.'';

Whereas the Chicago Summit presents an opportunity to show to the world the Heartland of the United States—the site of the first elevated railway, the first skyscraper in the world, the busiest futures exchange in the world, and the starting point for historic Route 66;

Whereas the thousands of visitors to the Chicago Summit will have the opportunity to enjoy the hospitality of the city of Chicago, the 77 distinct neighborhoods in Chicago, and the State of Illinois; and

Whereas the contributions of generations of immigrants have made the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois what they are today and the ancestral homelands of the immigrants now contribute to making NATO the organization it is today:

Mr. REID. I ask that we now have a vote on this matter, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (No. 395) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 395

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty, signed April 4, 1949, in Washington, District of Columbia, which created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (referred to in this preamble as ''NATO''), proclaims: ''[Members] are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area. They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defence and for the preservation of peace and security.'';

Whereas NATO has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security cooperation and an enduring instrument for promoting stability in Europe and throughout the world for over 60 years;

Whereas the NATO summit in Chicago, Illinois, is an opportunity to enhance and more deeply entrench those principles, which continue to bind the alliance together and guide our efforts today;

Whereas the new Strategic Concept, approved in Lisbon, Portugal in November 2010, affirms that all NATO members ''are determined that NATO will continue to play its unique and essential role in ensuring our common defence and security'' and that NATO ''continues to be effective in a changing world, against new threats, with new capabilities and new partners'';

Whereas the Chicago Summit will mark a critical turning point for NATO and a chance to focus on current operations, future capabilities, and the relationship between NATO and partners around the world;

Whereas the Chicago Summit will be the first NATO summit held in the United States since the 50th anniversary summit was held in Washington, District of Columbia, in 1999 and the first NATO summit held outside of Washington, District of Columbia;

Whereas NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen said, ''Chicago is a city built upon diversity, and on determination. Those are values that underpin NATO too.'';

Whereas the Chicago Summit presents an opportunity to show to the world the Heartland of the United States—the site of the first elevated railway, the first skyscraper in the world, the busiest futures exchange in the world, and the starting point for historic Route 66;

Whereas the thousands of visitors to the Chicago Summit will have the opportunity to enjoy the hospitality of the city of Chicago, the 77 distinct neighborhoods in Chicago, and the State of Illinois; and

Whereas the contributions of generations of immigrants have made the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois what they are today and the ancestral homelands of the immigrants now contribute to making NATO the organization it is today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the service of the brave men and women who have served to safeguard the freedom and security of the United States and the whole of the transatlantic alliance;

(2) honors the sacrifices of United States personnel, allies of the North American

Treaty Organization (referred to in this resolution as ''NATO''), and partners in Afghanistan;

(3) remembers the 63 years NATO has served to ensure peace, security, and stability in Europe and throughout the world;

(4) reaffirms that NATO, through the new Strategic Concept, is oriented for the changing international security environment and the challenges of the future;

(5) urges all NATO members to take concrete steps to implement the Strategic Concept and to utilize the NATO summit in Chicago, Illinois, to address current NATO operations, future capabilities and burden-sharing issues, and the relationship between NATO and partners around the world;

(6) conveys appreciation for the steadfast partnership between NATO and the United States; and

(7) expresses support for the 2012 NATO summit in Chicago.

PROMOTING PEACE AND STABILITY IN SUDAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 350, S. Res. 397.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 397) promoting peace and stability in Sudan, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble, as follows:

[Strike all after the enacting clause and the preamble (the part in boldface brackets) and insert the part printed in italic.]

S. RES. 397

[Whereas conflict between the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North (SPLM–N) has been ongoing since June 2011 in Sudan's border state of South Kordofan and since September 2011 in the border state of Blue Nile, resulting in a humanitarian crisis;

[Whereas the Government of Sudan has refused repeated requests by the United States Government, the United Nations, the African Union, the League of Arab States, nongovernmental organizations, and others to allow humanitarian access to the conflict areas;

[Whereas the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan signed a memorandum of understanding on non-aggression and cooperation in Addis Ababa on February 12, 2012, agreeing to respect each other's sovereignty and refrain from launching any attack against the other, including bombardment;

[Whereas the United Nations estimates that more than 130,000 refugees have fled South Kordofan and Blue Nile for South Sudan, Ethiopia, and elsewhere since June 2011, and hundreds of thousands more have been internally displaced or severely affected by conflict;

[Whereas the Government of Sudan bombed the Yida refugee camp in South Sudan on November 10, 2011;

[Whereas both the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North have reportedly prevented civilians from leaving Blue Nile and Southern Kordofan;

[Whereas the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNET), funded by the United States Agency for International Development, estimated in March 2012 that conflict-affected areas of South Kordofan would deteriorate further in coming weeks to Phase 4 emergency levels of food insecurity (one step before being classified as a famine), due mainly to conflict and government policies that have limited cultivation, displaced the population, restricted trade, and refused access for international humanitarian assistance;

[Whereas the United Nations Security Council issued a statement on February 14, 2012, expressing deep and growing alarm with the rising levels of malnutrition and food insecurity in some areas of Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile, calling on the Government of Sudan to allow immediate access to United Nations personnel, and urging the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to agree to an immediate cessation of hostilities and return to talks to address the issues that have fueled the current conflict;

[Whereas the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees appealed urgently to donors in February 2012 for $145,000,000 to assist refugees from South Kordofan and Blue Nile;

[Whereas President Barack Obama released a statement in June 2011 calling on the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to agree immediately to a ceasefire, end restrictions on humanitarian access and United Nations movements, and agree on security arrangements for Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile States through direct, high-level negotiations as opposed to the use of force;

[Whereas President Obama released a statement on February 2, 2012, strongly condemning the bombing by the Armed Forces of Sudan of civilian populations in Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile States in Sudan, which stated that aerial attacks on civilian targets are unjustified, unacceptable, and a violation of international law and compound the ongoing crisis in these areas;

[Whereas neither South Kordofan nor Blue Nile were able to complete the popular consultation process with the Government of Sudan as stipulated in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) before violence broke out;

[Whereas, despite the independence of South Sudan on July 9, 2011, many key issues between Sudan and South Sudan remain unresolved, including transit fees for oil pipeline use, citizenship, the status of Abyei, and border demarcation;

[Whereas the goal of democratic governance reform in Sudan as envisioned in the CPA has not been met;

[Whereas, in addition to the growing conflict-induced humanitarian and human rights crisis in Sudan's southern border states, the humanitarian crisis and ongoing insecurity in Darfur continues; and

[Whereas the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees estimates that more than 4,000,000 people in Sudan remain internally displaced, and in 2011, though for the first time since the Darfur conflict began, more Darfuris voluntarily returned to their homes (87,000) than were newly displaced (70,000), and additional tens of thousands are being displaced in southern Sudan:**]** Now, therefore, be it

Whereas conflict between the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North (SPLM–N) has been ongoing since June 2011 in Sudan's border state of Southern Kordofan and since September 2011 in the border state of Blue Nile, resulting in a humanitarian crisis;

Whereas the Government of Sudan has refused repeated requests by the United States Government, the United Nations, the African Union, the League of Arab States, nongovernmental organizations, and others to allow humanitarian access to the conflict areas;

Whereas the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan signed a memorandum of understanding on non-aggression and cooperation in Addis Ababa on February 12, 2012, agreeing to respect each other's sovereignty and refrain from launching any attack against the other, including bombardment;

Whereas the United Nations estimates that more than 130,000 refugees have fled Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile for South Sudan, Ethiopia, and elsewhere since June 2011, and hundreds of thousands more have been internally displaced or severely affected by conflict;

Whereas the Government of Sudan bombed the Yida refugee camp in South Sudan on November 10, 2011;

Whereas both the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North have reportedly prevented civilians from leaving Blue Nile and Southern Kordofan;

Whereas the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNET), funded by the United States Agency for International Development, estimated in March 2012 that conflict-affected areas of Southern Kordofan would deteriorate further in coming weeks to Phase 4 emergency levels of food insecurity (one step before being classified as a famine), due mainly to conflict and government policies that have limited cultivation, displaced the population, restricted trade, and refused access for international humanitarian assistance;

Whereas the United Nations Security Council issued a statement on February 14, 2012, expressing deep and growing alarm with the rising levels of malnutrition and food insecurity in some areas of Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile, calling on the Government of Sudan to allow immediate access to United Nations personnel, and urging the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to agree to an immediate cessation of hostilities and return to talks to address the issues that have fueled the current conflict;

Whereas the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees appealed urgently to donors in February 2012 for $145,000,000 to assist refugees from Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile;

Whereas President Barack Obama released a statement in June 2011 calling on the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to agree immediately to a ceasefire, end restrictions on humanitarian access and United Nations movements, and agree on security arrangements for Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile States through direct, high-level negotiations as opposed to the use of force;

Whereas President Obama released a statement on February 2, 2012, strongly condemning the bombing by the Armed Forces of Sudan of civilian populations in Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile States in Sudan, which stated that aerial attacks on civilian targets are unjustified, unacceptable, and a violation of international law and compound the ongoing crisis in these areas;

Whereas neither Southern Kordofan nor Blue Nile were able to complete the popular consultation process with the Government of Sudan as stipulated in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) before violence broke out;

Whereas, despite the independence of South Sudan on July 9, 2011, many key issues between Sudan and South Sudan remain unresolved, including transit fees for oil pipeline use, citizenship, the status of Abyei, and border demarcation;

Whereas the goal of democratic governance reform in Sudan as envisioned in the CPA has not been met;

Whereas, in addition to the growing conflict-induced humanitarian and human rights crisis in Sudan's southern border states, the humanitarian crisis and ongoing insecurity in Darfur continues; and

Whereas the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees estimates that, although for the first time since the Darfur conflict began, more Darfuris (87,000) voluntarily returned to their homes than were newly displaced (70,000), tens of thousands of additional people are still being displaced in southern Sudan and more than 4,000,000 people in Sudan remain internally displaced in total: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, [That the Senate—

[(1) welcomes the memorandum of understanding on non-aggression and cooperation signed between the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan in Addis Ababa on February 12, 2012;

[(2) calls on the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to reach a mutually beneficial political agreement;

[(3) urges the Government of Sudan to allow immediate and unrestricted humanitarian access to South Kordofan, Blue Nile, and all other conflict-affected areas of Sudan;

[(4) encourages the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to declare a cessation of hostilities to allow food and essential supplies to reach affected civilians;

[(5) implores the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan to refrain from any support of proxy forces;

[(6) urges the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to allow civilians to leave the two states voluntarily and seek refuge in more secure areas; and

[(7) supports the current efforts of the Obama Administration, working with partners in the international community, to facilitate humanitarian access to affected areas, to encourage all relevant parties to return to the negotiation table to reach agreements associated with the conclusion of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, to mitigate violence in the interim, and to allow full humanitarian access.]

That the Senate—

(1) welcomes the memorandum of understanding on non-aggression and cooperation signed between the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan in Addis Ababa on February 12, 2012;

(2) calls on the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to reach a mutually beneficial political agreement;

(3) urges the Government of Sudan to allow immediate and unrestricted humanitarian access to Southern Kordofan, Blue Nile, and all other conflict-affected areas of Sudan;

(4) encourages the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to declare a cessation of hostilities to allow food and essential supplies to reach affected civilians;

(5) implores the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan to refrain from any support of proxy forces;

(6) urges the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to allow civilians to leave Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile voluntarily and seek refuge in more secure areas; and

(7) supports the current efforts of the Obama Administration, working with partners in the international community, to facilitate humanitarian access to affected areas, to encourage all relevant parties to return to the negotiation table to reach agreements associated with the conclusion of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, to mitigate violence in the interim, and to allow full humanitarian access.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I ask the Senate now vote on adoption of the resolution, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (No. 397), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 397

Whereas conflict between the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North (SPLM–N) has been ongoing since June 2011 in Sudan's border state of Southern Kordofan and since September 2011 in the border state of Blue Nile, resulting in a humanitarian crisis;

Whereas the Government of Sudan has refused repeated requests by the United States Government, the United Nations, the African Union, the League of Arab States, nongovernmental organizations, and others to allow humanitarian access to the conflict areas;

Whereas the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan signed a memorandum of understanding on non-aggression and cooperation in Addis Ababa on February 12, 2012, agreeing to respect each other's sovereignty and refrain from launching any attack against the other, including bombardment;

Whereas the United Nations estimates that more than 130,000 refugees have fled Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile for South Sudan, Ethiopia, and elsewhere since June 2011, and hundreds of thousands more have been internally displaced or severely affected by conflict;

Whereas the Government of Sudan bombed the Yida refugee camp in South Sudan on November 10, 2011;

Whereas both the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North have reportedly prevented civilians from leaving Blue Nile and Southern Kordofan;

Whereas the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNET), funded by the United States Agency for International Development, estimated in March 2012 that conflict-affected areas of Southern Kordofan would deteriorate further in coming weeks to Phase 4 emergency levels of food insecurity (one step before being classified as a famine), due mainly to conflict and government policies that have limited cultivation, displaced the population, restricted trade, and refused access for international humanitarian assistance;

Whereas the United Nations Security Council issued a statement on February 14, 2012, expressing deep and growing alarm with the rising levels of malnutrition and food insecurity in some areas of Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile, calling on the Government of Sudan to allow immediate access to United Nations personnel, and urging the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to agree to an immediate cessation of hostilities and return to talks to address the issues that have fueled the current conflict;

Whereas the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees appealed urgently to donors in February 2012 for $145,000,000 to assist refugees from Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile;

Whereas President Barack Obama released a statement in June 2011 calling on the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to agree immediately to a ceasefire, end restrictions on humanitarian access and United Nations movements, and agree on security arrangements for Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile States through direct, high-level negotiations as opposed to the use of force;

Whereas President Obama released a statement on February 2, 2012, strongly condemning the bombing by the Armed Forces of Sudan of civilian populations in Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile States in Sudan, which stated that aerial attacks on civilian targets are unjustified, unacceptable, and a violation of international law and compound the ongoing crisis in these areas;

Whereas neither Southern Kordofan nor Blue Nile were able to complete the popular consultation process with the Government of Sudan as stipulated in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) before violence broke out;

Whereas, despite the independence of South Sudan on July 9, 2011, many key issues between Sudan and South Sudan remain unresolved, including transit fees for oil pipeline use, citizenship, the status of Abyei, and border demarcation;

Whereas the goal of democratic governance reform in Sudan as envisioned in the CPA has not been met;

Whereas in addition to the growing conflict-induced humanitarian and human rights crisis in Sudan's southern border states, the humanitarian crisis and ongoing insecurity in Darfur continues; and

Whereas the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees estimates that, although for the first time since the Darfur conflict began, more Darfuris (87,000) voluntarily returned to their homes than were newly displaced (70,000), tens of thousands of additional people are still being displaced in southern Sudan and more than 4,000,000 people in Sudan remain internally displaced in total: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) welcomes the memorandum of understanding on non-aggression and cooperation signed between the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan in Addis Ababa on February 12, 2012;

(2) calls on the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to reach a mutually beneficial political agreement;

(3) urges the Government of Sudan to allow immediate and unrestricted humanitarian access to Southern Kordofan, Blue Nile, and all other conflict-affected areas of Sudan;

(4) encourages the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to declare a cessation of hostilities to allow food and essential supplies to reach affected civilians;

(5) implores the Governments of Sudan and South Sudan to refrain from any support of proxy forces;

(6) urges the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement-North to allow civilians to leave Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile voluntarily and seek refuge in more secure areas; and

(7) supports the current efforts of the Obama Administration, working with partners in the international community, to facilitate humanitarian access to affected areas, to encourage all relevant parties to return to the negotiation table to reach agreements associated with the conclusion of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, to mitigate violence in the interim, and to allow full humanitarian access.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to the immediate consideration en bloc of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 414, S. Res. 415, and S. Res. 416.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the three resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate on any of those three measures, and any statements related to the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

The resolutions, with their preambles, read as follows:

S. RES. 414

Commemorating the 125th anniversary of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke

Whereas the University of North Carolina at Pembroke (referred to in this preamble as ''the University'') was founded on March 7, 1887, in Robeson County, North Carolina by an act of the General Assembly of North Carolina;

Whereas the University, originally named the Croatan Normal School, was created in response to a petition from the Indian people of Robeson County;

Whereas the University was founded for the purpose of training American Indian school teachers;

Whereas the University opened in the fall of 1887 with 15 students and 1 teacher;

Whereas the University moved to its present location in Pembroke, North Carolina in 1909;

Whereas a 2-year program beyond high school was added to the University in 1926;

Whereas the length of the program of college studies at the University was extended to 4 years in 1939;

Whereas, in 1941, the General Assembly of North Carolina changed the name of the University to Pembroke State College for Indians;

Whereas, until 1953, the University was the only State-supported 4-year college for Indians in the United States;

Whereas, in 1969, the General Assembly of North Carolina changed the name of the University to Pembroke State University and made the University a regional State university that provided instruction at both the undergraduate level and the graduate level;

Whereas, in 1972, the General Assembly of North Carolina established the 17-campus University of North Carolina system and made Pembroke State University 1 of the constituent institutions of the system;

Whereas, on July 1, 1996, Pembroke State University became the University of North Carolina at Pembroke;

Whereas, today, approximately 6,000 students from diverse backgrounds are enrolled in 41 undergraduate programs and 17 graduate programs at the University of North Carolina at Pembroke; and

Whereas March 7, 2012, marks the 125th anniversary of the founding of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commemorates the 125th anniversary of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke.

S. RES. 415

Designating April 4, 2012, as ''National Association of Junior Auxiliaries Day''

Whereas the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries and the members of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries provide valuable service and leadership opportunities for women who wish to take an active role in their communities;

Whereas the mission of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries is to encourage member chapters to render charitable services that—

(1) are beneficial to the general public; and

(2) place a particular emphasis on providing for the needs of children; and

Whereas since the founding of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries in 1941, the organization has provided strength and inspiration to women who want to effect positive change in their communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 4, 2012, as ''National Association of Junior Auxiliaries Day'';

(2) recognizes the great contributions made by members of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries to their communities and to the people of the United States; and

(3) especially commends the work of the members of the National Association of Junior Auxiliaries to better the lives of children in the United States.

S. RES. 416

Supporting the designation of April as Parkinson's Awareness Month

Whereas Parkinson's disease is the second most common neurodegenerative disease in the United States, second only to Alzheimer's disease;

Whereas there is inadequate comprehensive data on the incidence and prevalence of Parkinson's disease, as of 2011, it is estimated that the disease affects from 500,000 to 1,500,000 people in the United States;

Whereas although research suggests the cause of Parkinson's disease is a combination of genetic and environmental factors, the exact cause and progression of the disease is still unknown;

Whereas there is no objective test for Parkinson's disease, and the rate of misdiagnosis can be high;

Whereas symptoms of Parkinson's disease vary from person to person and include tremors, slowness, difficulty with balance, swallowing, chewing, speaking, rigidity, cognitive problems, dementia, mood disorders, such as depression and anxiety, constipation, skin problems, and sleep disruptions;

Whereas medications mask some symptoms of Parkinson's disease for a limited amount of time each day, often with dose-limiting side effects;

Whereas ultimately the medications and treatments lose their effectiveness, generally after 4 to 8 years, leaving the person unable to move, speak, or swallow;

Whereas there is no cure, therapy, or drug to slow or halt the progression of Parkinson's disease; and

Whereas increased education and research are needed to help find more effective treatments with fewer side effects and, ultimately, an effective treatment or cure for Parkinson's disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of April as Parkinson's Awareness Month;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Parkinson's Awareness Month;

(3) continues to support research to find better treatments, and eventually, a cure for Parkinson's disease;

(4) recognizes the people living with Parkinson's who participate in vital clinical trials to advance knowledge of the disease; and

(5) commends the dedication of local and regional organizations, volunteers, and millions of Americans across the country working to improve the quality of life of persons living with Parkinson's disease and their families.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 5

Mr. REID. 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 assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading, but I object to my own request. The reason I am doing this is to place the bill on the calendar under rule XIV.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read the second time on the next legislative day.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, March 29, through Monday, April 16, the majority leader, Senator WEBB, and Senator ROCKEFELLER be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO LAURA DOVE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was surprised earlier today when I was told by David Schiappa and Gary Myrick that somebody I care about a great deal is going to leave the Senate. I am so surprised. I served here when her dad was the Parliamentarian and I thought so much of him. He was a very courageous man. He jeopardized his position here in the Senate doing what he thought was right. He looked at the law. It didn't matter to him if it were a Republican asking for a decision or a Democrat, he did what he thought was right. I have so much admiration for Bob Dove.

Then I have gotten to know his daughter Laura, whom we all care about a great deal. She is somebody I can joke with or be serious with. She understands what my obligation is here as the majority leader and she doesn't hold it against me. She knows I am trying to do what I think is right.

She has been dedicated to making the Senate a better place during her 10 years as the assistant Republican secretary. This is her last week with us so, for me, since we are going to go out of session, this is her last day with us. She is an example of how this operation works.

Mr. President, I read through this stack of stuff very quickly. Could I have arranged all that myself? No. It is the Laura Doves of the Senate who allow us to get our work done. She was a page, just like these young boys and girls here, as a teenager. She may work for the other party but, as far as I am concerned, I never hesitated to ask her a question when somebody on this side wasn't available and she never hesitated to tell me what she thought or give me the information I was seeking. Her work is essential and she has done it with dedication.

Laura, I really have appreciated our relationship. Please give my warm regards to your very fine father. I have heard a little about what you are going to do in the next little bit. I hope as you have that motor home and come to Las Vegas, hopefully this summer, you will come to Searchlight, because that will be a place you have never been—I am sure of that. What could I do with you there, though? I could show you my home.

Anyway, I am so grateful to you for being the nice person you are.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 2, TO MONDAY, APRIL 16, 2012

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn and convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business conducted on the following dates. The reason we are going through this pro forma session which we thought we were through with is the House has not acted yet on agreeing to what we have done. But it is very clear there will be no recess appointments, period, because we are not going to be in recess, we hope. We hope the House will go along with us. But that is what Senator MCCONNELL and I have worked for and it has been accomplished.

So I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn and convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business conducted, on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Monday, April 2, at 2 p.m.; Thursday, April 5, at 11 a.m.; Monday, April 9, at 10 a.m.; Thursday, April 12, at 2 p.m.; and that the Senate adjourn on Thursday, April 12, until 2 p.m. on Monday, April 16, unless the Senate has received a message from the House that it has adopted S. Con. Res. 38—which will be the adjournment resolution—and if the Senate has received such a message, the Senate will stand in adjournment until 2 p.m. on Monday, April 16, under the provisions of S. Con. Res. 38; further, that when the Senate convenes at 2 p.m. on Monday, April 16, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, following any leader remarks, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2230, the Paying a Fair Share Act, with the time until 4:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; and that at 4:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be two rollcall votes then, on Monday, April 16. The first vote will be on Judge-to-be Thacker, we hope—that will be the fourth circuit—and the second vote will be a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the tax measure that is on the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 2, 2012, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent it adjourn under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, April 2, unless the Senate has received a message from the House that it has adopted S. Con. Res. 38, in which case the Senate will stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, April 16, under the provisions of S. Con. Res. 38.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:26 p.m., adjourned until Monday, April 2, 2012, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

PATRICK A. MILES, JR., OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE MARGARET M. CHIARA, RESIGNED.

DANNY CHAPPELLE WILLIAMS, SR., OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DAVID E. O'MEILIA, TERM EXPIRED.

PATRICK J. WILKERSON, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN WILLIAM LOYD, TERM EXPIRED.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

PATRICIA K. FALCONE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY, VICE PHILIP E. COYLE, III.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DOUGLAS M. GRIFFITHS, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MOZAMBIQUE.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

MARIA ROSARIO JACKSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2016, VICE TERENCE ALAN TEACHOUT, TERM EXPIRED.

DISCHARGED NOMINATIONS

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of the following nominations by unanimous consent and the nominations were confirmed:

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF VICE ADM. JOHN P. CURRIER, TO BE VICE ADMIRAL.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF REAR ADM. PAUL F. ZUKUNFT, TO BE VICE ADMIRAL.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF VICE ADM. MANSON K. BROWN, TO BE VICE ADMIRAL.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF REAR ADM. PETER V. NEFFENGER, TO BE VICE ADMIRAL.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PATRICK K. ABOAGYE AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM F. CSISAR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 1, 2012.

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination by unanimous consent and the nomination was confirmed:

CHRISTY L. ROMERO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 29, 2012:

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

PHYLLIS NICHAMOFF SEGAL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2013.

LISA M. QUIROZ, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING FEBRUARY 8, 2014.

MARGUERITE W. KONDRACKE, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 10, 2014.

RICHARD CHRISTMAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2012.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

MARTIN J. GRUENBERG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 27, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

THOMAS J. CURRY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL A. HAMMER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (PUBLIC AFFAIRS).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CHARLES DEWITT MCCONNELL, OF OHIO, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (FOSSIL ENERGY).

DAVID T. DANIELSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY).

LADORIS GUESS HARRIS, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MINORITY ECONOMIC IMPACT, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

GREGORY HOWARD WOODS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

JAMES R. HANNAH, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2013.

DANIEL J. BECKER, OF UTAH, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2013.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ROBERTA S. JACOBSON, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (WESTERN HEMISPHERE AFFAIRS).

ELIZABETH M. COUSENS, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

ELIZABETH M. COUSENS, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MICHAEL E. HOROWITZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

REBECCA M. BLANK, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

JON D. LEIBOWITZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSIONER FOR A TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM SEPTEMBER 26, 2010.

MAUREEN K. OHLHAUSEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSIONER FOR A TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM SEPTEMBER 26, 2011.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KATHRYN KENEALLY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MAURICE A. JONES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

THOMAS HOENIG, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

DEEPA GUPTA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2016.

CHRISTOPHER MERRILL, OF IOWA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2016.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

STEPHANIE ORLANDO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2011.

STEPHANIE ORLANDO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2014.

GARY BLUMENTHAL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2013.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

WENDY M. SPENCER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

MARY JOHN MILLER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

KATHLEEN KERRIGAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

ALASTAIR M. FITZPAYNE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

MARGARET ANN SHERRY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

EDUARDO ARRIOLA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2016.

J. KELLY RYAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 20, 2012.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

MICHAEL JAMES WARREN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2014.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

DAVID J. MCMILLAN, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY BOARD OF THE SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.

WENONA SINGEL, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY BOARD OF THE SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ANUJ CHANG DESAI, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2011.

ANUJ CHANG DESAI, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014.

DENNIS J. ERBY, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

EARL W. GAST, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ANNE CLAIRE RICHARD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (POPULATION, REFUGEES, AND MIGRATION).

TARA D. SONENSHINE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

ROBERT E. WHITEHEAD, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE TOGOLESE REPUBLIC.

LARRY LEON PALMER, OF GEORGIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BARBADOS, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ST. KITTS AND NEVIS, SAINT LUCIA, ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, THE COMMONWEALTH OF DOMINICA, GRENADA, AND SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES.

JONATHAN DON FARRAR, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA.

PHYLLIS MARIE POWERS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO REPUBLIC OF NICARAGUA.

NANCY J. POWELL, OF IOWA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, PERSONAL RANK OF CAREER AMBASSADOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO INDIA.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

BRUCE J. SHERRICK, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CORPORATION.

CHESTER JOHN CULVER, OF IOWA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CORPORATION.

JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL FELLOWSHIP FOUNDATION

CATHERINE ALLGOR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL FELLOWSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 27, 2014.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

THOMAS M. HARRIGAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF DRUG ENFORCEMENT.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GINA K. ABERCROMBIE-WINSTANLEY, OF OHIO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MALTA.

JULISSA REYNOSO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ORIENTAL REPUBLIC OF URUGUAY.

WILLIAM E. TODD, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF CAMBODIA.

JACOB WALLES, OF DELAWARE, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE TUNISIAN REPUBLIC.

PAMELA A. WHITE, OF MAINE, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI.

JOHN CHRISTOPHER STEVENS, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO LIBYA.

TRACEY ANN JACOBSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOSOVO.

KENNETH MERTEN, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CROATIA.

MARK A. PEKALA, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA.

RICHARD B. NORLAND, OF IOWA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO GEORGIA.

JEFFREY D. LEVINE, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA.

FREDERICK D. BARTON, OF MAINE, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (CONFLICT AND STABILIZATION OPERATIONS).

FREDERICK D. BARTON, OF MAINE, TO BE COORDINATOR FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND STABILIZATION.

LINDA THOMAS-GREENFIELD, OF LOUISIANA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

JEREMIAH O'HEAR NORTON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JULY 15, 2013.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GREGORY K. DAVIS, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH OLGA FORD AND ENDING WITH MARGARET SHU TEASDALE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 2, 2012.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TERRY L. MURPHREE AND ENDING WITH ANDREW J. WYLIE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 2, 2012.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MORGAN D. HAAS AND ENDING WITH STEPHEN L. WIXOM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 29, 2012.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE COMMANDANT OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 47:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JOHN P. CURRIER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 50:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. PAUL F. ZUKUNFT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 50:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. MANSON K. BROWN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 50:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. PETER V. NEFFENGER

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PATRICK K. ABOAGYE AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM F. CSISAR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 1, 2012.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

CHRISTY L. ROMERO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMEMBERING MSG CLARENCE O. LYALL

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man who put his life in harm's way for our country as a member of the iconic 101st Airborne Division's Easy Company during World War II. MSG Clarence Odell Lyall, a longtime resident of Leonardtown, Maryland, passed away on March 19.

The 101st Airborne Division was created in 1942 to put American boots on the ground in some of the most treacherous enemy-held territory—in possibly the most dangerous way possible. Paratrooper tactics were still very new, and the risks of jumping out of an aircraft, let alone into a warzone, were enough to give even some of our bravest soldiers pause. But for the men who were formed into the Division's E Company, known as ''Easy Company,'' landing safely on the ground was only the first obstacle.

On June 6, 1944, Clarence—''Clancy,'' to those of us who were fortunate to know him—jumped with Easy Company a few miles from Utah Beach in the opening hours of Operation Overlord, and he landed in a tree. He was so laden with heavy equipment that another soldier had to cut him down to safety. After the Normandy beachhead was secured, Clancy fought in France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Germany in Operations Market Garden and the Battle of the Bulge. The exploits of Easy Company were highlighted in the book Band of Brothers and the television miniseries of the same name.

Clancy's service to our country continued long after the Second World War came to a close. After the war, Clancy was honorably discharged. But he re-enlisted and went on to a military career that took him from occupation duty in West Germany to service in the Korean War and even a stint as an observer at the Battle of Dien Bien Phu in Vietnam in 1954, escaping the besieged town just two weeks before the fall of its French garrison. Over the course of his career, Clancy made an astounding four combat jumps, earned twenty-five decorations and citations, and retired as a Master Sergeant.

Since leaving the Army, Clancy continued to serve his country and community as a VFW Commander, President of the Veterans of the Battle of the Bulge, and President of the American Legion Vice Commander Lions Club. He served on the Southern Maryland Veterans Advisory Board and was a member of the Order of the Purple Heart in support of our wounded veterans.

I was proud to represent Clancy in Congress for so many years, and I continue to be in awe of what he and others in Easy Company and across the Armed Forces achieved during World War II. Their sacrifices, their courage, their bonds of brotherhood through unspeakable difficulty have ensured the lasting triumph of democracy.

Clancy Lyall was my dear friend, and I join in thanking Clancy for his service to this nation and to our community in Southern Maryland, and I offer my condolences to his wife, Liz, their five children, eight grandchildren, and one great-grandchild.

PROTECTING ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system:

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5, the so-called HEALTH Act. This misguided legislation undermines Medicare, raises deficits and restricts states' rights.

Last year, House Republicans voted to end the Medicare guarantee for seniors. Fortunately, Senate Democrats blocked this dangerous proposal from becoming law. Now, House Republicans are trying again to dismantle the program in their fiscal year 2013 budget proposal.

The Republican proposal would end the Medicare guarantee by pushing future seniors into the private insurance market with a voucher that fails to keep up with the rising costs of health care. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the Republican voucher proposal could force future seniors to pay $6,400 more for health care every year. Republicans claim that shifting rising health care costs onto future seniors will save billions of dollars. What do House Republicans proposed do with those savings? Reinvest in Medicare? Increase funding for education? Reduce the national debt? Remarkably, House Republicans are proposing to take Medicare dollars from future seniors to give a new $150,000 tax cut to the wealthiest individuals and corporations in America today. House Republicans introduced H.R. 5 to distract attention from their radical plans to dismantle Medicare and give more handouts to billionaires.

H.R. 5 repeals the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) created by the Affordable Care Act. IPAB was established in the new health care law to protect Medicare's long-term sustainability. The Board will do this by keeping program costs at a manageable level and preventing special interests from delaying implementation of reforms that strengthen Medicare.

IPAB will be composed of fifteen non-political experts, including doctors, consumers and senior advocates recommended by Congressional leaders, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. If Medicare costs exceed certain targets, these experts will make recommendations to Congress on ways to stabilize Medicare by reforming payment and delivery systems. Congress retains the power to reject these recommendations and pass their own reforms to reduce Medicare spending. IPAB experts are prohibited by law from recommending changes to Medicare that ration care, increase seniors' costs, reduce benefits or restrict eligibility. IPAB does not harm Medicare or seniors, but eliminating IPAB would weaken Medicare and raise the deficit.

The Congressional Budget Office found that repealing IPAB will add $3 billion to deficits over the next ten years. To offset this cost, House Republicans impose new federal rules to legal cases involving medical malpractice, product liability, health insurance and related issues. The broad provisions of this bill would offer new protections to drug companies, nursing homes, insurance companies and HMOs. These new restrictions would severely limit a patient's ability to recover damages suffered as a result of medical negligence, defective products or irresponsible insurance products. Every year, approximately 200,000 severe medical injuries are caused by negligence. Only seventeen percent of these patients ever file a malpractice claim. Patients who do seek legal recourse may not obtain full and just compensation for their injuries due to the caps on awards imposed by H.R. 5.

The National Conference of State Legislatures strongly opposes this federal mandate on states arguing that federal medical malpractice legislation is unnecessary. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office analysis of H.R. 5 noted the new medical malpractice caps ''might cause providers to exercise less caution, resulting in an increase in the number of medical injuries attributable to negligence.''

I urge my colleagues to reject these extreme and unprecedented changes mandated to state medical malpractice laws that will result in less justice for victims, less patient safety, and less flexibility for states to make their own laws.

Further, I urge my colleagues to stand up for seniors and protect Medicare by opposing H.R. 5.

HONORING CODY PAE

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Cody Pae of the Fulton High School Wrestling team for winning the Class 2 Missouri State Wrestling Championship in the 126-pound weight class.

Mr. Pae and his coaches should be commended for all their hard work throughout the

regular season and for bringing home the state title in the Class 2 126-pound weight class to his school and community. This is his third state medal and first state title.

I ask that you join me in recognizing Mr. Pae for a job well done.

CALVARY EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF INDIAN ROCKS BEACH, FLORIDA CELEBRATES ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Calvary Episcopal Church of Indian Rocks Beach, Florida, which I have the privilege to represent, will celebrate its 50th anniversary of service to our community next month and I would ask my colleagues to join me in saying congratulations to the members of this tremendous family oriented church.

The effort to establish this church began in 1954 and in April of 1962, this small church located on a beautiful piece of waterfront property opened its doors. With its mission statement expressing the congregation's belief that "God is calling us to make known His truth and to convey His love to all," Calvary Episcopal has become a key part of this beach community.

The church's energetic and beloved leader is Father Robert Wagenseil. Father Bob as he is affectionately called, traveled from New York 16 years ago to pay the church a visit, and never left. Together with the church's Deacon, The Reverend Melissa Sands, and Music Director and Parish Administrator Lynn Vera, Calvary Episcopal and Father Bob serve the church community in a combination of traditional and unique ways.

In addition to their wonderful music, Father Bob's inspirational messages, and the prayers they share together, the families of Calvary Episcopal reach out to help feed the hungry through an exceptional volunteer food bank. They teach our children through Sunday school programs and even a unique summer sailing school led by Father Bob. He tells me that one of his highlights every year is the graduation ceremony for his Intrepid Sailors.

They provide computer skills training in their church computer lab to help the unemployed and the underemployed. And Father Bob and the church have formed a special bond with the local fire fighting community and in particular Pinellas Suncoast Fire and Rescue and the Indian Rocks Volunteer Firemen's Association.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege to worship at Calvary Episcopal with my family and I can tell you that Father Bob and the members of his church always find new ways to amaze me both spiritually and through the compassion they show their neighbors in need. Please join me in saying congratulations to the members of Calvary Episcopal on their first 50 years of ministry and service.

RECOGNIZING THE TOWN OF LURAY, VIRGINIA AS IT CELEBRATES ITS 200TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ERIC CANTOR

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the Town of Luray, Virginia as it celebrates its 200th anniversary.

The Town of Luray was founded in 1812 and is the county seat of Page County, Virginia. Tucked away in the rolling hills of the Shenandoah Valley, Luray boasts of breathtaking views and is steeped in rich history.

Perhaps best known for the Luray Caverns, Luray is home to the largest and most popular caverns in the East. Upon its discovery by Andrew Campbell on August 13th, 1878, the Smithsonian Institute sent nine scientists to examine the caverns and reported the following: ". . . it is safe to say that there is probably no other cave in the world more completely and profusely decorated with stalactite and stalagmite ornamentation than that of Luray." Even today, this sentiment remains the same. The Luray Caverns now attract more than 500,000 visitors each year from around the world. Luray is lucky to be home to such a historic and significant token of natural beauty.

There is no doubt why the Town of Luray is such a popular attraction for those just passing through or visiting from many states away. When not touring the caverns, you can find visitors of Luray enjoying the 106-mile scenic Skyline Drive, or nestled into a cozy bed and breakfast. The Appalachian Trail also passes through Luray, where hikers can climb through the peaks and valleys of the Shenandoah region and explore the area first-hand.

Luray residents will celebrate and honor the Town's rich history with events and activities throughout the year, which began with a "Celebrate Luray" event back in February.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the citizens of Luray as they celebrate the town's bicentennial, and wishing them all the best for their continued growth and success.

HONORING ANDREW RODRIGUEZ, WINNER OF THE 2011 JAMES E. SULLIVAN AWARD

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Alexandria, Virginia resident Andrew Rodriguez, on his receipt of the highly-esteemed Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) 2011 James E. Sullivan Award. The award honors the nation's outstanding amateur athlete and has annually been presented since 1930. Finalists were selected from personal nominations following a review by the AAU Sullivan Award Executive Committee. Renowned recipients of the Award include: Mark Spitz, Jackie Joyner-Kersee, Florence Joyner, Peyton Manning, Michael Phelps, J.J. Redick, Tim Tebow, and Shawn Johnson, just to name a few.

As you may know, the AAU is dedicated to promoting amateur athletics throughout this nation and is one of the largest non-profit volunteer sports organizations in the U.S. For over 100 years, AAU has remained committed to helping young people develop as both athletes and as valued citizens of their communities. The Sullivan Award, which is in its 82nd year, making it even older than the Heisman trophy, salutes amateur athletes who not only succeed in sports, but who also exhibit strong moral character in their daily lives.

In order to be considered, Sullivan Award nominees must demonstrate talent, excellent character, leadership and sportsmanship— all qualities that Andrew has certainly surpassed during his career at the United States Military Academy at West Point. He recently received the Army's first Campbell Trophy and the National Football Foundation National Scholar-Athlete award, which recognizes the nation's best in combined academic success, community leadership, and performance on the football field. Andrew currently carries a 4.14 GPA as a mechanical engineering major and ranks third academically in his class of 1,052 cadets.

In addition to his exemplar character and scholarly record, Andrew is a senior linebacker on Army's football team and delivered 140 career tackles in 23 career games. Andrew suffered what many thought was a career-ending injury and missed the entire 2010 football season, but through determination and hard work, recovered and returned for the 2011 season as team captain.

Andrew is an outstanding leader both on the field and in the classroom. He has been very active in giving back to his community and honoring our military by spending many hours visiting the injured at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. He follows his father, Commanding General of the U.S. Army Forces Command David Rodriguez, and sister Amy, in a family tradition at West Point.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to ask my colleagues to join AAU and myself in congratulating Andrew on his outstanding achievement. We can all see that he is an exceptional, strong leader, and I very much look forward to following his continued success. It is truly an honor to represent Andrew and his family in the United States Congress, and I sincerely thank them for their commitment to our nation.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF DR. J.O. "ROCKY" MAYNES JR. AND BEKI SIGWORTH-MAYNES

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to congratulate Rocky and Beki Maynes on the occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary—a milestone reached January 19, 2012 and celebrated by the couple's ten children, thirty grandchildren, four great-grandchildren and other family and close friends. Verma and I have known and worked with this wonderful couple for many years and we sincerely wish them our heart-felt congratulations.

Rocky and Beki met at Arizona State College, (now ASU), where Beki was studying

music on a scholarship, and Rocky was pursuing a degree in education and language studies. In their eventual careers that followed, Rocky became the Director of Migrant Children Education for the State of Arizona, a position he held for many years until his retirement in 1990. Prior to being Director, he served as a dedicated teacher to countless Arizona high school and college students. Beki's leadership as president of the Glendale Women's Club and Glendale Historical Society helped advance both organizations' important missions, yet her most valued role remained as a mother to her and Rocky's large, ever-growing family.

Anyone who knows Rocky and Beki can attest to their great love for all of their children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren—a love deeply rooted first in their devotion to one another. Yet, this couple, time and time again, looked to the larger community and its needs, prompting Rocky and Beki to be proactive in serving others and furthering access to high-quality education for all children. Such efforts have proven to benefit numerous Arizona families, a testament to Rocky and Beki and especially their marriage, a source of continued strength and support for both of them.

In celebrating Rocky and Beki's 60th Anniversary, we reflect on the life they have built with one another, and join in congratulating them on what truly is an accomplishment of great significance.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Dr. and Mrs. Maynes on their 60th wedding anniversary and join with their family in wishing them many more years of continued happiness, health, and innumerable blessings.

HONORING MRS. PATRICIA ANDRADE

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Women's History month, I rise today to honor Patricia Andrade, a remarkable leader in the South Florida community.

Mrs. Andrade was born in Venezuela and has been living in the United States for more than 20 years. She holds both a law degree from Universidad Santa Maria and an International Diploma in Human Rights from the United Nations Association in Venezuela. These academic achievements have directly contributed to her campaign against human rights abuses by Hugo Chavez, following his rise to power.

In 2004, Mrs. Andrade founded the Venezuela Awareness Foundation, an organization whose focus is denouncing and defending human rights in Venezuela. Her commitment to democracy and respect for human rights around the world is a daily battle, yet she perseveres and finds motivation in all the Venezuelans living under oppression today. Mrs. Andrade works to keep close contact with political prisoners' family members and goes to great lengths to alleviate their economic hardships. Once a year, she works to promote education in Venezuela by providing political prisoners' children with school supplies including uniforms, books, and registration expenses.

Mrs. Andrade is also a weekly columnist in Miami's newspaper El Nuevo Herald, along with other Venezuelan online news sites. To further promote awareness of Venezuela's current situation and the abuse of human rights, she participates in different forums and conferences throughout South Florida and Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Mrs. Patricia Andrade for her continued service to the South Florida community and to all Venezuelans who continue to be oppressed daily by Chavez' fist. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual and wish her continued success.

HONORING GREENVILLE INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an institution noted for its resounding leadership, the Greenville Industrial College of Greenville, Mississippi.

Greenville Industrial College was founded in 1904 by Greenville native, Reverend Dr. A.B. Bolden. Dr. Bolden, along with other community pioneers purchased the land for the Greenville Industrial College from Dr. E.P. Brown and his family in the early 20th century.

The two-story brick building was located in the African-American community of ''Brown's Addition'', named after Dr. E.P. Brown. It was under the leadership of Dr. Bolden that the first chapter of this dynamic organization's history began.

The mission of the Greenville Industrial College is to provide African-American students with the necessary skills to make a successful transition to post secondary education or work, and to prepare these students to successfully compete in a global market. Since the 1900s, the college has offered career and technology programs which include theology, masonry, carpentry and machinery.

The college has produced many prominent members of society which include the famous Bishop Clarence LaVaughn Franklin, Willie Richardson of the National Football League Baltimore Colts, and Walter Jake Turnbull, founder of the Harlem Boys Choir.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Greenville Industrial College for its remarkable work in developing our citizens, our economy, and the great state of Mississippi.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. MICHAEL L. FOWLER, SR.—MORTICIAN OF THE YEAR

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and honor to extend my personal and heartfelt congratulations to Mr. Michael L. Fowler, Sr., on being named Mortician of the Year for the 4th District of the Georgia Funeral Service Practitioners Association, Inc. A celebration will be held in his honor on Saturday, March 31, 2012, at 7 p.m. at Albany Technical College in Albany, Georgia.

Mr. Fowler was born in Columbia, South Carolina, to Roland and Rosie Fowler. Following his birth, Mr. Fowler's family moved to Georgia where he was educated in the Dougherty County, Georgia Public School System and graduated from Dougherty Comprehensive High School. After graduating from high school, Mr. Fowler would go on to earn a degree in Mortuary Science from Gupton Jones College in Atlanta, Georgia.

A Certified Funeral Service Practitioner and a Licensed Funeral Director and Embalmer, Mr. Fowler performs Trade Embalming for many funeral homes in Georgia and Florida. He also founded and currently owns Fowler's Removal Service. As a retired Death Investigation Specialist for the Georgia Bureau of Investigation, he holds numerous certifications in the fields of Medicolegal Death Investigation, Death Scene Reconstruction, and Grief Management.

A strong leader with an exceptional work ethic, Mr. Fowler is the current President of the Georgia Funeral Service Practitioners Association. He also serves on the Georgia State Board of Funeral Service and is an active member of the Academy of Graduate Embalmers, Academy of Professional Funeral Service Practice, Albany Chamber of Commerce and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Of his many commendable qualities, one of the things I admire most about Mr. Fowler is his altruistic willingness to volunteer his time and lend his professional services to needy families who have lost loved ones to tragic accidents and natural disasters. As a member of the National Disaster Medical System's Disaster Mortuary Team (DMORT) and Kenyon International Service, Mr. Fowler has assisted in the morgue operations of mass fatalities associated with the Albany, Georgia floods of 1994 and 1998; the 1997 crash of Korean Airlines Flight 801 in Guam; the 9/11 World Trade Center terrorist attacks in 2001; the 2004 tsunami in Asia; Hurricane Katrina; Hurricane Rita; and the 2010 Haiti earthquake.

In conjunction with his professional accomplishments, Mr. Fowler lives a life of service and faith. He has been a member of Evangelical Faith Ministries, Inc. for 45 years and has served as a Deacon for the last 33 years. Additionally, he founded the S.O.L.A.C.E. (Stretching Out Loving Arms Creating Encouragement) Program for impoverished and at-risk youth in Southwest Georgia. Moreover, he co-facilitates the Let's Stay Together Marriage Enrichment Program; is Board Chair of Love and Mercy Outreach Programs, Inc.; and serves on the Community Development Council for the City of Albany.

Michael L. Fowler, Sr., has accomplished many things in his life but none of this would have been possible without the enduring love and support of his loving wife, Rosa, and wonderful children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Mr. Fowler for his outstanding professional achievements, dedicated community service and many good deeds on behalf of families all around the world who have lost loved ones to unforeseen tragedies.

HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF WRIGHT-HENNEPIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

HON. MICHELE BACHMANN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 75th anniversary of the Wright-Hennepin Electric Cooperative in Rockford, Minnesota. Today, March 29, 2012, the annual membership meeting will take place in celebration of their fruitful beginning on March 29, 1937.

Wright-Hennepin Electric was formed at the height of the Great Depression to meet the electrical needs of rural central Minnesota. Today, they provide service for more than 46,000 homes and businesses and continue to provide groundbreaking services to their customers in Wright and the western Hennepin counties.

Wright-Hennepin Electric is an industry leader in helping home and business owners save money, reduce energy consumption, and determine when alternative energy resources might be a good fit for their needs. Additionally, Wright-Hennepin Electric has expanded into security monitoring for 50,000 homes in 32 states and three Canadian provinces. Innovative business expansions like this help keep this magnificent company a step ahead of the rest.

Also importantly, Wright-Hennepin Electric is an active member of the community. Annually, high school students may apply to receive college scholarships from them. Each year one lucky student also receives a trip to our Nation's capital. It is possible that many of our congressional Members have met with some of these students participating in the Electric Cooperative Youth Tour program which makes this opportunity possible.

Many local charities and non-profits are also supported by Wright-Hennepin Electric as recipients of thousands of dollars of donations. Lastly, Wright-Hennepin Electric has been recognized by chambers, local governments, and businesses as a responsible corporate citizen and valued member of the communities they serve.

Congratulations on this 75th milestone, members and staff of Wright-Hennepin Electric Cooperative.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JOHN V. SULLIVAN, HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN, UPON HIS RETIREMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 2012

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to John Sullivan on his retirement from the post of Parliamentarian of the House.

John has served the House for 28 years, beginning as Counsel for the House Committee on Armed Services. In 1987, he joined the office of Parliamentarian where he rose from an Assistant Parliamentarian to Deputy Parliamentarian in 1994. He was named Parliamentarian by Speaker Dennis Hastert in 2004. He has served this body with dignity and professionalism.

I feel privileged to have worked with John, whom I consider a friend and a mentor. During the years when Democrats were in the majority, I enjoyed serving as Chair of the Committee of the Whole or as Speaker pro tem. When in the Chair I looked to John for wise guidance. He was a great teacher and I was eager to learn. He has a great command of and respect for the institutional history of the House, and its rules and precedents. John Sullivan was very supportive of Members who sought to learn more.

John is a kind man with a great intellect. We are all grateful for his service to the House and to the nation. I will miss him and wish him all of the very best in his future endeavors.

HONORING ILIANA CURRA

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Women's History Month, I rise today to honor Ms. Iliana Curra, a Cuban patriot who is the epitome of a freedom fighter. Her life's story has been one of hardship but has also been one of valor.

Ms. Curra was born in 1959 in Regla, Havana during a year of great turmoil in Cuba. As a result, she was unable to complete High School and began working at the young age of seventeen as a secretary. At this time, her political problems also began. She was transferred from one job to the next and cast as "disloyal," commonly done to those who opposed the regime.

On July 16, 1992, she was arrested and detained for 84 days at the Headquarters of State Security, known as Villa Marista, for spreading "propaganda." Upon her release, Ms. Curra courageously joined the opposition, the National Agenda Movement. After several arbitrary arrests, she was sentenced to three years in the Women's Correctional Facility for her political beliefs and associations. During this time, Ms. Curra witnessed horrendous and inhumane treatment. After completing her sentence, Ms. Curra was exiled from Cuba and began a new life in Miami, Florida.

In 1998, a year after her release, Ms. Curra started working for the freedom of Cuba. She began sharing her firsthand experiences of human rights abuses in Cuba, and continued fighting against the tyrannical Castro regime. Her life's mission will not cease until the Cuban people are truly free.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Iliana Curra for her continued service to the South Florida community, and solidarity with the Cuban people. A true advocate for democracy and human rights, she dedicates every second of her life to freedom and justice. She is an inspiration not only to women, but to all of us. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this outstanding individual, and wish Ms. Curra continued success and happiness in the future.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF DONALD HILL

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I celebrate the life of Donald E. Hill. A lifelong Christian who leaves behind a wife he married 42 years ago, Donald was an upstanding member of both his professional and personal communities, and worked as an attorney for 36 years. In his career he specialized in employment law, business law and estate planning.

Donald's personal life made a great impact on the lives of those around him. He and his wife Carol—along with their two sons—attended First Evangelical Free Church for over 30 years, and he served as a deacon, elder, chairman and regular Sunday school teacher. He was also involved with the Wichita Prayer Breakfast, Rotary, the Christian Legal Society and the Wichita Art Museum, and prided himself on being politically involved.

Donald, who was laid to rest on March 3, 2012, was a truly rare individual who put God, family and friends before himself time and time again. Whether it was at work, home or church, Donald saw to it that those around him received the full benefit of the blessings he himself had been given. We are all grateful to have known this wonderful man.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to have been part of Donald Hill's family for many years, and I am greatly saddened by his passing. I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating his life.

TRIBUTE TO WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. FREDERICA S. WILSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Women's History Month and to recognize the many contributions women have made to our community.

Specifically, I want to recognize these remarkable women from South Florida for their dedication and commitment: Annie Baker, Bishop Catherine P. Baskin, School Board Member Dorothy Bendross-Mindingall, Mayor Daisy Black, Patricia Jennings Braynon, Baltena Brown, Rhea Brown, Queen Brown, Senator Larcenia Bullard, Vanessa Woodard Byers, Representative Daphne Campbell, Lillian Cooper, Emma Curry, Nancy Dawkins, Martha C. Day, Lucia Davis-Raiford, Patricia Daniels, Melodie Delancey, Barbara Dent, Earlene P. Dotson, Gail Ash Dotson, Dr. Barbara Edwards, Gussie J. Ervin, Commissioner Betty Ferguson, Dr. Dorothy Jenkins Fields, Susie W. Francis, Regina Jollivette Frazier, Kimberly Gaines, Patricia Garrett, Mayor Shirley Gibson, Emily Gunther, Elsie Hamler, Thomasina Hargrove, Alexis Harris, Debi Harris, Karen Hawkins, Bea Hines, Bertha Henry, Nicole Henry, Anne T. Herriott, Cheryl Holder, Janice Powell Hopton, Vikki Hoshing, Andrea Ivory, Sandra Jackson, Jeanne F. Jacobs, Juanita B. Johnson, Commissioner Barbara

Jordan, Yolanda Cash-Jackson, Pamela Jones, Renee S. Jones, Juliet King, Linda Kelly Kearson, Juanita A. Lane, Pamela Luckie Latimore, Betty Major, Congresswoman Carrie P. Meek, Sigilenda Miles, Yvette Miley, Tracey Mourning, Georgia McClean, Shirlyon McWhorter, Bobbie Mumford (Posthumously), Maud P. Newbold, Beverly E. Nixon, Adora Obi Nweze, Dr. Rozlyn Paschal, Enid C. Pinkney, Bernadette Poitier, Michele Paramore, Tammy Reed, Rachel Reeves, Zarifa Reynolds, Collette Hart Richardson, Donna Riley, Treska Rodgers, Akua Scott, Sherrilyn Scott, Claudia Slater, Rhoda Shirley, Commissioner Michelle Spence Jones, Representative Cynthia Stafford, Jessie A. Stinson, Kay M. Sullivan, Mayor Myra Taylor, Penelope Townsley, Dr. Andrea Trowers, Priscilla Thompson, Rosetta Vickers, Sandy Walker, Thelma Walker, Representative Barbara Watson, Dolores Washington, Eloise Washington, Patrenia Washington, Gwendolyn Welters, Rhonda Wimberley, Heather Woolery-Lloyd, Geneva Woodard, Jacquelyn White, Bobbie Jones Wilfork, Mattie Williams, Katrina Wilson-Davis, Ellen Wright, Commissioner Audrey Edmonson, Rhonda Vangates, Georgia Ayers, Kim McCray, Deborah Owens, Misty Brown, Vice-Mayor Felicia Brunson, Commissioner Barbara Sharief, Marlene Bastien, Renita Holmes, Debra Toomer, Lavern Ellie-Scott, Carline Paul, Lucy Tundra, Josie Portier, Dr. Mae Christian, Tangela Sears, Barbara Hardemon, Stephanie Bromfield, Retha Boone, Lottie Hines, Karen Cartwright, Jackie Bell, Elaine Black, Annie Neasman, Dr. Evalina Bestman, Roslyn Frazier, Chief Therese Homer, Thelma Gibson, Frankie Rolle, Corkie Dozier, Shemele Jenkins, Geraldine Washington, Thema Campbell, Kiani Nesbitt, Marjorie Spicer, Sonya Flowers, Rita Pierre, Velma Lawrence, Terri Rutherford, Julia Brown, Beatrice Louissaint, Woodie Lesesne, Dr. Brenda Snipes, Carmen Morris, Sandra St. Amand, Faye Davis, Cheryl Mizell, Penelopy Townsend, Bloneva Jones, Inez Johnson, Joanna Chestnut, Ann Foster, Sharon Anderson, Belinda Tucker, Mary Francisco, Sharette Hepburn, Virginia Hepburn, Lenora Miller, Catherine McFarland, Mamie Jenkins, Mary Robinson, Virla Barry, Mary McRae, Esther Roundtree-Johnson, Dr. Mary A. Tumpkin, Dr. Gloria Williams, Farrah Wilson, LaKesha Wilson-Rochelle, Prophetess Charlene Holts, Karen Andre, Farah Juste, Romanita Ford, Opal Jones, Willowstine Lawson, Bernadette Morris, Aletha Player, Sharon Pritchett, Diana Ragbeer, Councilwoman Lisa Davis, Councilwoman Felicia Robinson, Commissioner Rose Tydus, Commissioner Dorothy Johnson and Jennifer Adger Grant.

I am proud to stand and pay tribute to all of these dynamic women, and say thank you on behalf of all the constituents of Florida's 17th Congressional District.

HONORING MR. BILLY CLAY FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE GREENWOOD, MISSISSIPPI COMMUNITY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man of great valor and integrity, Mr. Billy Clay. In October 2004, Mr. Clay founded The Greenwood Mentoring Group at the Jessie B. Henderson-Inez Beck Learning Center in the city of Greenwood, Mississippi. The Mentoring Group opens its doors five days a week to provide after school tutoring to neighborhood youth. The program has helped to increase the academic success and self-esteem of many youth in Greenwood, Mississippi and surrounding areas.

For more than 30 years, Mr. Clay has rendered countless hours of service to the young people throughout the Greenwood community. Not only is Mr. Clay a pillar within his community but is a little league baseball coach. As a role model, he plays a pivotal role in raising awareness on the various issues facing their community. He continues to be a strong voice for the community as he facilitates outreach in the community among sororities, fraternities, and other community organizations to make a positive and lasting impression in the lives of Greenwood community youth. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to join in congratulating Mr. Billy Clay for his service to the Greenwood community.

HONORING STATE ATTORNEY KATHERINE FERNANDEZ RUNDLE

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Women's History Month, I rise to honor State Attorney Katherine Fernandez Rundle, an outstanding individual serving the South Florida community.

Mrs. Fernandez Rundle was appointed to her position in 1993, and has subsequently been re-elected five times. Throughout her career, she has served South Florida admirably and has been a stalwart supporter of the community. Over the past two decades, she has served Miami-Dade County with distinction and has worked diligently to maintain the safety of our community. Her leadership has been critical in the creation of numerous programs dealing with issues that affect our area such as teen truancy, domestic violence, child support, and victim's rights.

Mrs. Fernandez Rundle served as the first and only Hispanic female on the State Constitutional Revision Council. Her passion and interest in public service is in large part due to the inspiration of her father, Dr. Carlos Benito Fernandez, one of Miami's first Hispanic Judges and a founding member of the Cuban American Bar Association, the largest Hispanic legal organization of which Mrs. Fernandez Rundle was elected its first female President in 1991.

Additionally, the State Attorney's office is the fourth largest district attorney's office in the nation with over 1,200 employees, 300 of them prosecutors also known as Assistant State Attorneys. Her office is the only prosecutor's office in the state that protects the rights of children with the creation and enforcement of a strict child support program. Other programs that have been established under her direction are the Juvenile Gun Offenders Program, the S.T.A.R.T. Program, and the Second chance Sealing and Expungement Program. Amongst her duties as State Attorney, she is also a founding member and Vice-President of Women of Tomorrow, a mentoring program that looks to inspire and motivate young at-risk high school women. In addition, Mrs. Fernandez Rundle is also very active in other organizations including City Year Miami, Amigos for Kids, and Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD).

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to State Attorney Katherine Fernandez Rundle for her continued service to the South Florida community and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

HONORING J'DEN COX

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating J'den Cox of the Hickman High School Wrestling team for winning the Class 4 Missouri State Wrestling Championship in the 220-pound weight class.

Mr. Cox and his coaches should be commended for all their hard work throughout the regular season and for bringing home the state title in the 220-pound weight class to his school and community. This is his third state championship. He is the Tribune Wrestler of the Year with his unofficially compiled 526 takedowns.

I ask that you join me in recognizing Mr. Cox for a job well done.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022:

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chair, the Republican budget reads like ''The Hunger Games''—forcing American families to compete for survival against a plutonium plutocracy. The Republican budget cuts Medicare. It cuts Medicaid. It cuts Pell Grants.

Yet, at the same time, their budget calls for more spending on the weapons of last century's Cold War. More nuclear bomb-making plants. More nuclear missiles. More nuclear subs.

Their budget fails to address the needs of the elderly, the children, the sick, and the most vulnerable. It makes no sense. It is insane.

The CPC budget includes my legislation, the Smarter Approach to Nuclear Expenditures Act—the SANE Act. SANE will save $100 billion over the next 10 years by reducing nuclear weapons spending. The CPC and the SANE Act puts people ahead of plutonium.

I urge my colleagues to join me and vote for the CPC "Budget for All".

CONGRATULATING THE REELECTION OF PRESIDENT MA YING-JEOU OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 2012, the Honorable Ma Ying-jeou was elected to a second term as the President of the Republic of China. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate President Ma and the people of Taiwan on the strength and vitality of their commitment to democracy.

For over a half century, Taiwan has been a strong, democratic ally to the United States in the Asia-Pacific region and across the world. Our peoples have enjoyed a close friendship forged by our political, economic, cultural, and strategic ties. Taiwan's sustained economic and sociopolitical development has set an admirable exemplar that many countries seek to emulate. Taiwan's global scope and leadership has transcended many sectors, particularly healthcare. Taiwan boasts one of the most innovative and efficient healthcare systems in the world. As an advocate for building mutual relationships, I am confident that the U.S.-Taiwan bond will only become stronger with Taiwan's inclusion in the U.S. Visa Waiver Program. Over 400,000 Taiwanese citizens visit the United States each year; this could increase by 20 to 30 percent once Taiwan gains admission into the U.S. Visa Waiver Program.

As Chair Emeritus of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I know firsthand the importance this partnership holds for our Taiwanese-American communities. According to the 2010 Census there are approximately 230,000 Taiwanese-Americans currently living here in the United States, many of whom live in my home district in Silicon Valley. Taiwanese-Americans are frequently highly educated contributors to the vibrancy of the U.S. economy, and this is reflected in their sectors of employment. The majority of Taiwanese-Americans work in management, business, finance, information technology, sciences and engineering. As a representative of ethnically diverse Silicon Valley, I proudly join Taiwanese-Americans and the technology industry in celebrating the growing, collaborative economic relationship between the United States and Taiwanese companies.

Many of these advances are attributed to President Ma's strong and visionary leadership during his first term as president. I commend President Ma and his Administration for their tremendous strides in working toward stability amidst international economic uncertainty and in strengthening cross-strait relations with the People's Republic of China. President Ma's reelection is a testament to the people of Taiwan supporting his efforts and leadership. In fact, Taiwan's presidential race elicited unprecedented grassroots organization, from everyday citizens to business executives, to rally support for President Ma's reelection. The Taiwanese people have truly spoken, and their approval of President Ma's rapprochement policy with the People's Republic of China is an encouraging beacon from which we can all learn from.

Once again, I congratulate President Ma Ying-jeou and the people of the Republic of China for a highly celebrated election. I look forward to my upcoming visit to Taiwan and meeting with President Ma. It will be a pleasure to continue working with President Ma and his Administration to strengthen our U.S.-Taiwan partnership and ensure peace and stability for our peoples, the region, and the world.

HONORING MS. TINA MATTE

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Women's History month I rise today to honor Ms. Tina McCain Matte, an outstanding individual and someone who has continuously supported the Southwest Florida community.

Ms. Matte is currently serving as President of Gravina, Smith, Matte & Arnold, an influential marketing and public relations firm located in Fort Myers. The firm specializes in developing long-term, results-oriented public relations programs for regional residential and commercial developments, resorts, governmental agencies, professional firms and nonprofit organizations. She has excelled in her position as President and in 2008 was named a Top 50 Power Player by Gulfshore Business, in recognition of her influence and leadership in Southwest Florida. The Florida Public Relations Association has also awarded her numerous times for her excellent service.

Amongst her duties as president she has also finds the time to be active in her community. From 2002–2008 she was appointed by then Governor Jeb Bush to serve on the Supreme Court Judicial Nominating Commission, where she served as chair from 2006–2007. Currently, Ms. Matte serves on the Board of Directors for the Salvation Army, as well as Floridians for Better Transportation, a statewide business and transportation association committed to making transportation safer and more efficient in Florida. Throughout her career, Ms. Matte has served the community admirably and has been a stalwart leader in the state.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Ms. Tina McCain Matte for her continued service to the Miami community and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

COMMEMORATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF CRAFTON HILLS COLLEGE IN YUCAIPA, CALIFORNIA

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 40th anniversary of one of the most dynamic centers of learning in my district: Crafton Hills College, in Yucaipa, California.

I have spoken to my colleagues before about this fine community college. It has grown from an initial 881 students in 1972 to more than 5,600 today. The faculty continues to expand, with more than 90 full-time teachers and administrators. More than 150,000 students have expanded their education and found new job skills at Crafton.

As many of my colleagues are aware, community colleges have become a haven for many of our fellow citizens who have lost jobs and are desperately seeking new skills to advance their place in our economy. Crafton Hills has certainly been one of those havens, offering more than 60 degrees and certificates ranging from Radiologic Technology to Internet Web Design. The college has maintained its high standards and student services despite facing its own budget cutbacks.

In just the past few years, the campus has seen a number of wonderful additions. Even as they faced tough economic times, voters in our area approved a bond measure that paid to build a 60,000-square-foot Learning Resource Center, which now houses the library, a computer center, an art gallery and a tiered auditorium. The bond also paid for installation of a fabulous new swim center, which incorporates the competitive pool used in the 2004 Olympic trials in Long Beach, California. I was pleased to help arrange moving the pool to the campus.

The campus will soon dedicate a seven-acre Solar Farm that will provide nearly all of the college's electrical needs, as well as taking a tremendous load off of the public electrical grid. All of these improvements are clear evidence that Crafton Hills College is laying the groundwork to be a top educational institution for decades to come.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to once again praise the college for its role in the San Bernardino Regional Emergency Training Center at the San Bernardino International Airport. Established with the support of the Federal Aviation Administration, the center has trained hundreds of firefighters from across the nation in how to handle commercial aircraft fires—with real-life scenarios set in the fuselage of a former jet-liner. I have no doubt that many lives will be saved in the future by firefighters who have learned their techniques here.

Mr. Speaker, Crafton Hills College is a top example of the kind of center for higher education that will train our future workers, researchers and academics. Please join me in congratulating the college's administration, faculty and students for their efforts, and wish them success for the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall No. 139 on March 28, 2012, I was unavoidably detained and unable to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on ordering the previous question, so that the House could consider the bipartisan Violence Against Women Act.

A TRIBUTE TO TOM LEDERER

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Tom Lederer. A lifelong resident of Philadelphia who gave much to the community, Tom was called by his Creator on Thursday March 22nd.

Thomas John Lederer was born on September 29, 1934 in Philadelphia to a family that believed in the principles of democratic government and civil service. His father Miles served as both Chair of the Democratic Party in Philadelphia and as a state legislator. His brothers Raymond and Bill would also serve in the legislature, with Ray becoming a member of Congress. Tom's brother Miles headed the local Riggers Union, while his brother Fran was the Chief of the County Detectives. Tom spent a lifetime serving as an inspector with the Philadelphia Water Department and raising kids, first his own six and then sixteen grandchildren. He also served the community as Boy Scout leader, community organizer and educator.

He was an active member of his Church, St. Michael's Roman Catholic, and his community. He was a Board Member of the Roman Catholic Alumni Association, Past President of the St. Joseph Prep Father's Club, Chairman of Kensington South Neighborhood Advisory Committee, Boy Scout Master of Troop 488, Member of the Horticultural Society of Philadelphia and Penn State's Gardening Progress program, winner of a ''Black Eye'' community award, but most of all he was ''Pop'' to his sixteen grandchildren.

However, in his mind, his most proud association was being Rita Lavery's husband. Born two days apart, they were married for 56 years and friends for 70 of his 77 years. They started kindergarten at St. Michaels on the same day and were classmates and pals thereafter.

Together with Tom's wife, Rita, his six children, his sixteen grandchildren, and all his family and friends, I mourn his passing but celebrate his life.

HONORING MS. GERRY SMITH

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Women's History Month, I rise to honor one of South Florida's finest community leaders, Ms. Geraldine ''Gerry'' Smith.

Ms. Smith currently serves as President of the Women's Club of Hialeah. She was born and raised by in Hialeah and has dedicated her time and efforts to our community. She has a passion for helping others, and relishes her current role as president. Previously she worked on the School Board in Hialeah, a position she enjoyed and served admirably. More recently, she has found a way to combine her artistic ability and her passion for the community by providing an educational hobby for local senior citizens.

Every Saturday morning Ms. Smith teaches a group of senior citizens how to make jewelry, along with other activities. Her goal is to ensure that senior citizens have a great time and remain active after retirement. She also donates her time and money to Angel's Reach, an organization which helps children with autism. Together with the Women's Club of Hialeah, Ms. Smith actively supports the autistic community in South Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Ms. Gerry Smith for her continued service to the South Florida community and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

HONORING TREY SMITH

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Trey Smith of the Moberly High School Wrestling team for his first Class 2 Missouri State Wrestling Championship. Mr. Smith won by decision in the 152-pound weight class.

Mr. Smith and his coaches should be commended for all their hard work throughout the regular season and for bringing home the state championship title in the Class 2 152-pound weight class to his school and community.

I ask that you join me in recognizing Mr. Smith for a job well done!

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JOHN V. SULLIVAN, HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN, UPON HIS RETIREMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 2012

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize parliamentarian John V. Sullivan for his long and distinguished service to the House of Representatives. Tomorrow, after 25 years of service to the House, John is retiring.

John is one of only four Parliamentarians who have served the House of Representatives. In this rare company, John stands out. In many ways, the Parliamentarian is the keeper of order in a House increasing lacking in civility. That John is equally respected on both sides of the aisle is testament to his fair hand and steady demeanor.

Before coming to Congress, John served in the United States Air Force as a Judge Advocate General (JAG). In this capacity, John had to represent, in a legal capacity, many odd and unruly individuals: an experience that prepared him well for his current position.

I will miss John's steady presence as Parliamentarian. However, I know the House will be well served by the excellent staff John assembled during his tenure.

John, thank you for your lifetime of public service, and good luck in your future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE MOUNT VERNON GIRLS BASKETBALL STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the girls of the Mount Vernon Lady Mountaineers Basketball Team for winning the Missouri Class 3 State Championship.

Basketball is a sport that challenges the human spirit and tests the mental and physical abilities of the players. These girls, Amelia Bramer, Sally Cowherd, Danielle Goodman, Madison Hadlock, Jenna Kleine, Tamiaya Henderson, Audrey LaSalle, Blair Tettenhorst, Shailyn Benbrook, Mackenzie Farmer, Kaylee Hood, Megan Pope, and Shea Vandergrift, faced those challenges and as a result became a team. They trained as one, they competed as one, and together though their hard work and dedication they won the Missouri Class 3 State Championship.

Of course, the basketball players aren't the only champions; they had an outstanding team of talented coaches supporting them and guiding them along the way. I commend Head Coach Doug Hepler and assistant coaches Bridgett Schmutz, and Tom Cox, on an amazing accomplishment and a job well done.

The Lady Mountaineers team had an edge against each and every one of their opponents; their friends, family, and fans attended the games, cheered them on throughout the basketball season and followed them to Columbia for the state championships. The Mount Vernon community is justifiably proud of their team, and the team is fortunate to have such strong support from their community.

As if winning a state championship isn't enough of an accomplishment, the Mount Vernon Lady Mountaineers Team has the distinct honor of winning it two of the last three years. This shows that our athletes and coaches in Mount Vernon are among the best in America and can stand proud in their accomplishments.

But even more important than that, the girls of the Mount Vernon Basketball team will have memories to last a lifetime. They've had that extraordinarily opportunity to live the dream of anyone who has ever dreamed of competing with the best and achieving victory.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Mount Vernon Lady Mountaineers Basketball Team, the Missouri Class 3 State Champions.

HONORING JOSEPH C. THOMAS FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, former Mississippi State Senator Joseph C. Thomas. Senator Thomas is a lifelong resident of Yazoo City, Mississippi. He is a graduate of Jackson State University where he

received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration and is a proud graduate of the University of Mississippi's School of Banking. After 30 years of service Senator Thomas retired as Vice President of AmSouth Bank.

In 1977, Senator Thomas received the Jackson State University Business Award and was selected by the Mississippi Economic Council as one of 50 outstanding young men under the age of 35 in the state of Mississippi. In that same year, he was also the recipient of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education Award in Washington D.C. A lover of history, Senator Thomas has served as Chairman of the Oakes African-American Culture Center since its start in 1992, earning him recognition as one of the most prominent Afro-American historians in the state of Mississippi.

Senator Thomas is a lifelong public servant. He served as National Treasurer and Executive Vice President of the Friends of Amistad, a national organization in support of the Amistad Research Center in New Orleans, Louisiana. He served on the Jackson State University National Development Foundation Board of Directors, served as Chairman of the Management Team of the Yazoo County Fair and Civic League, Inc., and was president of the League Management Team Corporation, whose purpose is to provide housing for the elderly and handicapped.

In 1984 Senator Thomas was appointed to the Yazoo City Public Service Commission, where he served as Vice Chairman from 1986 to 1995, and was elected Chairman in April 2000. He also headed the Policy Council and on the Board of Directors of the American Public Power Association, a national organization representing about 2,000 not-for-profit community owned electric utilities. Senator Thomas has also served as President of the Yazoo City Municipal School Board as well as Vice Chairman of the Mississippi Real Estate Appraisal Board.

In 2003, his lists of public service accomplishments were increased when he was elected as State Senator in Mississippi's 21st District. During his terms in office, he served on the Economic Development & Tourism, Education, Finance, Insurance, Judiciary, Division B and Public Health & Welfare Committees. In addition to his work in the State Legislator, Mr. Thomas has served on the National Conference of State Legislatures Health Committee and the Southern Conference of State Legislatures Education Committee.

Senator Thomas is married to the former Elizabeth Wilburn of Benton, Mississippi, and they are the parents of three children, Joseph, Jr., Kirk, and Whitney. They also have two grandchildren, Tytianna and Kameron.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing former State Senator Joseph C. Thomas for his unyielding dedication and service to Yazoo City, Mississippi and the entire state of Mississippi.

NATIONAL ESSENTIAL TREMOR AWARENESS MONTH

HON. KEVIN YODER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, today, I express my support and recognize March as National Essential Tremor Awareness Month. Essential Tremor, commonly known as ET, is a progressive neurological condition that impacts the lives of up to 10 million Americans. Every day those afflicted with this disorder face a rhythmic trembling of the hands, head, voice, legs or trunk. Daily activities that many of us take for granted, such as eating, drinking and writing, may become unbearable or even impossible.

Unfortunately, there is no medical test to easily diagnose this condition and it is often confused with Parkinson's disease and dystonia. In addition, due to stereotypes, embarrassment and a general lack of awareness, many people with ET never seek medical care or treatment. This can lead to more medical issues such as depression or isolation.

For these reasons, I appreciate the efforts of my predecessor, Rep. Dennis Moore, who recognized the importance of early awareness of this condition and in 2010 introduced legislation to declare the month of March as National Essential Tremor Awareness month.

Today, on the second anniversary of the passage of this legislation, I am happy to do my part to help increase awareness of this debilitating condition. I am honored to represent the home of the International Essential Tremor Foundation in Lenexa, Kansas. The IETF has served as an invaluable resource for thousands of its members since 1988, providing global educational information, services and support.

Most of all, the IETF provides hope. Staff, board members and volunteers work tirelessly to empower those with ET in Kansas and across the nation to regain control of their lives by providing educational opportunities, treatment options and coping skills necessary to minimize the impact of ET and improve the quality of life for those who suffer. I commend them for their outstanding efforts and look forward to working together to raise awareness and eventually, find a cure.

TRIBUTE TO MS. BERNIE WONG, PRESIDENT OF THE CHINESE AMERICAN SERVICE LEAGUE ON HER RECEIPT OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S CHAMPION OF CHANGE AWARD AT THE WHITE HOUSE

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I consider Ms. Bernie Wong to be among the very best of Social Workers in the United States of America or any place else in the world today. Bernie is being cited by President Obama for her outstanding leadership and development of the Chinese American Service League in Chicago. The Champion of the ''Change Award,'' recognizes a small select group of Americans who embody, innovate, educate and build. The Award ceremony is held at the White House to honor those who exemplify Cesar Chavez's core values including service to other, knowledge, innovation, acceptance of all people, and respect for life and the environment. Bernie Wong is being recognized for her tireless efforts on behalf of Chinese Chicagoans. Ms. Wong is one of ten individuals nationwide to receive this prestigious honor.

Bernie Wong was the youngest of seven children and grew up poor, but never realized it. A product of a catholic school upbringing, Bernie learned early in life the meaning of generosity and compassion for others. Bernie's mother was always available to help others in need and would take Bernie and her siblings to visit the sick every week and provide food for people. Experiences in Bernie early years set the stage for her mission driven approach to serving others with dignity and respect. At eighteen, Bernie left Hong Kong for Sioux City, Iowa where she earned a four year scholarship to pursue a Bachelors' Degree in Sociology from Briar Cliff College. She went on to earn a Masters' Degree in Social Work from Washington University in St. Louis, MO. Bernie truly understand what poor new immigrants face when confronted by completely different culture and language. This realization gave her the courage to gather a few friends and begin the task of building the Chinese American Service League from the ground up.

Founded in 1978, with a desk and chairs, the Chinese American Service League is now the largest and most comprehensive social service agency in the Midwest dedicated to the needs of Asian Americans. Housed in the award winning Kam L. Liu Building, and supported by an annual budget of $12 million, CASL's program reach over 17,000 clients each year. CASL services everyone in need, but primarily focuses on serving Chinese American immigrants in the metropolitan Chicago area. CASL's clients are low-income and a significant portion served is newly arrived immigrants. These individuals often have little formal education and possess a few transferable skills. Since 90% of CASL's clients speak little to no English, they find themselves unable to access needed social services. CASL provides a critical safety-net by employing over 400 multilingual professionals and support staff. CASL serves a vital niche in the community, often taking referrals from other social service agencies, neighborhood organizations, and government institutions in order to serve clients with specific language or other special needs. Bernie is a true she-roe and leader in her community. She is indeed a champion of change and I salute President Obama for recognizing it. She deserves every accolade that we can shower upon her.

HONORING CLAUDIA PUIG

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Women's History month, I rise today to honor Ms. Claudia Puig, a highly recognized national broadcast executive with over 26 years of experience in the U.S. Hispanic media market.

Ms. Puig was born in Cuba but was forced into exile after her father, a Cuban hero, was taken from her side by the tyrannical Castro regime. Since that time, Ms. Puig has worked hard and established herself as one of Miami's premier broadcast executives. She began her career in advertising/sales at AT&T BellSouth; having a strong work ethic, she quickly achieved Elite Club status, making her one of

the company's top performers. A few years later, Ms. Puig accepted an opportunity in broadcasting and has held management positions in the country's top Radio Broadcasting companies ever since.

In 1997, Ms. Puig joined Univision Radio, formerly known as the Hispanic Broadcasting Corporation, as General Manager of their four radio properties. After years of continued success, she was promoted to her current position as Senior Vice President/Eastern Regional Manager. Ms. Puig's current responsibilities are extensive, from the overall supervision of operations, finances, sales to programming for Univision Radio in Miami, Puerto Rico, and New York's nine radio stations. During her tenure, her leadership has been remarkable and has resulted in high revenues and ratings, particularly for Univision Radio in Miami and Puerto Rico.

Ms. Puig's accomplishments go beyond her professional career; her commitment to community service has led to leadership roles in several Miami charitable and civic groups. She was appointed by Governor Jeb Bush to serve as a member of Florida International University's Board of Trustees, and was recently reappointed by Governor Rick Scott. Ms. Puig currently serves as the Chair of the Florida Association of Broadcasters.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Ms. Claudia Puig for her outstanding professional career and dedication to our community in South Florida. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this accomplished individual, and wish her continued success in the future.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF OUR FEDERAL WORKFORCE

HON. J. RANDY FORBES

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, today, the House of Representatives will vote on a budget proposal that will begin to turn the tide away from Washington's habitual deficit spending. I applaud the House Budget Committee for making difficult choices to cut spending, for finding creative solutions to our country's fiscal challenges, and for taking vital action to stop planned cuts to our national defense—cuts that our military leaders have labeled as "catastrophic." Addressing our nation's fiscal problems is one of my top priorities; however, I believe this can be done in a responsible fashion that does not undercut our nation's federal workforce.

Federal employees have dedicated their lives to public service. They protect our nation's borders, defend our cities and communities from terrorism, provide critical assistance in the wake of natural disasters, and support and treat our nation's military personnel and veterans. At the same time, as our neighbors, they live, work, pay taxes, and spend the money that is helping to build economic growth in the private sector in Virginia.

I believe we must reduce the size of our federal government in order to achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness, but as we do so, we must never lose sight of the fact that a capable federal workforce is vital to that goal and we must recognize the contributions of our federal employees as we work to ensure our government is capable of meeting our country's future challenges.

IN HONOR OF JAMES J. SWEENEY

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor John Sweeney of Havertown, Pennsylvania. Mr. Sweeney entered the United States Navy after graduating from high school in 1943, and served aboard the USS *Hancock*. The *Hancock* took part in some of World War II's most pivotal battles, including the invasions of the Philippines, Iwo Jima and Okinawa. Mr. Sweeney was honored for his heroic service and awarded the Philippines Liberation Medal, two Battle Stars and a Presidential Unit Commendation.

It was during his time in the Navy, that Mr. Sweeney befriended his shipmate, John Finn. Lt. Finn received the Medal of Honor for his heroic actions at Pearl Harbor. During the Japanese surprise attack, Lt. Finn manned his machine gun and fought off the Japanese Zeroes for two and half hours even as he took an onslaught of bullets and shrapnel. And for the past nine years, John Sweeney has tirelessly worked to honor Lt. John Finn, who passed away in 2009.

On February 15th, 2011, those efforts proved successful as the Navy announced that a new guided missile destroyer will be named the USS *John Finn*. For these efforts Mr. Sweeney is being honored by American Legion Post 667 in Havertown. On behalf of a grateful nation, I congratulate Mr. Sweeney on his efforts to ensure that Lt. Finn's name and legacy lives on, and for his service during World War II, reflecting great credit upon himself and the United States Navy.

HONORING DR. TERRY CHRISTENSEN UPON HIS RETIREMENT FROM SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues, Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Congressman Mike Honda, to acknowledge and honor Dr. Terry Christensen upon his retirement from San Jose State University.

Terry has been a Professor of Political Science at San Jose State University (SJSU) since 1970. He received his B.A. at Stanford University and his PhD in Political Science at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He is a specialist on state and local politics and the media frequently call on him for analysis of politics in California and Silicon Valley.

Having served on numerous civic committee and commissions, he created and currently directs the political science department's internship program. He is the SJSU Coordinator for the Sacramento Semester Intern Program, the Panetta Congressional Internship Program, and the SJSU Poli Sci Congressional Internship Program. Terry works hard to give back to his students and stimulate interest in government.

In 1998, Terry was named San Jose State University's Outstanding Professor. The 2006 Political Science Class recognized him as Professor of the Year. He is a prolific writer and students regard him as a legend at SJSU.

He served for 2.5 years as founding Executive Director of CommUniverCity San Jose, which is a partnership among the City of San Jose, SJSU, and the Five Wounds and Brookwood Terrace neighborhoods. CommUniverCity San Jose seeks to empower students and residents and to build community by organizing service-learning projects that address education, community health and improvements to the neighborhood environment.

In order to preserve Terry's legacy, San Jose State University is creating a scholarship program in his name.

We hereby honor Terry Christensen, on the special occasion of his retirement and wish him all the best in the years to come. We commend Terry for his valuable service to our community and wish him the best in his future endeavors. We are very fortunate to have benefited from his compassion, expertise, and commitment. He has left his mark in San Jose State University and the larger community.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL SOCIAL WORKERS MONTH

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the month of March as National Social Workers Month. Social workers serve a critical role in our society, one that is deserving of our attention, respect and commendation. Upon becoming a social worker, one embraces a very simple but essential mission: to enhance the well-being of others and to help meet the basic needs of all people, especially the most vulnerable. In working towards that goal, social workers work in adolescent and youth development; aging and family care giving; child protection and family services; health care navigation; mental and behavioral health treatment and military and veterans assistance. Social workers are key to holding our social safety net together. They work to prevent the vulnerable in our country from falling through the cracks.

The Social Work Department at the Clayton County Public School System is a shining example of the importance of social workers. The department works to foster student performance, school completion and success in the workplace by assisting students in attaining the maximum benefits from their education. These excellent social workers collaborate with families and communities to remove barriers that interfere with student performance. Please join me today in thanking the Clayton County Public School social workers, and social workers nationwide for their hard work and dedication. I have great expectations that they will continue to serve us with the same excellence that they have always displayed.

KEY ALLIANCES IMPROVE REGIONAL SECURITY AND PROTECT CRITICAL U.S. INTERESTS

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues of the critical importance of our strategic allies. While some in Congress say that the United States should focus our efforts to defend our nation on building walls and restricting entry at our borders, we must continue to address the global threat of terrorism through cooperation and coordination with our allies.

While I am sure that most everyone would agree with the general concept that nations should work together to fight terrorism, I wanted to mention two countries to give my colleagues concrete examples of the critical importance of our alliances and the need to cultivate these relationships.

Turkey has a key strategic position, controlling the Bosporus Straits and sharing a border with Syria, Iran and Iraq. A member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Turkey has been a strong ally to the United States and to all of Europe. Turkey has proven to be an important partner as US forces have left Iraq and regional tensions have increased as the situation in Syria continues to devolve and Iran pursues nuclear technologies. Turkey's importance to the US and the world will continue to increase in the future, and Turkey will be critical to maintaining peace and stability.

At a time when the US and NATO continue to maintain a large military presence in Afghanistan, Azerbaijan is a valued partner. From providing critical access to Afghanistan to helping fight the flow of illegal drugs that fund Taliban insurgents, Azerbaijan has repeatedly proven their commitment to the fight against terrorism. As Azerbaijan continues to develop democratic institutions and a civil society, their contributions to regional and global security will increase even more. At a time when all of our alliances are being tested, the partnership between the United States and Azerbaijan remains strong.

The world is a safer place for all when we combine our efforts to fight those criminals who seek to use terror as a means to achieve their goals. When we work together, we become more than the sum of our parts. I urge my colleagues to support our nation's efforts along with those of our allies like Turkey and Azerbaijan to secure and protect our citizens

HONORING REGGIE COPELAND, MOBILIAN OF THE YEAR

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mobile City Council President Reggie Copeland who was recently named "Mobilian of the Year" by the Cottage Hill Civitan Club. I cannot think of anyone in our community who is more deserving of this high honor than Reggie.

Over 70 years ago, Reggie and his family moved to Mobile. He attended Murphy High School, Spring Hill College and the University of Alabama-Mobile Campus. During his school years, Reggie was a star athlete in football, basketball and softball. And as a young man, he developed a passion for athletics that not only taught him the value of sportsmanship, but instilled in him the very best qualities of success through teamwork.

After answering his county's call in the Korean conflict, Reggie returned stateside to embark on a long journey that would take him from the basketball courts to public office. After serving as a nationally recognized collegiate basketball official for 25 years and taking the role of executive with Alabama Power Company for an equal amount of time, Reggie found even greater challenges in leading the City of Mobile.

In 1985, he was elected to the Mobile City Council and has been re-elected six times. Currently, Reggie is in his second term as President of the City Council.

Among his long and storied history of community involvement, Reggie is credited with helping establish Mobile's Junior Miss Program, known today as the Distinguished Young Woman of America, and also helped bring the Magnolia Grove Golf Course, of the world-renowned RSA/Robert Trent Jones Golf Trail, to town.

He also led the construction, and later expansion, of the Copeland-Cox Tennis Center, which bears his name, and is generally considered one of the finest public municipal tennis complexes anywhere in the country.

Councilman Copeland also played a major role in helping reestablish minor league baseball in our city with the construction of Hank Aaron Stadium, home of the Mobile BayBears.

Reggie's considerable accomplishments and recognitions include former President, Mobile Jaycees; former Vice President of Alabama Jaycees; President of the TB Health Association of Mobile County; Chairman of the Mobile County Red Cross Blood Drive; Chairman, United Way Commercial Division; President of the Southeastern Conference Basketball Officials Association; President of the Port City Basketball Officials Association of Mobile; Member of the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame Board; Inducted into the Amateur Softball Association Hall of Fame, Mobile; Inducted into the Spring Hill College Hall of Fame; Chairman of the Gulf Coast Athletic Conference Basketball Tournament, 1995–97; Chairman of the Little Sisters of the Poor Golf Tournament, 1995–2000; Inducted into the Mobile Sports Hall of Fame, 1999; and member of the Board of Directors-Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce.

Reggie also assisted with the Mobile Mystics Hockey franchise and is currently working to develop a world-class soccer complex in Mobile. He also played a major role in development of the Riverfront Park and the Arthur R. Outlaw Convention Center.

In short, it is safe to say that there are few individuals in Mobile's rich history, which has spanned more than three centuries, who have been a more positive force for change than Mobilian of the Year Reggie Copeland.

Although Reggie recently announced his intention to retire from elected office at the end of his present term, I know him far too well to believe that he is going to slow down for even a minute. Reggie Copeland is Mobile's own version of the Energizer Bunny, and our community, our region and our entire state are better places because of his tireless efforts and unselfish example.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for all Mobilians in expressing our gratitude for Reggie's enormous dedication to making Mobile second to none. We all wish him and his fine family, including his five children and 13 grandchildren, all the best. Congratulations on this well-deserved honor.

RECOGNIZING GENEVA A. BLACK OF PHILADELPHIA ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the tenacious spirit, remarkable expertise and admirable accomplishments of Geneva A. Black in providing high-quality and compassionate in-home, community and center-based services for elderly and vulnerable residents in West Philadelphia.

As Ms. Black begins a richly deserved retirement as Executive Director of Haddington Multi-Services for Older Adults, Inc., where she has served our senior citizens for 41 years, it is time to reflect upon and thank this outstanding leader. In 1970 Ms. Black joined the Haddington Leadership Organization as its housing coordinator and two years later became Executive Director. At the time, Haddington had three employees. Now the renamed and expanded Haddington Multi-Services for Older Adults, Inc. has a fulltime staff of 25 and a million-dollar-plus budget.

Along the way, under Ms. Black's leadership, the Haddington organization purchased the vacant firehouse at 5500 Haverford Avenue and converted the building to a showplace center for senior activities, serving over 30,000 West Philadelphia seniors since 1975. It is only fitting that Philadelphia City Council recently named the stretch of Haverford Avenue adjoining the firehouse as "Geneva Black Way." This is where Geneva Black's way on behalf of older Philadelphians has been making a difference for decades—and that service will be her legacy into retirement.

Having her "Way" is only one of the many tributes flowing toward this remarkable leader. The Board of Directors of Haddington Multi-Services, in recognition of her valued contributions, will honor Geneva A. Black with a celebration on Friday April 27, 2012, at First District Plaza in West Philadelphia.

I invite my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in saluting and congratulating a great Philadelphian, Geneva A. Black, and to wish her good health and long life upon her retirement as Executive Director of Haddington Multi-Services for Older Adults Inc.

COMMEMORATING THE 33RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 33rd anniversary of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act.

Since the end of World War II, the United States and Taiwan have fostered a close relationship that has been of enormous strategic and economic benefit to both countries. When the United States shifted diplomatic relations from Taiwan to the People's Republic of China in January 1979, Congress moved quickly to pass the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) to ensure that the United States would continue its robust engagement with Taiwan in the areas of commerce, culture, and security cooperation. With President Carter's signature on April 10, 1979, this important and lasting piece of legislation became the Law of the Land and served as the statutory basis for U.S.-Taiwan relations going forward.

After 33 years, the TRA still stands as a model of congressional leadership in the history of our foreign relations and remains the cornerstone of a very mutually beneficial relationship between the United States and Taiwan. Through three decades marked by momentous social, economic, and political transformations, Taiwan has remained a trusted ally of the United States that now shares with us the ideals of freedom and democracy. The foresight of the TRA's drafters in providing that ''the United States will make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services . . . to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability,'' and affirming ''the preservation and enhancement of the human rights of all the people on Taiwan'' as explicit objectives of the United States, has contributed in large measure to make Taiwan what it is today—a vibrant, open society governed by democratic institutions.

Though the people of Taiwan now enjoy fundamental human rights and civil liberties, they continue to live day after day under the ominous shadow cast by over 1400 short and medium-range ballistic missiles that the People's Republic of China (PRC) has aimed at them. The PRC persists in claiming Taiwan as a ''renegade province,'' refusing to renounce the use of force to prevent formal de jure independence, even codifying its right to military action via passage of the so-called ''Anti-Secession Law'' on March 14, 2005. The United States Congress strongly condemned the ''Anti-Secession Law'' in House Concurrent Resolution 98, passed on March 16, 2005.

The TRA affirmed that the United States' decision to establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China was based on the expectation that the future of Taiwan would be determined by peaceful means. Furthermore, it stipulates that it is the policy of the United States ''to consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means . . . a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States.'' The unambiguous and principled stance contained in these provisions has been instrumental to the maintenance of peace and stability across the Taiwan Strait for more than thirty years.

I therefore invite my colleagues to join me in commemorating the 33rd anniversary of the TRA, to further underline our unwavering commitment to the TRA and our support for the strong and deepening relationship between the U.S. and Taiwan.

TO AMEND THE WAGNER-PEYSER ACT TO INCLUDE THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS IN THE EMPLOYMENT SERVICES PROVIDED UNDER THAT ACT

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill that will allow the Northern Mariana Islands to be eligible for Employment Service Programs by amending the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933, as amended by the Workforce Investment Act of 1998.

The Employment Service Programs provide funds to establish a nationwide system of public employment offices and One-Stop Career Centers across the United States. These centers have successfully connected millions of job seekers with employers throughout the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. The legislation I am introducing today, in remedying the statutory absence of the Northern Mariana Islands from the definition of ''State,'' will allow for the expansion of the federal Employment Service network to the NMI, thereby contributing to both the local and National economy by supporting the development of an experienced, motivated, and most importantly, employed American workforce.

Should the Commonwealth government choose to apply for this grant, the funds could be used to stand up One-Stop Centers in the NMI that would help those searching for work find jobs and help local employers find qualified workers. These Centers provide services that have a proven record of success in hundreds of locales throughout the United States.

Our national economy is still pulling itself out of the deepest recession since the 1930s. The economy in the NMI is in even worse condition, however, with declines in GDP every single year since 2004. This bill provides for the possible extension of a federal program that is helping address unemployment around our Nation to the one place, perhaps, that needs help the most, the Northern Marianas.

The employment services the Wagner-Peyser programs provide have proven effective in facilitating the connection between the employers' demand for employees and the labor market's abundant supply of a willing workforce. That is why I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

We have to do more in this Congress for U.S. workers. This is not a new program. This is not a fundamental amendment to the intent of the Act. This bill merely offers equal treatment to the Northern Marianas in giving them the chance to access funding to support our local businesses and workers in need.

TRIBUTE TO MARYK ELLIOTT-PARHAM

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize MaryK Elliott-Parham, who is retiring after more than two decades of service to Oregon's First Congressional District. For the past 27 years, MaryK has dedicated herself to the people of Northwest Oregon, ensuring that constituents always had a direct and meaningful connection to their government. Her tireless work and positive demeanor were a consistent inspiration to staff and citizens alike.

MaryK is a lifelong Oregonian, and graduated from Portland State University in 1978. She began her Congressional career as a caseworker for Representative Les AuCoin. Her efforts on behalf of constituents soon led to her promotion to lead caseworker. She built a staff that was renowned for its commitment to service.

During the 104th Congress, MaryK became district director for Representative Elizabeth Furse, a position she held up to the 112th Congress. She led the office, working day and night through the devastating storms and floods of 1996 and 2007, providing a critical access point to government assistance for constituents who had lost their homes and livelihoods. She was also known for her outstanding organizational efforts, helping members of Congress reach out to their constituents, developing detailed schedules and tracking every town hall and every visit to schools, businesses and community gatherings to be sure every community had access to its representative.

The loyalty and hard work of the staff and alumni of the First District are a testament to MaryK's management and leadership skills. Her first priority was always getting the job done for constituents, but her kindness and care for staff, especially in difficult times, created a network of people across the state, country, and globe who consider her part of their family.

On behalf of the constituents and staff of Oregon's First Congressional District, I want to congratulate MaryK on her retirement and wish her and her family all the best.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT FIRST CLASS FREDERIC NICHOLAS MOSES

HON. W. TODD AKIN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Sergeant First Class Frederic Nicholas Moses. A combat decorated veteran who deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan to serve his country, to protect those who could not protect themselves.

SFC Moses was born on 06 May 1985 in St. Charles, Missouri. He graduated from Duchesne High School in St. Charles, Missouri in 2003 and enlisted in the United States Army on 01 June 2004 as an 18X. He attended Basic Training and Advanced Individual Training at Fort Benning, Georgia. Upon

completion of the Special Forces Qualification Course in 2006, he was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 5th Special Forces Group (Airborne) at Fort Campbell, Kentucky as a Special Forces Communications Sergeant. He deployed with the Battalion Signal Detachment to Taji, Iraq from October 2007 to May 2008 in support of Operation IRAQI FREEDOM V. He went on to join Special Forces Operational Detachment—Alpha 5326, and deployed with them to Baqubah, Iraq from January through July 2009 in support of Operation IRAQI FREEDOM VI, and conducted a Joint Combined Exchange Training (JCET) exercise to Jordan from January through March 2010. SFC Moses then deployed to Baqubah, Iraq from August 2010 through March 2011 in support of Operation NEW DAWN. Following a short training cycle, he returned to Jordan for a second JCET exercise from October through November 2011.

Most recently, SFC Moses deployed to Baghlan-e-Jadid, Afghanistan from January through February 2012 in support of Operation ENDURING FREEDOM XVIII. SFC Moses' military education included Airborne School, Special Forces Assessment and Selection, Survival, Escape, Resistance and Evasion Course, Special Forces Qualification Course, Ranger School, Jumpmaster School, Basic Military Mountaineering Course, and the Advanced Special Operations Techniques Course. SFC Moses' awards and decorations included the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, and Army Achievement Medal. His decorations included the Special Forces Tab, Ranger Tab, Combat Infantryman Badge, and Parachutist Badge.

Today, we pay our respects and honor the life of Frederic Nicolas "Nic" Moses. His dedication to his job and fellow soldiers was unquestionable and unwavering. A hero to many, the community of St. Charles, and all who have served with him, will miss him.

To his family, we offer our prayers and gratitude for providing the world a great young man who made a positive impact on not only his community, but communities around the world.

I ask that my colleagues join me today in honoring the life of Nicholas Moses.

HONORING THE TRINITY VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE LADY CARDINALS

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize the outstanding achievement of the Trinity Valley Community College Lady Cardinals as the 2012 National Junior College Athletics Association (NJCAA) Division I Women's Basketball Champions. This marks the 6th NJCAA Championship for the Lady Cardinals.

In a 69 to 55 victory, the Lady Cards closed out their season with a perfect 36–0 record. That kind of differential is remarkable and a true testament to the great coaching staff of Co-Head Coaches Kenya and Michael Landers, Assistant Coach Courtney Simmons, and Coaching Assistant Jeremy Bonin. Trinity Valley Community College President Dr. Glendon Forgey, faculty, staff, and students are to be commended for their continued contributions to success both on the court and in the classroom.

Team members include: ShaQuita Arnick, Jenea Barrett, Starr Breedlove, ShaKayla Caples, Taneshia Davis, Keuna Flax, Brittney Gill, Ashley Jones, Breanna Lewis, Alice Robinson, and Keiana Vines.

On behalf of the citizens of Athens and the Fifth District of Texas, I am honored to be able to recognize the Lady Cardinals in the United States House of Representatives.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget for Fiscal Year 2013. The budget plan outlined by the CBC takes a direct and balanced approach to restoring America's promise, achieves fiscal responsibility and sets a priority to invest in our future.

The CBC Alternative Budget protects Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, TANF, Unemployment Insurance and other programs that are vital to the most vulnerable populations, which are in districts throughout this country.

Although our nation's economy is showing positive signs of growth, this Congress must continue to make critical investments in communities to accelerate—not stagger—our recovery.

To that end, the CBC Alternative Budget makes smart investments in education, workforce training, and transportation and infrastructure projects. These investments are necessary to ensure that America has a skilled and educated workforce that is prepared to tackle the challenges of the 2ist Century and compete with attempts to take American jobs overseas.

Specifically, the CBC Budget will:

invest an additional $25 billion above the President's budget in Education and Job Training in FY 2013 alone;

provide an additional $5 billion above the President's Budget request for housing programs, foreclosure assistance, and other important programs for community development;

invest an additional $50 billion in job creating transportation and infrastructure projects in FY 2013 alone and provide $155 billion above the President's budget over the next decade; and

increase the maximum Pell Grant award by nearly $1,000 over the President's Fiscal Year 2013 budget request.

The CBC Budget acknowledges the deficit and pays for domestic priorities by enacting tax reform measures to raise nearly $4 trillion in new revenue over the next decade through the Buffet Rule to ensure that millionaires and billionaires pay their fair share in taxes, and closes corporate tax loopholes and preferences for corporations that ship American jobs overseas.

The $4 trillion in revenue raised from millionaires paying their fair share will allow us to pay for an extension of tax cuts for hard working, middle class Americans—providing them with more money to feed their families, pay their bills, send their kids to school and fill up their gas tanks.

The budget would open an enormous hole in our country's social safety net by largely shifting healthcare costs to seniors on Medicare, while at the same time giving millionaires and billionaires a free pass by giving the rich an average tax cut of $150,000.

In California alone, 5,252,371 seniors would be forced onto vouchers when they retire—a system that has been shown to be a substandard version of Medicare.

The GOP budget will force seniors to pay higher premiums in order to access the same benefits they would receive under the current system. For a typical 67 year-old senior, the Ryan budget could increase out-of-pocket health care costs by $5,900.

The GOP budget would decimate our primary assistance to the poor by cutting $3.3 trillion from needed programs like Medicaid and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

In fact, a report conducted by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities found that 62 percent of proposed cuts in the Ryan budget plan come from programs that assist low-income individuals. This is the Republican vision: to balance the budget on the backs of the seniors and the poor.

The Ryan budget once again fails the test of balance, fairness, and shared responsibility. It takes a slash and burn approach to the budget, rather than going line by line to carefully examine where cuts and new sources of revenue should be implemented.

The Ryan budget plan would weaken job growth. The Economic Policy Institute found that if we were to follow Chairman RYAN's proposal, 1.3 million jobs would be lost in 2013 and 2.8 million jobs would be lost in 2014.

Mr. Chair, the CBC Alternative Budget has a better way. We understand that our current economic situation calls for a balanced and responsible approach that protects our fragile recovery and invests in our future.

For these reasons, Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the CBC Alternative Budget.

IN TRIBUTE TO ROBERT A. BRINER

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to Robert A. Briner, who is retiring this week as Chief of the Ventura County, California, District Attorney's Bureau of Investigation.

Chief Briner has more than 31 years of experience in law enforcement, 22 of them with

the District Attorney's Office. He began as a front-line investigator and was promoted through the ranks of the Bureau, culminating in his appointment as Chief of the Bureau of Investigation in February of 2007, where he manages 48 peace officers and 20 civilian employees.

As he rose through the Bureau, Chief Briner served as Supervising Senior District Attorney Investigator and Deputy Chief Investigator before his appointment as Chief of the Bureau of Investigation. During his tenure with the Bureau, he has served in the Sexual Assault/Family Protection Unit, Special Investigations/Criminal Intelligence Unit, Political Corruption Unit, Major Crimes Unit, Supervisor of the Welfare Fraud Unit, Supervisor of the Major Crimes Unit, and Deputy Chief of the Criminal Division.

Chief Briner is an active member of the FBI-Law Enforcement Executive Development Association. He also regularly attends meetings of the Ventura County Law Enforcement Coordinating Committee and chairs the Chiefs' Committee of the California District Attorney Investigators' Association. He holds an associate of science degree in administration of justice and a bachelor of arts degree in leadership. Chief Briner also has attended formal training from the State of California Department of Justice in supervision, management, and executive development.

Outside the office, Chief Briner enjoys lecturing on the topic of leadership, and most recently addressed the Young Leaders of Santa Maria. One of his greatest gifts is mentoring and encouraging young people, from little leaguers on the baseball field, to young college students at local universities, to newly hired investigators.

He also enjoys motorcycle riding, fishing, adventures in his motor home, playing golf with his son, Tyson, playing softball, and spending time with family and friends.

The Chief and his wife, Gail, will celebrate their 30th wedding anniversary in July. Chief Briner is an avid Dodger baseball fan and he and Gail often follow the team to spring training and attend many season games. He also enjoys photography and taking in nature.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in thanking Chief Briner for his lifetime of public service and in wishing him good health and many years of continued happiness with his family.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. BYUNG WOOK YOON AND NATIONAL KOREAN AMERICAN DAY

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Korean American Day, I would like to recognize the 109th anniversary of the first Korean immigrants to arrive in the United States and the achievements of the Korean-American responsible for bringing both this day and the importance of the contributions of Korean-Americans to light, Dr. Byung Wook Yoon.

In 2003, Dr. Yoon, then President of the Southern California Centennial Committee of Korean Immigration to the United States, began the campaign to establish a national Korean American Day. In 2004, when Dr. Yoon became president of the Korean-American Foundation, he formed the National Committee of Korean American Day. Under his leadership in 2005, the committee claimed victory when the U.S. Senate (S. 283) and U.S. House of Representatives (H.R. 487) passed resolutions supporting the goals and ideals of Korean American Day and establishing an annual celebration recognizing the many contributions of Americans of Korean descent to the life and cultural fabric of the United States.

Aside from spearheading the campaign to establish Korean American Day, Dr. Yoon has accomplished a great deal in his lifetime. He is the recipient of the Presidential Award from the Republic of Korea, the Grand Award for World Korean Day from the World Korean Interchange and Cooperation Association, and the Grand Award for Korean American Day from the Korean-American Foundation. Dr. Yoon was also selected as one of the one hundred honorable Korean immigrants to the United States by the Korean-American History Museum.

All his life, Dr. Yoon has demonstrated his leadership and dedication to the Korean-American community through his support of nonprofit and service organizations. For example, he is responsible for community oriented service projects such as Korean-American Respect for the Environment, KARE, and has served as the Honorary National Chairman of the Korean-American Foundation USA. He has also served three times as Chairman of the Korean Institute of Southern California.

On behalf of all of my colleagues within the U.S. House of Representatives I would like to honor Dr. Byung Wook Yoon for his outstanding work in raising awareness to the many contributions Korean-Americans have made in every facet of American society. In honor of Dr. Yoon's work, I introduced H.Res. 599. The resolution honors him for his outstanding service on behalf of the Korean American community. The resolution reads:

Whereas on January 13, 2012, the Korean American community in the United States celebrated Korean American Day initiated by Dr. Yoon.

Whereas this year marks the 109th anniversary of the first Korean immigrants to arrive in the United States.

Whereas in 2003, Dr. Yoon, then President of the Southern California Centennial Committee of Korean Immigration to the United States, began the campaign to establish a national Korean American Day.

Whereas in 2003, the Korean American Foundation was founded as the successor of the Centennial Committee of Korean Immigration with the goals of fostering pride in Korean cultural heritage and traditions as well as establishing Korean American Day.

Whereas in 2004, Dr. Yoon became president of the Korean American Foundation, forming the National Committee of Korean American Day, successfully campaigning for the passage of legislation recognizing Korean American Day on the Federal, State, and local levels.

Whereas on October 20, 2005, the U.S. Senate passed S. Res. 283, ''Recognizing the contributions of Korean Americans to the United States and encouraging the celebration of Korean American Day'.'

Whereas on December 13, 2005, the U.S. House of Representatives passed H. Res. 487 ''Supporting the goals and ideals of Korean American Day'', recognizing the many contributions of Americans of Korean descent to the life and cultural fabric of the United States.

Whereas Dr. Yoon is the recipient of the Presidential Award from the Republic of Korea.

Whereas Dr. Yoon received the first Grand Award for World Korean Day from the World Korean Interchange and Cooperation Association.

Whereas Dr. Yoon was honored with the first Grand Award for Korean American Day from the Korean American Foundation.

Whereas Dr. Yoon was selected as one of a group of 100 honorable Korean immigrants to the United States by the Korean American History Museum.

Whereas Dr. Yoon obtained a Bachelor of Arts in Political and Diplomacy Science from Korea University and a Master of Arts in Journalism and Communication from Brigham Young University.

Whereas Dr. Yoon received honorary doctorates from Yuin University and the World Mission University.

Whereas Dr. Yoon's professional career has included serving as a correspondent to the United States for the Seoul Kyunghyang Daily Newspaper as well as a Founding Director of Business and Trade for Wilshire State Bank in Los Angeles, California, and has also served three times as Chairman of the Korean Institute of Southern California.

Whereas Dr. Yoon authored the ''Korean American Legacies: Challenges and Responses'', a source of inspiration for current and future generations of Korean Americans.

Whereas over many years, Dr. Yoon has demonstrated his leadership and dedication to the Korean American community through his work and support of numerous nonprofit and service organizations, including creating KARE (Korean American Respect for the Environment), and serving as the Honorary National Chairman of the Korean American Foundation USA.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the House of Representatives honors Byung Wook Yoon for his outstanding work raising awareness and recognition of the contributions Korean Americans have made in every facet of United States society.

HONORING TRAVIS LANG

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Travis Lang of the Kirksville High School Wrestling team for winning the Class 2 Missouri State Wrestling Championship in the 182-pound weight class.

Mr. Lang and his coaches should be commended for all their hard work throughout the regular season and for bringing home the state title in the Class 2 182-pound weight class to his school and community. This is his third state title.

I ask that you join me in recognizing Mr. Lang for a job well done!

RECOGNIZING THE DUNN'S 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Joe Bob and Rose Lynne

Dunn, who on March 23, 1962, were married in the Everton Christian Church in Everton, Missouri, and are now celebrating their 50th wedding anniversary.

Joe Bob and Rose Lynne were born and raised in rural Dade County, Missouri. They both grew up on farms and graduated from Everton R3 Public School, Joe Bob—Class of 1959, and Rose Lynne—Class of 1961. While in school they were high school sweethearts and I am proud to say that their love has stood the test of time.

After graduating, Joe Bob and Rose Lynne went to work in Springfield, Missouri. Joe Bob spent his career in the Producers Creamery plant, now known as Dairy Farmers of America, and retired in 1999. Rose worked as a secretary at Lily Tulip, Zenith Electronics, and retired Emeritus from Missouri State University in 2007.

Joe Bob and Rose Lynne have been blessed with a son, Scott, who lives in Springfield, Missouri. Scott and his wife Tobin have provided the light of Joe Bob and Rose Lynne's life, their grandsons Taylor and Jordan. They both actively enjoy cheering on their grandsons in their various team sports.

When they were not busy with their family, Joe Bob and Rose Lynne enjoy square dancing together. They were active members of the Frisco Square Dance Club and to date have attended 13 national conventions. They are currently members of the Christian Church and are loyal supporters of the Missouri State athletic teams. As a family they enjoy the great outdoors by traveling and camping.

These days, they relish their well-earned golden years in the retirement home, at the Island Green Golf Community in Republic, Missouri.

I am proud of Joe Bob and Rose Lynne and am honored to call them my neighbors in the 7th Congressional District of Missouri. I want to commemorate their 50th wedding anniversary and may God bless them with many more happy and loving years together.

HONORING SUNFLOWER-HUMPHREYS COUNTIES PROGESS, INCORPORATED

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the community action agency, Sunflower-Humphreys Counties Progress, Incorporated. Sunflower-Humphreys Counties Progress, Inc. was founded in August 1965 and has locations throughout the Mississippi Delta. Sunflower-Humphreys Counties Progress, Inc. is dedicated to providing quality service to the community through diverse selections of programs that empower the community.

Sunflower-Humphreys Counties Progress, Inc. provides education and awareness about various educational and community development programs. As one of the organization's largest programs, the Sunflower Humphreys Head Start program promotes school readiness by enhancing the social and cognitive development of children through education, health, and nutritional services. Through the program's five Head Start sites and two school districts, they serve 570 Head Start children. Their Early Head Start program is for low-income infants, toddlers, and pregnant women and their families. This program addresses children's physical, social, and emotional development as well as assists pregnant women in accessing comprehensive prenatal and postpartum care. In their four Early Head Start sites they serve 72 Early Head Start children and twelve pregnant women.

Since its inception in 1965 the Sunflower, Humphreys Counties Progress, Inc. has also worked to combat poverty for persons living below the poverty guidelines within Sunflower County, Mississippi. They have implemented a food pantry which distributes donated foods to those in need and a thrift shop that sells donated items for a very low price. They also have a Senior Companion Aging Program, which is a service initiative for people age 60 and older that provides not only meals, but also assistance and friendship to elderly individuals who are homebound.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing the Sunflower-Humphreys Counties Progress organization in its commitment to combating poverty by taking action in empowering the citizens of Sunflower and Humphreys Counties.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. HENRY MADGWICK

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take a moment to honor the life of Mr. Henry Madgwick of Terrell, Texas. Henry, known to those closest to him as Harry, passed away on March 10, 2012.

Harry was born on May 16, 1923 in Hampshire, England to William Henry and Emma Mary Madgwick. At 16 years of age, Harry volunteered for Home Guard, which was a defense organization in the United Kingdom during World War II. Soon after joining the Home Guard, Harry was drafted into the Royal Air Force (RAF) as a cadet and at 17 years of age was made a squad leader in the Air Training Corps (ATC).

The Lend-Lease Act was signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on March 11, 1941. The President described the Lend-Lease Act as "helping to put out the fire in your neighbor's house before your own house caught fire and burned down." During World War II, thousands of British pilots learned to fly at six civilian training schools in the United States. The first and largest of the schools, known as the No. 1 British Flying Training School (BFTS), was in Terrell, Texas, located in Kaufman County. After the United States entered the war, American Aviation Cadets also trained at the school. More than 2,000 Royal Air Force and American Army Air Force pilots earned their wings in the skies over North Texas between 1941 and 1945 to help our nation achieve victory—including Harry, who arrived in 1944.

Harry met his soon-to-be wife, Kate Weatherford, in Terrell while training. Once the war ended and Harry was discharged from the military, he returned to Terrell and lived there for the rest of his life. Kate and Harry were married for 47 years until her passing in 1993. In 1995, he remarried to Kate Marriot Sanders, a widow of another RAF pilot who was trained at the No. 1 BFTS in Terrell. She passed away in 2001.

Harry was a fixture in Terrell, having served as Mayor, Chairman of the Baseball Committee, Director of Terrell Youth Council, the Terrell Park Board, and countless other boards and committees in the community. In 1974, he was named the Terrell Rotary Club Citizen of the Year. Most notably, though, Harry could always be found working as the President of the BFTS Museum. The BFTS Museum, located at the site of the No. 1 BFTS, was dear to Harry's heart. He had a wealth of knowledge and passion for the BFTS and has left a historic legacy for not only the city of Terrell, but for two grateful nations.

On behalf of the citizens of Terrell and the Fifth District of Texas, I am honored to recognize the life of Mr. Henry Madgwick and recognize the lasting impact he had on the Terrell community and this country.

HONORING LENORE GOODFRIEND ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Lenore Goodfriend on the occasion of her retirement from federal service. This week, Lenore will retire from her position with my office after over 20 years of public service. She is truly a remarkable person, having dedicated two decades to addressing the concerns of the many constituents in the 3rd Congressional District who contact my office on a daily basis, and someone I can call a friend to myself and my family.

I have been honored to know Lenore for many years beyond my time in Congress. Lenore is a compassionate and selfless public servant who has been active in her community in Oak Lawn and serves on the Johnson-Phelps VFW Post 5220 women's auxiliary. During her time in my office, she has helped countless members of the military with everything from dealing with the VA to obtaining medals they earned but never received. More than one constituent has remarked that her last name is no accident: she is truly a "good friend" to those in need of assistance.

Between balancing personal obligations and serving the public, Lenore is a true inspiration for her family, friends, and colleagues. I admire her strength and determination, and will miss her presence on my staff. I know Lenore will not be far away, I am sure I will be seeing her in the community, and I look forward to hearing about the next stage in her life's journey with her husband Dave, a veteran who served our nation in the Army.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Lenore Goodfriend on her many years of dedicated public service. May she enjoy her retirement to the fullest.

HAPPY 100TH BIRTHDAY TO THE GIRL SCOUTS OF THE USA

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled to congratulate the Girl Scouts of the USA on their 100th Anniversary.

With a mission to build, ''girls of courage, confidence, and character, who make the world a better place'' the Girl Scouts have served over 50 million women in the United States.

From the first ever Girl Scout troop created in 1912, the Girl Scouts have sought to instill girls and young women with the ability to be both self-reliant and resourceful and I believe very few organizations have shown the capacity to foster leadership in our nation's girls like the Girl Scouts of the USA.

The Girl Scouts have proven themselves to be an organization of action. With a goal of fostering leadership, the statistics alone speak to the overwhelming success of the Girl Scouts. Over half of my female colleagues in both the House and the Senate were Girl Scouts and over half of all female business owners in the United States were former Girl Scouts. I have no doubt that many of the 2.3 million girls currently involved with this dynamic organization will continue to live out their call to ''make the world a better place'' through their leadership, and I look forward to seeing what the next generation of dedicated Girls Scouts will accomplish.

I am proud to join my colleagues in cosponsoring H. Res. 460, Expressing support for designation of 2012 as the ''Year of the Girl'' and celebrating the 100th anniversary of the Girl Scouts of the USA.

RECOGNIZING THE LEGACY AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF RUFUS THOMAS, JR.

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the legacy and accomplishments of Rufus Thomas, Jr., one of the most charismatic and beloved performers of rhythm & blues, funk and soul music. Mr. Thomas was born in the tiny hamlet of Cayce, Mississippi on March 27, 1917 and moved to Memphis when he was two years old. He passed away in 2001 and would have turned 95 years of age this year. Before his passing, he had contributed significantly to the Memphis music scene and his legacy lives on through his daughter, singer Carla Thomas, and his son, keyboardist Marvell Thomas. In 1961, Carla Thomas' ''Gee Whiz (Look at His Eyes)'' charted within the Top 10 on the pop chart and within the Top 5 on the R&B chart. Marvell Thomas was keyboardist and arranger for such greats as The Staple Singers, Etta James and Albert King, and co-produced Isaac Hayes' album, ''Hot Buttered Soul.''

Entertaining people came naturally for Rufus. In his youth, Rufus earned pocket change by tap dancing on Beale Street. In his teenage years, he performed with the Rabbit Foot Minstrels, a traveling vaudeville show, as a tap dancer. He comprised one-half of the comedy team known as Rufus and Bones with Robert ''Bones'' Couch. Throughout the 1940s and 1950s he hosted Amateur Night at the Palace Theatre, where he introduced young performers such as B.B. King, Bobby ''Blue'' Bland and countless others.

In the late 1940s, Memphis radio station WDIA AM emerged as the first radio station in the country to target black audiences with black DJs playing black-oriented programming. Rufus landed a job there in 1948 and soon became one of the station's most popular DJs. His 2-hour nighttime show, ''Hoot and Holler'' premiered and helped launch the careers of music icons such as Elvis Presley, Ike Turner, Isaac Hayes, Roscoe Gordon and Junior Parker. Rufus continued to be an on-air personality at WDIA, influencing musicians in the Memphis area for the next 40 years, while still creating and performing his own music.

Rufus played an indispensable role in the birth of Memphis' two great record companies, Sun Records and Stax Records. His 1953 single, ''Bear Cat,'' an answer to Big Mama Thornton's then-popular record, ''Hound Dog,'' became the first national hit for the upstart record label. In 1959, Rufus and his then-teenage daughter Carla became the first stars of the new Stax Records with their single, '''Cause I Love You.'' Rufus would go on to release a string of popular songs for Stax, including favorites such as ''Walking The Dog'' (1964) and ''Do The Funky Chicken'' (1969). Throughout his career, Rufus appeared on the Billboard charts 29 times with the help of such singles as ''Push and Pull'' (1970) and ''The Breakdown'' (1971).

His life and seventy-year career were inextricably linked with the development of black entertainment in the 20th century and his work earned him an array of accolades. In January 1992, he was honored by the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, named as an ''Early Influence.'' That same year the Rhythm and Blues Foundation honored him with its prestigious Pioneer Award. In 1996, he was featured as a performer at the Olympic Games in Atlanta. For his 80th birthday in 1997, the city of Memphis renamed Hernando Street as Rufus Thomas Boulevard at the intersection of Beale Street where the Palace Theater once stood. In 1998, Rufus received an award from the Rock & Roll Hall of Fame in recognition of his five decades of promoting black music on radio.

Off stage, Thomas was entirely serious about his work as an ambassador for Memphis and its music. In his characteristically forthright fashion, he told the journalist Richard Knight: ''Memphis has made more of a contribution to music than any other one city in the whole world, and that includes New York.'' Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in remembering the life and legacy of Rufus Thomas, Jr.

CONGRATULATING DR. JOHN HITT FOR 20 YEARS OF SERVICE AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate Dr. John Hitt on his tremendous record of accomplishment as President of the University of Central Florida (UCF). This month marks Dr. Hitt's 20th year of service to UCF, and it gives me great pleasure to recognize Dr. Hitt's contributions to UCF and the Central Florida community.

Under Dr. Hitt's leadership, UCF has planned and won approval for a new college of medicine, doubled enrollment while enhancing the quality of academic offerings, exponentially increased the number of doctoral degrees awarded each year, and expanded research funding from $6.2 million to more than $121 million per year.

Before coming to UCF, Dr. Hitt held numerous posts as both faculty and executive leadership at academic institutions, including Assistant Professor of Psychology at Tulane University, Vice President of Texas Christian University Research Foundation, and Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Bradley University.

Dr. Hitt's passion for education led him to UCF, where he arrived in March 1992. Since that time, he has been honored with many awards and recognitions, including Junior Achievement's Spirit of Achievement Award in 2008, Orlando Business Journal's inaugural Legacy Award in 2006, Metro Orlando Economic Development Commission James B. Greene award in 2002, and the Greater Orlando Chamber of Commerce's John Young Award in 2008.

It was a personal honor to work with Dr. Hitt while serving as a member of the Board of Trustees for UCF. Dr. Hitt's attitude of servant leadership and his dedication to quality education for UCF's students has been a testimony to his personal modesty and humility. Dr. Hitt is not only a great president for UCF, but he is a model for the University's students.

On behalf of the citizens of Central Florida, I congratulate and applaud Dr. Hitt on his 20th year of service as the president of the University of Central Florida. May his character, life, and efforts inspire others to follow in his footsteps.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus Alternative Budget for Fiscal Year 2013. The budget plan outlined by the CPC takes a calculated and balanced approach to restoring America's promise, and investing in our future.

Unlike the House GOP Budget Resolution, the CPC Alternative Budget protects Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, TANF, Unemployment Insurance and other programs that are vital to the most vulnerable populations in our society.

In my district, we suffer from rates of unemployment and home foreclosure that are significantly higher than the rest of the country. Although our nation's economy is showing positive signs of growth, we must continue to make critical investments in our communities to accelerate our recovery.

To that end, the CPC Alternative Budget makes smart investments in education, job creation measures, and transportation and infrastructure projects. These investments are necessary to ensure that America has a skilled and educated workforce that is prepared to tackle the challenges of the 21st Century. Without these investments, the United States will lose its competitive edge.

A $556 billion surface transportation bill would help meet the overwhelming need for repair and construction of our roadways and aging infrastructure. Lastly, the Budget for All outlines a plan for nearly $1.7 trillion in widespread domestic investment, getting badly needed funds to valuable programs that are scheduled for starvation under current law.

This budget outlines a plan to put over 2 million individuals back to work over the next 2 years by hiring them for work in areas critical to our quality of life. This would create the School Improvement Corps for public school rehabilitation projects, the Park Improvement Corps made of youth ages 16 to 25 for restoration on public lands, the Student Jobs Corps of college students for part-time work study positions, among others. Priority hiring is given to the unemployed and veterans.

Domestic investments create jobs and lay the foundation for exceptional American industries competing in the global economy. The creation of an infrastructure bank would attract private investment toward critical infrastructure projects and facilitate private-public partnerships with our states and localities. Some projections estimate that the iBank could mobilize up to $625 billion in funding for infrastructure.

The revenue raised from tax reform measures in the CPC budget will allow us to pay for an extension of tax cuts for hard working, middle class Americans—providing them with more money to feed their families, pay their bills, and fill up their gas tanks.

Mr. Chair, the CPC Budget will do all of this while managing to be able to reduce the deficit by $6.8 trillion.

Instead of working to strengthen Medicare, the Ryan budget would end Medicare as we know it, turning the guarantee of retirement security into a voucher that will shift higher and higher costs over time to over 45 million seniors.

In California alone, 5,252,371 seniors would be forced onto vouchers when they retire.

The GOP budget will force seniors to pay higher premiums in order to access the same benefits they would receive under the current system. For a typical 67 year-old senior, the Ryan budget could increase out-of-pocket health care costs by $5,900.

The GOP budget would decimate our primary assistance to the poor by cutting $3.3 trillion from essential programs like Medicaid and SNAP.

In fact, a report conducted by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities found that 62 percent of proposed cuts in the Ryan budget plan come from programs that assist low-income individuals. This is the Republican vision: to balance the budget on the backs of the seniors and the poor.

The Ryan budget plan would weaken job growth. The Economic Policy Institute found that if we were to follow Chairman Ryan's proposal, 1.3 million jobs would be lost in 2013 and 2.8 million jobs would be lost in 2014.

Mr. Chair, the CPC has a better way. We understand that our current economic situation calls for a balanced approach that protects our fragile recovery and invests in our future.

For these reasons, Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the CPC Alternative Budget.

IN HONOR OF CÉSAR CHÁVEZ

HON. JERRY McNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of César Chávez on the occasion of what would have been his 85th birthday.

César Chávez was born on March 31, 1927, near Yuma, Arizona. After losing their family farm, the members of the Chávez family became migrant workers, moving to California and following seasonal harvests around the state. Upon experiencing the exploitation of migrant workers and injustices committed against them, Mr. Chávez became a champion of workers' rights.

In 1962, Mr. Chávez and Dolores Huerta cofounded National Farm Workers Association, later known as the United Farm Workers, UFW. Mr. Chávez was inspired by leaders such as Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and understood the power of non-violence as a tool for change. As a leader of UFW, he used non-violent tactics and strong organizing methods to protest poor working conditions. Mr. Chávez fought for basic improvements for farm workers such as access to drinking water, shade, and restrooms. He was also a tireless advocate for fair wages and decent living conditions.

César Chávez led the fight for the passage of the landmark California Agricultural Labor Relations Act in 1975. This law was the first in the nation to guarantee farm workers the right to organize and bargain collectively. Additionally, his understanding of human suffering led him to fight against the use of the short-handled hoe, which caused personal injury and pain to farm laborers. A California Supreme Court ruling in 1975 banned the use of this tool.

Mr. Chávez was known for his spirit as much as his accomplishments. Mr. Chávez and the UFW embraced an empowering and enduring rallying cry that exemplifies his optimism of the human spirit: "Sí se puede," or "Yes we can."

César Chávez is an inspirational figure in California and throughout our nation. I have no doubt that his efforts have made a positive impact on the lives of countless workers. It is for these reasons that I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring César Chávez on the occasion of the 85th anniversary of his birth.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RANDY NEUGEBAUER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I .was unable to vote on rollcall vote numbers 107 110. Had I been present, I would have voted the following way: rollcall No. 107, Amendment to H.R. 3606 by Rep. Peters, "no"; rollcall No.108, Amendment to H.R. 3606 by Rep. Capps, "no"; rollcall No. 109, H.R. 3606, Motion to Recommit with Instructions, "no"; rollcall No. 110, H.R. 3606, the JOBS Act, "yes."

RECOGNIZING THE MILLBROOK HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Millbrook High School Girls Basketball team, on becoming the only Virginia high school team that has ever won three consecutive State championships in girls basketball.

Earlier this month, the Millbrook Pioneers broke the 61-year-old Virginia High School League record by winning an unprecedented third state title with a victory over the Courtland Cougars. I commend the team for their hard work and their passion for basketball. I would like to extend a special thank you to Coach Debby Sanders who has led the team on the path to success.

I submit the following piece from the Winchester Star on the Millbrook Pioneers' record-breaking victory.

[Mar. 12, 2012]

OUR VIEW: PERFECT PIONEERS—THIRD TITLE "ICING ON THE CAKE"

RICHMOND.—Thirty minutes before her girls basketball team took the floor in search of an unprecedented third straight state title Saturday night, Millbrook High Principal Carrie Butler was talking about cake.

No, Mrs. Butler was not hungry, at least not discernibly. The cake she was rather nervously describing to Frederick County School Board member Peggy Clark was purely figurative.

"I told Debby (Millbrook coach Sanders), 'The cake is sweet . . . with or without the icing,' " Mrs. Butler said to Mrs. Clark.

In other words, even if the Pioneers somehow came up short of their 80th consecutive victory on the Siegel Center floor, this "cake," baked with care and love over the last three winters, would not lose its "sweet" taste. Win or lose, what the Pioneers had accomplished up to then—a record 79 straight wins, two state championships—was simply amazing. Or, like the famous song or hit new TV drama, "unforgettable."

Nurturing principal that she is, Mrs. Butler was simply erecting, through metaphor, a firebreak (or ''cakebreak''?) against letdown. Courtland, the Pioneers' opponent, was also entering the contest undefeated. And anything can happen in sports, and often does—especially when two teams that have not played each other previously collide.

Then again, this is Millbrook we're talking about. Which is another way of saying, ''No need to worry. This is old hat. The situation's well under control.''

And, indeed, it was.

The Pioneers spotted the Cougars the first four points of the game, and traded buckets on a brace of ensuing alternate possessions. But then it came, as predictable as the morning sun. With Courtland leading 8–4, the Pioneers ripped off one of their patented runs, this time to the tune of 20–4, to double the score at 24–12.

The Cougars crept back to within eight at the half, 29–21, and, after Millbrook stretched its lead to 37–23, they managed to cut the margin back to single digits, at 37–28, late in the third quarter. But then, as is their wont, the locals ran away and hid, dosing out the game on a 10–0 spurt to win 63–38.

The contest, though intensely played, had none of the drama of the Pioneers' first two state titles, against Greensville County (2010) when star Courtni Green hurt an ankle, or Robert E. Lee last year. So schooled, so measured and yet so relentless, these girls drain drama out of on-court proceedings by sheer talent and will.

In fitting style, the team's trio of college-bound standouts—Miss Green, Alisha Mobley, and Sara Mead—dominated the stats sheet, all hitting double figures in points. As dominant as Miss Green has been over four years, amassing more than 2,600 points, on this night, it was the ''paint'' presence of Miss Mobley for whom the opposition had absolutely no answer. She was unstoppable.

But then, consider this: So, too, have been the Pioneers, with their seven seniors and an enviable bench used adroitly by Miss Sanders.

As such, they've earned the right to revel. That previously unblemished foe has been vanquished; the icing, too, has been whipped. Let them eat cake. And so let us all—as we've just witnessed something truly special, something worth celebrating.

REMARKS BY FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL MICHAEL MUKASEY

HON. DANIEL E. LUNGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 24, 2012, former Attorney General of the United States Michael Mukasey spoke at an event in Paris about Iran and the Iranian opposition.

Judge Mukasey's comments warrant our consideration in light of the events which are currently taking place in Iran and their potential impact on the global community. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to submit them to this Body:

Thank you very much. Thank you to the sponsors of this wonderful conference. Thank you David Amess for your clear, penetrating comments on what is going on.

You know it seems as though we've come together many times before to talk about the plight of the residents of Ashraf, and now the plight of the residents of both Ashraf and the ironically named Camp Liberty. And we were told on each of those occasions that these broadcasts, that these meetings were broadcast to Ashraf. And we haven't been told it, but I wonder whether perhaps they're being broadcast at Camp Liberty as well.

I would suggest to you, I would suggest to you that there's someplace else that they should be broadcast. They should be broadcast to the United States State Department. Of course, based on what's happened in the last couple of weeks, I can't guarantee that the signal would get through. I mean it may very well be that at the State Department, just as in Cuba and North Korea and Iran, they jam broadcasts with which they disagree. I don't know whether that's true at the State Department or not. I sincerely hope so. But I would hope that a broadcast like this would get through, because then they would see. They would see Mrs. [Maryam] Rajavi open this session by extending her sympathy to the Jewish community of Toulouse. They would see and hear her discuss what her religion really means and what it has to do with terrorism, which is nothing. They would get a hint as to what kind of, quote, terrorist organization, unquote, this really is.

Of course this wasn't the way it was supposed to be. In 2003 when coalition forces invaded Iraq and encountered the residents of Ashraf, the Ashraf residents peacefully surrendered their weapons, the weapons they had, the only thing they had to defend themselves, and received in return on a piece of paper a guarantee that they would be treated as protected persons under the fourth Geneva Conventions, a guarantee signed on behalf of all coalition forces by a United States general. And they received identity cards that carry the telephone number of the military police, commanded by another United States general who has appeared at these meetings before, General Phillips. As I'm sure you know, because we've told the story several times, the Clinton administration put the MEK on a list of foreign terrorist organizations really to appease the Iranians in the hope that that would invite a dialogue. Some dialogue. Some dialogue, with the regime that only a couple of months ago plotted to assassinate a Saudi diplomat in the United States. Those are the people they wanted to talk to.

The FBI went in 2003 and vetted each of the residents of Ashraf to make sure that none of them were a terrorist, and in each case it was certified that none were. The Iraqis, as we know, have been acting increasingly at the behest of the Iranian government, now that the United States has withdrawn. And Nouri al-Maliki himself is behind the pressure that is being brought and the persecution that is being brought against the residents of both Ashraf and Camp Liberty. This is how we get thanks for the sacrifices that were made by American troops and by the United States as a whole in freeing the people of Iraq.

The United Nations says transfer to Camp Liberty. We've had 1,200 people transfer to Camp Liberty. And we're told each time, notwithstanding the completely inadequate conditions at Camp Liberty, that this is progress. We're making progress. People are moving out of Ashraf into Camp Liberty and this is progress. You know, I had an uncle once who died of progress. He was—it's true, he was in the hospital. And every day the doctor came and checked on him and said he was showing progress, until one day he was dead. And the family concluded he must have died of progress. Ambassador [Martin] Kobler reminds me of that doctor.

Of course, it's even worse than that here because the potentially fatal disease that the residents of Ashraf have really comes from their designation as a foreign terrorist organization. The U.S. designation. And when I say the U.S. designation advisedly because we're the only ones left in the civilized world who apply that designation. And it's time to get rid of it.

So, how is this all going to end? Well, I suggest to you ladies and gentlemen that I'm very hopeful about how it's going to end. I'm a lawyer, I deal in evidence. We have evidence. We have statements from anonymous sources that those of us who are here voicing our views are behaving illegally under U.S. law.

It's a funny thing about anonymous sources, what are they afraid of? They must be afraid of something. They're afraid to have their names used. Look at the timing. The MEK tells the State Department and the Justice Department, ''You know, you've been dragging your feet long enough with this designation. We're going to go into court.'' They gave them not only advanced notice that they're going to do it, they gave them an advanced copy of the papers they were going to file. And they disclosed the names of the people. Mayor Giuliani, Tom Ridge, others, many others, who would have also filed paper in court as friends of the court, telling them on the basis of our experience and our knowledge—many people on that brief directly involved in national security affairs—that there is no basis, no reason for that designation. They were told that in advance. And lo and behold a couple days later subpoenas get served on the speaker agencies that send those people out to express their views. I stopped believing in coincidences like that when I stopped believing in the Tooth Fairy, and that was a long time ago.

But how is it going to come out? Well, look at the behavior. The people who release information to the press are afraid to give their names. The State Department hears that papers are going to be filed on behalf of MEK, that papers are going to be filed by people who have spoken out in behalf of delisting, scurry to the Treasury Department, get them to serve subpoenas.

What are they afraid of? The people here aren't afraid. Rudy Giuliani, John Bolton, Patrick Kennedy, Tom Ridge, they're all sitting up there behind placards that have their names on them. We all use our names. The people who are not here, and who have been here before and who will be here again if necessary, Howard Dean, Ed Rendell, they used their names. They don't get up as anonymous informants to speak at these meetings. They get up, they give their names and they express their views. So who's going to prevail?

But can these people prevail in the face of the United States government? Let me repeat the words of a famous American industrialist, a man named Henry Kaiser who was once confronted by the U.S. government. And people asked him, ''Do you think that you can prevail against the U.S. government in the view that you've expressed and the course of action that you want to follow?'' And his response was, ''You know what? There's no such thing as the U.S. government. They're just a bunch of people.'' Some of them are smart and dedicated and some of them are stupid and lazy. And we know who's on which side in the current dispute.

Ladies and gentlemen, I haven't got any doubt about how this is going to come out. And the way this is going to come out is that eventually right will prevail in my country. And when right prevails in my country it is my sincere hope that it won't be long before right prevails in your country and you restore Iran to the glorious civilization that it was and will be. Thank you very much.

HONORING SAM CRANE

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Sam Crane of the Rock Bridge High School Bruins Wrestling team for winning the Class 4 Missouri State Wrestling Championship in the 132-pound weight class.

Mr. Crane and his coaches should be commended for all their hard work throughout the regular season and for bringing home the state title in the Class 4 132-pound weight class to his school and community. His win represents the school's first state champion in Class 4 since 1997.

I ask that you join me in recognizing Mr. Crane for a job well done.

RECOGNIZING THE GIRL SCOUTS OF THE MISSOURI HEARTLANDS

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Girl Scouts of the Missouri Heartland, a council in the 7th District of Missouri, as Girl Scouts celebrates 100 years of leadership development for girls.

Girl Scouts of the Missouri Heartland is headquartered in Springfield, Missouri, and has a membership of approximately 17,000 girls living in southwest and central Missouri, southeast Kansas, and northeast Oklahoma. Last year, Girl Scouts of the Missouri Heartland experienced a more than 17 percent increase in its membership, ranking it third in the country for growth out of 112 Girl Scout councils.

March 12, 2012, marked the 100th anniversary of Girl Scouts of the USA. Self-discovery and community service were core values that Girl Scouts founder Juliette Low sought to instill in girls from the earliest days. In 1912, many girls' paths in life were limited and Low's vision was for girls to be able to expand their personal horizons by having fun while exploring new interests and contributing to society.

Girl Scouts today benefit from tangible outcomes such as a strong sense of self, practical life skills, healthy relationships, and feeling empowered to make a difference. In southwest Missouri, Girl Scouts are participating in robotics teams, financial literacy activities, environmental stewardship campaigns, and numerous other initiatives that reflect the continued strength and relevance of the Girl Scout Leadership Experience.

They also give back to their community with thousands of hours of community service each year. During this year's Girl Scout Cookie Program, many Girl Scouts participated in the Cookie Share program, through which Girl Scout Cookies are shared with military organizations or food pantries. At summer camp and locally, girls will participate in Girl Scouts Forever Green projects to promote environmental stewardship. This year, girls have also helped to replenish food supplies at local pantries, provide comfort and supplies to families displaced by tornadoes, bring joy to residents at nursing homes, thank veterans for their service, and much more.

Folks in Southwest Missouri should be proud to know that the Girl Scout program remains strong and provides a significant opportunity for girls today to learn and grow safely. I too am proud and honored to know that young girls in the 7th District of Missouri are demonstrating positive values and strong leadership skills—and will continue to do so for years to come.

CONGRATULATING PATTY HARRELSON ON RECEIVING THE 2011–2012 PRINCIPAL ACHIEVEMENT AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING LEADERSHIP

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate Patty Harrelson on receiving the 2011–2012 Principal Achievement Award for Outstanding Leadership. I am honored to have the opportunity to offer my sincere appreciation for the hard work and dedication that went into this well-deserved award.

At Florida's Commissioner's Summit for Principals, Florida Education Commissioner Gerard Robinson awarded Ms. Harrelson the award, naming Ms. Harrelson the state's top principal for her leadership at Rosemont Elementary School. Under Ms. Harrelson's guidance and direction, the Orange County school improved its school accountability grade from a "D" to an "A" in a single year.

Taking on the responsibility of principal in 2010, Ms. Harrelson instituted reforms on every level, from curtailing truancy to bringing cutting edge technology into the classrooms. Because of her belief in Rosemont's students and her confidence in their ability to learn and meet academic standards, Ms. Harrelson worked tirelessly to raise expectations and reward achievement publicly.

Her spirit of dedication and commitment to her students is an example of the life-changing impact a dedicated educator can have on a community and on the individual lives of students. She is a shining example of the fruits of selflessness demonstrated by our teachers and administrators who devote themselves to Florida's future by investing in Florida's children.

On behalf of the citizens of Central Florida, I congratulate and applaud Ms. Harrelson for her hard work, dedication, and leadership. She is most deserving of the 2011–2012 Principal Achievement Award for Outstanding Leadership. May her investment in Florida's students and Florida's future inspire others to follow in her footsteps.

COMMEMORATING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE B 1 U.S. NAVY BAND

HON. MELVIN L. WATT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make sure that we acknowledge in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the 70th Anniversary of a group of African-American World War II Navy Veterans known as the B–1 United States Navy Band.

The B–1 United States Navy Band was formed in 1942 and was comprised of talented African-American musicians, many of whom were from North Carolina, who were among the first African-Americans to serve in the modern U.S. Navy in roles other than kitchen staff positions. Most of the Band's approximately forty-four original members were affiliated with North Carolina A&T State University, which is located in Greensboro, North Carolina in my congressional district. The Band was stationed at the U.S. Navy's Pre-Flight Training School in Chapel Hill, North Carolina and provided musical entertainment to pilot trainees during World War II. In 1944 the Band was transferred to sea duty in Hawaii and continued to perform for military personnel and civilians for the duration of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the members of the B–1 U.S. Navy Band for their service to our country and to join me in commemorating the Band's 70th Anniversary which will be celebrated on April 14, 2012 on the campus of North Carolina A&T State University.

CONGRATULATORY REMARKS FOR OBTAINING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SANDY ADAMS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mrs. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Max Christopher DiRocco for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

Throughout the history of the Boy Scouts of America, the rank of Eagle Scout has only been attained through dedication to concepts such as honor, duty, country and charity. By applying these concepts to daily life, Max has proven his true and complete understanding of their meanings, and thereby deserves this honor.

I offer my congratulations on a job well done and best wishes for the future.

HONORING MRS. LOURDES LOZANO

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Women's History month, I rise today to honor Mrs. Lourdes Lozano, a remarkable leader in the South Florida community.

Mrs. Lozano was born in Las Villas, Cuba and attended the Escuela Normal de Maestros in preparation for her teaching profession. After graduation she received a post graduate degree from the University of Martha Abreu, in Santa Clara. Once arriving in Miami, she received her Bachelor's degree in Psychology from St. Thomas University.

Mrs. Lozano began her professional career working at ARSCO International, a company in the paint roller industry. While working for this company she became the first woman in the

industry to hold the position of Plant Manager. She later went on the become Vice President and General Manager of the company. Mrs. Lozano has also worked as a realtor for the past 28 years and as a supervisor for twelve social workers and one specialist for 22 years. In the past she has also been appointed to serve the community as a Commissioner for Hialeah's Housing Authority.

Mrs. Lozano's work does not stop there, as she has been a volunteer for Liga Contra el Cancer and for the Muscular Dystrophy Association for over 30 years. Along with her husband Richard Irizarry, Mrs. Lozano has made tremendous contributions to our community and both are highly admired for their hard work. In 2004 she was recognized as one of the eight public service employees in Miami-Dade who perform their professional duties with excellence. She has also received the "Most Humanitarian Award" from the Department of Children and Families. She has also been recognized by the Mayor of the City of Hialeah, for her leadership on a number of projects which help alleviate some of the burdens of needy families in the community.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to my dear friend Mrs. Lourdes Lozano for her continued service to the South Florida community. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual and wish her continued success.

HONORING MID-DELTA HOME HEALTH AND HOSPICE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Mid-Delta Home Health and Hospice Center. The Mid-Delta Home Health and Hospice Center was founded by Clara T. Reed in 1978 in Belzoni, Mississippi. For more than 30 years the Mid-Delta Home and Hospice has been dedicated to serving the needs of patients throughout the Mississippi Delta.

Mid-Delta Home Health and Hospice Center continues under the dynamic leadership of Chief Executive Officer Clara T. Reed. Mrs. Reed received her licensed practical nursing degree from Mississippi Valley State University in 1964. She later received her Registered Nursing degree in 1970 and a Bachelor's degree in Gerontology from Mississippi Valley State University in 1990.

Mrs. Reed's outstanding leadership and dedication has moved the organization on a progressive track and helped to expand its reach around and beyond the state of Mississippi. Mid-Delta Home Health and Hospice provides health and hospice care to individuals and their families in 32 of the 82 counties in the State of Mississippi. Mid-Delta operates 10 branches in Mississippi locations which include Batesville, Belzoni, Clarksdale, Cleveland, Canton, Greenwood, Greenville, Lexington, Madison, and Tunica. They also have offices in Bastrop and Vidalia, Louisiana. Currently, Mid-Delta has over 650 employees spread throughout the Mississippi Delta and treats over 3,500 patients annually. Mid-Delta prides itself on providing specialized services 24 hours a day and seven days a week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mid-Delta Home Health and Hospice for its unwavering commitment and continued home health care services it provides in the great state of Mississippi and surrounding areas.

TRIBUTE TO MAX McINTOSH

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Max McIntosh, the director of the VA's Southern Oregon Rehabilitation Center and Clinics (SORCC) in White City, Oregon, who will retire tomorrow, March 30, after 39 years of service to the VA.

Since 2003, Max has run the SORCC, transitioning it from a domiciliary into a world class rehabilitation center and a system of clinics for veterans in southern Oregon. He came to the clinic two years earlier as Chief Operating Officer.

When he arrived, the SORCC served 7,000 outpatients in the region—no small feat. Today, through the good work of Max and his staff of over 500 employees and another 500 volunteers, the SORCC cares for 450 residential patients and 18,000 outpatients in Southern Oregon. These are men and women who have worn the nation's uniform to defend our freedom and cherished way of life, and they deserve the highest levels of care. Max made sure that they received it.

In his years as director of the SORCC, Max and the facility have adapted to serve our nation's heroes—from those who served in World War II to Iraq and Afghanistan. Vocational rehabilitation and employment services place veterans with community employers and partners. They have programs focused on post-traumatic stress disorder and suicide prevention, and clinics on chronic pain and diabetes. They recently instituted a system of home-based primary care, caring for veterans in their homes.

Perhaps the greatest challenge he faced in his tenure was among the first, when a proposal was floated to close or reduce services at the SORCC. Max stood arm-in-arm with me and the rest of the community as a fierce advocate for the facility. Today it stands as a nationally known veteran rehabilitation center, in no small part because of Max's leadership.

When I spent Veterans Day with Max and the veterans of southern Oregon at the SORCC this past November, I noted that "A nation is judged by the way it takes care of the people who protect its freedom." In his 39 years of service to our country, Max has made us proud. I understand that he's already signed up to do volunteer work at the SORCC.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful community, state, and nation, I thank Max for his service to this country's heroes, and wish him well as he moves on.

CONGRATULATING SHANA CHANDLER AND BRANDON WEST ON THE BIRTH OF HUDSON SCOTT WEST

HON ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to congratulate Shana Chandler and Brandon West on the birth of their son, Hudson Scott West. Hudson Scott was born this morning, March 29, 2012, at 1:32 a.m., in Washington, DC.

Weighing eight pounds and ten ounces, Hudson Scott measured twenty-one and one-quarter inches long. I understand that both he and his mother are doing very well.

I am excited by this blessing, and I am extremely happy for Shana, Brandon, and the West and Chandler families. I wish them all the very best.

FRUSTRATION WITH ABC NEWS REPORTING ON BEEF PRODUCTS, INC. (BPI)

HON. TIM HUELSKAMP

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing my frustration with ABC News' muckraking "journalism" that has forced the closure of a plant employing more than 200 people in my district.

What we have before us is a perfect example of mainstream media completely disconnected from reality. In a quest for accolades and attention, reporters, talking heads, and morning talk show hosts at ABC have made it their intention to drive Beef Products, Inc. (BPI) out of business. And they may have succeeded. Despite developing a process that adds approximately $15 of value to each head of cattle processed, and providing safe, healthy, lean meat for more than 300 billion meals, BPI is being forced to close the doors of its plant in Finney County, Kansas.

But while the reporters, producers, and executives at ABC move on to their next "public interest" story as questions of finely textured lean beef fade into the background, the same cannot be said of employees at BPI. It is ironic that a perfectly good "public interest" story for them to cover is the loss of hundreds of jobs for people in my district and from the three other BPI plants across the country. But doing so would bring too much attention to ABC's role in causing these people to lose their jobs.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker—finely textured lean beef is just that: beef. In terms of meat content, it is no different from the steak being served at Charlie Palmer's, or the hamburger at Five Guys. It's not scrap, filler, or substitute. It's beef.

And it's safe to eat. While much has been made of the use of ammonia to treat the meat once it is processed, it has not been, and should not be a safety concern. This process has been approved by the USDA on a whole host of food products, including meat, cheeses, chocolate, pudding, condiments, and beverages to prevent food-borne diseases.

Not once, in nearly 20 years of production, has there ever been a report of e.coli or other food-borne illness resulting from finely textured lean beef. It is safe, healthy and only being vilified because someone thought it might win them an award.

It is my hope that the American people will not be so easily fooled in the future, and will explore the facts for themselves, rather than allowing a news organization, on a crusade to win awards, take down a safe, successful company providing good jobs for hundreds of Americans.

HONORING MS. JENNIFER VALOPPI

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Women's History Month, I rise today to honor Ms. Jennifer Valoppi, an outstanding individual and leader in South Florida.

Ms. Valoppi is a multi-Emmy Award winning TV journalist, award winning author and social entrepreneur. Ms. Valoppi is the President and Co-Founder of the Women of Tomorrow Mentor and Scholarship Program (WOT), a unique mentoring organization that helps young at-risk women live up to their full potential. She is currently engaged in expanding WOT nationally to inspire and motivate women across the nation. Through Ms. Valoppi's leadership, WOT has received national recognition and has been the focus of study by the Harvard Business School Community Partners Program.

As lead anchor at NBC 6 WTVJ in Miami, Ms. Valoppi covered historic moments including the 2000 Presidential election, the Elian Gonzalez saga, the Versace Murder, the Olympics, and California's Northridge earthquake. She also took a leading role in driving the stations commitment to fair, accurate, and balanced journalism.

Both Ms. Valoppi and her husband, Christian Berdouare have made tremendous contributions to our community and are highly admired for their hard work. Ms. Valoppi is a recipient of Florida Jeb Bush's Points of Light Award, the highest honor in Florida. She was named a Heavy Hitter in Non-Profit by the South Florida Business Journal. She has also been awarded the "Inner Circle of 12 Distinction" from the American Cancer Society and the "Woman of Impact Award" from the Women's History Coalition, among many other awards and recognitions.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Ms. Jennifer Valoppi for her continued service to the South Florida community and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a dear friend and an exemplary individual.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK PALMERSHEIM

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Patrick Palmersheim for being awarded the Medal of Honor from the Iowa State Daughters of the American Revolution.

Daughters of the American Revolution was founded in 1890 and incorporated by Congress in 1896 as a national volunteer organization committed to encouraging patriotism and promoting American ideals though better education for our nation's children. Nationwide, DAR boasts more than 170,000 members from 3,000 chapters across all 50 states in addition to various international chapters as well.

The most prestigious honor awarded by Daughters of the American Revolution is the DAR Medal of Honor. To receive this prestigious award, one must be a native born American who has shown an extraordinary commitment to the qualities of service, leadership, trustworthiness and, of course, patriotism. DAR Medal of Honor recipients are recognized for making lasting contributions to our American heritage through selfless service to their country, state, community and fellow man.

Accordingly, Mr. Palmersheim has been serving Iowans his entire career. Patrick served nine years in our nation's Air Force before civically serving in his rural Iowa community through his roles on the city council, as a volunteer firefighter, and as mayor. In 2002, he was appointed Executive Director of the Iowa Commission of Veterans Affairs by then Governor Tom Vilsack. Patrick's leadership in his new role directly led to Iowa becoming the first state in the U.S. to pass legislation that allowed nursing homes the opportunity to report their residents for potential eligibility for federal benefits from the Veterans Administration. Mr. Palmersheim was also instrumental in establishing the long-desired Iowa Veterans Cemetery, which has provided a final resting place for 80,000 veterans since its groundbreaking in November of 2006.

Mr. Speaker, what Mr. Palmersheim has done for the state of Iowa and our veterans cannot be understated. He is truly the benchmark for which this prestigious award is bestowed. It is an honor to represent Patrick and all of Iowa's veterans in the United States Congress and I trust my colleagues in the House will rise to join me in congratulating Patrick for all he has done.

HONORING DONALD JONES, JASON BOWMASTER, AND DANIEL DIMATTEO

HON. TIM GRIFFIN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor three Arkansas heroes.

Jacksonville Fire Department Captain Donald Jones and Engineer Jason Bowmaster along with Jacksonville Police Officer Daniel DiMatteo were struck by a van while responding to an accident on Monday, March 19th.

Engineer Bowmaster and Officer DiMatteo are in stable condition.

However, tragically, Captain Jones, a 31-year veteran of the department, passed away as a result of his injuries. He is the first member of the Jacksonville Fire Department to be killed in the line of duty.

Captain Jones served the last years of his career with Station 4 and is survived by his wife, Betty, his five children, three brothers, nine grandchildren, and one great-grandson.

Every day across the nation, our first responders put their lives on the line, sacrificing to keep us safe in our communities.

And, these three men were doing just that: serving and protecting their communities.

I honor them for their service to Jacksonville, and I keep them and their families in my prayers as they recover from this tragic accident.

HONORING MARCUS SCHMIDT

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Marcus Schmidt of the Centralia High School Wrestling team for winning the Class 1 Missouri State Wrestling Championship in the 120-pound weight class.

Mr. Schmidt and his coaches should be commended for all their hard work throughout the regular season and for bringing home the state title in the Class 1 120-pound weight class to his school and community. This is his fourth state medal and second consecutive Class 1 championship.

I ask that you join me in recognizing Mr. Schmidt for a job well done!

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BRANSON, MISSOURI

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize world-famous Branson, Missouri. This year, Branson celebrates 100 years of heritage, harmony, and hospitality. Branson is a community of people, shaped and inspired by the lakes and hills that surround her, with a common mission, united in perseverance and service to others.

Over the past 100 years, millions of people from around the world have enjoyed and appreciated this special location in Ozark Mountain Country. However, it wasn't always this way, as Branson comes from humble beginnings.

In 1882, a community was founded when a young schoolteacher named Reuben Branson built a store and opened the first post office in a rural area of southwest Missouri. Branson continued to grow, helped by steamboats and the White River Railroad arriving in 1906, and Branson was officially incorporated on April 1, 1912.

In 1907, preacher Harold Bell Wright wrote a best-selling book, "Shepherd of the Hills," which led to an attraction still thriving today. Inspired entrepreneurs kept arriving and in 1949, Hugo Herschend signed a 99-year lease on a cave and went on to build Silver Dollar City. In 1959, Branson's distinction as a music destination began when the Mabe brothers opened the first music show. The Presley family opened the town's second music show on what eventually became Missouri Route 76.

Today, Branson entertains millions of visitors who embrace the city's heritage, harmony and hospitality. I am proud to have the city and the community of Branson in my district and I congratulate them on the past 100 years and I look forward to 100 more.

HONORING RIPLEY BLACKWELL HEAD START CENTER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Ripley Blackwell Head Start Center, Inc. The center was named in honor of two civil rights pioneers, Mrs. Minnie Ripley, and Mrs. Unita Blackwell, the first African-American elected as the Mayor of Mayersville, Mississippi, in 1976. The center was originally known as the Friends of Children of Mississippi, until 1980 when they adopted the name of Ripley Blackwell Head Start Center. The center serves both Sharkey and Issaquena counties in the Mississippi Delta. The center's mission is to educate the children of Sharkey & Issaquena counties as well as serving their families.

The Ripley Blackwell Head Start became a valuable part of the community by addressing the barriers that hindered growth and development, and the nurturing of a community bond. The area director, Mr. Roger Robinson, was instrumental in convincing the school board to purchase an old high school for the growth and expansion and all the amenities needed to accommodate the center.

In the beginning the center served 180 children and their families with nine units. Currently, Ripley Blackwell Head Start serves 111 children and their families with six units. They have successfully transitioned over 5,558 children into the public schools of Sharkey and Issaquena counties.

For over 30 years the Ripley Blackwell Head Start Center has prepared children to enter kindergarten confidently with the social, physical, emotional, and cognitive skills and competencies necessary for continued school success. Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join in recognizing the Ripley Blackwell Head Start Center, Inc. for their commitment to educating the community.

TRIBUTE TO MARK HENRY FARLINGER

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mark Farlinger of Cresco for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about five percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained over the years.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. Mark's project was to construct a kiosk and a welcome sign to assist the visitors of Vernon Springs Park in Howard County. The work ethic Mark has shown in this project, and every other project leading up to his Eagle Scout rank, speaks volumes of his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent Mark and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating him in obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking, and will wish him continued success in his future education and career.

IN HONOR OF CHIEF STEPHEN WHITE

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Doylestown Township's Chief of Police, Mr. Stephen White, who on March 2nd 2012 retired after a 40-year career in law enforcement. For Chief White, public service runs in the family. Steve's grandfather was a prominent Philadelphia police officer for a number of years, which truly inspired him to pursue a career path in law enforcement. After earning a bachelor's degree in international relations from St. Joseph's University, White started his career by working for the Capitol Police in the Nation's Capital.

On February 16th 1974, Steve White settled in Bucks County and began what would be a distinguished career, first working as a patrolman for Doylestown Township. He quickly moved up in the ranks and was promoted to Sergeant the following year. After three years of hard work and dedication to the force, he became a lieutenant, and on January 12th 1988 Steve was promoted to Chief of Police, where he remained until this year. As Chief, he served as the Township's Emergency Management Coordinator, flawlessly supervising a staff of 21 officers and 3 civilians with a budget of just over $3 million.

Over the course of his career, Chief White has received numerous honors and awards. He was inducted into the International Police Association's Hall of Fame in 1999, and was named an extraordinary Member in August 2007 by the FBI National Academy Associates. Previously, he served as President of the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association.

Chief White has devoted his life to making his community a safer and better place to live. I am honored to speak on his behalf today, and I am proud to be his representative in Congress. I wish Steve many years of continued success.

COMMEMORATING THE INDUCTION OF PHILIP P. SMITH INTO NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY'S 2012 ENTREPRENEUR HALL OF FAME

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exceptional entrepreneur and my dear friend, Philip P. Smith. As the president and chief executive officer of Phil Smith Management, Inc., he is better known as the founder of Phil Smith Chevrolet, a successful General Motors (GM) dealership in my Congressional district that serves the greater South Florida area from Palm Beach to Broward and Miami-Dade Counties. On April 18, 2012, Phil will be inducted into the 2012 Entrepreneur Hall of Fame at the H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship at Nova Southeastern University (NSU) for his longstanding business leadership and community involvement.

The NSU Entrepreneur Hall of Fame was established in 1990 to honor the lifetime achievements of outstanding entrepreneurs who contributed not only to the growth of a phenomenal entrepreneurial business, but have also demonstrated a willingness to contribute time, effort, and financial resources to programs and activities that enhance the quality of life in the communities in which they live. For more than 30 years, Phil has been serving the South Florida community as a business leader and philanthropist. His first equity venture was in a Toyota dealership in Homestead, Florida in 1980. With a direct hands-on sales and management approach, Phil has since built his organization from the ground up and now operates 14 auto dealerships throughout Florida, Georgia, and North Carolina.

Phil is responsible for the overall operations of Phil Smith Management, Inc., including working with the equity partners at all locations and orchestrating its acquisitions and growth strategies. Thanks to entrepreneurs like him, GM has again become the world's top-selling automaker. Phil Smith Chevrolet has consistently ranked as one of the top dealerships in Broward County in a variety of GM categories, including customer satisfaction, service, and vehicle fleet and GM parts sales. Furthermore, in recent years, Phil Smith Chevrolet has proven to be a true economic linchpin to distressed areas in Broward County. Phil takes great pride in the fact that most of his 104 employees have worked for the dealership for many years and live in and have strong relationships with the surrounding community.

The Phil Smith Automotive Group has received numerous awards, including the J.D. Powers Quality Dealer Award, Toyota President's Award, Ford Chairman's Award, and Acura Dealership of Distinction recognition. Phil is also past chairman of the Southeast Toyota Dealer Council, a past member of the National Toyota Dealer Council, past president of the South Florida Auto-Truck Dealers Association, and a past director of the Florida Automobile Dealers Association.

Raised in South Florida, Phil is well-known for his civic and charitable involvement. He is actively involved with the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, Humane Society of Broward County,

American Cancer Society, Make a Wish Foundation, and other organizations. In addition, Phil is Co-Chairman of the South Florida Super Bowl Host Committee and has board positions with the Orange Bowl Committee and the Broward Workshop, a nonprofit organization that represents the interests of 100 Broward businesses and professions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor and privilege to recognize Phil Smith on this special occasion. His business leadership and commitment to the South Florida community is a testament to American entrepreneurship, and I can think of no one more deserving than Phil to be admitted to Nova Southeastern University's Entrepreneur Hall of Fame. I am so pleased to pay tribute to my dear friend, and wish him great success for many years to come.

RECOGNIZING APRIL AS PARKINSON'S AWARENESS MONTH

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as a co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Parkinson's Disease, I am proud to join my colleagues in recognizing April as Parkinson's Awareness Month. It is estimated that there are between 500,000 and 1.5 million Americans living with Parkinson's disease, a chronic, progressive neurological disease, for which there is no therapy or drug to slow or halt its progression, let alone a cure. I support the federal government's continued funding for research to find better treatments and a cure for Parkinson's. I also recognize the people living with Parkinson's who participate in vital clinical trials to advance knowledge of this disease, and commend the dedication of local and regional organizations, volunteers, and millions of Americans across the country working to improve quality of life for people living with Parkinson's disease and their families.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022:

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chair, the Republican budget proposal, very similar to their draconian proposal from last year, fails the middle class, undermines our Nation's values, and destroys the social safety net. It's been said that this year's Republican budget is ''austerity on steroids.'' I would call that an understatement.

In the name of deficit reduction, Republicans would end the Medicare guarantee, put Social Security on the fast track to benefit cuts, and slash critical job-creating investments in education, infrastructure and basic research. These deep cuts do not even go to reduce the deficit. Instead, they are used to pay for massive tax cuts for the wealthy and to continue our out of control defense spending. The Republican budget will provide an average tax cut of $394,000 to people making over $1 million and increases defense spending. This budget is just a grab bag of failed right-wing ideas and it's harmful to America's future.

Senior citizens and people with disabilities in Medicare get a particularly bad deal under the Republican proposal because their plan ends the guarantee of Medicare. Medicare beneficiaries would be given a voucher to try to obtain health care coverage from private insurers—there would be no guaranteed benefits and whether one could afford coverage would depend on what is available in the marketplace. What's more, the Republicans' voucher is designed to diminish in value over time, placing a growing cost burden on senior citizens and people with disabilities in the future. The Republican budget pays lip service to maintaining the traditional Medicare program, but those words amount to nothing. Traditional Medicare would become increasingly expensive as those with high health needs tried to stay there. Eventually, it would go into a death spiral with costs far exceeding the premiums it could realistically charge. Medicare as we know it would be gone—another Republican gift to the private insurance industry.

In contrast, the Congressional Progressive Caucus has offered a balanced budget, entitled the ''Budget for All,'' which strengthens Medicare and Social Security, protects the middle class, makes job-promoting investments for America's future, reins in defense spending, and ensures everyone pays their fair share in taxes. It includes a number of my proposals, including closing tax loopholes that allow lobbyists and lawyers to avoid paying Medicare taxes and putting a price on carbon pollution to prevent catastrophic climate change.

My constituents deserve a budget that addresses our Nation's fiscal challenges, creates jobs, and protects Medicare and Social Security. The Congressional Progressive Caucus does just that. I urge my colleagues to support the Progressive Budget for All and reject the failed ideas in the Republicans' budget for the 1 percent.

SEIZURE SMART AND EPILEPSY AWARENESS

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the millions who live with seizures and deserve to be able to live, work, learn and play safely in their own communities. On April 3, representatives from around the country will be here on Capitol Hill meeting with our staff about epilepsy and what it's like to live with this condition, which is the 3rd most prevalent neurological condition and yet has no cure. While I hope that research will one day result in a cure, we can do something very meaningful now—we can help school personnel know what to do when a child has a seizure in school. We can help employers know how to help an employee in the workforce when he or she has a seizure, and communities can learn to help keep both children and adults safe wherever they go by having trained first-responders. Many great programs have been developed and implemented over the years to help educate our communities and teach them how to be ''Seizure Smart.'' Together, with the help of a united public awareness campaign, we can help everyone to become seizure smart. We need to educate everyone about epilepsy and help everyone to know what to do when someone has a seizure. When individuals from the Epilepsy Foundation come by to see your office on April 3, tell them that you are getting Seizure Smart and offer your support to House Resolution 298.

HONORING JUSTIN VANHOOSE

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Justin VanHoose of the Kirksville High School Wrestling team for winning the Class 2 Missouri State Wrestling Championship in the 138-pound weight class.

Mr. VanHoose and his coaches should be commended for all their hard work throughout the regular season and for bringing home the state title in the Class 2 138-pound weight class to his school and community. This win places him in a short, elite list of only 21 other Missouri wrestlers to have ever won four state titles.

I ask that you join me in recognizing Mr. VanHoose for a job well done!

RECOGNIZING THE BILLINGS STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the young gentlemen of the Billings Wildcats Boys Basketball Team for winning the Missouri Class 2 State Championship.

The Wildcats have a philosophy built around teamwork and a desire to be champions. These talented young men, Kaleb Harter, Connor Jenisch, Nathan Blades, Brady Chastain, Austin Essick, Chad Yeokum, Dawson Meyer, Lane Truman, Sawyer Hawkins, and Seth Haggerman are the true definition of a team. Through their hard work and dedication they won the Missouri Class 2 State Championship.

Coach Kendall Tilley and his talented coaching staff should be proud of their accomplishment in guiding such a phenomenal group of young men. I commend them all on a job well done.

The Wildcats had a wild final with their opponent rallying multiple times, but Billings held

fast and came out on top. In the end, the Wildcats refused to lose. They ended with a 29 3 record.

The Billings community is justifiably proud of the extraordinary group of young and talented future leaders on the Wildcats Basketball Team.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Billings Wildcats Basketball Team, the Missouri Class 2 State Champions.

HONORING ATTORNEY EDWARD BLACKMON, JR. FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE GREENWOOD, MISSISSIPPI COMMUNITY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Attorney Edward Blackmon, Jr. Attorney Blackmon was born and raised in Canton, Mississippi. He is a graduate of Tougaloo College, where he obtained his Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science. He received his Juris Doctorate from the George Washington University Law Center in Washington, DC in 1973.

Shortly after completing George Washington University, Attorney Blackmon began practicing law in Mississippi at the North Mississippi Rural Legal Services in Greenwood, Mississippi. Attorney Blackmon remained with North Mississippi Rural Legal Services until 1974 when he entered into private practice in Canton, Mississippi with the Law Firm of Blackmon & Smith. In 1989, Attorney Blackmon and his wife, Attorney Barbara Blackmon, formed the Law Firm of Blackmon & Blackmon in Canton where he currently serves as the firm's Senior Partner.

Attorney Blackmon has extensive experience in personal injury, products liability and defense law. His clientele reads like a "Who's Who" among corporate America. Attorney Blackmon has defended some of the nation's top corporate companies in civil litigation, and obtained hundreds of millions of dollars in civil awards for damages on behalf of his clients.

Attorney Blackmon also has lengthy experience in criminal law defense as well. During a 20 year period involving more than 50 defense trials, Attorney Blackmon excelled without losing a single case.

He is a 24 year member of the Mississippi House of Representatives, where he previously served as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee. In other capacities, he has served as Chairman of the Legislative Black Mississippi State House of Representatives Caucus, President of the Magnolia Bar Association, and is currently serving as a member of the Tougaloo College Board of Trustees, in addition to the George Washington University School of Law Board of Advisors.

In 2002 Attorney Blackmon was named by the National Law Journal as one of the Nations Top 10 Litigators. Among his many achievements in his role as a public servant, Attorney Blackmon is most proud of his work as a State Legislator. He has led redistricting efforts that led to the reapportionment of legislative and judicial districts which increased the number of minority representation in each of those offices.

Attorney Blackmon and his wife, Attorney Barbara Blackmon, are celebrated for their philanthropic services in the area of education. They have made substantial financial contributions to their alma maters, Tougaloo College and Jackson State University, in addition to a number of other institutions and individual students seeking to advance themselves through higher education. Attorney Blackmon is a member of the Cade Chapel Missionary Baptist Church and is the father of four children, Janessa, Madison, Bradford and Stephen.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Attorney Blackmon for his dedication and service to the state of Mississippi.

CELEBRATING GLADYS WILLIAMS' 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ROBERT T. SCHILLING

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. SCHILLING. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and honor that I congratulate Ms. Gladys L. Williams of East Moline, Illinois on a momentous milestone, her 100th birthday, which will be on April 15, 2012.

Born in Kansas on April 15, 1912, the very day the Titanic sank, Gladys grew up to be tough, but a dedicated and wonderful mother whose kids always knew she had their backs. Along with her husband A.H. and her three children, Gladys moved around the country more than 30 times over the years due to her husband's job with the Rock Island Railroad. The family moved in and out of the Quad Cities nearly a dozen times until they finally made Moline home in 1954, around the time A.H. was named General Manager.

Gladys and her family have been active in Moline's First Baptist Church, and she worked in an area high school's cafeteria before eventually relocating to East Moline 16 years ago. Her family did the math recently, and determined that Gladys has been blessed with 17 grandchildren, 36 great-grandchildren, and 21 great-great-grandchildren.

East Moline Mayor John Thodos declared April 15th, 2012 "Gladys Williams Day" in honor of this remarkable woman. Mr. Speaker and my distinguished colleagues, I respectfully ask that you join me in wishing Gladys a very happy 100th birthday, and the best as she celebrates this joyous occasion with her friends and many members of her family.

COMMEMORATING BELARUSAN INDEPENDENCE DAY BY FIGHTING FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN BELARUS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 25, Belarusan-Americans commemorated Belarusan Independence Day. On that date in 1918, during World War I, the Belarusan National Republic was declared. Although independence was short-lived and Belarus forcibly subjected to Soviet rule, it did mark an historically significant milestone in the aspirations of the Belarusan people for freedom and their own unique identity.

While Belarus became independent in 1991 with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, this independence today is under threat thanks to the dictatorial rule of Alexander Lukashenka, who has relentlessly squelched dissent, strangled democratic institutions and the rule of law, stifled human rights and political liberties, and refused to reform the Soviet-type state-dominated economy. This has made Belarus dangerously vulnerable to Russian influence and has greatly weakened its prospects for integration into the European family of nations.

The brutal crackdown that began 15 months ago with the fraudulent December 19, 2010 election persists. Its most recent manifestation is the barring of numerous opposition leaders, human rights activists and independent journalists from traveling abroad—yet another in a litany of violations of Belarus' OSCE commitments. Especially egregious is the continued imprisonment of democratic opposition leaders and activists, and human rights defenders Andrei Sannikau, Mikalai Statekevich, Zmitser Bandarenka, Ales Byalyatski, Syarhei Kavalenka, Zmitser Dashkevich, Pavel Seviarynets, and others, many of whom face inhumane conditions in detention. I'd like to add my voice to those of countless Belarusans and Belarusan-Americans calling for the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners in Belarus.

Mr. Speaker, in January the President signed into law the Belarus Democracy and Human Rights Act of 2011, which I authored. This law strengthens, in view of Lukashenka's crackdown, two earlier laws I wrote promoting democracy and supporting the Belarusan people in their struggle to replace the Lukashenka dictatorship with a representative government that will respect human rights and democratic values. But Congress's efforts on behalf of the Belarusan people can't end there—I'd like to ask my colleagues to continue to raise Belarusan human rights issues with the administration, with foreign parliamentarians, and, whenever we encounter them, with officials of the Lukashenka dictatorship.

HONORING MAYOR RUDY GIULIANI

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration for Mayor Rudy Giuliani. He is a courageous American leader who speaks with authority when it conies to the safety and security of the American people. On Saturday, March 24, 2012, on the occasion of the Iranian New Year, Nowrouz, Mayor Giuliani addressed a conference in Paris attended by nearly 1,000 people to discuss ways to counter the Iranian threat and standing with the people of Iran and their organized opposition.

His remarks are crucial since they were preceded just a few days before by a campaign by unidentified U.S. Government officials who wanted to silence him and other senior former U.S. Government officials who had called for regime change in Iran and support for the Iranian opposition. Mayor Giuliani was flanked by other former officials including Attorney General Michael Mukasey, Homeland Security

Secretary Tom Ridge, Ambassador John Bolton, Congressman Patrick Kennedy and others who called for the removal of the main Iranian opposition movement, the Mujahedin-e Khalq (MEK), from the list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations.

They also called for the U.S. Government to uphold its written commitment to the safety and security of the 3,400 Iranian dissident residents of Camp Ashraf as well as those who relocated to Camp Liberty.

Mayor Giuliani and his colleagues have extensive support in the U.S. Congress who commend their work. In this respect, nearly 100 of my colleagues have co-sponsored H. Res. 60, which calls on the Secretary of State to remove the MEK from the terrorist list. I am pleased to submit Mayor Giuliani's remarks in Paris.

Mayor Rudy Giuliani: Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. I want to begin by joining Madam Rajavi in expressing my deep sympathy and empathy and prayers for the families of the victims of excessive fundamentalism here in France. As mayor of a city that suffered that fate over ten years ago, I think I have particular understanding of how much pain and suffering that causes. I also want to join Madam Rajavi in her pointing out that this is an example not of Islam or the Islamic religion, but an example of how any religion or ideology can be taken to excess by people who misuse it. And I think the people of France understand that as the people of America did.

I also want to assure you, speaking for myself and so many of my colleagues, that anonymous, cowardly sources in the State Department or elsewhere who unknowingly are doing the bidding of the mullahs don't frighten me, won't stop me, won't stop any of us, ever.

It would seem—thank you. It would seem to me that the resources of my government could be better used to try to figure out who these anonymous leakers are in the State Department who seem to be doing the bidding of the Iranian regime, rather than fighting for freedom and democracy and decency in Iran. But if anything, this will just make us more determined. I also want to congratulate all my colleagues who have shown great courage in dealing with this, as I knew they would. And really, it doesn't take a great deal of courage. It just takes doing the right thing. We believe we are right. We are aware of the pressures. And I'm going to tell you what I believe and I'm also going to tell you how I think this can be easily resolved in sort of a common sense, sensible way.

First of all, I believe that, I believe that Camp Liberty is an inhumane and indecent place. I don't believe it's a detention facility at all. I think it's a prison camp. The amount of space that's being given to the people there is a couple of feet per person, well below the minimums for American prisons, significantly below what's given to accused terrorists at Guantanamo, for example. I believe it's a place in which there are prison guards and police that menace the people who now are at Camp Liberty.

I believe that they are in danger, the people of Camp Liberty are in danger of possibly having the same fate as the people at Ashraf, of whom some 47 have already been killed, 11 in 2009 and 36 in 2011. And I believe that there is no facility in Camp Liberty for processing these people the way you would process people if, in fact, in good faith, America and the UN were living up to their promise.

Now, I believe all these things in my heart. I've seen proof of it. I've seen indications of it. I've seen evidence of it. But I guess I could be wrong. Here's the way to find out. If the anonymous sources in the State Department are so convinced of the validity of what they're saying, and I say this with greatest respect also for the Secretary of State, Mrs. Clinton, for whom I have a great deal of respect; send me there. Let me go there. Let me see it with my own eyes. I have eyes. I have a brain. I have senses. If you bring me back, you can put me under oath and ask me to tell the truth about it. I can bring a camera with me so that we don't have to dispute whether I'm right or you're right. Let's see how much space they have. Let's see how decent or indecent these facilities are. Let's see if there are provisions being made to relocate people or there are not. In other words, let's see if my country that I love, the United States of America, is living up to the promise that it made to the people of Ashraf to protect them and to treat them decently or it's breaking that promise. I promise you, I will tell the truth about it if you let me go there.

And if you don't want to send me, you can send Judge Mukasey or Tom Ridge or Patrick Kennedy or four or five of us and then you can put us before Congress and put us under oath and I assure you, we'll tell the truth about it and we'll get this resolved. Are we being misled or is the State Department breaking its promise to the people of Ashraf? Let's get an answer to it once and for all.

I hope they take us seriously. And I hope they want to get this resolved because this is truly a humanitarian issue of gravest importance, above and beyond all of the other political issues. Twelve hundred people have now been moved to Camp Liberty. We are aware of what happened to the people in Camp Ashraf in 2009 and in 2011, where Maliki, doing the bidding of the Iranian government, had them killed. We have grave fears that somehow that may happen again and we have grave fears that this is not a decent, legitimate attempt to relocate people.

This has to be resolved. This is beyond all of the other issues that are involved. Delisting, how to deal with the Iranian regime. This is just a matter of common decency and I am so disappointed. I can't express to you how disappointed I am in my government and the way they've acted here. They made a promise to protect these people and they are unwilling to live up to that promise. And we are going to fight very, very hard to make sure that they do.

The second point that I would like to make is that I fear that this is all part of a dangerous and misguided approach that will yield many, many more problems beyond this. I believe that my president and my country, at least with regard to this policy, has a serious and dangerous misconception that you can negotiate with the mullahs, that you can negotiate with Ahmadinejad.

I believe the President still is attempting to do that. He's still writing letters to the Ayatollah. I can't imagine what's in those letters. I don't even know how you begin a letter to an ayatollah. Dear Ayatollah, your eminence, your holiness, or I don't know what you call them, but in any event, President—Somehow I don't think letters are going to persuade him to become humane, decent, to embrace democracy, and to stop trying to develop nuclear weapons. I have a feeling that the only thing that will stop him and the only thing that will stop Ahmadinejad is if they see strength, if they see power, if they see determination, if they see an America that is willing to support the people that want to overthrow the regime of Iran.

We are for—America is and has participated and has been for regime change in Egypt, regime change in Libya. We now talk of regime change in Syria. All of which is fine, particularly Syria. But much worse than all three combined is the regime in Iran for the last 20 or 30 years. So how can we possibly be for regime change in these three places, but we're not for regime change in the worst actor in the region, the biggest supporter of state sponsored terrorism in the world, and the biggest opponent of the United States of America, at least since 1980? So, how about we now are for regime change in Iran and we side with the people like you who hopefully can bring that about?

There are people that say that you have no influence inside Iran. The same anonymous sources from the State Department then say that you're responsible for identifying Iranian nuclear scientists that the Israeli agents are killing. Well, you deny that. The Israelis deny that. But somehow I can't figure out if these anonymous sources are talking to each other. Either you have no influence inside Iran, in which case you couldn't possibly be responsible for fingering and identifying these scientists, or you have a lot of influence inside Iran, which is something, you know, we should take into consideration. So, these sources are so contradictory that I don't know how anybody can rely on them.

Here's what I know. You, Madam Rajavi and all of you, stand for democracy. That's an American value. You stand for freedom of religion. That's an American value. You stand for a secular government. That's an American value. You stand for due process of law. You stand for a non-nuclear Iran. You stand for the rights of women. And these place that hates you the most is the Iranian government. The EU has delisted you. The United Kingdom has delisted you. I can't find any other place that lists you as a terrorist group but two. Iran, and they are executing people in Iran who they believe are members of the PMOI. One is up for execution right now. That shows how dangerous Iran thinks you are. I kind of get encouraged by groups that Iran finds dangerous.

So, I think it's about time that the Secretary of State make a decision. Almost a year ago, she was ordered to make that decision. It's supposed to be made in 180 days. Again, from what I see, from the facts that I see—I don't have possession of all the secret facts—but so far every single fact that I've seen is that this organization stands for everything that gives us hope of a decent life and a decent future in Iran. And if there are any facts to the contrary, then why is it taking so darn long to make this decision that should have been made eight or nine or ten months ago? If you have facts that are contrary to that, it's really easy to write them and it's really easy to put it out there and it's really easy to file the decision.

So, I hope that over the course of the next several months, we can accomplish two things. We can protect the people in Ashraf who are moving to Camp Liberty. We can get there. We can get to see it and we can allow them to make the changes that might be necessary to make it a decent and livable place. We can get them relocated to places where they can be safe.

And we can finally see a delisting of a decision that was the wrong decision in the first place. It was a decision that was intended to placate. It was a decision that was intended to appease. It was a decision that was intended to try to set up a dialogue years ago that never worked. And right now, the enemy, the enemy of stopping a nuclear Iran is appeasement. That's the enemy. That's the false notion that has made Iran bolder, stronger, and more determined to become nuclear. Let's stop the appeasement. Let's stop trying to negotiate. Let's stop writing

letters to the ayatollah. And let's stand up, united as Americans in saying we are for regime change in Iran and we will take any step necessary to stop Iran from becoming nuclear. Thank you.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF MS. PAT JORDAN

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today in recognition of a dynamic lady who has had a strong influence in promoting our community's cultural legacy. As we celebrate the artistic achievement of our high school artists at the annual Congressional Art Competition, it is appropriate to honor a patron of the arts, Ms. Pat Jordan. She knows Kansas City, Missouri, as this is where she grew up, attending Southeast High School in the heart of the City. She obtained a degree from the University of Missouri in Journalism, which gave her the tools to investigate, promote and educate what she loves most, the arts.

The rich cultural history of African Americans who lived in a segregated Kansas City during the 1920's, 30's and 40's can be traced to the area centered on 18th and Vine. This is where the black community lived, worked, worshipped, and cultivated a unique lifestyle preserved in the arts, education and sports of the time. More than most, Pat realizes the importance of preservation of an era that was indigenous to the area but with time has faded. She understands that a culture uniquely African American must not be allowed to fade. Through the arts and education, this culture will be revealed and celebrated along with today's artist who expresses their interest through artistic discovery.

While I served on the Kansas City, Missouri City Council and later as Mayor, my goal was to preserve the history of 18th and Vine by restoring the area. This is when I met the enthusiastic Pat Jordan, who I enlisted to spearhead the renovation of the Gem Theater. She worked on the Gem Theater bond fund that was essential in making the renovation of the Gem Theater a reality. She continues to promote the area with the Gem Cultural and Educational Center that promotes visual and performing artists.

Presently, Pat serves as Co-Chair of the Mayor's Task Force for the Arts; Chairman of The Light in the Other Room for Kansas City African American Artists; Member of the Arts Committee for the Mayor's Google Task Force and President of Cross-Lines Towers, Inc. She has an amazing record of public service and has served on many advisory boards. She has been a long time supporter and member of the Advisory Boards of the Kansas City Friends of Alvin Ailey, the William Jewel Fine Arts Series and the Department of Architecture, Urban Planning & Design of the University of Missouri at Kansas City.

This summer, Kansas City will host the 2012 All-Star Baseball Game. Pat is instrumental in efforts that will bring out-of-town guests to the heart of 18th and Vine. There, visitors will enjoy an iconic culture uniquely Kansas City at the Gem Theater, the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum, and the American Jazz Museum.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Ms. Pat Jordan for seeing beyond a concept, working to achieve a goal, and proudly promoting cultural enhancement through the arts. Through her outreach and events, local artists are introduced and Kansas City talent is exhibited. Her accomplishments are many as she is one of the gems for our community.

HONORING JAYDIN CLAYTON

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jaydin Clayton of the Father Tolton Catholic High School Wrestling team for winning the Class 1 Missouri State Wrestling Championship in the 113-pound weight class.

Mr. Clayton and his coaches should be commended for all their hard work throughout the regular season and for bringing home the state title in the Class 1 113-pound weight class to his school and community. His win represents the school's first state title in Class 1.

I ask that you join me in recognizing Mr. Clayton for a job well done.

RECOGNIZING THE REPUBLIC GIRLS BASKETBALL STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the young ladies of the Republic Lady Tigers Basketball Team for winning the Missouri Class 4 State Championship.

The Lady Tigers had some up and down moments in their championship run, but were able to rely upon each other to persevere. These talented young women, Brooke Dutton, Alice Heinzler, Alex Botkin, Alexis Edwards, Sarah Kreul, Kayla Bartelsmeyer, Baylee Rayl, Micah Mansker, Mercedes Doty, Taylor Wells, Kailey Mathis, Lindsey Carlson, and Tori Taylor are the true definition of a team. Through their hard work and dedication they won the Missouri Class 4 State Championship.

They were outstandingly guided by Coach Kris Flood and his talented coaching staff, Tori Mooneyham and Curt Plotter, whom I commend on an amazing accomplishment and a job well done.

The Republic Basketball team had tremendous support throughout their season; their friends, family, and fans attended the tournaments, cheered them on throughout the basketball season and followed them to Columbia for the state championships. Uniquely, many of the excited fans would dress up in costumes, like superheroes and whoopee cushions, for their title run.

The Republic community is justifiably proud of the extraordinary group of young future leaders on the Republic Lady Tigers Basketball Team, but even more important, the young ladies of the Republic Basketball team will have memories to last a lifetime. They've had the extraordinarily opportunity to live the dream of defying the odds and achieving victory through greatness.

This is third time that the Republic Lady Tigers have won the state championship.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Republic Ladies Basketball Team, the Missouri Class 4 State Champions.

HONORING THE LATE MRS. JESSIE PENDLETON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a civil rights champion, the late Mrs. Jessie Pendleton. Mrs. Pendleton served Copiah County for years as a stanch civil rights activist.

She was born on April 29, 1924 to Allee and Pearlie Bowens in Crystal Springs, Mississippi. Jessie was the wife of Mr. J.C. Pendleton and mother to four children, James Cecil, Mattie, Helen and Eva.

Mrs. Pendleton joined Providence Missionary Baptist Church at an early age, where she continued her walk in faith as a dedicated member. She was the organizer of the first Providence Missionary Baptist Church Family & Friends day, which continues as a time honored tradition today. Mrs. Pendleton later became a member of St. Mary's United Methodist Church where she held many leadership positions.

Mrs. Pendleton's love for God and humanity was instrumental in her endeavors to ensure that all men were treated fairly, a passion that ultimately led to her Human Rights activism. On her list of many accolades, is the redistricting lawsuit she filed in Copiah County, Mississippi which resulted in the creation of two predominantly Black districts in Copiah County, Mississippi which were both represented by black Supervisors. Mrs. Pendleton also filed a complaint against Harmony Ridge Water Association, which prior to that restricted water from being provided to citizens in the rural areas of the County.

Mrs. Pendleton founded the Citizens for Progress Club in 1987, whose primary focus was to assist the economically deprived in the Copiah County and surrounding areas. She also had the privilege of serving as President of the Crystal Springs branch of the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People. Mrs. Pendleton's tireless efforts in increasing civic participation led to her receiving the mother of the year award for Copiah County in 1986.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Mrs. Jessie Pendleton for her dedication and service to Copiah County, Mississippi.

HONORING VETERANS OF THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. ANN MARIE BUERKLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Ms. BUERKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to our Veterans of the

Vietnam War and to reflect upon their courage, strength, and love for the United States of America.

March 29, 2012 has been proclaimed Vietnam Veterans' Day in the State of New York, but it is important that we recognize our Veterans of the Vietnam War not only today but every day.

During the Vietnam War, of the more than 3.4 million Americans that were deployed, over 58,000 were killed, 153,000 were wounded, and over 2,000 remain missing in action.

It is important that we remind our Vietnam Veterans and their families that we are a grateful nation. Our country recognizes and appreciates the bravery and steadfastness of every American soldier. These are the men and women who risked their lives so our country remains free. It is because of their service that the United States of America remains the greatest nation in the history of the world.

The men and woman who served our country in the Vietnam War are shining examples of patriotism, strength, courage, and decency. It is with great pride and honor that I pause and reflect upon their sacrifice and thank our Vietnam Veterans for their dedicated service to the United States of America.

GRAND OPENING OF PLANNED PARENTHOOD HEALTH FACILITY IN OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark the occasion of the grand opening of a new Oakland County, Michigan facility for Planned Parenthood, an organization that I stand with proudly in spirit, purpose and commitment.

Never before in recent history have we witnessed such feverish and brazen attacks on the reproductive and health care rights of women. Planned Parenthood, in particular, has been unfairly targeted in this war on women.

More than ever, our communities and families need organizations like Planned Parenthood. In fact, 97 percent of Planned Parenthood's services are basic, preventive health care, like annual exams, testing and treatment of sexually transmitted diseases, HIV testing and counseling, and procedures to address pre-cancerous conditions of the cervix. Seventy-five percent of Planned Parenthood Mid- and South-Michigan patients are women between the ages of 20 and 40, many of whom struggle without health insurance. Planned Parenthood is there for them.

I especially applaud the opening of this facility because for more than five years there has been no Title X family planning provider in Oakland County that serves everyone, regardless of ability to pay. In 2010, Planned Parenthood served 5,420 Oakland County patients who had to travel to other counties to receive basic and preventive health care. This means critical federal dollars were not being spent in Oakland County, an area of significant need. It is time for Oakland County to get its fair share of federal dollars, and for it's citizens to receive much-needed reproductive health services in their own community.

In conclusion, we need to stop playing politics with women's health care. We need to get our struggling families the services they need. This facility is a first step in the right direction for women and families in our region.

A TRIBUTE TO CHRISTINE JACKSON WASHINGTON

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Mrs. Christine Jackson Washington, who died last week. She was the wife of the deceased Father Paul Washington, the long time, much revered rector of the Episcopal Church of the Advocate, and an internationally recognized peace and rights activist.

But, Mrs. Washington was also a community change agent. She founded the non-profit Advocate Community Development Corporation, a neighborhood-based community development corporation that provided affordable housing and social services to the residents of North Philadelphia. The bedrock of her family, Mrs. Washington sang on the choir, taught Sunday school, and helped out at the church's food kitchen that fed more for more than 350 people daily.

However, beyond all of these responsibilities and accomplishments Mrs. Washington is remembered for his kindness, gentleness, and graciousness. We were all blessed to have known her and we cherish her memory.

HONORING UTE AND PATRICK GOGGINS

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th wedding anniversary of Ute and Patrick Goggins, longtime friends and constituents in Mill Valley, California. Ute and Patrick have been dedicated and conscientious members of our community since the late 1960s, and their joint passion for social justice and community service has made their active presence in the San Francisco Bay Area a true blessing.

Ute and Patrick were married March 27, 1962, in a lunchtime civil ceremony at San Francisco City Hall. The setting was appropriate for a couple who have always had a natural partnership. In the years since, Ute and Patrick have become important voices in the peace movement not only in the Bay Area, but worldwide. The Gogginses were at the forefront of opposition to the war in Vietnam, and eventually they were joined by their children in more recent demonstrations against war in Iraq.

Ute and Patrick have also contributed to a richer cultural environment, and to the idea that a stronger sense of community is a precursor to peace and justice. Patrick has spearheaded a number of local Irish cultural and historical associations, including the Irish-Mexican Association and the Irish Forum. Ute has long been a recognized local artist, and taught art at San Domenico School for over three decades.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the 50th anniversary of Ute and Patrick Goggins. We wish them many more years of happiness, collaboration, and companionship.

IN HONOR OF FRANCINE BLOCK

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Francine Block, who is receiving the Bucks County Women's History Month Award today. Since 1982, the award has been presented every year to a woman in the county who ''has made the biggest difference.'' Candidates are active volunteers, role models and social advocates.

For 25 years Francine has worked eagerly in the fields of education and college admissions. Currently, she is the President of the American College Admissions Consultants. Formerly, Francine served as President of the Pennsylvania Association for College Admissions Counseling. Previously a high school English teacher in the United States and the United Kingdom, Francine has gone on to work with college applicants from all over the world. She has contributed to numerous books and has been interviewed by CNN, CNBC, NBC, the Wall Street Journal and Time Magazine.

Francine Block has also held many other critical posts in the field of education throughout her lifetime. She is the National Assembly Delegate to the National Association for College Admission Counseling, and previously was a member of the Admissions Advisory Board of Penn State University. Locally, she serves on the Board of Directors of the United Way of Bucks County and the Lower Bucks County Chamber of Commerce. I had the honor to serve as Francine's Solicitor while she served as Chairman of the Board of the Lower Bucks County Chamber of Commerce.

Francine Block has devoted her life to promoting higher education and making certain that parents and students have the best available resources to apply to colleges and universities. She is an inspiration to all of us, and it is my pleasure to honor her today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

THE DISABLED MILITARY CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 2012

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Disabled Military Child Protection Act of 2012. To put it simply, this bill will permit military retirees the ability to place their self funded Survivor Benefit Plan into a Special Needs Trust to ensure their surviving dependent child's future.

This is an equity and fairness issue. Civilians are allowed to create a Special Needs Trust for their permanently disabled children to ensure they receive care beyond the guardian's death but under current law, military personnel with severely disabled children are legally prohibited from establishing a Special

Needs Trust to ensure their surviving dependent child's future care.

This bill will provide veterans with the ability to direct their Survivor Benefit Plan annuity payments to a Special Needs Trust. The creation of an SNT will ensure that a dependent, disabled child will continue to qualify for means-tested benefits, such as Social Security Disability Insurance and Medicaid. Assets placed into a Special Needs Trust are not generally counted as income or assets, allowing dependent children to remain eligible for these benefits throughout their lifetime.

This bill would impact approximately 1,065 military dependents who are incapacitated beneficiaries under Survivor Benefit Plan and with individual care costs for a disabled child exceeding $100,000 a year, this additional benefit will increase their quality of life significantly.

For those who believe this bill may contribute to abuse, it must be noted that a Special Needs Trust is administered under both federal and state law. Appointed fiduciaries are subject to auditing and are responsible for managing a benefit for a specific group. Annuities are also placed in Special Needs Trusts that are subject to income tax. Therefore, beneficiaries are shielded from abuse considering each trust has significant oversight.

Finally, I am proud that this bill has 4 esteemed public servants as original co-sponsors: Congressmen CAPPS, POLIS, RANGEL, and ROTHMAN. This bill is also supported by the Military Officers Association of America.

TRIBUTE TO VERNON VALENZUELA

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the life and service of longtime Kern County veterans' advocate and Vietnam veteran, Vernon Valenzuela, who recently passed away due to cancer at the age of 63.

Vernon began his career in service to our country during the Vietnam war where he was wounded in 1968. Upon returning home, he attended Bakersfield College and became president of the Associated Veterans Student Club, where he developed his passion for helping his fellow veterans and their families in Bakersfield and around Kern County.

Vernon cared deeply about the well being of veterans, and he eventually became a Marriage and Family Therapist specializing in helping veterans with Post Traumatic Stress transition into civilian life after experiencing combat. In 2008, after advocating for a Vet Center to be built in Kern County, Vernon was hired as the Team Leader for the Bakersfield Vet Center where he was further able to help veterans transition and re-enter civilian life.

His most recent legacy is the establishment of the Veterans Justice Program in Kern County, which helps provide veterans—some of whom may have mental or other combat-related illnesses—who get in trouble with the law a second chance by ensuring they receive access to mental health and substance abuse programs provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs. While many doubted such a justice program could be formed and much less work, Vernon made it happen by bringing everyone together on behalf of all the local veterans returning from war and in need of help.

Vernon's work has touched the lives and benefited thousands of local veterans and their families. The loss of Vernon will surely be felt in our communities, and we express our deepest condolences to his wife Lise, his son Robert, and his daughters Alison and Katherine. His selflessness, perseverance, and service-minded dedication will continue to serve as an inspiration in our community and remain a constant reminder we must all continue to have of our commitment to the men and women in the Armed Forces who bravely serve our country.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REV. BONIFACE HARDIN

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to honor the life of Reverend Boniface Hardin, a luminary of the civil rights movement and a pioneer in higher education from Indiana's Seventh Congressional District who passed away this past Saturday.

Reverend Hardin became a Benedictine monk in 1953 at the young age of twenty, was ordained a Roman Catholic priest in 1959, and received a master of divinity degree in 1960. While serving as an associate pastor at the Holy Angels Catholic Church in Indianapolis, he became a vocal advocate for racial and socio-economic equality during the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s.

His spiritual commitment and dedication to self-improvement led him to found the Martin Center in 1969 and later the Indianapolis Sickle Cell Center in 1977. Under his leadership, the Martin Center College became Martin University, a fully accredited institution offering undergraduate and graduate degrees to low-income and minority adult learners.

Recognizing his limitless compassion and unceasing commitment to education, Reverend Hardin was named a ''Living Legend'' in 2002 by the Indiana Historical Society for the indelible mark he made on the City of Indianapolis and the State of Indiana.

It is with a heavy heart and profound sense of sadness that I express my condolences to the family and friends of Reverend Hardin. But it is with gratitude and admiration that I remember his life and contributions to our community. We were all truly lucky to have had such a caring, giving servant in our midst.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $15,580,211,803,539.46. We've added $4,953,334,754,626.38 to our debt in 3 years. This is debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CELEBRATING THE CAREER OF LISA REED

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the work of Lisa Reed for her accomplished career in public service to the State of New Jersey. Lisa began her career in law enforcement with the Plainfield Police Department. She later joined the Hunterdon County Prosecutor's Office where she specialized in sexual assault and child abuse investigations.

Her distinguished work prompted her promotion to Detective Sergeant and supervisor of the Sex Crimes and Child Abuse Unit. She was a tremendous asset and valued member of the Prosecutor's Office and her portfolio expanded to homicides and narcotics. Lisa was later assigned to the Somerset County Police Academy as the Continuing Education Coordinator. There she shared her expertise with young officers until her retirement in 2005.

Lisa developed a small business with her talents, Lisa S. Reed Investigations of Flemington, New Jersey. Lisa's most noted accomplishment is her vital role in the arrest of Roger Day, a fugitive who led an international conspiracy to defraud the military. This criminal was named a member of ''America's Most Wanted'' and Lisa's work was part of a three-year effort that brought Roger Day to justice.

Lisa Reed is an outstanding public servant who has continually demonstrated bravery in the critical area of public safety. I congratulate her on this long and distinguished career.

HONORING REAR ADMIRAL (RADM) HEWITT FOR HIS SERVICE IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a fellow Oregonian and leader for his extraordinary service in United States Coast Guard. Rear Admiral (RADM) Ronald T. Hewitt served his country for 34 years in the Coast Guard and on April 6th, RADM Hewitt will retire as the Assistant Commandant for Human Resources at Coast Guard Headquarters, a position he has held since May 2009. We all owe him a debt of gratitude for his commitment to service and to our country.

His efforts were pivotal to improving the Service's readiness while providing advancement, professional development and quality of life enhancements for all Coast Guard personnel. He established a comprehensive strategy to enhance diversity within the Coast Guard, developing and leveraging important partnerships with Congress, the Administration, academic institutions, and key outreach and affinity organizations, setting new heights

for the number of women and minorities accessed into and retained in the Coast Guard.

Demonstrating exemplary stewardship, RADM Hewitt implemented rigorous internal controls over financial reporting, enabling the Service to accurately value and track over $7 billion in pay and medical accounts. In response to the 2010 Haiti Earthquake and Deepwater Horizon Oil spill disasters, he guided the strategic resourcing of Coast Guard personnel, including Reserve forces, for these herculean first responder events, expertly balancing immediate needs with long-term workforce sustainment. His unwavering advocacy and commitment to Coast Guard personnel and their families was evidenced through expanded child care services and subsidies, initiatives improving government owned housing, and enhancements to work-life programs. These accomplishments are remarkably significant and representative of RADM Hewitt's distinguished 34-year career in the service of his country.

A native of Sandy, Oregon, in my Congressional district, RADM Hewitt is a 1978 graduate of the United States Coast Guard Academy where he earned a Bachelor of Science degree in electrical engineering. In 1982, he earned a Master of Science degree in electrical engineering from Purdue University. In 2000, he received a Master's Certificate in Information Technology Project Management from George Washington University and is a certified Project Management Professional.

RADM Hewitt and his wife Ann married in 1979, and they currently reside in Arlington, Virginia with their son Michael, a high school sophomore who was born during their assignment in Boston. Their daughter Laura, a recent college graduate, was born while they were stationed in Virginia during an earlier tour of duty. RADM Hewitt's parents are Wallace and Irene Hewitt of Sandy, Oregon.

RADM Hewitt's other Flag Officer assignments include Commander, Coast Guard Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic in Portsmouth, Virginia, and Assistant Commandant for Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Information Technology in Washington, DC, where he was detailed to the Department of Homeland Security as their acting Chief Information Officer. Earlier assignments included serving as Project Manager for the ''Rescue 21'' and the Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement systems; serving as Commanding Officer, Electronics Support Unit Boston; serving as Executive Officer, Communications Area Master Station Pacific; serving as Project Engineer at the Omega Navigation Systems Center and at the Electronics Engineering Center in Wildwood, New jersey, and in his first assignment out of the Coast Guard Academy, serving as Operations Officer on the USCGC *Bittersweet.*

Rear Admiral Hewitt's personal military decorations include multiple awards of the Legion of Merit, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Coast Guard Commendation Medal, the Coast Guard Achievement Medal, and the Commandant's Letter of Commendation.

HONORING ANTHONY SILVEIRA

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mann County dairy rancher Anthony (Tony) Silveira who passed away March 9, 2012, at the age of 90. Mr. Silveira spent most of his life working on the family ranches and was known for his proud defense of the family's property rights as the County became increasingly urbanized.

Mr. Silveira's father, like many of Mann County's early dairy ranchers, emigrated from the Azores. He founded the ranching business in 1900, and in 1920 helped found Mann-Dell Dairy (sold in 1954).

Born in 1921 on the Miller Ranch (now Marinwood), Tony Silveira was committed to the family business; after his father died when he was only 15, he and his siblings helped his mother Mary run two ranches. With Marinwood ranch and the Burdell Ranch north of Novato along Highway 101, drivers could enjoy the sight of some of the family's 1500 cows grazing on prime Mann County grasslands.

After graduating from local schools, Mr. Silveira attended UC Davis before returning to Mann ranching. The ''Home'' ranch in Marinwood, where his father had acquired land around St. Vincent's School for Boys, is centrally located and soon became the focus for possible housing growth. Others argued that the land should be preserved as buffer zone, with minimum development. Mr. Silveira fought passionately for the right not to have the property down-zoned, speaking out often at meetings and in press.

Mr. Silveira was involved in agricultural organizations such as the Mann County Farm Bureau and the Western United Dairymen as well as the University of California Alumni Association, Native Sons of the Golden West, and the IDESST Portuguese Hall in Sausalito.

He is survived by Lorraine, his wife of 65 years; daughter, Renee; siblings George and Jean; and three grandchildren. His son, Ronald Anthony Silveira, predeceased him in 2000.

Mr. Speaker, Anthony Silveira's proud ranching background is an important part of the fabric of Mann County history and his battles for property rights reflect the pressures and conflicts that are an ongoing dialogue of life in the County. I am honored to salute his long life and career.

TO HONOR THE LEADERSHIP OF JOEL JACOB AS CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF MAZON: A JEWISH RESPONSE TO HUNGER

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, Mr. Joel E. Jacob, as he steps down as Chairman of the Board of MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger and for his lifetime of advocacy in the realm of hunger and food insecurity.

For years, Joel has been a champion for those facing the challenges of food insecurity. His advocacy to eradicate hunger has earned him international accolades and allowed him to develop close relationships with leaders across the globe. As the Chairman and Founder of The Bottle Crew, a business based in West Bloomfield, Michigan, Joel has instilled the importance of community service at his office because it is a value central to his life.

As a teenager bussing tables at weddings and Bar Mitzvahs, Joel grew frustrated as he saw the amount of food going to waste after the meals were served. These images of lost food helped motivate Joel to be an activist for the hungry. Now, as the official shofar blower for Congregation Shaarey Zedek in Southfield, Michigan, Joel blasts the clarion call for justice. Joel has made the fight against hunger central to his pursuit of justice in the world.

Joel was first elected to the MAZON Board of Directors in 2003 and was elected Chair of the Board of Directors in 2009. He has served on MAZON's Finance Committee, Strategic Planning Committee and Executive Committee and also served as Co-Chair of the Development and Communications Committee. During his time on the Board, Joel has traveled to several continents to help the malnourished and raise awareness for food insecurity. For nearly three decades, MAZON has been a leading national nonprofit organization dedicated to preventing and alleviating hunger among people of all faiths and backgrounds. MAZON, which means ''food'' or ''sustenance'' in Hebrew, was the first national organization to rally the American Jewish community around the issue of hunger. MAZON provides for people who are hungry and advocates for ways to alleviate hunger. Thanks to the efforts of Joel, the concept in the Passover Haggadah of ''Letting All Who Are Hungry, Come and Eat'' is now a core theme at synagogues and Jewish organizations across the nation. Joel has successfully brought this message far beyond the Jewish community and has developed relationships worldwide to pool resources to feed those most in need including shaping legislation in the Israeli Knesset and the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Joel's years of service on behalf of countless people around the world facing challenges such as food insecurity and hunger. His leadership as Chairman of the Board at MAZON has profoundly improved the lives of countless people in need around the world and was deeply felt by those who have benefitted from his commitment, passion and advocacy. As a personal friend of Joel, I know that this will in no way affect his dedication to the issue of hunger and that he will continue to be a champion for fighting hunger and repairing the world.

CONGRATULATING THE LEADER ON 25 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE

HON. TIM GRIFFIN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate The Leader newspaper on its twenty-five years of excellence.

In 1987, Garrick Feldman and his wife, Eileen, published the first edition of The Leader, a community-oriented weekly newspaper that strove to serve all of its readers "without fear or favor."

Today, the Feldmans, with the help of their dedicated staff, bring Arkansans in Pulaski, Lonoke, White, and Prairie counties the important news that affects their lives.

The Leader's coverage of our local schools' academic and athletic accomplishments serves as a reminder of the talent throughout the community and the promise of the future.

Over the past quarter-century, The Leader has experienced tremendous growth, earning the title, "the best large weekly in Arkansas" for the past four years.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating The Leader on their accomplishments during their twenty-five years in business and in wishing them continued success.

Mr. Speaker, The Leader recently published an article highlighting this milestone, and I submit it in the RECORD.

[From the Leader, Mar. 17., 2012]

NEWSPAPER CELEBRATES 25 YEARS

(By Eileen Feldman)

In the first issue of The Leader on March 4, 1987, publisher Garrick Feldman said, ''The North Pulaski Leader intends to be a mirror to the community—to report all that is newsworthy in Jacksonville, Sherwood, the air base and surrounding areas . . . We want to chronicle the events, both small and large, that are taking place here . . . The newspaper also promises to serve its advertisers well.''

He continued, ''This newspaper will be about you and your neighbors, so let us hear from you if you have news to share with others.''

Twenty-five years later, The Leader is keeping its promise of delivering community news for an affordable subscription price and delivering consistent results for advertisers through a combination of mail (with its free edition, The Extra) and home delivery to subscribers in an expanded local area which now includes Pulaski County from Sherwood and Gravel Ridge to Jacksonville to Little Rock Air Force Base. The Leader is also serving all of Cabot and most of Lonoke County including Lonoke, Austin, Ward and Carlisle and the surrounding rural confines. In White County, The Leader serves Beebe, McRae, El Paso, Garner and Butlerville and to a lesser extent Searcy including many White County rural routes. The Leader's reach also extends into Prairie County giving our advertisers an even bigger bonus for their buck.

By all accounts, The Leader has grown by leaps and bounds and we want to thank you, dear readers and also our advertisers for your steadfast loyalty to The Leader and to the American dream.

Some of our advertisers have been with us since the beginning, and to you we extend our gratitude and our wishes for your continued success in business. May we continue to grow together.

What publisher Feldman said then still holds true today, ''Share with us our joys and sorrows—your proud moments and your sad ones. The news that ordinary people make is just as important to us as what their leaders do on city councils and school boards.''

And it still holds true today that ''if you have an engagement or wedding announcement, send us the announcement and also a photo. If there is a birth in your family, send us a picture also.''

Of course, times have changed in 25 years so we now accept all this by e-mail at leadernewsarkansasleader.com or at editor@arkansasleader.com. But we still do some things the old-fashioned way—mailed submissions are still accepted and cards of thanks and obituaries are still free.

We love to cover our local schools and encourage teachers to let us know of their students' accomplishments and awards as well as their own.

We still consider covering significant birthdays, centenarians in particular, and submitted photos are always welcome. Letters to the editor are always welcome. We want to hear the voice of the community.

We also pride ourselves on our local sports coverage including football, basketball, baseball, volleyball and soccer and also local news which impacts sports. Coaches comments and local submissions of news tips and photos help to give flavor to those pages.

As we said back in 1987, ''This newspaper will try to serve all of its readers without fear or favor. The Leader intends to open its pages to everyone.''

We also want to extend a big thank you to the many on our staff including our son Jonathan, who joined our staff as an editor and who will help us continue to produce a strong family-owned and community-oriented newspaper.

We wish to thank our veteran reporters, Rick Kron, Joan McCoy and John Hofheimer, who rejoined the staff after a brief hiatus and a visit to Greece. All journalism award winners, they've helped make The Leader what it is today.

Also Christy Hendricks, our creative designer, as well as Jeffrey Smith, who has come a long way since his first days at The Leader and who's made many friends with his Cabot and Beebe coverage. Sarah Campbell, an ASU-Jonesboro grad, has local roots in the area, which have helped her ferret out some outstanding local stories.

Sports editor Ray Benton's attention to local sports is outstanding and caters to our greater local area with the help of veteran sportswriter Jason King.

We also wish to thank our advertising staff led by General Manager John Henderson and our Publications Manager Matt Robinson. Also invaluable members of the sales staff are Linda Hostetler and Susan Swift. You've stuck with us through thick and thin, through the idiosyncracies of the economy, its ups and downs.

We couldn't have done it without you. You've all helped us get to where we are today.

There are many other staff members—designers, artists and photographers—who should be singled out for their loyalty and outstanding work ethic. And there are many more starting at the front office and on to the pressroom and mailroom, where the final product is prepared which arrives at your front door or in your mailbox. (We'll introduce them all to you in a later edition.)

Readers, advertisers and staff, you have helped The Leader become what it is today. Continue to grow and thrive with us.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT L. TURNER

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career and achievements of State Representative Robert L. Turner. Representative Turner was first elected in 1990 and has served in the Wisconsin State Assembly for eleven consecutive terms. While representing the eastern half of the City of Racine, he has utilized his booming voice to become an advocate for issues such as criminal justice, urban affairs, racial equality, and veterans affairs.

Public service has always been a cornerstone of Representative Turner's life. After graduating high school in Mississippi and moving to Wisconsin, he was soon drafted into the United States Air Force. He bravely answered his country's call and completed tours of duty in both Vietnam, where he received a Medal of Commendation for meritorious service, and Korea during the *Pueblo* incident. Representative Turner turned his experience in the armed forces into a lifelong promise to support and encourage local veterans groups. During his first term in the Assembly, Representative Turner earned a perfect rating on veterans issues and was named to the All Star Team by the State Council of the Vietnam Veterans of America (VVA). Additionally, his legislative work earned him the Vietnam Veterans of America Distinguished Achievement Award in 1992 and he received life membership from the Vietnam Veterans of America in 1999.

Representative Turner has served on numerous committees during his time in the Wisconsin State Assembly, lending his expertise to everything from the Highways and Transportation Committee to the Judiciary Committee. His overwhelmingly friendly demeanor gives Representative Turner a unique ability to build close working relationships that extend far beyond party affiliations. While representing an area hit especially hard by the recent economic downturn, Representative Turner has consistently supported new economic development projects, increases in unemployment benefits, and affordable, quality health care for his constituency.

In addition to his tenure in the Assembly, Representative Turner also served on the Racine City Council for 28 years from 1976 to 2004. As both a State Representative and an Alder, he developed close relationships with many local organizations such as the NAACP, Big Brothers Big Sisters, the Urban League of Racine and Kenosha, and the Racine Raider Football team.

I had the honor of serving with Representative Turner in the Assembly for three terms and I am proud to continue to call him a close friend today. His service to his constituents and the City of Racine has always been a source of inspiration for me. To understand who Representative Turner truly is, one only needs to know that he considers one of his biggest accomplishments being able to serve, listen to, and assist his constituents for so long. Without fail, every time I see Bob, the only thing bigger than the smile on his face is the warm embrace I receive from him.

It is nearly impossible to mention everything Representative Turner has accomplished; it is even harder to overstate the positive impact he has had on our community. It is without a doubt that his work has bettered the lives of the people of Racine, Wisconsin, and our great nation. Today, I rise to honor and thank State Representative Robert L. Turner for his more than two decades of leadership in the Wisconsin State Assembly. May Bob's unwavering dedication, vision, and never-ending smile serve as an inspiration for all of us.

TRIBUTE TO CENTRAL OREGON VETERANS OUTREACH

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to pay special tribute to Central Oregon Veterans Outreach (COVO) for their tireless efforts on behalf of homeless veterans in Oregon's Second District. Since its founding in 2005 by members of the Bend/La Pine Vietnam Veterans of America, COVO has grown from a handful of concerned veterans reaching out to other veterans in the homeless camps around the area to a full-fledged nonprofit organization with countless volunteers, a dedicated staff, and a truly professional board of directors.

In the early years of this organization, a small group of Vietnam veterans took it upon themselves to visit homeless camps on the High Desert, providing much needed supplies and support to those veterans who fell upon hard times and were in desperate need of a hand up. Today, COVO has a full time staff that coordinates continuing volunteer efforts to deliver food, water, tents, sleeping bags, clothing, and propane to the region's homeless camps. In addition to making weekly trips with supplies, COVO has transformed a van into a mobile medical clinic that is staffed by volunteer doctors, nurses, and medical staff who provide free care to the homeless population each week. This is an invaluable service to those in need.

COVO continues to provide free assistance to veterans in the form of benefits claim-filing, bus passes, medical shuttle reservations, and assistance with accessing resources like the HUD VASH housing voucher program and transitional housing at their 6-bed "Home of the Brave" facility. COVO continues to advocate for those veterans who are most in need of assistance and who are unable to be their own voice in times of need.

Mr. Speaker, we like to say, "We will never forget what our veterans have done for our way of life." They put their lives on the line for this country, and we cannot turn our backs on them. Any of them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my fellow colleagues join me in recognizing COVO for their staunch and invaluable advocacy on behalf of our most vulnerable veterans: President Linda Heatley; Secretary/Treasurer Rob Bryce; Directors Susan Steves, Craig Jorgensen, Rickie Gunn, Jerry Chinn, Dan Lauderback, Lauri Imholt, and Dr. Elizabeth Leeburg; Executive Director Chuck Hemingway; Counselors Alex Weiss and Allen Wilson; Homeless Veteran Reintegration Program staff Steve Wilkes, Ruth Clark, and Yvonne Devine; Outreach Coordinator Lisa Miller; Volunteer Coordinator Kim Darling; Office Administrator and DAV Shuttle Coordinator Chuck Man; Housing Manager Steve Haupt, and; Veteran Service Officer Patricia White and VSO Intern Kim Burger.

Mr. Speaker, the staff, board, and volunteers who comprise COVO deserve the thanks of a grateful nation for all they have done and continue to do for the veterans of Deschutes, Crook and Jefferson Counties.

IN HONOR OF CORRINE CODY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Corrine Cody, who passed away on Saturday March 3, 2012. Mrs. Cody was originally from Queens, New York, but she moved to Bucks County Pennsylvania with her husband and children in 1966 and remained in Doylestown for 45 years. Corrine worked for the Central Bucks School District for almost 30 years, where she taught elementary students for 15 years, served as principal for several years, and finished her career as a teacher in the gifted program.

Mrs. Cody was incredibly passionate about teaching. One of her greatest accomplishments was creating the Central Bucks School District's program for gifted students. At one point in her career, Corrine actually decided to leave her job as principal at Paul W. Kutz Elementary School because she believed she could do even more to help children reach their full potential. She would go on to become the coordinator of the social studies and science curriculum for all C.B. elementary schools.

Her teaching and activism went beyond the classroom too. Corrine worked closely with the Peace Valley Nature Center to start a program that would teach fifth and sixth graders about clean water, storm water runoff, and other aspects of the Bucks County environment. As a member of the Bucks County League of Women Voters, she was instrumental in the formation of the Kids Voting program in Central Bucks. Corrine also played a huge role in the development of the Doylestown bike and hike trail, which many of my constituents take advantage of today.

Mrs. Cody leaves behind an inspirational legacy on generations of Bucks County children. I am proud and pleased to speak on her behalf today, and am grateful for all that she did for our area.

ROBY ANNOUNCES CONGRESSIONAL PEANUT CAUCUS

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the newly formed bipartisan Congressional Peanut Caucus that I have co-founded with Representative SAMFORD BISHOP. The caucus will serve as an informal group of Members of Congress dedicated to all issues related to peanuts and the role they play in on our Nation's agriculture industry.

Representative BISHOP and I formed this caucus to promote and support peanut production—a crucial part of the agriculture industry in the Southern States we represent. Representative BISHOP has been a strong force in shaping Federal policies to advance the U.S. peanut industry and ensure it remains competitive. I am grateful for the opportunity to work on this initiative with such a strong advocate.

Agriculture remains the number one industry in my State of Alabama, and has been a top priority for me since taking office. The peanut industry—specifically—is an essential and recognizable commodity for Alabama. Seven States account for approximately 99% of all peanuts grown in the U.S. Alabama is among the top few States, along with Georgia, Florida, and Mississippi that produces a major share of our Nation's peanut crop.

Our country's reliance on domestic agricultural production is rising with continuous population growth. Peanuts are the 12th most valuable cash crop grown in the United States with a farm value of over one billion dollars. The World Bank and the U.S. Agency for International Development are both looking at peanuts and peanut producers as vital components in fighting global malnutrition. In addition, the spectrum of new and emerging research related to peanuts and health is broadening quickly. The application of this research may lead to a better understanding of ways to reduce the risk of certain diseases, including Type Two diabetes and some cancers. Therefore, we must ensure that our farmers across the Nation have the resources necessary to maintain successful peanut crops from year to year.

Congressional Caucuses are an important way to increase awareness of principal issues and identify legislative priorities. As Representatives, it is our responsibility to bring the voices of farmers from all over the country to the forefront of the discussion and to ensure that all of their interests are fairly represented. Members of the Peanut Caucus will have the ability to collectively advocate in Congress for peanut farmers and producers of this important crop.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues and I begin to prepare for the next Farm Bill, we believe it must contain provisions that are beneficial to American farmers, while also maintaining fiscal restraint. With that in mind, it is my hope that this Caucus will serve as a working group for members from our Nation's peanut States and will help streamline communication between Congressional offices. I urge any interested colleague to join us on the Peanut Caucus, and I look forward to working with Chairman LUCAS and the House Agriculture Committee on the next Farm Bill as we consider legislative issues that affect our Nation's peanut farmers.

HEAVY TRUCK TAX FAIRNESS ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more essential to restoring the economy, revitalizing our communities, and protecting our environment than the effort to rebuild and renew America. The U.S. faces steep infrastructure challenges. Our infrastructure inventory is in poor repair and much of it is outdated—not just decades, but often centuries old. Our effort to rebuild and renew that infrastructure is stalled because of a funding impasse. The Highway Trust Fund nearly exhausted its funding several times recently and it is clear that our existing funding mechanisms are insufficient to meet our current, much less future, needs. Congress must consider new revenue sources to meet our infra-

structure challenges and must work with transportation users to find the most efficient means of raising this revenue.

I rise today to reintroduce the Heavy Truck Tax Fairness Act, bipartisan legislation to ease barriers to investment in new, heavy trucks. The funding sources for the Highway Trust Fund can be volatile, depending on the health of the economy. Current law places a 12% tax on the sale of new heavy trucks, trailers, and certain tractors. This tax is an important source of Highway Trust Fund revenues. In times of economic stress, these sales fall dramatically, badly limiting Trust Fund resources. These lost sales have several important effects. By reducing revenue to the Trust Fund, the decline hinders economic productivity by imposing costs from poor infrastructure. It also reflects an increase in the average age of the trucking fleet. New trucks have significant environmental and safety advantages, and Congress should reduce the barriers to new truck acquisition. To meet the demand for new trucks, most truck manufacturers will add employees, as most have significant engine and final assembly operations in the U.S.

The Heavy Truck Tax Fairness Act would replace the 12% excise tax currently levied on new truck, trailer, and certain tractor sales with an off-setting increase in the diesel fuel excise tax of $0.064 per gallon. This modest change will ensure that the aggregate tax burden stays roughly equivalent over 10 years; it will also have the effect of smoothing the resources available to the Highway Trust Fund and ensure the U.S. can continue investing in our vital transportation infrastructure. I also note that this legislation does not affect all transportation stakeholders equally. In particular, smaller companies and owner-operators could see fewer benefits. I pledge to work with affected groups as this legislation advances to ensure that the legislation, as enacted, is as carefully tailored and broadly beneficial as possible.

HONORING AUSTIN ROPER

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Austin Roper of the Krisksville High School Wrestling team for winning the Class 2 Missouri State Wrestling Championship in the 132-pound weight class.

Mr. Roper and his coaches should be commended for all their hard work throughout the regular season and for bringing home the State title in the Class 2 132-pound weight class to his school and community. This is his third State title.

I ask that you join me in recognizing Mr. Roper for a job well done.

RECOGNIZING GEORGE DEAN CARDEN'S 60TH BIRTHDAY

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 60th birthday of George Dean Carden, a man from southwest Missouri who went from humble beginnings to becoming the largest producer of Shrine Circuses in the country.

George Carden was born on March 19, 1952 in Springfield, Missouri. It was in Springfield he was raised, staying with his grandparents as his parents traveled the country working in a circus. After a few years his parents bought a circus of their own, but this time George came along. It wasn't too long before George started his own circus company—George Carden Circus International—in 1981. Eventually, he bought out his father's circus, combined the two, and after years of hard work became one of the largest circus producers in North America. In fact, George and his father have produced the Abou Ben Adhem Shrine Circus for almost fifty years.

The circus is usually a family affair and the Cardens are no different. George's wife, Alexandra, is also involved with the circus, as are his two sons, Larry and Brett Carden. George also has a daughter, Michelle, and two grandsons, George Brett and Cash Carden. Working in the circus means a life on the road, but when it comes time to relax, George and his family spend their time on their 800-acre ranch in Hickory County, Missouri, enjoying deer hunting and fishing.

Giving back to the community is also important to George. He is a lifetime member of Abou Ben Adhem Shriners and is very active in the Shriner community, even financially supporting renovations to the Shrine Mosque. George also has a soft spot for children and has taken care of over 100,000 special and needy children over the past thirty years. For his service, George has become honorary member of many Shrine Temples.

Mr. Speaker, George is a great man and I am privileged to honor him on his 60th birthday.

HONORING BOLIVAR COUNTY HEAD START

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Bolivar County Head Start Program (BCHSP) which began as an affiliate program under the umbrella of the Bolivar County Community Action Agency, Inc. The program was chartered on June 16, 1965 by the State of Mississippi under Governor Paul B. Johnson. Bolivar County Head Start Program is a non-profit corporation organized for the purpose of eliminating poverty and the causes thereof in Bolivar County, Mississippi.

The Association of Communities of Bolivar County began its operations the summer of 1965 and enrolled 1,308 children in seventeen centers. At its inception, the Bolivar County Head Start Program was housed in multiple buildings and churches. It began its operations the summer of 1966 with an enrollment of 1,550 children served in eight centers located throughout the county. Unfortunately, they have had to reduce the number of sites over the years due to inadequate funding.

Most recently, Bolivar County Head Start Program has made tremendous strides in its development. After years of record growth the Bolivar County Head Start Program was able to transition out of make shift facilities such as churches and old homes to mobile units stationed throughout the county. Thanks to funding from several sources they were able to build three state of the art head start centers in the communities of Rosedale, Shaw and Mound Bayou. In 2012 they added the Early Head Start Program for children 0–3 years of age and expectant mothers, increasing their total enrollment to 890 children.

It has been through strong leadership that the agency has been recognized not only throughout the State of Mississippi, but also nationwide for its performance and service provided to children, families and communities. Mr. Amzie Moore was the first Head Start Director under the Association of Communities of Bolivar County; Mr. Dick Gurnie, the first Executive Director and later Mr. Billy J. McCain was both Head Start Director and Executive Director. After Mr. McCain's untimely departure in 2009, the charge was passed on to Mr. Adolph Hilliard to continue the agency legacy. Shortly afterwards, Mr. Hilliard retired, Mrs. Elnora Littleton was appointed the interim Executive Director. Mrs. Littleton is currently serving as the first African American female to head the Bolivar County Head Start Program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Bolivar County Head Start for its outstanding commitment to improving the lives of children and families throughout Bolivar County, Mississippi.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed H.R. 4281, Surface Transportation Extension Act.

Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 38, Adjournment Resolution.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2187–S2285

Measures Introduced: Thirty-four bills and eight resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2250–2283, S. Res. 411–417, and S. Con. Res. 37. **Pages S2242–43**

Measures Reported:

H.R. 2297, to promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia. (S. Rept. No. 112–154)

S. 2159, to extend the authorization of the Drug-Free Communities Support Program through fiscal year 2017, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S2242**

Measures Passed:

Surface Transportation Extension Act: Senate passed H.R. 4281, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs. **Pages S2209–12**

Adjournment Resolution: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 38, providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives. **Page S2275**

Southwest Waterfront in the District of Columbia: Senate passed H.R. 2297, to promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S2275–76**

Reid (for Lieberman) Amendment No. 1998, to deauthorize a portion of the project for navigation of the Corps of Engineers at Potomac River, Washington Channel, District of Columbia. **Pages S2275–76**

Baha'i Minority in Iran: Senate agreed to S. Res. 80, condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S2276**

Reid (for Paul) Amendment No. 1999, of a perfecting nature. **Page S2276**

People of Tibet: Senate agreed to S. Res. 356, expressing support for the people of Tibet. **Pages S2276–78**

Journalists and Freedom of the Press in Syria: Senate agreed to S. Res. 391, condemning violence by the Government of Syria against journalists, and expressing the sense of the Senate on freedom of the press in Syria. **Page S2278**

North Atlantic Treaty Organization Summit: Senate agreed to S. Res. 395, expressing the sense of the Senate in support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the NATO summit to be held in Chicago, Illinois, from May 20 through 21, 2012. **Pages S2279–80**

Promoting Peace in Sudan: Senate agreed to S. Res. 397, promoting peace and stability in Sudan, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S2280–82**

University of North Carolina at Pembroke 125th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 414, commemorating the 125th anniversary of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke. **Page S2282**

National Association of Junior Auxiliaries Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 415, designating April 4, 2012, as "National Association of Junior Auxiliaries Day". **Page S2282**

Parkinson's Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 416, supporting the designation of April as Parkinson's Awareness Month. **Page S2282**

Measures Considered:

Paying a Fair Share Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2230, to reduce the deficit by imposing a minimum effective tax rate for high-income taxpayers. **Pages S2188–99, S2223–24**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, March 29, 2012, a vote on cloture will occur on Monday, April 16, 2012, when the Senate resumes legislative session immediately following the vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Stephanie Dawn Thacker, of West Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit. **Pages S2223–24**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 2 p.m., on Monday, April 16, 2012. **Page S2283**

Oil Tax Subsidies: Senate resumed consideration of S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation, after agreeing to the motion to proceed, and taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Page S2199**

Pending:

Reid Amendment No. 1968, to change the enactment date. **Page S2199**

Reid Amendment No. 1969 (to Amendment No. 1968), of a perfecting nature. **Page S2199**

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 1970, to change the enactment date. **Page S2199**

Reid Amendment No. 1971 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 1970), of a perfecting nature. **Page S2199**

Reid Amendment No. 1972 (to Amendment No. 1971), of a perfecting nature. **Page S2199**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 63), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the bill. **Page S2199**

Signing Authority—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that from Thursday, March 29, 2012 through Monday, April 16, 2012, the Majority Leader, Senator Webb and Senator Rockefeller be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions. **Page S2282**

Authorizing Leadership to Make Appointments—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President Pro Tempore, and the Majority and Minority Leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate. **Page S2282**

Pro Forma Sessions—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, March 29, 2012, it convene for pro forma sessions only with no business conducted on the following dates and times and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Monday, April 2, 2012 at 2 p.m., Thursday, April 5, 2012 at 11 a.m., Monday, April 9, 2012 at 10 a.m., Thursday, April 12, 2012 at 2 p.m.; and that the Senate adjourn on Thursday, April 12, 2012 until 2 p.m., on Monday, April 16, 2012, unless the Senate has received a message from the House of Representatives that it has adopted S. Con. Res. 38, and if the Senate has received such a message, the Senate stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, April 16, 2012, under the provisions of S. Con. Res. 38. **Page S2283**

Thacker Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 4:30 p.m., on Monday, April 16, 2012, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Stephanie Dawn Thacker, of West Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit; that there be 60 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination; and that no further motions be in order. **Page S2275**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Phyllis Nichamoff Segal, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2013.

Lisa M. Quiroz, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring February 8, 2014.

Marguerite W. Kondracke, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring June 10, 2014.

Richard Christman, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for the remainder of the term expiring October 6, 2012.

Thomas M. Harrigan, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of Drug Enforcement.

Jon D. Leibowitz, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of seven years from September 26, 2010.

Deepa Gupta, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2016.

Anuj Chang Desai, of Wisconsin, to be a Member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the term expiring September 30, 2011.

Anuj Chang Desai, of Wisconsin, to be a Member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the term expiring September 30, 2014.

Dennis J. Erby, of Mississippi, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Mississippi for the term of four years.

Kathleen Kerrigan, of Massachusetts, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for the term of fifteen years.

Christopher Merrill, of Iowa, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2016.

Martin J. Gruenberg, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term expiring December 27, 2018.

Gregory K. Davis, of Mississippi, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi for the term of four years.

Thomas J. Curry, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of the Currency for a term of five years.

Mary John Miller, of Maryland, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Charles DeWitt McConnell, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Fossil Energy).

Michael A. Hammer, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Public Affairs).

Stephanie Orlando, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for the remainder of the term expiring September 17, 2011.

Stephanie Orlando, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2014.

Bruce J. Sherrick, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation.

Chester John Culver, of Iowa, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation.

Maureen K. Ohlhausen, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of seven years from September 26, 2011.

David T. Danielson, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy).

LaDoris Guess Harris, of Georgia, to be Director of the Office of Minority Economic Impact, Department of Energy.

Michael E. Horowitz, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of Justice.

Gregory Howard Woods, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Energy.

Eduardo Arriola, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation for a term expiring October 6, 2016.

J. Kelly Ryan, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation for the remainder of the term expiring September 20, 2012.

James R. Hannah, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2013.

Daniel J. Becker, of Utah, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2013.

Catherine Allgor, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation for a term expiring September 27, 2014.

David J. McMillan, of Minnesota, to be a Member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

Wenona Singel, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

Michael James Warren, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2014.

Kathryn Keneally, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Alastair M. Fitzpayne, of Maryland, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Maurice A. Jones, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Gary Blumenthal, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2013.

Earl W. Gast, of California, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Roberta S. Jacobson, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Western Hemisphere Affairs).

Elizabeth M. Cousens, of Washington, to be Representative of the United States of America on the

Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Elizabeth M. Cousens, of Washington, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Wendy M. Spencer, of Florida, to be Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

Gina K. Abercrombie-Winstanley, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Malta.

Julissa Reynoso, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.

Robert E. Whitehead, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Togolese Republic.

Thomas Hoenig, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of six years.

Rebecca M. Blank, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

Larry Leon Palmer, of Georgia, to be Ambassador to Barbados, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Antigua and Barbuda, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

Anne Claire Richard, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Population, Refugees, and Migration).

Tara D. Sonenshine, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy.

Margaret Ann Sherry, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security.

Frederick D. Barton, of Maine, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Conflict and Stabilization Operations).

Frederick D. Barton, of Maine, to be Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization.

Jonathan Don Farrar, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Panama.

Phyllis Marie Powers, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Nicaragua.

William E. Todd, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

Jacob Walles, of Delaware, to be Ambassador to the Tunisian Republic.

Nancy J. Powell, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to India.

Linda Thomas-Greenfield, of Louisiana, to be Director General of the Foreign Service.

Pamela A. White, of Maine, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Haiti.

John Christopher Stevens, of California, to be Ambassador to Libya.

Tracey Ann Jacobson, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kosovo.

Christy L. Romero, of Virginia, to be Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program. (Prior to this action, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration.)

Jeremiah O'Hear Norton, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 2013.

Kenneth Merten, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Croatia.

Mark A. Pekala, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Latvia.

Richard B. Norland, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to Georgia.

Jeffrey D. Levine, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Estonia.

4 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral. (Prior to this action, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration.)

Routine lists in the Coast Guard. (Prior to this action, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration.)

Routine lists in the Foreign Service.

Pages S2272–74, S2283–85

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Patrick A. Miles, Jr., of Michigan, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Michigan for the term of four years.

Danny Chappelle Williams, Sr., of Oklahoma, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Oklahoma for the term of four years.

Patrick J. Wilkerson, of Oklahoma, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for the term of four years.

Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, of California, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

Patricia K. Falcone, of California, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Douglas M. Griffiths, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mozambique.

Maria Rosario Jackson, of California, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2016. **Page S2283**

Messages from the House: **Pages S2238–39**

Measures Referred: **Page S2239**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S2239**

Executive Communications: Pages S2239–41

Petitions and Memorials: Page S2241

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S2242

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S2243–46

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S2246–71

Additional Statements: Pages S2235–38

Amendments Submitted: Page S2272

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S2272

Privileges of the Floor: Page S2272

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—63) Page S2199

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned, pursuant to the provisions of S. Con. Res. 38, at 6:26 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, April 2, 2012 (Unless the Senate has received a message from the House of Representatives that the House has adopted S. Con. Res. 38, Adjournment Resolution. And if the Senate has received such a message, the Senate stand adjourned until 2 p.m., on Monday, April 16, 2012.) (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2283.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2013 for the Department of Agriculture, after receiving testimony from Thomas Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Frank Kendall III, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and James N. Miller, Jr., of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Policy, who were both introduced by Senator Reed, Erin C. Conaton, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, who was introduced by Representative Hoyer, Jessica Lynn Wright, of Pennsylvania, and Katharina G. McFarland, of Virginia, both to be an Assistant Secretary, and Heidi Shyu, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, all of the Department of Defense, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Jerome H. Powell, of Maryland, and Jeremy C. Stein, of Massachusetts, both to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Jeremiah O'Hear Norton, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and Richard B. Berner, of Massachusetts, to be Director, Office of Financial Research, and Christy L. Romero, of Virginia, to be Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, both of the Department of the Treasury.

SAFE AND EFFICIENT MOBILE PAYMENTS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine developing the framework for safe and efficient mobile payments, after receiving testimony from Sandra F. Braunstein, Director, Division of Consumer and Community Affairs, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and Kenneth C. Montgomery, First Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

FUEL PRICE TRENDS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine current and near-term future price expectations and trends for motor gasoline and other refined petroleum fuels, after receiving testimony from Howard Gruenspecht, Acting Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy; Daniel Yergin, IHS Cambridge Energy Research Associates, and Frank A. Verrastro, Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), both of Washington, D.C.; and Paul Horsnell, Barclays, London, United Kingdom.

NIGERIA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on African Affairs concluded a hearing to examine Nigeria, focusing on security, governance, and trade, after receiving testimony from Johnnie Carson, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs; Sharon Cromer, Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator for Africa, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Paul Marin, Regional Director, Sub-Saharan Africa, U.S. Trade and Development Agency.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Contracting Oversight concluded a hearing to examine contractors, focusing on how much they are costing the government, after receiving testimony from Jay D. Aronowitz, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Force Management, Manpower and Resources, Department of Defense; Debra M. Tomchek, Executive Director, Balanced Workforce Program Management Office, Department of Homeland Security; and Charles D. Grimes III, Chief Operating Officer, U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Food and Drug Administration (FDA) user fee agreements, focusing on strengthening FDA and the medical products industry for the benefit of patients, after receiving testimony from Janet Woodcock, Director, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, and Jeffrey Shuren, Director, Center for Devices and Radiological Health, both of the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; and David E. Wheadon, Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, Sara Radcliffe, Biotechnology Industry Organization, David R. Gaugh, Generic Pharmaceutical Association, David Nexon, Advanced Medical Technology Association, and Allan Coukell, Pew Health Group, all of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2159, to extend the authorization of the Drug-Free Communities Support Program through fiscal year 2017, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Richard Gary Taranto, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, Robin S. Rosenbaum, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, Gershwin A. Drain, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, and Gregory K. Davis, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi, Department of Justice.

FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT

Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 2219, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, after receiving testimony from Fred Wertheimer, Democracy 21, Washington, D.C.; David Keating, Center for Competitive Politics, Alexandria, Virginia; and Richard L. Hasen, University of California Irvine School of Law.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION BUDGET

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2013 for the Small Business Administration, after receiving testimony from Karen G. Mills, Administrator, Peggy E. Gustafson, Inspector General, and Winslow Sargeant, Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Office of Advocacy, all of the Small Business Administration; William B. Shear, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office; Ridgely Evers, SCORE, Healdsburg, California; Christopher G. Hurn, Mercantile Capital Corporation, Orlando, Florida; and Anthony Wilkinson, National Association of Government Guaranteed Lenders, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 49 public bills, H.R. 4295–4343; and 13 resolutions, H.J. Res. 107; H. Con. Res. 115; and H. Res. 602–611, were introduced. **Pages H1803–05**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1807–08**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 2309, to restore the financial solvency of the United States Postal Service and to ensure the efficient and affordable nationwide delivery of mail, with an amendment (H. Rept. 112–363, Pt. 2). **Page H1803**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bass (NH) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1743**

Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012: The House passed H.R. 4281, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, by a yea-and-nay vote of 266 yeas to 158 nays, Roll No. 147. **Pages H1751–62**

H. Res. 600, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by voice vote after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 237 yeas to 178 nays, Roll No. 146. **Pages H1744–51**

Suspension—Failed: The House failed to agree to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on March 27th:

Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012: H.R. 4239, amended, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs. **Pages H1775–76**

Agreed by unanimous consent that the ordering of the yeas and nays on the motion that the House suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4239, as amended, be vacated to the end that the Chair put the question de novo. **Pages H1775–76**

Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 112, to establish the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 151. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, March 28th. **Pages H1762–75, H1776–95**

Rejected:

Honda amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 112–423) that was debated yesterday that sought to provide for deficit reduction and job creation that protects the social safety net (by a recorded vote of 78 ayes to 346 noes, Roll No. 148); **Pages H1762–63**

Garrett amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 112–423) that sought to make reforms to several federal programs, freeze spending at $931 billion until the federal budget is balanced, and balance the budget by 2017 (by a recorded vote of 136 ayes to 285 noes with 3 answering ''present'', Roll No. 149); and **Pages H1763–75**

Van Hollen amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 112–423) that sought to emphasize job creation, protect Medicare beneficiaries, and end additional tax breaks for special interests and the wealthiest Americans by including a number of job-creation initiatives, preserving the Medicare guarantee, and extending tax relief for the middle-class. Would also have set discretionary spending at the Budget Control Act levels and use alternative savings to replace that law's future sequesters (by a recorded vote of 163 ayes to 262 noes, Roll No. 150). **Pages H1776–89**

H. Res. 597, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution, was agreed to yesterday, March 28th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow, March 30th; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, April 3rd; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Friday, April 6th; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, April 10th; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, April 13th; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, April 16th. **Page H1795**

Public Interest Declassification Board—Reappointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Minority Leader, in which she reappointed Mr. David E. Skaggs of Longmont, Colorado to the Public Interest Declassification Board. **Page H1795**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H1795.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1751, H1761–62, H1762, H1775, H1788–89, and H1794–95. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

Committee Meetings

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—SECURITY CHALLENGES IN LATIN AMERICA

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a hearing on Security Challenges in Latin America. Testimony was heard from Kevin Whitaker, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs; William R. Brownfield, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs; and Mark Feierstein, USAID Assistant Administrator for Latin American and the Caribbean Bureau.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—DOT AND HUD MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Management Issues. Testimony was heard from Calvin L. Scovel III, Inspector General, Department of Transportation; David Montoya, Inspector General, Department of Housing and Urban Development; Phillip Herr, Government Accountability Office; Mathew Scire, Government Accountability Office; and Valerie Melvin, Government Accountability Office.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on FY 2013 Budget Request for Intelligence Community. This was a closed hearing.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—PUBLIC WITNESS DAY

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing on FY 2013 Budget Issues for Public Witnesses. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—PACIFIC COMMAND/KOREA

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies held a hearing on FY 2013 Budget Request Pacific Command/Korea. Testimony was heard from Admiral Samuel Locklear, PACOM Commander; and General James Thurman, U.S. Forces Korea.

U.S. NAVAL VESSEL ACQUISITION PROGRAM—NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a hearing on oversight of U.S. Naval Vessel Acquisition Programs and Force Structure of the Department of the Navy in the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Budget Request. Testimony was heard from Sean Stackley, USN, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition; Vice Admiral Terry Blake, USN, Deputy Chief Naval Operations for Integration of Capabilities and Resources (N–8); Lieutenant General Richard Mills, Deputy Commander for Combat Development and Integration; and public witnesses.

PRICE OF ENERGY SECURITY: FROM BATTLEFIELDS TO BASES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing on What is the Price of Energy Security: from Battlefields to Bases. Testimony was heard from Sharon Burke, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy, Department of Defense; Katherine Hammack, Assistant Secretary of the Army

Installations, Energy, and the Environment; Jackalyne Pfannenstiel, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Energy, Installations and Environment; Terry Yonkers, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Installations, Environment and Logistics; and Dorothy Robyn, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment.

BALANCING PRIVACY AND INNOVATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a hearing entitled ''Balancing Privacy and Innovation: Does the President's Proposal Tip the Scale?''. Testimony was heard from Jon Leibowitz, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; Lawrence E. Strickling, Assistant Secretary for Communication and Information, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Semi-Annual Report of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau''. Testimony was heard from Richard Cordray, Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

ASSESSING CHINA'S ROLE AND INFLUENCE IN AFRICA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights held a hearing entitled ''Assessing China's Role and Influence in Africa''. Testimony was heard from Donald Y. Yamamoto, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; Carolyn Bartholomew, Commissioner, United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission; and public witnesses.

FISCAL YEAR 2013 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE DEPARTMENT HOMELAND SECURITY'S OFFICE OF HEALTH AFFAIRS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications held a hearing entitled ''The Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Request for the Department Homeland Security's Office of Health Affairs''. Testimony was heard

from Alexander Garza, Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs,

Chief Medical Officer, Department of Homeland Security.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition and the Internet held a hearing on H.R. 1946, the "Preserving Our Hometown Independent Pharmacies Act of 2011". Testimony was heard from Rich Feinstein, Director of the Bureau of Competition, Federal Trade Commission; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs held a hearing on the following: H.R. 1917, the "Joint Ventures for Bird Habitat Conservation Act of 2011"; H.R. 1960, the "North American Wetlands Conservation Extension Act 2011"; and H.R. 3074, the "Cormorant Management and Natural Resources Protection Act". Testimony was heard from Representatives Peterson and Klein (MN); Jerome Ford, Assistant Director for Migratory Birds, Fish and Wildlife Service; Jimmy Anthony, Assistant Secretary, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries; Robert Ellis, Deputy Director, Bureau of Wildlife Resources, Virginia Department of Wildlife and Fisheries; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands held a hearing on the following: H.R. 1241, the "Rio Grande del Norte National Conservation Area Establishment Act"; H.R. 1818, the "Mt. Andrea Lawrence Designation Act of 2011"; H.R. 2984, the "Maine Coastal Islands Wilderness Act of 2011"; and H.R. 4234, the "Grazing Improvement Act of 2012". Testimony was heard from Representative Luján; Leslie A. C. Weldon, Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Mike Pool, Deputy Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior; and public witnesses.

SECURITY POLICY JEOPARDIZING USAID RECONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND PERSONNEL IN AFGHANISTAN

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security, Homeland Defense, and Foreign Operations held a hearing entitled "Are Changes in Security Policy Jeopardizing USAID Reconstruction Projects and Personnel in Afghanistan?". Testimony was heard from Steven Trent, Acting Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction; and J. Alexander Their, Assistant to the Administrator for the Office of Afghanistan and Pakistan Affairs, USAID.

FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH: EXAMINING PUBLIC ACCESS AND SCHOLARLY PUBLICATION INTERESTS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight held a hearing entitled "Federally Funded Research: Examining Public Access and Scholarly Publication Interests". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability and Memorial Affairs held a hearing on the following: H.R. 4142, the "American Heroes COLA Act"; H.R. 4114, the "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2012"; H.R. 2051, the "Veterans Missing in America Act of 2011"; H.R. 2498, the "Veterans Day Moment of Silence Act"; H.R. 2377, the "Rating and Processing Individuals' Disability Claims Act"; H.R. 2717, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate one city in the United States each year as an 'American World War II City', and for other purposes; and H.R. 4168, the "Caring for the Fallen Act". Testimony was heard from Representatives Guinta; Frank (MA); McIntyre; and Donnelly; Colonel Thomas Moe, Director, Ohio Department of Veterans Services; Max Cleland, Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission; Thomas Murphy, Director of Compensation Service, Veterans Benefits Administration; and public witnesses.

INDIVIDUAL AND EMPLOYER MANDATES IN THE DEMOCRATS' HEALTH CARE LAW

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on individual and employer mandates in the Democrats' health care law. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 30, 2012

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, April 2

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will meet in pro forma session.

Unless the Senate has received a message from the House of Representatives that the House has adopted S. Con. Res. 38, Adjournment Resolution. And if the Senate has received such a message, the Senate stand adjourned until 2 p.m., on Monday, April 16, 2012.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11 a.m., Friday, March 30

House Chamber

Program for Friday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 11 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Adams, Sandy, Fla., E498
Akin, W. Todd, Mo., E491
Bachmann, Michele, Minn., E484
Baldwin, Tammy, Wisc., E484, E509
Barton, Joe, Tex., E495
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E483
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E507, E510
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E490
Bonamici, Suzanne, Ore., E491
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E487, E506
Buerkle, Ann Marie, N.Y., E505
Cantor, Eric, Va., E482
Carson, André, Ind., E507
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E505
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E507
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E495
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E488
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E483, E484, E485, E486, E487, E488, E498, E500, E503
Emerson, Jo Ann, Mo., E502
Fattah, Chaka, Pa., E490
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E501, E506, E510
Forbes, J. Randy, Va., E489
Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E492
Griffin, Tim, Ark., E500, E508
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E501
Hensarling, Jeb, Tex., E492, E494
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E486
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E481
Huelskamp, Tim, Kans., E499
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E487
Lance, Leonard, N.J., E507
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E500, E501
Lewis, Jerry, Calif., E486
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E494
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E489
Long, Billy, Mo., E487, E493, E498, E500, E502, E505, E511
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E481, E485, E487, E493, E498, E500, E502, E505, E511
Lungren, Daniel E., Calif., E497
McCarthy, Kevin, Calif., E507
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E481
McNerney, Jerry, Calif., E496
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E484
Markey, Edward J., Mass., E485
Meehan, Patrick, Pa., E489
Miller, George, Calif., E486
Moran, James P., Va., E482, E506
Neugebauer, Randy, Tex., E496
Pastor, Ed, Ariz., E482
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E506, E508
Reyes, Silvestre, Tex., E490
Richardson, Laura, Calif., E492, E495
Roby, Martha, Ala., E510
Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho, Northern Mariana Islands, E491
Schilling, Robert T., Ill., E503
Scott, David, Ga., E489
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E503
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E502
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E483, E485, E487, E494, E499, E501, E503, E505, E511
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E491
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E502
Walden, Greg, Ore., E499, E510
Waters, Maxine, Calif., E493
Watt, Melvin L., N.C., E498
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E495, E498
Wilson, Frederica S., Fla., E484
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E496
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E506, E508
Yoder, Kevin, Kans., E488
Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E482

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.